

REFERENCES

- Abraham, M., Auspurg, K., Bähr, S., Frodermann, C., Gundert, S., & Hinz, T. (2013). Unemployment and the willingness to accept job offers: First results from a factorial survey approach. *Journal of Labour Market Research*, 46(4), 283–305.
- Abraham, M., Auspurg, K., & Hinz, T. (2010). Migration decisions within dual-earner partnerships: A test of bargaining theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(4), 876–892.
- Adamowicz, W., Boxall, P., Williams, M., & Louviere, J. J. (1998). Stated preference approaches for measuring passive use values: Choice experiments and contingent valuation. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 80(1), 64–75.
- Alexander, C. S., & Becker, H. J. (1978). The use of vignettes in survey research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(1), 93–104.
- Allison, P. D. (2009). *Fixed effects regression models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alriksson, S., & Öberg, T. (2008). Conjoint analysis for environmental evaluation. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 15(3), 244–257.
- Alves, W. M., & Rossi, P. H. (1978). Who should get what? Fairness judgments of the distribution of earnings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(3), 541–564.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1985). The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 48(4), 535–552.
- Amaya-Amaya, M., Gerard, K., & Ryan, M. (2008). Discrete choice experiments in a nutshell. In M. Ryan, K. Gerard, & M. Amaya-Amaya (Eds.), *Using discrete choice experiments to value health and health care* (pp. 13–46). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Armacost, R. L., Hosseini, J. C., Morris, S. A., & Rehbein, K. A. (1991). An empirical comparison of direct questioning, scenario, and randomized response methods for obtaining sensitive business information. *Decision Sciences*, 22(5), 1073–1090.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Brewer, M. B. (1998). Experimentation in social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 99–142). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Atzmüller, C., & Steiner, P. M. (2010). Experimental vignette studies in survey research. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 128–138.
- Auspurg, K., & Hinz, T. (2013). *Validity and generalizability of factorial survey research: A comment* (Working paper of the DFG-Project “The Factorial Survey as a Method for Measuring Attitudes in Population Surveys” 11). Konstanz, Germany: University of Konstanz.
- Auspurg, K., Hinz, T., & Liebig, S. (2009, August). *Complexity, learning effects and plausibility of vignettes in factorial surveys*. Paper presented at the 104th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (ASA), San Francisco, CA.
- Auspurg, K., Hinz, T., & Sauer, C. (2013, August). *Status construction or statistical discrimination? New insights on fair earnings from a factorial survey study*. Paper presented at the 108th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (ASA), New York, NY.
- Auspurg, K., Hinz, T., Sauer, C., & Liebig, S. (2014). The factorial survey as a method for measuring sensitive issues. In U. Engel, B. Jann, P. Lynn, A. Scherpenzeel, & P. Sturgis (Eds.), *Improving survey methods: Lessons from recent research*. (pp. 137–149). New York: Routledge.
- Auspurg, K., & Jäckle, A. (2012). *First equals most important? Order effects in vignette-based measurement* (ISER Working Paper 2012-1). Essex, UK: Institute for Social & Economic Research (ISER).

- Barter, C., & Renold, E. (2000). "I wanna tell you a story": Exploring the application of vignettes in qualitative research with children and young people. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(4), 307–323.
- Beck, M., & Opp, K.-D. (2001). Der faktorielle Survey und die Messung von Normen [The factorial survey and the measuring of norms]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 53(2), 283–306.
- Bennett, J., & Adamowicz, V. (2001). Some fundamentals of environmental choice modelling. In J. Bennett & R. Blamey (Eds.), *The choice modelling approach to environmental valuation* (pp. 37–72). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Berk, R. A., & Rossi, P. H. (1977). *Prison reform and state elites*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Blamey, R. K., & Bennett, J. (2001). Yea-saying and validation of a choice model of green product choice. In J. Bennett & R. K. Blamey (Eds.), *The choice modelling approach to environmental valuation* (pp. 178–201). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Brewer, M. B. (2000). Research design and issues of validity. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 3–16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, W. J. (2009). Fitting and interpreting Cragg's tobit alternative using Stata. *Stata Journal*, 9(4), 584–592.
