

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

1

Evaluation of an online panel for Public Participation Geographic Information Systems (PPGIS) surveys**Abstract**

With declining survey response rates across all modes, online panels may be attractive for conducting public participation geographic information systems (PPGIS) research. In PPGIS surveys, participants identify spatial attributes on a map as well as answer text-based questions. This study evaluates the use of an online panel for PPGIS surveys as an alternative to random household sampling, on-site survey recruitment, or self-selected (river) sampling, using several criteria of data quality: participation rate, mapping effort, and data usability. PPGIS responses from panelists indicate less mapping effort due to respondent “satisficing” resulting in lower quality PPGIS data than obtained through other sampling strategies. We discuss the implications for future PPGIS survey research.

Keywords: public participation GIS; PPGIS; online panel; survey quality; response rates

Introduction

Online panels are increasingly being used in market, social, psychological, and medical research (Callegaro & DiSogra, 2007). With declines in survey response rate across all modes of delivery (Curtin, Presser, & Singer, 2005; de Leeuw & de Heer 2002; Hansen 2006) online panels may appear an attractive option for conducting public participation geographic information systems (PPGIS) surveys despite limitations compared to probability sampling methods including undercoverage of the target population, high nonresponse within the panel, and self-selection bias (see Baker et al., 2010). This research evaluates the use of an online, opt-in panel (Couper, 2000) for conducting PPGIS surveys as an alternative to random household sampling, on-site survey recruitment, or self-selected (river) sampling. We evaluate the use of the online panel against several criteria of survey data quality: participation rate, mapping effort, and usability of survey responses. We discuss the implications of the results for future PPGIS survey research.

Public participation geographic information systems (PPGIS) is a general set of methods for collecting local knowledge of places to inform land use planning processes. In PPGIS surveys, participants identify spatial locations on a map, either hardcopy or digital, using stickers, markers, or digital annotations. Typically they then respond to a set of survey questions that allow the investigator to examine correlations between these responses and the placement of their markers. PPGIS surveys are adaptable to a variety of social survey contexts where measuring perceptions of place is an important research objective. PPGIS applications have ranged from community and neighborhood planning to environmental and natural resource management (see Brown, 2005; Dunn, 2007; Sieber, 2006; and Sawicki & Peterman, 2002, for reviews of PPGIS applications and methods).

PPGIS survey recruitment has been most frequently implemented through random household selection and mail invitation, but researchers are increasingly looking at alternative means of participant recruitment through websites and blogs, local media advertising, or commercial email lists.

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

3

Internet-based PPGIS surveys, in contrast to mail-based PPGIS methods, usually provide an option for self-selection or rater sampling of a “volunteer” public because it costs no more to implement and is easy to track multiple survey participant groups to a website using access codes.

PPGIS surveys have been implemented using different modalities including self-administered mail and internet surveys, or in-person group administration. Response rates for mail-based household PPGIS surveys have ranged from 18 to 47 percent while internet-based random household surveys averaged 13 percent across five studies (Pocewicz et al., in press). The first mixed-mode PPGIS survey (mail with paper maps and internet with digital maps) was completed in 2010 with reported 17 and 7 percent response rates for paper-based and internet-based PPGIS respectively (Pocewicz et al., 2010). This result is consistent with studies suggesting that in populations with access to the internet, response rates for Web surveys may not match those of other survey methods (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000; Couper, 2000).

Internet-based PPGIS surveys offer significant technological advantages over paper-based surveys with the most important being access to multiple map scales, customizable cartography and base map features, and elimination of the need to digitize responses thus reducing spatial error. However, the technological benefits of digital PPGIS surveys may be offset by the inability of researchers to achieve higher response rates in a variety of research settings.

The use of online panels may be an attractive option for PPGIS surveys because recruitment and participation are combined in a single modality (participation is achieved through a click on a survey link sent in an email message) while the mapping part of the survey can utilize the mapping features of familiar internet-based applications such as Google® Maps or Earth. This research evaluated the use of an online panel for a PPGIS survey implemented for the purpose of regional conservation planning by Parks Victoria, an Australian agency responsible for national park planning and management. The results are compared to other similar PPGIS surveys.

