"Opinions in Web Surveys: Promoting Extremism?"

by

Jo Dipnall, CogNETive Pty Ltd and Andrew Jeavons, Jeavons Associates (USA)

Web surveys are now a fact of life. There is little doubt they will continue to grow as a tool for market research. The question must now be: what are they best used for ? To assume that web surveys function in exactly the same way as CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) is misleading.

To get the data for the survey instrument, questions have to be presented to a human somehow and the responses recorded. The best way of doing this seems to be using another human. This is the principle behind CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing), CATI and paper. With Web Assisted Interviewing (WAI) we have replaced the human being with a very large amount of technology. Consider the interface elements in CATI. We need clear telephone lines (a simple technology these days), a CATI system running on a computer and an interviewer. We don't usually need to think hard about the reliability or quality of the telephone connection (for instance it is perfectly feasible to perform interviews in Japan from Australia or the United Kingdom). We don't have to worry about what sort of telephone the respondent has and how it works or how well they can operate it. Telephones are simple appliances; you pick them up and speak into them. CATI involves (mostly) calling the respondent and asking them questions. In CATI the technology is sufficiently mature as to appear relatively transparent. Telephone networks are complex things, but we really don't see that in our day to day usage of them.

In comparison, Web surveys use a lot of complex and immature technology. Respondents need some sort of machine to access the Web, at the very least a personal computer (PC) of some form. This involves a telephone call (again), but that is only the first step in the process. The respondent needs an Internet Service Provider (ISP), who then has to be made to establish a connection to the site that is hosting the Web survey. There is a modem speed factor and an overall machine hardware factor. Next comes the Web browser where there are a lot of different versions of browsers and conformity to HTML (Hyper Text Markup Language) that can vary in some subtle and some radical ways. On top of this the user can vary the way their browser looks to them. Font size, colour, graphics and screen layout can all vary from respondent to respondent. Imagine if the respondent's telephone is not uniform in terms of basic sound clarity, or if the words spoken were delayed or the pitch shifted or distorted in CATI. Imagine if the telephone call between the respondent and the interviewer at certain times of day had a good chance of simply disconnecting without warning. Interviewers can have some distorting effects in traditional interviewing, but these are more controllable via interviewer training and appropriate Supervisor monitoring. Web surveys contain many more potentially detrimental factors than traditional interviewing techniques. Also, the respondents in WAI have to be proactive in initiating the survey in the first place. The sum of all this is that it seems dangerous to assume that the dynamics and process of WAI is the same as traditional survey data collection. WAI is not CATI in another form. The influence of technology is far higher in WAI than other interviewer mediated forms of survey data collection.

Given these differences between CATI and WAI it doesn't seem too unreasonable to assume that the responses to questions may differ between the two. A lot of research has concentrated on trying to show that WAI is just like CATI - which it can't be. The real question should be: what is the advantage of WAI over other data collection methodologies ? CATI is superior to paper in many ways CAPI in some ways is superior to CATI. What are the unique features of WAI that can be harnessed to enhance and improve data collection ?

We decided to investigate an aspect of web surveys, which we had heard of anecdotally. We had heard that on the web there was a tendency for open end responses (verbatims) to be richer and there was some evidence that ratings (using a rating scale) could differ between the web and CATI. We thought it would be interesting to conduct a survey to look at the differences between a web and CATI survey in these terms.

Web surveying is growing. Numbers differ, companies report anywhere from 7-40% of their interviewing now being performed via the web. This rise in web surveying also generates some interesting issues.

It's the sample, stupid.

It doesn't take long when working with web surveys to hit the sampling issue. Web samples are said to be biased in many ways (too many single males with no life living vicariously through the web). In the USA in particular, CATI is held up as the "gold standard" against which all other research methods are measured. Frankly, this seems to be a paradox given the parlous state of CATI in the USA. The rising non-compliance rates are making it look increasingly suspect. In reality CATI sample is in many ways self selected in the same way as WAI. You aren't forced to perform a CATI survey even if you are called at random and you can always screen them with an answering machine or number-display.

