SURVEY RESEARCH FEEDBACK: ASSESSING AND MOVING BEYOND

American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences
16th Annual Meeting
Las Vegas, Nevada
February 14-15, 2013

George Beam
Associate Professor
Department of Public Administration
University of Illinois at Chicago
Email: gbeam@uic.edu
Website: www.george-beam.com

SURVEY RESEARCH FEEDBACK: ASSESSING AND MOVING BEYOND[i]

Survey research[ii] feedback—in contrast to naturally occurring feedback in which part of the output of a system returns to its input to regulate its further output for optimal operation—is information based on answers to questions. Answers are unreliable (may or may not be correct) and, therefore, may, or may not, regulate output for optimal operation. Moving beyond survey research feedback occurs when reliable information (obtained by observation, experiments, formal/predictive models, documents, and comparison of non-asking phenomena) regulates output, and when antecedent control and consequence control are practiced.

Feedback, as natural phenomena—for example, in biology—is part of the output (of any living thing) that returns as input (to the living thing) to regulate its further output. Natural feedback (excluding major and sudden disruptions to the system in which the feedback occurs) always works; i.e., via positive and negative feedback, natural systems operate/perform optimally.

Assessing Survey Research Feedback

Survey research feedback (concerning a program, policy, or any other human-made object) is answers to questions and, as will be shown in the remainder of this section, unreliable information; i.e., information that may, or may not, be correct or accurate. Because survey research feedback is unreliable, it may not be able to keep the system of which it is a part operating optimally. (Also—and this will be discussed later—in many instances, survey research feedback does not keep the system operating optimally because it is not used to regulate output but, instead, is used to provide opportunities for respondents to express themselves, and for other purposes.)

Answers Unreliable

---

[i] Parts of this paper are based on George Beam, *The Problem with Survey Research* (Transaction, 2012).

[ii] Survey research is the use of any instrument or procedure that asks questions of respondents.

Answers to questions—whether produced by feedback or any other instrument or procedure that asks questions of respondents—are unreliable because when all you have are answers to questions it's impossible to know if the answers are correct (Category One Answers) or incorrect (Category Two Answers). It's not the every answer is incorrect; obviously, some are but, when all you have are answers, it's impossible to determine which, if any, are in either Category. The *only* way to know if answers are correct or incorrect is to check or verify them with information from one or, preferably, two or more non-asking sources of information; say, from observation, experimentation, and documents. Those who rely on survey research (for feedback or any other purpose) do not have information from non-asking sources and, therefore, not able to discern which, if any, answers are in Category One or Category Two; all survey researchers/askers have is unreliable information. Each of the four components of survey research, singly and in combination, makes answers unreliable: respondents, asking instruments, settings in which questions are asked and answers given, and survey researcher/askers themselves.

Respondents

Respondents make answers unreliable—i.e., give answers that may, or may not, correspond to what's really going on—and, thus, information in their answers may, or may not, be sufficient to regulate output optimally because they (1) sometimes lie[1], (2) often do not have relevant and correct information[2], (3) and because their values and norms affect answers[3], as do their (4) interest in[4], and (5) sensitivity to[5] question topics. Also, (6) answerers' memory biases responses[6], (7) they are not always who they say they are[7], (8) those dissatisfied (with a product or program) are more likely to respond/give feedback than those satisfied[8], and there are (9) many other ways respondents make answers unreliable; e.g., by improperly marking Likert scales, by not following questionnaire branching instructions, and so on[9].

Instruments

Asking instruments (surveys, interviews, focus groups, and other types of asking) skew answers, producing information that may, or may not, be accurate. Thus, polls, interviews, and other survey research instruments (as is the case for respondents) do not produce reliable information for regulating further output. Evidence that asking instruments produce unreliable information is provided by numerous studies demonstrating (1) that asking instruments produce symbolic and unrealistic answers[10], (2) that each instrument produces different results[11], and that they (3) often generate inconsistent or conflicting answers[12], (4) much nonresponse[13] and, more often than not, (5) unrepresentative results[14].

Settings

Settings in which questions are asked and answers given make answers unreliable because settings are stimuli and reinforcers that skew answers into Category One or Category Two. Askers for feedback, having only answers to their questions, cannot identify which, if any, are in either Category; thus, they're not able to regulate output for optimum benefit.

