

Vol 2 Issue 4 Oct 2014

ISSN No: 2321-5488

---

*International Multidisciplinary  
Research Journal*

# Research Directions

---

Editor-in-Chief  
S.P. Rajguru

**Welcome to Research Direction**  
**ISSN No.2321-5488**

Research Direction Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double-blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

**CHIEF PATRON**

Mr. Sanjeev Patil  
Chairman :  
Central Div. Rayat Shikshan Sanstha, Satara.

**PATRON**

Suhasini Shan  
Chairman -  
LMC & Director - Precision Industries, Solapur.

**EDITOR IN CHIEF**

S.P. Rajguru  
Asst. Prof. (Dept. of English) Rayat Shikshan Sanstha's,  
L. B. P. Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur. (M.S.)

***Sub Editors (Dept. Of Humanities & Social Science)***

Dr. Prakash M. Badiger  
Guest Faculty, Dept. Of History,  
Gulbarga University, Gulbarga.

Nikhilkumar D. Joshi  
Gujrat

Dr. Kiranjeet Kaur

Nikhil Joshi  
Dept. of English G.H. Patel College of  
Engineering and Technology, Gujrat.

***Advisory Board***

S. N. Gosavi

Shrikant Yelegaonkar

Punjabrao Rongre

D. R. More

T. N. Kolekar

Seema Naik

M. L. Jadhav

Annie John

Suhas Nimbalkar

Adusumalli Venkateswara Raw

Deepa P. Patil

R.D. Bawdhankar

Ajit Mondal

***Guest Referee***

Maryam Ebadi Asayesh  
Islamic Azad University, Iran

Henry Hartono  
Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

Judith F. Balares Salamat  
Department of Humanities, IASPI, Philippines

Mukesh Williams  
University of Tokyo, Japan

**Address:-Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India**  
**Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.ror.isrj.org**

---

## SURVEY RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi

Assistant Professor A.R. Burla Vartishta Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur.

**Abstract:**—Overview examination is a real apparatus for offering truths information as a powerful influence for political science speculations (Brady, 2000). The route in which overview scientists do in this way, by gathering information from the few to sum up to the a lot of people, is at the end of the day experiencing a time of significant change. In the last critical time of progress, review examination moved from a dependence on vis-à-vis talking with in respondent homes amid the 1960s to the less expensive and quicker universe of phone reviewing in the 1970s and 1980s. Today, as the 21st century achieves its second decade, this move to an innovation interceded knowledge of the review meeting proceeds (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009).

**Keywords:**Survey Research , Political Science , gathering information .

### INTRODUCTION

The upset in computerized interchanges innovation has realized significantly greater changes, from the enduring supplanting of landlines with phones to the extension and frequent dependence of an ever-bigger number of Americans on the Internet. What's more in spite of the fact that review specialists have managed open wariness of surveying and a refusal to take an interest some time recently, today it is higher than any other time. By the by, review research has dependably been an investigative instrument moving with the predominating social patterns (Tourangeau, 2004). As the investigation of overview examination has turned into an experimental order of its own, review explore in political science is decently arranged to meet these difficulties and will adjust to do so.

### II. ESSENTIAL IDEAS IN SURVEY RESEARCH

In spite of the fact that these overviews all impart a typical sympathy toward comprehension the convictions, demeanor, and estimations of mass popularity based publics, a general meaning of an exploratory study is shockingly subtle, given the numerous courses in which overview exploration is led. At its center, review examination is the methodology of gathering information from a little piece of a populace to put forth general expressions, or inductions, about attributes of the bigger populace (de Leeuw, Hox, & Dillman, 2008a). These information are gathered by having individuals answer inquiries to create a set of efficient depictions of the example (Weisberg, 2005). The establishment of this methodology is constructed from composing a review poll and drawing a specimen of people to question.

