









Basic Non-comparative Scales					
Scale	Basic Characteristics	Examples	Advantages	Disadvantages	
Continuous Rating Scale	Place a mark on a continuous line	Reaction to TV commercials	Easy to construct	Scoring can be cumbersome unless computerized	
Itemized Rati Scales	ng			·	
Likert Scale	Degrees of agreement on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale	Measurement of attitudes	Easy to construct, administer, and understand	More time-consuming	
Semantic Differential	Seven-point scale with bipolar labels	Brand, product, and company images	Versatile	Controversy as to whether the data are interval	
Stapel Scale	Unipolar ten-point scale, -5 to +5, without a neutral point (zero)	Measurement of attitudes and images	Easy to construct, administer over telephone	Confusing and difficult to apply 7	

Semantic Differential Sc	ale
1) Ruggod · · · · · · · · Doligato	
2) Evoltable :	
2) Excitable	
3) Uncomfortable ::::: Comfortable	
4) Dominating ::::: Submissive	
5) Thrifty :::: Indulgent	
6) Pleasant :::: Unpleasant	
7) Contemporary :::: Obsolete	
8) Organized :::: Unorganized	
9) Rational :::: Emotional	
10) Youthful ::::: Mature	
11) Formal ::::: Informal	
12) Orthodox :::: Liberal	
13) Complex :::: Simple	
14) Colorless :::: Colorful	
15) Modest ::::: Vain	8

Balanced Scale	Unbalanced Scale
Nivia for Men is Extremely good Very good Good Bad Very bad Extremely bad	Nivia for Men is Extremely good Very good Good Somewhat good Bad Very bad

		Ratin	ig Sca	le Co	onfigur	ations
A variety of scale configurations may be employed to measure the gentleness of Surf detergent. Some examples include:						
1) Very harsh					Very gentle	
2) Very harsh 1	2 3	3 4	5	6 7	Very gentle	
3) . Very harsh . Neither harsh	nor gentle					
. Very gentle 4)						
Very harsh Harsh	Somewhat harsh	Neither harsh nor gentle	Somewhat gentle	Gentle	Very gentle	
5) -3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Very harsh		Neith	ner harsh gentle			Very gentle 10





Dr. Paurav Shukla

	Development of a Multi-item Scale
[[Develop Theory
	Generate Initial Pool of Items: Theory, Secondary Data, and Qualitative Research
← _[Select a Reduced Set of Items Based on Qualitative Judgement
	Collect Data from a Large Pretest Sample
ll r	Statistical Analysis
┝───「	Develop Purified Scale
	+
	Collect More Data from a Different Sample
П	
∙ —_[Evaluate Scale Reliability, Validity, and Generalizability
l r	Final Scale 42
L	13



Potential Sources of Error on Measurement 1) Other relatively stable characteristics of the individual that influence the test score, such as intelligence, social desirability, and education. 2) Short-term or transient personal factors, such as health, emotions, fatigue. 3) Situational factors, such as the presence of other people, noise, and

- distractions.
- 4) Sampling of items included in the scale: addition, deletion, or changes in the scale items.
- 5) Lack of clarity of the scale, including the instructions or the items themselves.
- Mechanical factors, such as poor printing, overcrowding items in the questionnaire, and poor design.
- 7) Administration of the scale, such as differences among interviewers.8) Analysis factors, such as differences in scoring and statistical

15

3, 30011 23 01101

analysis.





Technique	Strengths	Weaknesses
Nonprobability Sampling Convenience sampling	Least expensive, least time- consuming, most convenient	Selection bias, sample not representative, not recommended for descriptive or causal research
Judgmental sampling	Low cost, convenient, not time- consuming	Does not allow generalization, subjective
Quota sampling	Sample can be controlled for certain characteristics	Selection bias, no assurance of representativeness
Snowball sampling	Can estimate rare characteristics	Time-consuming
Probability sampling Simple random sampling (SRS)	Easily understood, results projectable	Difficult to construct sampling frame, expensive, lower precision, no assurance of representativeness.
Stratified sampling	Include all important subpopulations, precision	Difficult to select relevant stratification variables, not feasible to stratify on many variables, expensive
Cluster sampling	Easy to implement, cost effective	Imprecise, difficult to compute and interpret results
Systematic sampling	Can increase representativeness, Easier to implement than SRS, sampling frame not necessary	Can decrease representativeness
		18

Choosing Nonprobability vs. Probability Sampling				
Factors	Conditions Fav Nonprobability sampling	ouring the Use of Probability sampling		
Nature of research	Exploratory	Conclusive		
Relative magnitude of sampling and Non-sampling errors	Non-sampling errors are larger	Sampling errors are larger		
Variability in the population	Homogeneous (low)	Heterogeneous (high)		
Statistical considerations	Unfavourable	Favourable		
Operational considerations	Favourable	Unfavourable		
		19		



Tennis's Systematic Sampling Returns a Smash

Tennis magazine conducted a mail survey of its subscribers to gain a better understanding of its market. Systematic sampling was employed to select a sample of 1,472 subscribers from the publication's domestic circulation list. If we assume that the subscriber list had 1,472,000 names, the sampling interval would be 1,000 (1,472,000/1,472). A number from 1 to 1,000 was drawn at random. Beginning with that number, every 1,000th subscriber was selected.

A brand-new dollar bill was included with the questionnaire as an incentive to respondents. An alert postcard was mailed one week before the survey. A second, follow-up, questionnaire was sent to the whole sample ten days after the initial questionnaire. There were 76 post office returns, so the net effective mailing was 1,396. Six weeks after the first mailing, 778 completed questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 56%.

21