- Buskens, V., & Weesie, J. (2000). An experiment on the effects of embeddedness in trust situations. *Rationality and Society*, 12(2), 227–253.
- Byers, B., & Zeller, R. A. (1998). Measuring subgroup variation in social judgment research: A factorial survey approach. *Social Science Research*, 27(1), 73–84.
- Cameron, A. C., & Trivedi, P. K. (2009). *Microeconometrics using Stata*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Campbell, D. T. (1957). Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 54(4), 297–312.
- Carson, R. T., Louviere, J. J., & Wasi, N. (2009). A cautionary note on designing discrete choice experiments: A comment on Lusk and Norwood's "effect of experiment design on choice-based conjoint valuation estimates". *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 91(4), 1056–1063.
- Champ, P. A., & Welsh, M. P. (2006). Survey methodologies for stated choice studies. In B. J. Kanninen (Ed.), *Valuing environmental amenities using stated choice studies: A common sense approach to theory and practice* (pp. 21–42). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Charlton, J. (2002). Review: Factorial survey methods: A valuable but under-utilised research method in nursing research? *Nursing Times Research*, 7(1), 44–45.
- Chrzan, K., & Orme, B. (2000). *An overview and comparison of design strategies for choice-based conjoint analysis*. Sequim, WA: Sawtooth.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Collett, J. L., & Childs, E. (2011). Minding the gap: Meaning, affect, and the potential shortcomings of vignettes. *Social Science Research*, 40(2), 513–522.
- Cragg, J. G. (1971). Some statistical models for limited dependent variables with application to the demand for durable goods. *Econometrica*, 39(5), 829–844.
- de Wolf, I., & van der Velden, R. (2001). Selection processes for three types of academic jobs: An experiment among Dutch employers of social sciences graduates. *European Sociological Review*, 17(3), 317–330.
- Diefenbach, H., & Opp, K.-D. (2007). When and why do people think there should be a divorce? An application of the factorial survey. *Rationality and Society*, 19(4), 485–517.
- Dülmer, H. (2007). Experimental plans in factorial surveys: Random or quota design? *Sociological Methods and Research*, 35(3), 382–409.

- Eifler, S. (2007). Evaluating the validity of self-reported deviant behavior using vignette analyses. *Quality and Quantity*, 41(2), 303–318.
- Eifler, S. (2010). Validity of a factorial survey approach to the analysis of criminal behavior. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 139–146.
- Emerson, M. O., Yancey, G., & Chai, K. J. (2001). Does race matter in residential segregation? Exploring the preferences of White Americans. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 922–935.
- Faia, M. (1980). The vagaries of the vignette world: A comment on Alves and Rossi. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(1), 951–954.
- Fehr, E., Fischbacher, U., Von Rosenblatt, B., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. (2002). A nation-wide laboratory: Examining trust and trustworthiness by integrating behavioral experiments into representative surveys. *Journal of Applied Social Science Studies [Schmollers Jahrbuch]*, 122(4), 519–542.
- Ferrini, S., & Scarpa, R. (2007). Designs with apriori information for nonmarket valuation with choice-experiments: A Monte Carlo study. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 53(3), 342–262.
- Finch, J. (1987). The vignette technique in survey research. *Sociology*, 21(1), 105–114.
- Fox, J. (2008). *Applied regression analysis and generalized linear models* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Franzen, A., & Pointner, S. (2012). Anonymity in the dictator game revisited. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 81(1), 74–81.
- Ganong, L. H., & Coleman, M. (2006). Multiple segment factorial vignette designs. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(2), 455–468.
- Garret, K. (1982). Child abuse: Problems of definition. In P. H. Rossi & S. L. Nock (Eds.), *Measuring social judgments. The factorial survey approach* (pp. 177–204). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Green, P. E., & Srinivasan, V. (1990). Conjoint analysis in marketing: New developments with implications for research and practice. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4), 3–19.