#### A. Review Questionnaire Design

In the right on time to mid-twentieth century, the work of composing study inquiries and

Please cite this Article as :Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi , “SURVEY RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE” :  
Research Directions (Oct; 2014)

laying out an overview survey looked like the craft of an artist; tasteful standards and gifted specialty brought about a work reflecting the vision of its maker and acknowledged on her terms. Today, be that as it may, science has supplanted workmanship; a vigorous writing testing essentially all parts of study survey configuration gives solid direction to scientists (Schaeffer & Presser, 2003). In spite of the fact that excessively voluminous to be condensed here, there are three vital perspectives: (1) distinctions being referred to structure from open- to shut finished, (2) how occasion review and disposition inquiries are replied, and (3) results of the stating and request of study inquiries.

### 1. Open and Closed Ended Questions

The most fundamental refinement inside study surveys is between open- and shut finished inquiries. Open-finished inquiries are conversational, for example, a question the ANES (2004) hosts got some information about gatherings: "I'd now like to ask you what you think are the great and awful focuses about the two national gatherings. Is there anything specifically that you like about the Democratic Party?" If the respondent says, "Yes," then the questioner asks, "What is that?" The questioner records everything the respondent says. Ordinarily, study specialists break down open-finished reactions by classifying expressions, numbering notice of a subject, for example, their handling of the economy. Open-finished inquiries are exorbitant in overview time to oversee and examine via analysts; hence, shut finished inquiries are substantially more regular in review research. Shut finished inquiries give reaction alternatives to a respondent to distinguish and select. There are numerous methods for organizing the reaction choices for shut finished inquiries, however the most well-known is to ask a respondent to choose a thing from a rating scale.

Two separate sorts of rating scales show up in Table 1. The upper 50% of the figure shows a bipolar reaction scale for gaging a respondent's ideological ID. The scale ranges from two shafts, greatly liberal to a great degree progressive. In noting the inquiry, the respondent is asked to choose both a course and quality of ideological personality. For the procedure to be as substantial and solid as could reasonably be expected, all focuses on the scale are named. Respondents who haven't pondered it are prohibited from the scale. In the lower a large portion of Table 1, respondents are given a spreading scale that unfolds in two steps. Respondents first select a heading of their gathering ID (Democrat, Republican, or Independent), then second, select a quality of ID, solid or not extremely solid, and if Independent, whether they incline to either party. Albeit both scale sorts are worthy, spreading arrangements are wanted to bipolar reaction scales in which not all focuses on the bipolar scale are named (Krosnick & Berent, 1993).

### 2. Noting Factual Recall and Attitude Questions

Shut finished inquiries may be utilized to gage respondent review of goal authentic data. Case in point, an analyst may ask, "How long in the previous week did you watch the national system news on TV?" The reaction plan B range from "1 day" to "7 days." In noting such inquiries, respondents might essentially endeavor to review the previous week's calendar and gauge (or review from working memory) the right reply. (This portrayal rearranges a complex procedure depicted in more noteworthy detail in Tourangeau, Rips, & Rasinski, 2000.) In political reviews, such inquiries are generally of less enthusiasm than those evaluating a respondent's demeanor or their positive or negative supposition around a political gathering, chose authority, or arrangement issue. In spite of the fact that marginally distinctive, the individual convictions in Table 1 additionally contain an evaluative perspective and are like state of mind. For respondents, the procedure of noting demeanor inquiries is in a far-reaching way distinctive and more intricate.

For instance, a mentality address normally asked in U.s. reviews is presidential support. In numerous contemporary studies, respondents are solicited, "Do you sanction or oppose from the way Barack Obama is taking care of his employment as president?" When respondents answer such inquiries, they don't haul previous assessments out of memory. Rather, feelings are built on the fly. Individuals draw on general values, inclinations, and sections of earlier convictions in communicating an assumption through a procedure termed conviction examining (Tourangeau et al.,

2000).