PPGIS Survey Evaluation Criteria

To evaluate response quality in PPGIS survey research, we introduce two new metrics—*mapping effort* and *data usability*—to augment existing survey response metrics for public opinion research. Mapping effort is defined as the exertion of physical and mental power to complete the PPGIS mapping activity. It is hypothesized to be related to measurement error and thus data quality, i.e., less mapping effort is associated with lower spatial data quality. Because many PPGIS variables (e.g., recreation experiences) can apply to a wide range of landscapes, PPGIS surveys often lack a direct measure of spatial error. In the absence of specific evidence indicating that a marker was placed in error, there is a presumption of PPGIS marker placement validity.

Mapping effort in PPGIS surveys may be indicative of participant “satisficing” or suboptimal responses and lower PPGIS data quality. According to satisficing theory, respondents with lower motivation are likely to engage in a suboptimal response strategy (satisficing) rather than optimizing (Krosnick 1991; Kaminska, McCutcheon, & Billiet, 2010). The sampling groups examined in this PPGIS study—an opt-in panel and self-selected public—represent *prima fascia* different types and levels of motivation. Online panelists routinely complete online surveys for extrinsic rewards. Panelist interest and connection with the survey subject content is coincidental. In contrast, participation by a self-selected public requires some pre-existing interest in the survey content to provide sufficient motivation to visit the PPGIS website and participate without any prospect of reward; the motivation is primarily intrinsic.

PPGIS *data usability* is defined as the proportion of total PPGIS markers placed that are appropriate to the purpose of the PPGIS survey and is an indirect, but operational indicator of PPGIS measurement error. Usability can be defined with a range of criteria such as marker location, map scale at time of marker placement, or other survey-specific criteria. PPGIS surveys usually have a

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

5

1
2
3 designated study area where markers are intended to be placed. Markers placed outside the study,
4
5 while presumptively valid for the attribute being identified, are not usable for the stated purpose of the
6
7 survey. In this survey, we operationalized data usability as markers placed within the study area prior
8
9 to the implementation of map controls that limited where markers could be placed by participants.
10
11
12
13

14 Methods

15 Survey content

16
17
18 A PPGIS survey website was developed and implemented using a combined Google® Maps
19
20 and Earth application interface (see <http://www.landscapemap2.org/swparks3>). The website had the
21
22 following features: (1) an initial screen where a survey access code could be entered and validated,
23
24 followed by (2) an informed consent screen, followed by (3) a Google Maps screen with an open
25
26 window containing instructions for placing markers and completing the survey, followed by (4) a
27
28 screen with standard text-based survey items to identify respondent characteristics.
29
30
31
32

33
34 The mapping application contained a panel on the left of the screen with 47 markers
35
36 representing different park experiences, values, perceived impacts, and preferences for park facilities.
37
38 See Figure 1. Participants were instructed to drag and drop the markers onto a map where these
39
40 attributes were located. There was no limit on the number of markers that could be placed. Thus, the
41
42 mapping activity with multiple markers is conceptually similar to a multi-response survey item where a
43
44 participant can check “all that apply”. Standard Google Maps navigational tools were available to pan
45
46 and zoom the map to different locations to place the markers. In the initial launch of the application,
47
48 no minimum map scale (Google Maps zoom level) for placing markers was established under the
49
50 assumption that respondents would navigate to the appropriate zoom level to gain enough map
51
52 resolution to place the marker.
53
54
55

56
57 **[Insert Figure 1 here]**
58
59
60

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

6

Sampling and recruitment

Parks Victoria contracted with Newspoll Market Research® and Lightspeed Research Australia®, to administer survey recruitment using a national, opt-in survey panel. The Australian panel contains over 135,000 members that earn points redeemable for prizes by completing surveys online.

Potential panelists for the PPGIS survey were identified as individuals living in regional Victoria or in Melbourne, the state's largest city. In October, 2010, 2,815 individuals were sampled with replacement from a list of individuals meeting self-reported geographic criteria from panel enrolment. Eligible panelists were sent an email announcing the availability of a new survey and inviting participation. Interested panelists were directed to an online survey to screen panelists using two selection criteria: (1) residence in regional Victoria or Melbourne, (2) visitation to one of nine specific state or national parks in the study region within the last 12 months. Panelists satisfying the screening criteria were provided a link to the PPGIS survey website with an automated access code. The online panel yielded 304 complete responses that included one or more mapped attributes and completion of the survey questions following the mapping activity.