- Greene, W. H. (2003). *Econometric analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Groß, J., & Börensen, C. (2009). Wie valide sind Verhaltensmessungen mittels Vignetten? Ein methodischer Vergleich von faktoriellem Survey und Verhaltensbeobachtung [How valid are measurements of behavior by means of vignettes? A methodological comparison of factorial survey and observational data]. In P. Kriwy, C. Gross, & M. Jungbauer-Gans (Eds.), *Klein aber fein! Quantitative empirische Sozialforschung mit kleinen Fallzahlen* (pp. 149–178). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Jr., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2009). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Gunst, R. F., & Mason, R. L. (1991). *How to construct fractional factorial experiments*. Milwaukee, WI: ASQC Quality Press.
- Gustafsson, A., Herrmann, A., & Huber, F. (2007). Conjoint analysis as an instrument of market research practice. In A. Gustafsson, A. Herrmann, & F. Huber (Eds.), *Conjoint measurement: Methods and applications* (4th ed., pp. 3–30). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica*, 46(6), 1251–1271.
- Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J., & Yamamoto, T. (2014). Causal inference in conjoint analysis: Understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments. *Political Analysis*, 22(1), 1–30.
- Hechter, M., Ranger-Moore, J., Jasso, G., & Horne, C. (1999). Do values matter? An analysis of advance directives for medical treatment. *European Sociological Review*, 15(4), 405–430.
- Hembroff, L. A. (1987). The seriousness of acts and social contexts: A test of Black's theory of the behavior of law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(2), 322–347.

- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83.
- Hensher, D. A., Rose, J. M., & Greene, W. H. (2005). *Applied choice analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hermkens, P. L. J., & Boerman, F. A. (1989). Consensus with respect to the fairness of incomes: Differences between social groups. *Social Justice Research*, 3(3), 201–215.
- Hole, A. R. (2007). A comparison of approaches to estimating confidence intervals for willingness to pay measures. *Health Economics*, 16(8), 827–840.
- Horne, C. (2003). The internal enforcement of norms. *European Sociological Review*, 19(4), 335–343.
- Hox, J. J., Kreft, I. G. G., & Hermkens, P. L. J. (1991). The analysis of factorial surveys. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 19(4), 493–510.
- Huber, J., & Zwerina, K. (1996). The importance of utility balance in efficient choice designs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33(3), 307–317.
- Jann, B. (2005). *Erwerbsarbeit, Einkommen und Geschlecht. Studien zum Schweizer Arbeitsmarkt [Industriousness, income and gender: Studies regarding the Swiss labor market]*. Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Jasso, G. (1988). Whom shall we welcome? Elite judgments of the criteria for the selection of immigrants. *American Sociological Review*, 53(6), 919–932.
- Jasso, G. (2006). Factorial survey methods for studying beliefs and judgments. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 34(3), 334–423.
- Jasso, G. (2012). Safeguarding justice research. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 41(1), 217–239.
- Jasso, G., & Opp, K.-D. (1997). Probing the character of norms: A factorial survey analysis of the norms of political action. *American Sociological Review*, 62(6), 947–964.
- Jasso, G., & Rossi, P. H. (1977). Distributive justice and earned income. *American Sociological Review*, 42(4), 639–651.
- Jasso, G., & Webster, M., Jr. (1997). Double standards in just earnings for male and female workers. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(1), 66–78.
- Jasso, G., & Webster, M., Jr. (1999). Assessing the gender gap in just earnings and its underlying mechanisms. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62(4), 367–380.
- John, C. S., & Bates, N. A. (1990). Racial composition and neighborhood evaluation. *Social Science Research*, 19(1), 47–61.
- Johnson, J. W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 35(1), 1–19.
- Johnson, R. F., Kanninen, B., Bingham, M., & Özdemir, S. (2006). Experimental design for stated choice studies. In B. Kanninen (Ed.), *Valuing environmental amenities using stated choice studies: A common sense approach to theory and practice* (pp. 159–202). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- King, G., Murray, C. J. L., Salomon, J. A., & Tandon, A. (2004). Enhancing the validity and cross-cultural comparability of measurement in survey research. *American Political Science Review*, 98(1), 191–207.
- King, G., & Wand, J. (2007). Comparing incomparable survey responses: Evaluating and selecting anchoring vignettes. *Political Analysis*, 15(1), 46–66.
- Kreft, I., & De Leeuw, J. (1998). *Introducing multilevel modeling*. London, UK: Sage.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1987). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response-order effects in survey measurement. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51(2), 201–219.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1988). A test of the form-resistant correlation hypothesis: Ratings, rankings, and the measurement of values. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52(4), 526–538.