On account of President Obama, respondents could have an extensive variety of positive and negative contemplations inferred when asked. For instance, a respondent may have as of late seen a report depicting rewards paid to ransomed bank administrators on Wall Street, and when the respondent is later gotten some information about Obama, this thought rings a bell, drawing him or her to communicating objection to Obama's administration. For the most part, the equalization of negative or positive contemplations brings about a comparable bearing of disposition communicated by the respondent. One ramifications of conviction inspecting is that scientists ought not naturally incorporate a "don't have a clue" reaction elective in review inquiries focused around their supposition that respondents don't have a prior notion. Additionally, the vitality of the idea of conviction examining is that it is helpful for clarifying connection impacts in studies: how question wording and contrasts being referred to request can adjust overview results. An all the more inside and out discourse of conviction examining and connection impacts is Schwarz, Knäuper, Oyserman, and Stich (2008), while Asher (2007) gives an open acquaintance a reasonable application with the elucidation of survey results.

### 3. Review Question Wording and Order

Plainly, question wording and request is critical on account of the impact of words on the inspecting of contemplations. Unpretentious changes being referred to wording can adjust the contemplations inferred. Asher (2007) examines a sample in which Americans were approached about their backing for cuts in state administrations; when respondents were given the choice of slicing what was termed support to the penniless, just 8% picked this alternative, however when the alternative was substituted with the term open welfare, 39% picked it. The term welfare clearly prepared considerably more negative contemplations. The most general guidance about composing review inquiries is to be mindful of how such wording changes can influence results. Past that, inquiries ought to be worded in such a route, to the point that terms are characterized as solidly as could be allowed, utilizing impartial, straightforward dialect, while maintaining a strategic distance from supposed twofold zoomed inquiries that allude to two subjects on the double.

The request of review inquiries can influence singular reactions in light of the fact that specific inquiries prime certain contemplations. Case in point, if one inquires as to whether they would say that over the previous year the country's economy has shown signs of improvement, stayed about the same, or deteriorated, before an inquiry on presidential regard, it would lead respondents to assess the president in light of financial contemplations. As a result of the potential for the request of inquiries to impact individual overview reactions, wherever conceivable proficient review specialists randomize the request of inquiries.

At a commonsense level, when building a poll scientists ought to have close by an extensive reference. Legitimate, breakthrough course readings are Fowler (2009) and Groves et al. (2004), and a somewhat dated course reading is Weisberg, Krosnick, and Bowen (1996). A fantastic reference with down to earth guidance is Dillman et al. (2009).

### B. Arbitrary Sampling

Given an overview survey and a populace of people to study, the specialist must draw a specimen from that populace. Randomization is the foundation of likelihood inspecting strategies and is the expert standard for study research. It is delineated in its purest structure in the straightforward arbitrary specimen by means of the utilization of an examining casing. A casing is a rundown of every last individual inside the number of inhabitants in investment. The specimen will be drawn from the people on the casing; the edge ought to precisely reflect the number of inhabitants in investment, or else the example will be liable to scope lapse: the contrast between the people showing up on the edge and in the populace. In a straightforward irregular example, all people in the populace have a known and nonzero, equivalent shot of being chosen. From the recorded components of the testing edge, a randomnumber generator could be utilized to choose the

comparing people recorded successively on the casing.

Next, an analyst would control an overview survey. With answers to these inquiries recorded from every part of the example, established hypotheses of factual induction from any starting measurements reading material could evaluate populace qualities inside a room for mistakes. With give or take 1,500 meetings, a specialist could gauge a trademark, (for example, party distinguishing proof) with an astounding level of exact precision, inside approximately two rate purposes of the genuine populace esteem.

In examining, be that as it may, there is frequently a disjuncture between the fundamental hypothesis and achievable practice. Straightforward arbitrary specimens are infrequently ever connected, in particular for any review of a geologically scattered populace, for example, a whole area or country. Consider two illustrations, the first from study examination including vis-à-vis meetings of broadly illustrative American voters and the second from arbitrary digit dial (RDD) phone reviewing, the two surveying strategies most regularly utilized as a part of vast scale explore over the previous century.