At the 2000 CASRO (Committee of American Survey Research Organisations) technical conference in New York a panel was convened of the leading web survey companies (DMS/AOL, Greenfield Online, Harris Interactive) with an invited speaker to comment on the state and validity of web surveys. The invited speaker was Warren Mitofsky who widely seen as the "god" of survey sampling in the USA and one of the first advocates of Random Digit Dialing (RDD) as a sampling method. Mitofsky roundly condemned web surveys as totally invalid in sampling terms. He quite simply does not believe in the validity of web surveys. The reaction of the members of the panel was interesting. It is fair to say that they do believe in them and not in Mitofsky. More importantly, the issue is **so what** *else do we have*? CATI is not seen as the future of data collection in the USA, so arguing about the validity of web surveys vs CATI is seen as pointless. CATI can't stay as the gold standard so other means must be found. At the moment the web is the next big hope.

When is spam not spam ? When it is a telephone call....

At the same CASRO conference there was an interesting discussion of spam or unsolicited email. This is particularly apposite given the recent legal tussle between Harris Interactive and an independent "watchdog" organisation who blacklisted Harris Interactive as allegedly spamming to obtain respondents. This battle raises the issue of **permission research**. Is CATI is telephone spam? Unsolicited email is condemned as being intrusive, but in the same breath some researchers will still see CATI as perfectly valid. Yet is CATI a form of spamming? We take a random sample of all possible telephone numbers, and then we systematically dial them without permission ! With the web we have entered the age of both permission marketing and permission research, where we need to obtain the agreement of the respondent before asking them questions or trying to sell to them

Web surveys, conducted properly, are an evolutionary step in survey research. We need to research where this step takes us.

Paradata and Web Surveys

Mick Couper at the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan has put forward a new data concept in relation to surveys. He terms this "paradata". We already now what data is, metadata is data about the data, code lists and so on. Paradata is described as data that concerns the *process of the survey or instrument*. For example, interview length, error logs, timings of question responses, counting of repeated questions, counts of where the survey was abandoned and the characteristics of responses. This later property is the one which will be examined later in this paper. The way people respond to surveys is as important as what they say in the response.

Paradata has been available from CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) systems for many years. However, it has a particular relevance and importance for web surveys. Web surveys share few of the characteristics of CATI surveys, in fact they are probably more like dynamic paper interviews than any other mode of data collection used within survey research. The most significant difference is the absence of the interviewer and all the benefits that they bring to ensuring the completion and quality of the interview. This is not to say that interviewers may present their own set of problems where bias is always an issue. Paradata has the potential to greatly improve our present web survey practices in two ways.

The quality of data .

The first use of paradata is as a source of information for quality control of web surveys. Very little seems to be said about quality control of web surveys. We know that we can get a lot of data and this is one of the greatest advantages of web surveys. But what do we know of the quality of the data ? And what can we use to measure the quality of the data ? Monitoring within CATI is the front line of quality control. This is usually to control interviewer bias. What is the equivalent for web surveys ? Paradata can hold the key to this. The biggest problem with paradata for web surveys currently is that it is not integrated (this is based on the packages we have used or investigated) with the survey data or metadata. The data about the timing of the questions, how long it took to get a response, or how long the server took to respond may be in system related logfiles which are large and cumbersome to manipulate. Using paradata with the data and metadata is currently not possible on a production basis. Surely it needs to be?

What sort of paradata can we obtain ? Below is a table of some sorts of paradata and their uses within web surveys.

Paradata type	Use
Questions Timings: respondent reaction times (server and client side).	Determination of extreme value for responses to questions, detection of problems with questions.
Question Timings: web server response to requests.	Maintenance of quality of connection to respondent (Bayer "3 second" metric)
Data on repeat presentations of questions.	Detection of error by respondent in completing the question - detection of problem questions.
Survey abandonment data - which question did the respondent quit on ?	Detection of problem questions or technical problems (speed of connection)
Number of responses on multiple selection questions.	Detection of "cruising" the questionnaire/random responding.
Length of open ended responses.	Detection of "cruising" the questionnaire/random responding.

The term "cruising" refers to the respondent making any response to get through the questionnaire; this can be a problem with surveys that employ incentives. The "Bayer 3 second metric" was coined by Len Bayer from HarrisInteractive, it refers to there being a response within 3 seconds to any submission by a respondent to the interviewing system.