Both types of settings, societal and immediate, have powerful attributes or components that affect answers[15]. Characteristics of, and forces within, societal settings—such as culture, laws, media, and socialization—bias answers, as do aspects of immediate asking settings, including third parties, gender of interviewer, whether the setting is the workplace, school, or home, and so on. Virtually every component of every setting "contaminates"[16]; forcing respondents to say what's compatible with each particular setting[17].

Askers

Askers, as is the case for instruments and settings, affect answers; thereby answers are made unreliable and unfit to regulate output for optimal operation. Characteristics of askers that cue and induce the answers they receive include their styles of behavior (e.g., asking questions rapidly, pausing, voice intonation, and so on[18]) as well as their personal attributes, such as judgments when coding responses, experiences, competencies, ethnicity, socioeconomic features, gender, and age[19].

Survey Research Feedback for Self Expression and Other Purposes

Of course, people should be asked for feedback because both askers and answers benefit. Answerers feel better than those who've not been asked. Askers, as a result of answerers feeling better, are in a more pleasant and productive relationship with answerers—and correct information might be obtained.

Survey research feedback also is used by organizations, groups, and individuals for promotion and sales. For example, university alumni associations ask for feedback via surveys of members to promote the association and induce renewals. However, those who ask for feedback for sales, promotion, and the like, need to keep in mind that the only way to know if information in feedback answers is correct—and, thus, the type of action required to regulate output for optimum output (in sales, promotion, or anything else)—is to check answers with data from two or more non-asking sources. Ask for feedback, but don't rely on it.

Moving Beyond Survey Research Feedback

Moving beyond survey research feedback requires (1) obtaining information from observation, documents, experiments, formal/predictive models, and comparison of non-asking phenomena. (When two or more of these sources or procedures are used to determine if the data from each are compatible, or moving in the same direction, the reliability of the acquired information is enhanced[20].) (2) Also, antecedent control and consequence control are procedures that effectively regulate output for optimal operation.

Observation

The greater value of data produced by observation over answers produced by questions and, thus the greater value of observation-based information for regulating output, is captured in common speech; e.g., actions speak louder than words, and, do what I say, don't do as I do. Similarly, a maxim of political scientist, Arthur Bentley (1870-1957)—one of the first modern proponents of observation to collect data about what's really going on—was: observe "`something doing'"[21]; "actually performed . . . activities"[22]. Sociologist, C. Wright Mills, points out that answers to questions are unreliable because many times respondents do not say what they have done, or intend to do: "[O]ften there is a disparity between lingual and social-motor types of behavior. . . . [i.e.,] between talk and action"[23].

Observation, including observation of behavioral traces, produces reliable information about outputs of individuals and institutions, as well as of policies and programs (e.g., concerning illicit drug use, littering, taxes, recycling, and so on) that can be, and sometimes are, used as inputs to regulate further outputs of those policies and programs[24]. When you want to improve policy and program outputs, don't ask for feedback, observe.

Experiments

Another procedure for acquiring reliable information about output that can be used as input to regulate further output is to experiment with the inputs of a system to identify effects on outputs. An experiment is "a test or a series of test in which purposeful changes are made to the input variables of a process or system so that we may observe the reasons [causes[25]] for changes that may be observed in the output"[26]. Experiment-based studies have led to improvements in organizational personnel retention, productivity, as well as in educational and other social programs[27]. When you want to improve policy and program outputs, don't ask for feedback, experiment.

Models

Building and testing models is a research design for generating reliable data that can be used as input to improve further output. A formal, or logical, model is a simplified description of the object of investigation (e.g., a policy, program, or institution) from which hypotheses are deduced and, then, tested. Support for the deduced hypotheses is support for the model's assumptions, which are inputs for further output.

When a computer is used for modeling, it's called a simulation, a simulation model, or a computer simulation. An example of computer simulation, as well as its application to social, political, and organizational problems and issues, is a specific research design, named "system dynamics". As stated on the System Dynamics Society website: "System dynamics is a methodology for studying and managing . . . feedback systems, such as one finds in business and other social systems. . . . The methodology: identifies problem, develops a hypothesis explaining the cause of the problem, builds a computer simulation model of the system at the root of the problem, tests the model to be certain that it reproduces the behavior seen in the real world, devises and tests in the model alternative policies that alleviate the problem, and implements this solution"[28]. The "alternative policies" are the inputs for further outputs. Rather than using survey research for feedback to be used as input, generate input for further output by building and testing formal models. This is "essential" if the social sciences are to have greater and positive impacts on "the real world"[29].