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality and Quantity*, 47(4), 2025–2047.

- Krysan, M., Couper, M. P., Farley, R., & Forman, T. A. (2009). Does race matter in neighborhood preferences? Results from a video experiment. *American Journal of Sociology*, *115*(2), 527–559.
- Kuhfeld, W. F. (1997). *Efficient experimental designs using computerized searches*. Sequim, WA: SAS Institute.
- Kuhfeld, W. F. (2010). *Marketing research methods in SAS: Experimental design, choice, conjoint and graphical techniques*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
- Kuhfeld, W. F., Tobias, R. D., & Garrat, M. (1994). Efficient experimental design with marketing research applications. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *31*(4), 545–557.
- Lancaster, K. J. (1966). A new approach to consumer theory. *Journal of Political Economy*, *74*(2), 132–157.
- Li, J.-C. A., Chang, E. C., & Jasso, G. (2007, August). *Computerized multivariate factorial survey*. Paper presented at the 102nd Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, NY.
- Liebig, S., & Mau, S. (2005). Wann ist ein Steuersystem gerecht? Einstellungen zu allgemeinen Prinzipien der Besteuerung und zur Gerechtigkeit der eigenen Steuerlast [When is a tax system just? Attitudes towards general principles of taxation and the justice of tax burdens]. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, *34*(6), 468–491.
- Lodge, M., & Tursky, B. (1981). On the magnitude scaling of political opinion in survey research. *American Journal of Political Science*, *25*(2), 376–419.
- Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata* (2nd ed.). College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Louviere, J. J. (1988). *Analyzing decision making: Metric conjoint analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Louviere, J. J. (2006). What you don't know might hurt you: Some unresolved issues in the design and analysis of discrete choice experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, *34*(1), 173–188.
- Louviere, J. J., Flynn, T. N., & Carson, R. T. (2010). Discrete choice experiments are not conjoint analysis. *Journal of Choice Modelling*, *3*(3), 57–72.
- Louviere, J. J., Hensher, D. A., & Swait, J. D. (2000). *Stated choice methods: Analysis and application*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Louviere, J. J., Hensher, D. A., & Swait, J. (2007). Conjoint preference elicitation methods in the broader context of random utility theory preference elicitation methods. In A. Gustafsson, A. Herrmann, & F. Huber (Eds.), *Conjoint measurement: Methods and applications* (4th ed., pp. 167–198). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Louviere, J. J., Islam, T., Wasi, N., Street, D., & Burgess, L. (2008). Designing discrete choice experiments: Do optimal designs come at a price? *Journal of Consumer Research*, *35*(2), 360–375.
- Luce, R. D., & Tukey, J. W. (1964). Simultaneous conjoint measurement: A new type of fundamental measurement. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *1*(1), 1–27.
- Ludwick, R., Wright, M. E., Zeller, R. A., Dowding, D. W., Lauder, W., & Winchell, J. (2004). An improved methodology for advancing nursing research: Factorial surveys. *Advances in Nursing Science*, *27*(3), 224–238.
- Ludwick, R., & Zeller, R. A. (2001). The factorial survey: An experimental method to replicate real world problems. *Nursing Research*, *50*(2), 129–133.
- Markovsky, B., & Eriksson, K. (2012). Comparing direct and indirect measures of just rewards: What have we learned? *Sociological Methods and Research*, *41*(1), 240–245.
- McDermott, R. (2002). Experimental methodology in political science. *Political Analysis*, *10*(4), 325–342.
- McFadden, D. (1976). Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior. In P. Zarembka (Ed.), *Frontiers in econometrics* (pp. 105–142). New York, NY: Academic Press.

- McFadden, D. (1986). The choice theory approach to market research. *Marketing Science*, 5(4), 275–297.
- Meudell, B. M. (1982). Household and social standing: Dynamic and static dimensions. In P. H. Rossi & S. L. Nock (Eds.), *Measuring social judgments: The factorial survey approach* (pp. 69–94). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Meyerhoff, J., & Liebe, U. (2009). Status quo effect in choice experiments: Empirical evidence on attitudes and choice task complexity. *Land Economics*, 85(3), 515–528.