Visual inspection of the online panel map markers indicated data quality concerns such as markers placed outside the study area, some markers placed in counter-intuitive geographic locations, and a general lack of precision in marker placement. Mapping effort appeared less than reported in other PPGIS surveys. As a result, a decision was made to modify the PPGIS website to implement two spatial data quality controls. The application was modified to disallow markers placed outside the study region and a map control was implemented that would not allow marker placement until the map was zoomed to a scale that achieved minimum acceptable map resolution.

Four months from initial survey completion, the same panelists were invited to complete the same PPGIS survey again. Approximately 200 first round respondents accepted the invitation to repeat

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

7

1
2
3 the survey. Following a similar screening process, 63 resampled individuals completed the survey a
4
5 second time. We assume the significant drop in the number eligible participants was a result of the
6
7 intervening four month period that included the popular Easter period, in which potential participants
8
9 became ineligible by virtue of not visiting a park within the 12 month screening window. Twenty three
10
11 additional completions were gained via requesting new participants from the panel.
12
13
14

Data analysis

15
16
17
18
19 *Participation rates.* We calculated the participation rate for the opt-in panel as “the number of
20
21 respondents who have provided a usable response divided by the total number of initial personal
22
23 invitations requesting participation” (AAPOR, 2011). We also calculated the proportion of eligible
24
25 panelists that were screened out and the screening participation rate, defined as the proportion of
26
27 screened eligible individuals that fully or partially completed the PPGIS survey. The panel dropout
28
29 rate was defined and calculated as eligible panelists that accessed the PPGIS website, but failed to
30
31 place any markers or answer any survey questions.
32
33
34

35
36
37 *Mapping effort.* We assessed mapping effort by examining three indicators: the total number of
38
39 markers placed in the survey process, the total elapsed clock time placing the markers, and the mean
40
41 elapsed time in placing a marker. These measurements are compared to other PPGIS surveys
42
43 completed with random household sampling, on-site recruitment, or self-selected public sampling. We
44
45 also compared navigational diligence between panelists and the self-selected public by examining the
46
47 zoom level at which markers were placed in the first round prior to the implementation of a minimum
48
49 zoom level control. Markers placed at high zoom levels indicate greater navigation effort in marker
50
51 placement.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

8

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Usability of PPGIS survey responses. We assessed the usability of the mapped PPGIS data by calculating the percentage of total markers placed inside the study area for both the online panel and self-selected public prior to the implementation of map controls.

Participant characteristics. We compared online panelists with the self-selected public on the variables of age, level of formal education, income, general reason for visiting parks, and self-reported knowledge of parks in the region. To test for differences in characteristics, we applied chi-squares tests for proportional data and t-tests for continuous data ($\alpha=0.05$).

Results

The participation rate for eligible individuals in the online panel was 12 percent for the first round of invitations and 4 percent for the second round. These overall participation rates appear low because 85 and 87 percent of the geographically eligible panelists were screened out for not visiting one of the region's parks in the last 12 months. For those individuals that passed the screening questions, the participation rates were 77 and 31 percent respectively for the two rounds. About 41 percent of resampled panelists were screened out in the second round, presumptively because about four months had elapsed between rounds and the 12 month park visit requirement was no longer applicable. The screening participation rate was lower for resampled participants (54%) in the second round.

The dropout rate, defined as the proportion that passed screening, accessed the PPGIS survey website, but failed to map any attributes or answer any survey questions, was 21 percent for the first round of invitations, 46 percent for the resampled panelists, and 69 percent for new invitees in the second round. The higher dropout rate for the second round is likely the result of inadvertent resampling of the same panelists from the first round who accessed the survey only to realize they had already completed the survey.

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

9

The PPGIS mapping effort results are presented in Table 1 and plotted in Figure 2. The mean number of PPGIS markers placed and the time spent mapping by the online panelists were significantly less than other reported PPGIS surveys and all other sampling groups. Round one panelists placed a mean of 10 markers with an average mapping time of just over two minutes. The resampled panelists in round two put even less effort into their responses, averaging eight markers and less than two minutes mapping time. This online panel mapping effort was considerably less than the self-selected public sample within the same study (11 markers, 5 minutes) and other sampling groups in recent internet PPGIS surveys. For example, random household sample mapping effort in three recent PPGIS surveys ranged from a mean of 15 markers (11:03) to a high of 34 markers (15:18). Beverly et al. (2008) reported a mean of 26 markers (9:15) and Pocewicz et al. (2010) reported 18 markers (9:00) with random household samples in Canada and the U.S. respectively. Mapping effort from participants recruited on-site for PPGIS surveys was also significantly greater than online panelists, and ranged from a mean of 12 to 14 markers and mean mapping time from 6:51 to 10:35.