Documents

Another method for collecting reliable information to be used as input for further output is document analysis[30] (or content analysis when maps, Internet sites, social media, and so on are included[31].) Analyses of budgets and other documents[32] provide reliable information about organizations[33]—and, more specifically, organizational decision making[34], budget decision making processes, structures, and personnel—as well as individual performance, organizational change, and strategy formation[35]. When you want to improve policy and program outputs, don't ask for feedback, analyze documents.

Comparison

Comparison is a social science procedure that generates reliable information that can be used as input to enhance further output. In one form of comparative research, an ideal type of the phenomenon investigated (e.g., bureaucracy, or a particular policy, program, or process), is constructed. Then, the ideal type is compared or contrasted with actual instances of the phenomenon and, on the basis of similarities and differences, hypotheses that postulate explanations—causes—for the similarities and differences are constructed and tested. Hypotheses supported by empirical evidence become inputs for the generation of further outputs.

Another variety of the comparative approach begins with identifications of similarities and differences between two or more actual instances of the phenomenon being investigated; then hypotheses are formed and tested, and when empirically substantiated become inputs for further output. Examples of this approach include comparing decision making in organizations, organizational personnel, environmental policies, bureaucratic systems, and so on[36]. Instead of asking for feedback, compare to generate input data for further output.

Antecedent Control and Consequence Control

Antecedent control and consequence control are, in contrast to survey research feedback, better able to improve the further output of the policies, programs, institutions, groups or individuals being investigated. Because outputs are functions of their antecedents and consequences, antecedent control and consequence control enhance outputs by controlling what stimulates (antecedents) and by controlling what reinforces them (consequences) consequences.

Antecedent Control

Optimizing output requires going beyond survey research feedback to antecedent control; to input control. Antecedent control is control over an output by control over its antecedent, its input. Control of the antecedent, the input, increases the likelihood that the desired output will occur[37].

Antecedent control, by identifying the input data that cause an output, can be preventive. For example, managers practicing antecedent control identify and resolve labor problems/issues as they arise; thereby preventing a strike. Also, "`[s]etting an objective, restructuring a boring task to make it more interesting, and providing skill training all amount to [antecedent] control because each is carried out *prior* to job performance'"[38].

Consequence Control

Although antecedents cue or stimulate outputs, the fact remains that outputs cannot be sustained without reinforcing consequences of the stimulated or cued outputs. Consequence control sustains the antecedent-cued output via positive or negative consequences of that output. Thus, consequence control is essential to keep the system at optimal output[39]. Practitioners of consequence control, to paraphrasing Skinner, control consequences that return as input and, thereby, increase the probability that the output that produced these consequences will occur again[40].

Conclusion

Survey research feedback produces unreliable information and, therefore, should not be used to evaluate outputs of policies, programs, institutions, or individuals. Reliable information for assessments and betterment is acquired from observation, experiments, logical/predictive models, documents, and comparison of non-asking phenomena. Also, outputs are enhanced by antecedent control and consequence control.

Endnotes

[1] Everyone knows that everyone, including respondents, lie and, depending upon circumstances (e.g., who's asking whom about what), quite often. See, e.g., James T. Bennett and Thomas J. DiLorenzo, *Official Lies: How Washington Misleads Us* (Alexandria, Virginia: Groom, 1992); Alex Rubner, *The Mendacious Colours of Democracy: The Anatomy of Benevolent Lying* (Charlottesville, Va.: Imprint Academic Philosophy Document Center, 2006), e.g., pp. 3, 40-41; David J. Lieberman, *Never Be Lied to Again* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998), p. 1; Sissela Box, *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life* (New York: Vintage, 1978); and, Jeremy Campbell, *The Liar's Tale: A History of Falsehood* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000).

[2] See, e.g., Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* New York: Pantheon, 1988, 2002); Noam Chomsky, *Chomsky on Miseducation* (Lanham: Roman & Littlefield, 2000); and Diane Ravitch, *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn* (New York: Vintage, 2003, 2004).