### **1. Up close and personal Interviews and Area Probability Cluster Sampling**

Amid the 1950s, the time portrayed by Weisberg (2005) as the time of professionalization and extension of study research, a vast extent of American families still did not have a phone. Real national studies of the day, for example, the Gallup Poll and the ANES were led in individual; questioners flew out to the homes of review respondents. Without an exact inspecting edge of American nationals of voting age (the ANES study populace), a basic arbitrary specimen was (and stays) unthinkable. Regardless of the fact that it were conceivable, gathering eye to eye with a straightforward irregular example of Americans spread over the United States would be restrictively lavish. So the strategy for drawing specimens for such talks with has depended on an option that does not oblige a national inspecting casing and arbitrarily disseminated meetings: range likelihood group testing (Weisberg et al., 1996).

Zone likelihood bunch testing for eye to eye overviews, for example, the ANES happens in stages, bringing about a broadly illustrative specimen of people talked with in local groups. Initially, the United States would be partitioned into totally unrelated essential inspecting units (Psus, for example, metropolitan factual ranges (huge urban communities) or sets of country districts. Testing is stratified by locale, examining units from inside the north, south, east, and west of the nation. Second, utilizing maps of the zones inside every PSU, various city pieces and comparative country regions are inspected as lumps. At the third stage, an inspecting edge is built of all the lodging units inside these squares. At that point, fourth, individual lodging units are inspected, and from inside every one, an individual family part is chosen for the meeting. (A typical technique for determination is to question the qualified individual with the latest birthday.) The result is a broadly illustrative example; what may not be conceivable, be that as it may, is surmising to every U.s. state, since meetings in little states may happen in stand out city or area. There are numerous different viewpoints to this system; see Fowler (2009) for a further exchange.

This approach has remained the platinum standard for attaining astounding information and reaction rates and can be connected to any topographically characterized range. In creating nations, it is the essential device for national overview research. All things considered, vis-à-vis studies are progressively lavish to lead. A current general guideline is that in the United States, the reviews cost more or less \$1,000 every questioned respondent. Contrasted and more or less \$5 for 15 minutes of time with a respondent on a RDD survey, national vis-à-vis meeting surveys are expense restrictive for about all reasons.

### **2. Phone Surveys in the RDD Poll**

Reviews directed by means of the landline phone turned into the standard in mass review research with the coming of RDD procedure. Starting in the 1970s, with sufficient scope of landline phones over the United States, the less expensive expense of reaching respondents via telephone

implied that analysts could all the more rapidly and effectively finish their work. (For an exchange of these advancements, see the 2007 extraordinary issue of *Public Opinion Quarterly* on phone studying.) Thus started the prime of the RDD survey, which stretched out through the 1980s and into the 1990s.

To make phone testing expense effective, analysts needed to decide how to disconnect private phone numbers out of all the conceivable numbers, for example, those no more meeting expectations or doled out to a location other than a private family unit, which was the situation for most phone numbers. Haphazardly dialing any phone number, like a straightforward arbitrary example, would turn out to be excessively wasteful. The Mitofsky-waksberg (MW) system was the first convention to create a productive option, in view of the rationale of bunch examining (Tourangeau, 2004). Private phone numbers have never been spread arbitrarily all through every mix of 7-digit phone numbers; the MW system gave an approach to reach more private phone numbers with less dialing.

The MW technique is a two-stage testing configuration, starting with distinguishing proof of examining bunches and after that proceeding with inspecting of people (Brick & Tucker, 2007). Consider a phone number, given a zone code (curtailed AAA), a prefix (PPP), and the last four numbers (SSRR): AAA-PPP-SSRR. Since private phone numbers have a tendency to be bunched together, in the WM technique, numbers are chosen in bunches. From a zone code and prefix (AAA-PPP) bank, phone numbers are examined by arbitrarily selecting a SS parcel of the addition. At that point, in the second stage, two RR numbers are arbitrarily picked, and that phone number is dialed. In the event that it is not a private number, that specific phone bank is disposed of, and the specialist proceeds onward to the following bunch. In the event that it is a private number, then the specialist keeps on dialling extra numbers by arbitrarily picking RR numbers inside the bunch, maybe directing upwards of 10 meetings inside the group.