[Insert Table 1 and Figure 2 here]

Finally, we examined the usability of the PPGIS mapped responses using a simple measure of the percent of attributes placed within the study area as directed in the survey instructions. In the first round of panel invitations before map controls were implemented to restrict marker placement, 36 percent of the markers were placed outside the study area by online panelists. By contrast, the number of markers placed outside the study area by the self-selected public sample was 13 percent.

An additional PPGIS map control was implemented in the second round of panel invitations that required navigation to a minimum map scale (Google Maps zoom level) before a marker could be placed. This minimum zoom control had the consequence of reducing the number of map markers placed. The same panelists placed significantly fewer markers in the second round, with the average

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

number of markers dropping from 14 to 8 ($t=2.12$, $p \leq 0.05$). About 48 percent of panelists placed fewer markers in the second round while about 40 percent placed more markers.

There were no statistically significant differences in age between the panelists and self-selected public (t -test, $p > 0.05$), and no statistically significant associations between level of formal education, general reason for visiting parks, or self-reported knowledge of parks in the region (chi-square tests, $p > .05$). The online panel reported somewhat lower income levels than the volunteer public (47.9% of panelists reported income of 60 K or less compared to 26% of self-selected public). The only difference between panelists and self-selected public potentially related to mapping effort was the number of times the participant had visited national parks in the region in the previous year. Panelists averaged five visits compared to a mean of eight for self-selected participants. However, there was no significant correlation ($p > 0.05$) between the number of times visited last year and total number of markers placed.

Discussion

PPGIS surveys are a relatively new specialization with the first internet-based survey being completed in 2006 (Beverly et al., 2008). The emergence of this new type of survey that places higher cognitive demands on participants comes at a time when general survey response rates are in decline. With the upper end of internet-based household PPGIS surveys response rates near 20 percent, and recent studies reporting even lower response rates (Brown, Montag, & Lyon, in press, Pocewicz et al., in process), it is inevitable that survey sponsors would trial alternatives such as online panels to increase PPGIS participation. As a recent AAPOR task force concluded, "increasing nonresponse in traditional methods, rising costs and shrinking budgets, dramatic increases in internet penetration, the opportunities in questionnaire design on the Web, and the lower cost and shorter cycle times of online

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

11

1
2
3 surveys—continue to increase pressure on all segments of the survey industry to adopt online research
4
5 methods” (Baker et al., 2010).

7 While online mapping technology offers clear advantages over mail-based PPGIS surveys, but
8
9 lower response rates and mapping effort, sampling approaches and PPGIS designs that increase
10
11 participation rates and mapping effort will be essential to advance PPGIS survey methods.

14 PPGIS responses from online panelists indicate less mapping effort resulting in lower quality
15
16 PPGIS data than obtained with random household sampling, on-site site sampling, or self-selected
17
18 public sampling. We attribute this outcome to panelist satisficing due to lower motivation levels. The
19
20 cognitive demands of the PPGIS mapping activity may amplify the satisficing effect. A repeat of the
21
22 PPGIS survey with the same panelists to improve mapping results had the opposite effect; there was
23
24 less mapping effort with a higher refusal rate and fewer overall markers placed suggesting lower
25
26 motivation. A potentially confounding variable—level of familiarity with the study region—was also
27
28 examined. Other PPGIS surveys have reported that familiarity with the study area positively influences
29
30 mapping effort (Brown & Reed, 2009) but there was no significant difference in self-reported
31
32 familiarity between online panelists and the self-selected sample. Further, there was no observed
33
34 relationship between the number of park visits and total number of markers placed.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Because nonprobability samples are generally less accurate than probability samples, there
41
42 should be compelling evidence that online panels offer advantages over household-based probability
43
44 samples. While caution is warranted for overreaching conclusions based on a single trial of an online
45
46 panel, our results are not encouraging. The survey cycle is shorter using an online panel but PPGIS
47
48 surveys are generally not time critical as the survey data normally feeds into an extended planning
49
50 process. The potential cost advantage of using an online panel was not clearly evident in this study.
51
52 Based on the participation rates, the cost per completion using the online panel was approximately \$42.
53
54
55 The recruitment costs using a random household sampling design would compare favorably to this
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