[3] See, e.g., Hugh J. Parry and Helen M. Crossley, "Validity of Responses to Survey Questions" *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Spring 1950), Vol. 14, No. 1, p. 56; David Riesman and Mark Benny, "Asking and Answering", *Journal of Business* (October 1956), Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 226-27; Brian D. Silver, Paul R. Ambramson, and Barbara A. Anderson, "The Presence of Others and Overreporting of Voting in American National Elections", *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Summer 1986), Vol. 50, No. 2, p. 235; Derek L. Phillips and Kevin J. Clancy, "Response Biases in Field Studies of Mental Illness", *American Sociological Review* (June 1970), Vol. 35, No. 3, p. 504. Stuart W. Cook and Claire Selltiz "A Multiple-Indicator Approach to Attitude Measurement", *Psychological Bulletin* (July 1964), Vol. 62, No. 1, p. 38; K. Anders Ericsson and Herbert A. Simon, *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*, Rev. ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1993), p. 44; and, Peter Brooks, *Troubling Confessions: Speaking Guilt in Law and Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000), p. 5.

[4] See, e.g., Carole L. Jurkiewicz and Kenneth L. Nichols, "Ethics Education in the MPA Curriculum: What Difference Does It Make?" *Journal of Public Affairs Education* (April 2002), Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 107; and Dana E. Dolsen and Gary E. Machlis, "Response Rates and Mail Recreation Survey Results: How Much Is Enough?" *Journal of Leisure Research* (1991), Vol. 23, No. 3, p. 273.

[5] See, e.g., Fendrich, Michael, et al., "Accuracy of Parent Mental Health Service Reporting: Results from a Reverse Record-Check Study", *Journal of American Academy of Child and*

Adolescent Psychology (February 1999), Vol. 38, No. 2, p. 148.

[6] Typically, the longer the interval separating the time when questions are asked from objects of inquiry, the greater the unreliability of answers. Charles F. Cannell and Robert Kahn, “Interviewing”, in Gardner Lindzey and Eliot Aronson, eds., *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2nd ed. (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968), pp. 54**???**-543, 560-563;--**check** page nos. Kent H. Marquis, *Record Check Validity of Survey Responses: A Reassessment of Bias in Reports of Hospitalizations*, (Santa Barbara: Calif.: RAND, May 1978), p. 42; and, Don Cahalan, “Correlates of Respondent Accuracy in the Denver Validity Survey”, *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 1968-1969), Vol. 32, No. 4, p. 609.

[7] See, e.g., Andrew Hacker, “Obama: The Price of Being Black”, *New York Review of Books* Sept. 25, 2008), p. 14; and, John Keilman and Deborah Horan, “The middle class: It’s a `state of mind’”, *Chicago Tribune* (April 10, 2008), sec. 1, p. 1.

[8] “[I]nbound communications [feedback] from customers [citizens, clients of programs] tend to include more complaints and negative comments than compliments or positive comments. Essentially, customers having negative experiences are overrepresented . . . , and the experiences of other customers are underrepresented, if not completely excluded”. D. Randall Brandt, “Hearing Aids: How well are you capturing the voice of the customer?” *Quality Progress* (Oct. 2012), p. 22.

[9] E.g., respondents make answers unreliable when, rather than responding to the questions put to them, make their own points. This is common practice by government officials, always crafting answers for maximum advantage.

[9] See, e.g., Gerhart Saenger and Emily Gilbert, “ Customer Reactions to the Integration of Negro Sales Personnel”, *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research* (1950), Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 71; Howard Schuman and Michael P. Johnson, “Attitudes and Behavior”, *Annual Review of Sociology* (1976, Vol. 2, pp. 197-98; and, Richard T. LaPiere, “Attitudes vs. Actions”, *Social Forces* (March 1934), Vol. 13, No. 1, p. 236.

[11] See, e.g., Daniel Katz, “Do Interviewers Bias Poll Results?” *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Summer 1942), Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 248; Herbert H. Hyman, “Do They Tell the Truth?” *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 1944-45), Vol. 8, No. 4, p. 558; Herbert B. Asher, *Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know*, 6th ed., Washington, D.C.: CQ, 2004), pp. 102, 186; Roger Tourangeau, et al., “Design and Results of the Women’s Health Study”, in Lana Harrison and Arthur Hughes, eds., *The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates*, (Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1993), pp. 344, 349; Adel V. Harrell, “The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use Data: The Accuracy of Responses on Confidential Self-Administered Answer Sheets”, in Lana Harrison and Arthur Hughes, eds., *The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates*, (Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1993), p. 41; and, Mick P. Couper, “Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches”, *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 2000), Vol. 64, No. 4, p. 472.