- Miller, G. A. (1994). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 101(2), 343–352.
- Miller, J. L., Rossi, P. H., & Simpson, J. E. (1986). Perceptions of justice: Race and gender differences in judgments of appropriate prison sentences. *Law and Society Review*, 20(3), 313–334.
- Mood, C. (2010). Logistic regression: Why we cannot do what we think we can do, and what we can do about it. *European Sociological Review*, 26(1), 67–82.
- Mutz, D. C. (2011). *Population-based survey experiments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nisic, N., & Auspurg, K. (2009). Faktorieller Survey und klassische Bevölkerungsumfrage im Vergleich: Validität, Grenzen und Möglichkeiten beider Ansätze [Comparison of factorial surveys and classic population surveys: Validity, limits and potential of both methods]. In P. Kriwy & C. Gross (Eds.), *Klein aber fein! Quantitative empirische Sozialforschung mit kleinen Fallzahlen* (pp. 211–246). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Nock, S. L. (1982). Family social standing: Consensus on characteristics. In P. H. Rossi & S. L. Nock (Eds.), *Measuring social judgments: The factorial survey approach* (pp. 95–118). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- O'Toole, R., Webster, S. W., O'Toole, A. W., & Lucal, B. (1999). Teachers' recognition and reporting of child abuse: A factorial survey. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 23(11), 1083–1101.
- Pager, D., & Quillian, L. (2005). Walking the talk? What employers say versus what they do. *American Sociological Review*, 70(3), 355–380.
- Rabe-Hesketh, S., & Skrondal, A. (2008). *Multilevel and longitudinal modeling using Stata* (2nd ed.). College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Raudenbush, S., & Bryk, A. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (Vol. 1). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rauhut, H., & Winter, F. (2010). A sociological perspective on measuring social norms by means of strategy method experiments. *Social Science Research*, 39(6), 1181–1194.
- Rogers, W. H. (1994). Regression standard errors in clustered samples. *Stata Technical Bulletin*, 3(13), 19–23.
- Rossi, P. H. (1979). Vignette analysis: Uncovering the normative structure of complex judgments. In R. K. Merton, J. S. Coleman, & P. H. Rossi (Eds.), *Qualitative and quantitative social research: Papers in honor of Paul F. Lazarsfeld* (pp. 176–186). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Rossi, P. H., & Alves, W. M. (1980). Rejoinder to Faia. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(4), 954–955.
- Rossi, P. H., & Anderson, A. B. (1982). The factorial survey approach: An introduction. In P. H. Rossi & S. L. Nock (Eds.), *Measuring social judgments: The factorial survey approach* (pp. 15–67). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rossi, P. H., Sampson, W. A., Bose, C. E., Jasso, G., & Passel, J. (1974). Measuring household social standing. *Social Science Research*, 3(3), 169–190.
- Ryan, M., Gerard, K., & Amaya-Amaya, M. (2008). *Discrete choice experiments to value health and health care*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

- Ryan, M., McIntosh E., Dean, T., & Old, P. (2000). Trade-offs between location and waiting times in the provision of health care: the case of elective surgery on the Isle of Wight. *Journal of Public Health, 22*(2), 202–210.
- Samuelson, W., & Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status quo bias in decision making. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 1*(1), 7–59.
- Sauer, C., Auspurg, K., Hinz, T., & Liebig, S. (2011). The application of factorial surveys in general populations samples: The effects of respondent age and education on response times and response consistency. *Survey Research Methods, 5*(3), 89–102.
- Sauer, C., Auspurg, K., Hinz, T., Liebig, S., & Schupp, J. (2014). *Method effects in factorial surveys: An analysis of respondents' comments, interviewers' assessments, and response behavior* (SOEP Papers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research 629). Berlin: German Institute for Economic Research (DIW).
- Scarpa, R., & Rose, J. M. (2008). Design efficiency for non-market valuation with choice modelling: How to measure it, what to report and why. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 52*(3), 253–282.
- Schaeffer, N. C., & Bradburn, N. M. (1989). Respondent behavior in magnitude estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 84*(406), 402–413.