12

1
2
3 result while providing the possibility for population estimation. The cost of using an online panel does,
4
5 however, does compare favorably to the cost of on-site recruitment for PPGIS surveys involving
6
7 geographically dispersed sampling locations unless the recruitment effort could be implemented using
8
9 park volunteers.
10

11
12 The use of online PPGIS surveys is likely to increase and self-selected sampling will continue
13
14 to be a sampling option. But government and NGO-sponsored PPGIS research must be credible if it is
15
16 to influence policy, and toward that end, the production of high quality spatial data is of paramount
17
18 importance. Although this study used a large, reputable panel, there are significant differences in the
19
20 composition and practices of individual panels that can affect survey results. Additional panel trials for
21
22 PPGIS survey research would be beneficial; especially those that can meaningfully address
23
24 motivational factors, perhaps through increased incentives or more targeted screening questions that
25
26 better identify cognitive or emotional connection of potential panelists to the PPGIS subject content.
27
28 Although an emotive connection to the PPGIS study area is not essential for PPGIS survey
29
30 participation, it is a distinguishing feature of PPGIS survey research that can be leveraged in
31
32 recruitment methods.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Participant satisficing in PPGIS surveys is an area of future research that would benefit from
40
41 experimental design. Satisficing behavior is more likely when there are not clearly communicated and
42
43 understood expectations of participant mapping behavior. The majority of PPGIS surveys currently
44
45 provide wide latitude for participant mapping given the highly variable spatial attributes being
46
47 solicited. There are a number of possible experiments in both PPGIS survey design and instruction to
48
49 decrease satisficing behavior: displaying a finite rather than unlimited number of PPGIS markers;
50
51 instructing participants to map a specific (and potentially variable) number of markers; automated
52
53 prompts to encourage additional mapping effort; positive reinforcement for markers placed;
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

13

1
2
3 disallowing markers to be placed outside the study boundaries or at an inappropriate scale; and real-
4
5 time dashboards displaying the number of markers placed compared to other participants in the survey.
6

7
8 One of the challenges for PPGIS survey research, however, is that optimal response behavior is
9
10 likely to be unknown for a given application. Encouraging additional mapping beyond participant
11
12 capacity could result in spurious and random mapping of attributes and may pose a greater threat to
13
14 research validity than satisficing. Controlling and guiding participant mapping effort is a delicate dance
15
16 in which researchers are just beginning to learn the steps. Given that PPGIS survey research will
17
18 increase with the proliferation of internet mapping applications, a significant investment in PPGIS
19
20 survey methods appears warranted.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

14

References

- American Association for Public Opinion Research. (2011). *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 7th edition. AAPOR.
- Baker, R, Blumberg, S., Brick, J.M., Couper, M., Courtright, M., Dennis, J.M., Dillman, D., Frankel, M., Garland, P., Groves, R., Kennedy, C., Krosnick, J., Lavrakas, P., Lee, S., Link, M., Piekarski, L., Rao, K., Thomas, R., & Zahs, D. (2010). Research synthesis: AAPOR report on online panels. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(4), 711–781.
- Beverly, J., Uto, K., Wilkes, J., & Bothwell, P. (2008). Assessing spatial attributes of forest landscape values: An internet-based participatory mapping approach. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 38(2), 289-303.
- Brown, G. (2005). Mapping spatial attributes in survey research for natural resource management: Methods and applications. *Society & Natural Resources*, 18(1), 1-23.
- Brown, G., & Reed, P. (2009). Public Participation GIS: A new method for national forest planning. *Forest Science*, 55(2), 166-182.
- Brown, G., & Weber, D. (2011). Public Participation GIS: A new method for use in national park planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 102(1), 1-15.
- Brown, G. & Weber, D. In review. Using Public Participation GIS (PPGIS) on the Geoweb to monitor tourism development preferences. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*.
- Brown, G., Montag, J., & Lyon, K. In press. Accepted 4 April 2011. Public Participation GIS: A method for identifying ecosystem services. *Society & Natural Resources*.
- Callegaro, M., & DiSogra, C. (2008). Computing response metrics for online panels. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(5), 1008–1032.