[12] Peter V. Miller, "Review: Is `Up' Right? The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse", *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 1997), Vol. 61, No. 4, p. 632; Bennett and DiLorenzo, *Official Lies*, p. 88; John Brehm, "Stubbing Our Toes for a Foot in the Door? Prior Contact, Incentives and Survey Response", *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* (1994), Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 56; and Michael Fendrich and Connie Vaughn, "Diminishing Lifetime Substance Use Over Time: An Inquiry into Differential Underreporting", *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Spring 1994), Vol. 58, No. 1, p. 119.

[13] See, e.g. Brehm, *International Journal of Public Opinion Research Public Opinion Research* (1994), Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 45; Edith de Leeuw and Wim de Heer, "Trends in Household Survey Nonresponse: A Longitudinal and International Comparison", in Robert M Groves, et al., eds., *Survey Nonresponse*, (New York: Wiley, 2002), pp. 52-53; Charlotte Steeh, et al., "Are They Really as Bad as They Seem? Nonresponse Rates at the End of the Twentieth Century", *Journal of Official Statistics* (2001), Vol. 17, No. 2, p. 227; and, B. K. Atrostic, et al., "Nonresponse in U.S. Government Household Surveys: Consistent Measures, Recent Trends, and New Insights", *Journal of Official Statistics* (2001), Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 223-224.

[14] See, e.g., Asher, *Polling and the Public*, 6th ed., pp. 101, 135; Thomas I. Miller and Michelle Miller Kobayashi, *Citizen Surveys: How to Do Them, How to Use Them, What They Mean,* 2ed., (Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association, 2000) p. 62; and Couper, *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 2000)Vol. 64, No. 2, p. 472.

[15] See, e.g., Barbara A. Anderson and Brian D. Silver, "The Validity of Survey Responses: Insights from Interviews of Married Couples in a Survey of Soviet Emigrants", *Social Forces* (Dec. 1987), Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 539, 540-41; Diane O'Rourke, "An Inquiry into Declining RDD Response Rates: Part IV: Lack of Standardization", *Survey Research Newsletter* (2000), Vol. 31, No.1, p. 1 [The *Survey Research Newsletter* is a publication of the Survey Research Center, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Chicago]; Anne Zanes and Euthemia Matsoukas, "Different Settings, Different Results? A Comparison of School and Home Responses", *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 1979), Vol. 43, No. 4, p. 552; and Schuman and Johnson, *Annual Review of Sociology* (1976), Vol. 2, p. 191.

[16] Anderson and Silver, *Social Forces* (Dec. 1987), Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 539, 540-41, and O'Rourke, *Survey Research Newsletter* (2000), Vol. 31, No. 1, p. 1.

[17] Schuman and Johnson, *Annual Review of Sociology* (1976), Vol. 2, p. 191.

[18] See, e.g., Ed Blair, "More of the Effects of Interviewer's Voice Intonation", *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter, 1977-1978), Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 544-48, and Joseph D. Matarazzo and Arthur Wiens, *The Interview: Research on Its Anatomy and Structure* (New Brunswick, Transaction, 1972, 2007).

[19] See, e.g., Shulamit Reinhartz, *On Becoming a Social Scientist: From Survey Research and Participant Observation to Experiential Analysis*, (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1984), pp. 82, 103, and Endnote 53, p. 298; Katz, *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Summer 1942), Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 267; Cannell and Kahn, in Lindzey and Aronson, eds., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2nd ed.,

p. 586; and Asher, *Polling and the Public*, 6th ed., pp. 94-98.

[20] Eugene Webb, et al., *Unobtrusive Measures*, rev. ed. (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2000).

[21] Arthur Bentley, *The Process of Government: A Study of Social Pressures* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1908, 2008) p. 176.

[22] Ibid., pp. 187, 180.

[23] C. Wright Mills, "Methodological Consequences of the Sociology of Knowledge", *American Journal of Sociology* (July 1940-May 1941), Vol. 46, p. 329.

[24] See, e.g., William Rathje and Cullen Murphy, *Rubbish! The Archeology of Garbage* (Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona, 1992, 2220); Phillip K. Lehman and F. Scott Geller, "Behavior Analysis and Environmental Protection: Accomplishments and Potential for More", *Behavioral and Social Issues* (2004) Vol. 13, No 1, pp. 13-32; and discussions and examples of the use of observation in, Harry P. Hatry, et al., *How Effective Are Your Community Services? Procedures for Performance Measurement*, 3rd ed. (Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association and Urban Institute, 2006).