- Schrenker, M. (2009). Warum fast alle das deutsche Rentensystem ungerecht finden, aber trotzdem nichts daran ändern möchten [Why almost everybody considers the German pensions system to be unjust, but nobody wants to change it: The perception of just pensions and the acceptance of reforms]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 61*(2), 1–24.
- Schuman, H., & Presser, S. (1981). *Questions and answers in attitude surveys: Experiments on question form, wording and context*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Schwarz, N. (2007). Cognitive aspects of survey methodology. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21*(2), 277–287.
- Schwarz, N., & Knäuper, B. (2000). Cognition, aging and self-reports. In D. C. Park & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Cognitive aging: A primer* (pp. 233–252). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Shepelak, N. J., & Alwin, D. F. (1986). Beliefs about inequality and perceptions of distributive justice. *American Sociological Review, 51*(1), 30–46.
- Shlay, A. B. (1985). Castles in the sky: Measuring housing and neighborhood ideology. *Environment and Behavior, 17*(5), 593–626.
- Shlay, A. B. (1986). Taking apart the American dream: The influence of income and family composition on residential evaluations. *Urban Studies, 23*(4), 253–270.
- Sniderman, P. M., & Grob, D. B. (1996). Innovations in experimental design in attitude surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22*, 377–399.
- Snijders, T. A. B. (2001). Sampling. In A. Leyland & H. Goldstein (Eds.), *Contribution to multilevel modelling of health statistics* (pp. 159–174). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Snijders, T. A. B. (2005). Power and sample size in multilevel linear models. In B. S. Everitt & D. C. Howell (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science* (Vol. 3, pp. 1570–1573). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (1993). Standard errors and sample sizes for two-level research. *Journal of Educational Statistics, 18*(3), 237–259.
- Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (2012). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Soofi, E. S., Retzer, J. J., & Yasai-Ardekani, M. (2000). A framework for measuring the importance of variables with applications to management research and decision models. *Decision Sciences, 31*(3), 595–625.
- Stevens, S. S. (1957). On the psychophysical law. *Psychological Review, 64*(3), 153–181.

- Struck, O., Krause, A., & Pfeifer, C. (2008). Entlassungen: Gerechtigkeitsempfinden und Folgewirkungen [Dismissals: Feelings of justice and subsequent effects. Theoretical concepts and empirical results]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 60(1), 106–126.
- Telser, H., & Zweifel, P. (2007). Validity of discrete-choice experiments evidence for health risk reduction. *Applied Economics*, 39(1), 69–78.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1927). A law of comparative judgment. *Psychological Review*, 34(4), 273–286.
- Tobin, J. (1958). Estimation of relationships for limited dependent variables. *Econometrica*, 26(1), 24–36.
- Tourangeau, R., Rasinski, K. A., Bradburn, N., & D'Andrade, R. (1989). Carryover effects in attitude surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 53(4), 495–524.
- Vonesh, E. F., & Chinchilli, V. G. (1997). *Linear and nonlinear models for the analysis of repeated measurements*. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
- Wallander, L. (2009). 25 years of factorial surveys in sociology: A review. *Social Science Research*, 38(3), 505–520.
- Wallander, L. (2012). Measuring social workers' judgements: Why and how to use the factorial survey approach in the study of professional judgements. *Journal of Social Work*, 12(4), 364–384.
- Wason, K. D., Polonsky, M. J., & Hyman, M. R. (2002). Designing vignette studies in marketing. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 10(3), 41–58.
- Weinberg, J., Freese, J., & McElhattan, D. (2014). Comparing data characteristics and results of an online factorial survey between a population-based and a crowdsourcing-recruited sample. *Sociological Science*, 1, 292–310.
- Will, J. A. (1993). The dimensions of poverty: Public perceptions of the deserving poor. *Social Science Research*, 22(3), 312–332.
- Wirtz, J. (1996). Controlling halo in attribute-specific customer satisfaction measures: Towards a conceptual framework. *Asian Journal of Marketing*, 5(1), 41–58.
- Wittink, D. A., Krishnamurthi, L., & Nutter, J. B. (1982). Comparing derived importance weights across attributes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8(4), 471–474.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2013). *Introductory econometrics: A modern approach* (5th ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.