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

15

- 1
2
3 Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R.L. (2000). A Meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-
4 based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60, 821–26.
5
6
7
8 Couper, M.P. (2000). Web surveys: A review of issues and approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly*,
9 64(4), 464–494.
10
11
12
13 Curtin, R., Presser, S., & Singer, E. (2005). Changes in telephone survey nonresponse over the past
14 quarter century. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(1), 87–98.
15
16
17
18 de Leeuw, E., & de Heer, W. (2002). Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and
19 international comparison. In R.M. Groves, D.A. Dillman, J.L. Eltinge, & J.A. Roderick (Eds.)
20 Survey nonresponse, (pp. 41–54). New York: Wiley.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Dunn, C. (2007). Participatory GIS – A people’s GIS? *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(5), 616–
27 637.
28
29
30
31 Hansen, K. (2006). The effects of incentives, interview length, and interviewer characteristics on
32 response rates in a CATI-study. *International Journal of Public Opinion*, 19(1), 112-121.
33
34
35
36 Kaminska, O., McCutcheon, A., & Billiet, J. (2010). Satisficing among reluctant respondents in a
37 cross-national context. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(5), 956-984.
38
39
40
41 Krosnick, J.A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures
42 in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 213–36.
43
44
45
46
47 Pocewicz, A., Schnitzer, R., & Nielsen-Pincus, M. (2010). The social geography of southern Wyoming:
48 Important places, development, and natural resource management, The Nature Conservancy,
49 Lander, WY, 16 pp. Available from: <http://www.nature.org/wyoscience> (Accessed 28
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

16

Pocewicz, A., Nielsen-Pincus, M., Brown, G., & Schnitzer, R. In process. An evaluation of internet versus paper-based methods for Public Participation Geographic Information Systems (PPGIS). *Transactions in GIS*.

Sawicki, D., & Peterman, D.R. (2002). Surveying the extent of PPGIS practice in the United States. In W. J. Craig, Harris, T.M., & D. Weiner (Eds.), *Community Participation and Geographic Information Systems* (pp. 17-36). London: Taylor & Francis.

Sieber, R. (2006). Public Participation Geographic Information Systems: A literature review and framework. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96(3), 491-507.

EVALUATING ONLINE PANELS FOR PPGIS SURVEYS

Figure 1. The public participation GIS (PPGIS) survey interface. Participants drag and drop markers from left panel onto a Google® Map image of study area. Following the placement of markers, participants click button in lower left corner to answer text-based survey questions.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1.

PPGIS survey "mapping effort" of online panel compared to other PPGIS sampling and recruitment methods.

PPGIS Survey	Participant Group	Range of markers placed	Mean number of markers per participant	Mean total mapping time (mm:ss)	Total mapping time std. deviation (mm:ss)	Mean time per marker (mm:ss)
SW Parks (Victoria) 2011	Online panel (Round 1 rounds) (n=333)	1 – 118	10.1	2:12	3:56	00:12
	Online panel resample (n=63)	1 – 50	8.0	1:57	3:52	00:11
	Online panel (Rounds 1 and 2) (n=359)	1 – 57	8.8	2:02	3:48	00:11
	Self-selected public (n=41)	1 – 103	11.1	5:02	15:53	00:15
Alpine Region (Victoria) 2009 <i>Source: Brown and Weber, 2011</i>	On-site visitors (n=253)	1 – 70	14.0	6:51	11:51	00:27
	Kangaroo Island (South Australia) 2010 <i>Source: Brown and Weber, in review</i>	Random sampled households (n=104)	1 – 195	33.8	15:18	14:43
Southland Region (New Zealand) 2011 <i>Source: NZ Department of Conservation Report</i>	Random sampled households (n=21)	1 – 111	15.4	11:03	18:29	00:40
	On site visitors (n=67)	1 – 80	11.8	10:10	12:55	00:50
	Self-selected public (n=182)	1 – 379	20.2	16:01	23:28	00:50
Otago Region (New Zealand) 2011 <i>Source: Unpublished data</i>	Random sampled households (n=60)	1 – 187	21.6	14:38	19:38	00:49
	Self-selected public (n=357)	1 – 320	22.4	13:59	35:75	01:03
	On site visitors (n=10)	2 – 42	14.4	10:35	8:56	00:25



Figure 1. The public participation GIS (PPGIS) survey interface. Participants drag and drop markers from left panel onto a Google® Map image of study area. Following the placement of markers, participants click button in lower left corner to answer text-based survey questions. 148x68mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2. PPGIS survey mapping effort across multiple studies and sampling groups.
123x78mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review