[25] "Experimental research is often called *causal research*." [David E. McNabb, *Research Methods in Public Administration and Nonprofit Management: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2002), p. 225.]

[26] Douglas C. Montgomery, *Design and Analysis of Experiments*, 5th ed. (New Jersey: Wiley, 1997, 2001), p. XX.

[27] See, e.g., J. E. Bragg and I. R. Andrews, "Participative decision making: an experimental study in a hospital", *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* (1973), Vol. 9, No 6, pp. 727-35; Christopher Orpen, "The effects of job enrichment on employee satisfaction, motivation, involvement, and performance: a field experiment", *Human Relations* (1979), Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 189-217; Howard S. Bloom, ed., *Learning More from Social Experiments: Evolving Analytic Approaches* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2005; and David Greenberg and Mark Schroder, *The Digest of Social Experiments*, 3rd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 2004).

[28] http://www.systemdynamics.org/ Retrieved 11/12/07.

[29] Rein Taagepera, *Making Social Sciences More Scientific: The Need for Predictive Models*, (New York: Oxford, 2008), pp. 238, 11.

[30] For the use of documents as sources for input that improves output, see, e.g., relevant parts of, Hatry, et al., *How Effective Are Your Community Services?*, 3rd ed.

[31] See, e.g., Klaus Krippendorff, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2004).

[32] Other relevant budget and financial documents include, *Financial Report of the United States Government*, published annually by the U.S. Department of the Treasury: http://www.fms.treas.gov/fr/index.html Retrieved 1/21/2013. See also, James T. Bennett and Thomas J. DiLorenzo, *Underground Government: The Off-Budget Public Sector* (Washington, D.C.: Cato, 1983).

[33] Marc J. Ventresca and John W. Mohr, "Archival Research Methods", in Joel A. C. Baum, ed., *Companion to Organizations* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002, 2005), pp. 805-28.

[34] See, e.g., D. Bradford Hunt, *Blueprint for Disaster: The Unraveling of Chicago Public Housing* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2009).

[35] E.g., Henry Mintzberg and Alexandra McHugh, "Strategy Formation in an Adhocracy", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (June 1985), pp. 160-97.

[36] See, e.g., Aaron Wildavsky, *Budgeting: A Comparative Theory of Budgetary Processes*, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1986), and Michael S. Hamilton, *Mining Environmental Policy: Comparing Indonesia and the USA* (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2005).

[37] Fred Luthans and Robert Kreitner, *Organizational Behavior Modification and Beyond: An Operant and Social Learning Approach* (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1985, 1975), pp. 93-94.

[38] Fred Luthens and Robert Kreitner, *Organizational Behavior Modification and Beyond: An Operant and Social Learning Approach* (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1985, 1975) , p. 94; citing Robert Kreitner, "Controversy in OBM: History, Misconceptions, and Ethics", in, L. Fredrickson, ed., *Handbook of Organizational Behavior Management* (New York: Wiley, 1982), pp. 71-91.

[39] Luthens and Kreitner, *Organizational Behavior Modification and Beyond*, p. 113.

[40] B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior* (New York: Free Press, 1953), p. 59.

References

Anderson, B. A., and Silver, B.D. "The Validity of Survey Responses: Insights from Interviews of Married Couples in a Survey of Soviet Emigrants". *Social Forces*. Dec. 1987, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 537-54.

Asher, H. B. *Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know*, 6th ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ, 2004.

Atrostic, B. K. et al. "Nonresponse in U.S. Government Household Surveys: Consistent Measures, Recent Trends, and New Insights". *Journal of Official Statistics*. 2001, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 209-26.

Bennett, J. T., and DiLorenzo, T. J. *Official Lies: How Washington Misleads Us*. Alexandria, Virginia: Groom, 1992.

Bennett, J. T., and DiLorenzo, T. J. *Underground Government: The Off-Budget Public Sector*. Washington, D.C.: Cato, 1983.

Bentley, A. *The Process of Government: A Study of Social Pressures*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1908, 2008.