The WM technique is still utilized today (Brick & Tucker, 2007; Lepkowski et al., 2008). Obviously, the technique has developed (Dillman et al., 2009), since in the course of recent years phone administration has extended drastically and private lines are less thickly relegated to specific banks of numbers, decreasing the proficiency of RDD phone reviews (Tucker & Lepkowski, 2008). Accordingly, today, analysts progressively utilize RDD strategies supplemented by obtained arrangements of working banks that capacity much like an inspecting edge (Tourangeau, 2004).

Consequently, RDD surveys have gotten to be more lavish, especially with the across the board utilization of guest ID and voice message for screening calls from surveyors. Confronted with progressively hard to-achieve respondents, a few specialists may be enticed to take the less expensive, off base choice to supplant these family units in the specimen with an extra, simpler to-achieve family. Such a choice can result in issues when there is a huge distinction between the two sets of respondents. For instance, amid the 2008 Democratic presidential essential in New Hampshire, overview analysts overestimated backing for Senator Obama while thinking little of it for Senator Clinton; the harder-to-achieve family units had a tendency to help Clinton, skewing the results since they were barred from examples (American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2009). Yet the greater sympathy toward the eventual fate of phone studies is the development of cell phones and the potential for a scope predisposition because of the expanding number of Americans who own cell phones yet not landlines and are in this way avoided from (not secured in) the customary phone technique.

#### IV. NEW WEB SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Any easy web surfer must perceive the universality of reviews led over Internet web programs, from the one- or two-inquiry glimmer surveys showing up on news sites to client fulfillment overviews and email requesting for protracted showcasing studies. Web studies are focused around an extensive variety of review examining methodology; despite the fact that news blaze surveys may not in any case be illustrative of guests to a specific site, other web overviews are focused around exceedingly experimental, exact likelihood tests. At its center, the web gives a study mode: an interface for leading reviews, free of a specific testing procedure. Albeit more seasoned

review procedures, for example, RDD surveys, intimate both the inspecting system (RDD) and a meeting mode (phone), Web reviews suggest nothing (Couper & Miller, 2008). The utilization of web overviews over a wide scope of examining purposes has produced a rich show of improvements in web review innovation, especially programming, the assortments of which are awfully various and diffuse to adequately outline here. (An extensive asset for engineering and grant of web overviews is the site for Web Survey Methods: <http://www.websm.org/>) Yet what is considered here are two concerns: One is a key peculiarity of web reviews and wellspring of new research, and the second is a ramifications of an unfulfilled guarantee for web studies to convey shoddy yet highquality information.

Contrasted and overview systems for vis-à-vis or phone meetings, web overviews are not questioner supported, since much review scrutinize progressively is through advanced correspondences innovation. However customary paper-and-pencil reviews, as well, are not questioner supported. Furthermore web reviews have a tendency to be designed according to the paper-and-pencil overviews of eras back; the design of the more famous online web study organizations offering free review facilitating are designed according to this format. Some mourn this state, requiring an examination concerning the rich capability of web overviews to communicate with the respondent through media (Couper, 2007). Couper (2008) has composed a thorough web study plan manual. Others find that the pencil-and-paper strategy has kept on being the most alluring for gathering solid and substantial information (Dillman et al., 2009).

As web study philosophies created, analysts planned to reveal another system that would prompt inconceivable new routines for gathering new overview information. Yet overview research has not yet done so. At any rate for the time being, it doesn't give the idea that the organization of reviews through the web has conveyed on trusts that this mode would recover the reaction rates of yesteryear or of the phone review undertaking in its prime. Reaction rates for web overviews seem, by all accounts, to be no more noteworthy than those for other overview techniques (Couper & Miller, 2008). Yet it does show up, notwithstanding, that a web review could supplement other, more conventional overview modes as a method for decreasing study costs. Respondents can answer web overviews, while more extravagant mail-back or face-toface study modes could be utilized for different respondents (Rookey, Hanway, & Dillman, 2008). The utilization of these blended modes of review exploration is prone to turn into a standard piece of overview examination ventures (de Leeuw, Hox, & Dillman, 2008b).