Blair, E. "More of the Effects of Interviewer's Voice Intonation". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter, 1977-1978, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 544-48,

Bloom, H. S., ed. *Learning More from Social Experiments: Evolving Analytic Approaches*. N. Y.: Russell Sage Foundation, 2005.

Box, S. *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*. New York: Vintage, 1978.

Bragg, J. E., and Andrews, I. R. "Participative decision making: an experimental study in a hospital". *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 1973, Vol. 9, No 6, pp. 727-35.

Brandt, D. R. "Hearing Aids: How well are you capturing the voice of the customer?" *Quality Progress*. Oct. 2012, pp. 18-25.

Brehm, J. "Stubbing Our Toes for a Foot in the Door? Prior Contact, Incentives and Survey Response". *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 1994, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 45-63.

Brooks, P. *Troubling Confessions: Speaking Guilt in Law and Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.

Cahalan, D. "Correlates of Respondent Accuracy in the Denver Validity Survey". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter 1968-1969, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 607-21.

Campbell, J. *The Liar's Tale: A History of Falsehood*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.

Cannell, C. F., and Kahn, R. "Interviewing". In Lindzey, G., and Aronson, E., eds. *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2nd ed. (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968), pp. 526-95.

Chomsky, N. *Chomsky on Miseducation*. Lanham: Roman & Littlefield, 2000.

Cook, S. W., and Selltiz, C. "A Multiple-Indicator Approach to Attitude Measurement". *Psychological Bulletin*. July 1964, Vol. 62, No. 1, pp. 36-55.

Couper, M. P. "Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter 2000, Vol. 64, No. 4, pp. 464-94..

de Leeuw, E., and de Heer, W. "Trends in Household Survey Nonresponse: A Longitudinal and International Comparison". In Groves, R. M., et al. eds., *Survey Nonresponse*. New York: Wiley, 2002, pp. 41-54.

Dolsen, D. E., and Machlis, G. E. "Response Rates and Mail Recreation Survey Results: How Much Is Enough?" *Journal of Leisure Research*. 1991, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 272-77.

Ericsson, K. A., and Simon, H. A. *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*, Rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1993.

Fendrich, M., and Vaughn, C. "Diminishing Lifetime Substance Use Over Time: An Inquiry into Differential Underreporting". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Spring 1994, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 96-123.

Fendrich, M., et al. "Accuracy of Parent Mental Health Service Reporting: Results from a Reverse Record-Check Study". *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychology*. February 1999, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 147-55.

Financial Report of the United States Government. U.S. Department of the Treasury: http://www.fms.treas.gov/fr/index.html Retrieved 1/21/2013

Greenberg, D., and Schroder, M. *The Digest of Social Experiments*, 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 2004.

Hacker, A. "Obama: The Price of Being Black". *New York Review of Books*. Sept. 25, 2008, pp. 12-16.

Hamilton, M. S. *Mining Environmental Policy: Comparing Indonesia and the USA*. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2005.

Harrell, A. V. "The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use Data: The Accuracy of Responses on Confidential Self-Administered Answer Sheets". In Harrison, L., and Hughes, A., eds. *The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates*. Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1993, pp. 37-58.

Hatry, H. P., et al. *How Effective Are Your Community Services? Procedures for Performance Measurement*, 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association and Urban Institute, 2006.

Herman, E. S., and Chomsky, N. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon, 1988, 2002

Hunt, D. B. *Blueprint for Disaster: The Unraveling of Chicago Public Housing*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2009.

Hyman, H. H. "Do They Tell the Truth?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter 1944-45, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 557-59.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., and Nichols, K. L. "Ethics Education in the MPA Curriculum: What Difference Does It Make?" *Journal of Public Affairs Education*. April 2002, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 103-14.

Katz, D. "Do Interviewers Bias Poll Results?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Summer 1942, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 248-68.

Keilman, J., and Horan, D. "The middle class: It's a `state of mind'". *Chicago Tribune*. April 10, 2008, sec. 1, pp. 1, 18.

Kreitner, R. "Controversy in OBM: History, Misconceptions, and Ethics". In, Fredrickson, L. ed. *Handbook of Organizational Behavior Management*. N. Y.: Wiley, 1982, pp. 71-91.

Krippendorff, K. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2004.

LaPiere, R. T. "Attitudes vs. Actions". *Social Forces*. March 1934, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 230-37.

Lehman, P. K., and Geller, F. S. "Behavior Analysis and Environmental Protection: Accomplishments and Potential for More". *Behavioral and Social Issues*. 2004, Vol. 13, No 1, pp. 13-32.

Lieberman, D. J. *Never Be Lied to Again*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.

Luthans, F., and Kreitner, R. *Organizational Behavior Modification and Beyond: An Operant and Social Learning Approach*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1985, 1975.

Marquis, K. H. *Record Check Validity of Survey Responses: A Reassessment of Bias in Reports of Hospitalizations*. Santa Barbara: Calif.: RAND, May 1978.

Matarazzo, J. D., and Wiens, A. *The Interview: Research on Its Anatomy and Structure*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1972, 2007.

McNabb, D. E. *Research Methods in Public Administration and Nonprofit Management: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2002.

Miller, P. V. "Review: Is `Up' Right? The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter 1997, Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 627-41.

Miller, T. I., and Kobayashi, M. M. *Citizen Surveys: How to Do Them, How to Use Them, What They Mean*, 2ed. Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association, 2000.

Mills, C. W. “Methodological Consequences of the Sociology of Knowledge”. *American Journal of Sociology*. July 1940-May 1941, Vol. 46, pp. 316-30.

Mintzberg, H., and McHugh, A. “Strategy Formation in an Adhocracy”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 30, No. 2, June 1985, pp. 160-97.

Montgomery, D. C. *Design and Analysis of Experiments*, 5th ed. New Jersey: Wiley, 1997, 2001.

O’Rourke, D. “An Inquiry into Declining RDD Response Rates: Part IV: Lack of Standardization”. *Survey Research Newsletter*. 2000, Vol. 31, No.1, pp. 1-2.

Orpen, C. “The effects of job enrichment on employee satisfaction, motivation, involvement, and performance: a field experiment”. *Human Relations*. 1979, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 189-217.

Parry, H. J., and Crossley, H. M. “Validity of Responses to Survey Questions”. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Spring 1950, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 56-80.

Phillips, D. L., and Clancy, K. J. “Response Biases in Field Studies of Mental Illness”. *American Sociological Review*. June 1970, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 503-15.

Rathje, W., and Murphy, C. *Rubbish! The Archeology of Garbage*. Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona, 1992, 2220.

Ravitch, D. *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn*. New York: Vintage, 2003, 2004.

Reinhartz, S. *On Becoming a Social Scientist: From Survey Research and Participant Observation to Experiential Analysis*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1984.

Riesman, D. and Benny, M. “Asking and Answering”. *Journal of Business*. October 1956, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 225-36.

Rubner, A. *The Mendacious Colours of Democracy: The Anatomy of Benevolent Lying*. Charlottesville, Va.: Imprint Academic Philosophy Document Center, 2006.

Saenger, G., and Gilbert, E. “Customer Reactions to the Integration of Negro Sales Personnel”. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*. 1950, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 57-76.

Schuman, H., and Johnson, M. P. “Attitudes and Behavior”. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1976, Vol. 2, pp. 161-207.

Silver, B. D., Ambramson, Ambramson, P. R., and Anderson, B. A. “The Presence of Others and Overreporting of Voting in American National Elections”. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Summer 1986, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 228-39.

Skinner, B. F. *Science and Human Behavior*. N. Y.: Free Press, 1953.

Steeh, C., et al. “Are They Really as Bad as They Seem? Nonresponse Rates at the End of the Twentieth Century”. *Journal of Official Statistics*. 2001, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 227-47.

System Dynamics Society: http://www.systemdynamics.org/ Retrieved 11/12/07.

Taagepera, R. *Making Social Sciences More Scientific: The Need for Predictive Models*. N. Y.: Oxford, 2008.

Tourangeau, R., et al. “Design and Results of the Women’s Health Study”. In Harrison, L., and Hughes, A., eds. *The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates*. Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1993, pp. 344-65.

Ventresca, M. J., and Mohr, J. W. “Archival Research Methods”. In Baum, J. A. C., ed. *Companion to Organizations*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002, 2005, pp. 805-28.

Webb, E., et al. *Unobtrusive Measures*, rev. ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2000.

Wildavsky, A. *Budgeting: A Comparative Theory of Budgetary Processes*, 2nd ed. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1986.

Zanes, A., and Matsoukas, E. “Different Settings, Different Results? A Comparison of School and Home Responses”. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter 1979, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 550-57.