One of the key advantages of web reviews is the democratizing impact of Internet engineering. Lower expenses extend the range of leading overviews to more analysts, yet the commonplace difficulties from unequal Internet get to still remain (Couper & Miller, 2008). In view of the proceeded with advanced partition (the methodical contrasts between those with home-based, predictable access to broadband Internet and those without), the test stays of respondent Internet access, representation, and generalizability from the example to the populace (Groves et al., 2004). Yet in light of the issue of scope predisposition in web reviews, various developments have developed, smearing the refinement in the middle of likelihood and nonprobability testing.

#### CONCLUSION:

The difficulties confronting study research for the 21st century are incredible, yet it would be untimely to start penning the system's tribute. Overview research has confronted comparative difficulties in the past and been the subject of feedback that the business would decrease. At the point when overview analysts confronted seriously declining reaction rates for vis-à-vis overviews in the 1960s, some addressed whether studies would survive. As opposed to declining, review examination flourished, prompting the across the board logical investigation of overview polls and testing philosophies. So today, review specialists will meet the difficulties of the current period. No other exploration apparatus encourages the investigation of populace attributes on the premise of a generally little specimen and study research. Indeed difficulties, for example, the improvement of cell phone advances will probably turn out to be surmountable. The spread of Internet access, further advancement of interpersonal interaction innovation, and the proceeded with development of elite



PDA possession will probably be future exploration subjects, guaranteeing the spot of study research in political science.

Peruse all exploration paper illustrations or perspective political science examination paper themes.

#### REFERENCES:

1. American Association for Public Opinion Research, Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling. (2009). An evaluation of the methodology of the 2008 pre election primary polls. Retrieved from <http://www.aapor.org/Home.htm>
2. American National Election Studies. (2004). Codebook variable documentation file. Retrieved January 8, 2014, from <http://www.electionstudies.org/study pages/2004prepost/nes04var.txt>
3. Asher, H. B. (2007). *Polling and the public: What every citizen should know*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
4. Bethlehem, J., & Stoop, I. (2007). Online panels A paradigm theft? Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Survey Computing, University of Southampton, UK.
5. Biemer, P. P., & Christ, S. (2008). Weighting survey data. In E. D. de Leeuw, J. J. Hox, & D. A. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 317-341). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
6. Blumberg, S. J. (2007). Coverage bias in traditional telephone surveys of low income and young adults. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71, 734-749.
7. Blumberg, S. J., & Luke, J. V. (2009). Wireless substitution: Early release of estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, July-December 2008. National Center for Health Statistics. Retrieved January 8, 2014, from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm>
8. Brady, H. E. (2000). Contributions of survey research to political science. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 33, 47-57.
9. Brick, J. M., & Tucker, C. (2007). Mitofsky Waksberg: Learning from the past. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71, 703-716.
10. Couper, M. P. (2007). Whither the web: Web 2.0 and the changing world of web surveys. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Survey Computing, University of Southampton, UK.
11. Couper, M. P. (2008). *Designing effective web surveys*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
12. Couper, M. P., & Miller, P. V. (2008). Web survey methods: Introduction. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 831-835.
13. de Leeuw, E. D., Hox, J. J., & Dillman, D. A. (2008a). The cornerstones of survey research. In E. D. de Leeuw, J. J. Hox, & D. A. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 1-17). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
14. de Leeuw, E. D., Hox, J. J., & Dillman, D. A. (2008b). *International handbook of survey methodology*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
15. Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed mode surveys: The tailored design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
16. Fowler, F. J., Jr. (2009). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
17. Gaines, B. J., Kuklinski, J. H., & Quirk, P. J. (2007). The logic of the survey experiment reexamined. *Political Analysis*, 15, 1-20.
18. Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Jr., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
19. Harkness, J. A., Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Mohler, P. P. (2003). *Cross cultural survey methods*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
20. Keeter, S., Kennedy, C., Clark, A., Tompson, T., & Mokrzycki, M. (2007). What's missing from national landline RDD surveys? The impact of the growing cell only population. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71, 772-792.
21. Kempf, A. M., & Remington, P. L. (2007). New challenges for telephone survey research in the twenty first century. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 28, 113-126.
22. Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 537-567.

23. Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1993). Comparisons of party identification and policy preferences: The impact of survey question format. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37, 941-964.
24. Lavrakas, P. J. (1993). *Telephone survey methods: Sampling, selection, and supervision*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
25. Lee, S. (2006). Propensity score adjustment as a weighting scheme for volunteer panel web surveys. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 22, 329-349.
26. Lee, S., & Valliant, R. (2009). Estimation for volunteer panel web surveys using propensity score adjustment and calibration adjustment. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 37, 319-343.
27. Lepkowski, J. M., Tucker, C., Brick, J. M., de Leeuw, E. D., Japec, L., Lavrakas, P. J., et al. (Eds.). (2008). *Advances in telephone survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
28. Lupia, A. (2002). New ideas in experimental political science. *Political Analysis*, 10, 319-324.
29. Rookey, B. D., Hanway, S., & Dillman, D. A. (2008). Does a probability based household panel benefit from assignment to postal response as an alternative to Internet only? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 962-984.
30. Schaeffer, N. C., & Presser, S. (2003). The science of asking questions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 65-88.
31. Schwarz, N., Knäuper, B., Oyserman, D., & Stich, C. (2008). The psychology of asking questions. In E. D. de Leeuw, J. J. Hox, & D. A. Dillman (Eds.), *International handbook of survey methodology* (pp. 18-34). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
32. Sniderman, P. M., & Grob, D. B. (1996). Innovations in experimental design in attitude surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 377-399.
33. Tourangeau, R. (2004). Survey research and societal change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 775-801.
34. Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., & Rasinski, K. A. (2000). *The psychology of the survey response*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
35. Tucker, C., & Lepkowski, J. M. (2008). Telephone survey methods: Adapting to change. In J. M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J. M. Brick, E. D. de Leeuw, L. Japec, P. J. Lavrakas, et al. (Eds.), *Advances in telephone survey methodology* (pp. 3-28). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
36. Web survey methods: <http://www.websm.org/>
37. Weisberg, H. F. (2005). *The total survey error approach: A guide to the new science of survey research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
38. Weisberg, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. D. (1996). *An introduction to survey research, polling, and data analysis* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



**Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi**

Assistant Professor A.R. Burla Vartishta Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur.

## Publish Research Article International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

### Associated and Indexed

- PDOAJ
- Directory of Research Journals Researchbib
- SocioSite
- Tjdb

**Frequency: Monthly**

International Research Directions Journal

**Review & Advisory Board :**

Research Directions Journal is seeking scholars.

Those who are interested in our serving as our volunteer Editorial Review Board, Editorial Board and Advisory Board.

**Call for editorial board:**

All of faculties, experts and researchers are invited to join us as member of editorial board.

For applying, send your CV at [researchdirection2013@gmail.com](mailto:researchdirection2013@gmail.com) / [researchdirection@yahoo.com](mailto:researchdirection@yahoo.com).

We welcome you in research documentation.

Email: [researchdirection2013@gmail.com](mailto:researchdirection2013@gmail.com) / [researchdirection@yahoo.com](mailto:researchdirection@yahoo.com)

Research Direction Journal

Editor-in-Chief:

Prof. Santosh P. Rajguru

Address for Correspondence

56, 'PARASHURAM' Ayodhya Nagari, Near Reliance Office,  
Hydrabad Road, Dahitane,

Solapur-413006. (Maharashtra)

Email: [researchdirection2013@gmail.com](mailto:researchdirection2013@gmail.com)

cell: 9822870742