It is important to have guidelines on the basic responsiveness of the software system that is used to deliver the survey. In a conversation it can be very disconcerting and disturbing if one part replies slowly to the other. There is a well know phenomenon within cognitive psychology called delayed auditory feedback. This is where the sound of someone's voice is played back to them with a delay. If the correct delay is used it renders speech impossible, the delayed feedback disrupts the speech generation process. Consistent feedback from the survey instrument is important to the respondent too. To keep the respondent motivated the survey system should maintain a consistent level of response. Of course one of the problems with this is the variation of activity with in the web. From moment to moment the speed of access to the web for both the respondent and the web survey system can vary.

The Study

We decided to look at the characteristics of responses to rating scales and open ended questions on the web and on CATI. We developed a questionnaire, which had two parts. The first was a series of 42 randomly presented statements, which required the respondent to respond via a rating scale. The second part was a series of four verbatims requiring the respondent to provide comments on current issues. Four compulsory verbatims were collected based only if the Respondent Agreed/Disagreed in the first part to the following statements:

"The changes to the Australian gun laws were a good thing." "Abortion is murdering an unborn child." "Voluntary Euthanasia means the right to die with dignity." "I would much rather work fewer hours and earn less money."

Selecting the issues to use for the statements and verbatims was a little difficult. We decided to focus on five areas: Capital punishment, Abortion, Land rights, Euthanasia, Work and support of Australian industry. We wanted to have some issues that were contentious and others that were simply topical. We also collected demographic information such as age, sex, education, experience with the internet, usage of the internet, geographical location and city type, ethnicity, marital status, employment status, income and occupation. All respondents were informed that they could vote for a favorite charity for the top two to receive a donation as thanks for conducting the survey.

For the web part of the sample we used four different sources of respondents:

- (1) Some CogNETive Panel members.
- (2) Email survey Respondents who indicated they were willing to do some more internet research.
- (3) Respondents from some previous CATI studies who indicated they were willing to do some internet research.
- (4) Recent intercept survey Respondents who indicated they were willing to do some more internet research.

We issued one email reminder for groups 1, 2 and 3 and the survey was kept live for 2 weeks. Group 4 was not emailed a reminder due to the timing of the study.

We performed the web survey first, and then used its mix to determine the quotas for the CATI audience. The final quotas for the CATI study were:

- Location (ie Australian State)
- o Age
- o Gender

We were careful to use the same questionnaire for both Web and CATI. We ran the interviews over a one week period.

For the rating questions, the interviewers were instructed to prompt, "Was that Agree/Disagree A Little or Strongly Agree/Disagree" only if Respondent said simply "Agree/Disagree". We tried to keep the mode of presentation as neutral as possible, so there was no prompting for open-ended verbatims. Since the same introduction for Web was used for CATI, some interviewers indicated that the introduction was rather long and people dropped out here. Of the 4,768 contact calls, 1,935 refused to continue with the survey, of which 1,921, or 99%, refused straight away at the introduction stage.

Response Rate

The Web response rate was calculated to be 35%, based on the formula :

Number of completes divided by valid emails

(where number of valid emails = number sent - number of bounce-backs)

The CATI response rate was calculated to be 12%, based on the formula :

Number of completes divided by number of dials

(where number of dials = total dials - Not Used - Unobtainable - Business)

This dramatic difference in the response rate could be attributed to the large number of initial refusals obtained in CATI. Since it was imperative that everyone be treated the same way, the Interviewers were briefed **not** to sumarise the introduction or alter it in an way. Also, since the web Respondents had already given their permission to be interviewed again, it would be wrong of us to pay too much attention to this response rate difference.

Results

The demographic profile of Web and CATI was remarkably similar, which is largely due to the type of quotas used in CATI. This is confirmed in the following graphs:

Age



Gender





*Note: The *Overseas* Respondents in the web study were filtered out of the main analysis in order to keep the two Respondent types consistent.

City Type



Marital Status



Employment Status



We compared the means for scores on each rating in the web versus CATI groups. Statistically there was not significant difference between the two sets of rating using a Wilcoxon matched pairs test. There are some variations in the first 7 or 8 scales on capital punishment and the scales 29-42 that deal with Euthanasia, Life and Big business issues. The values were very close to each other for most of the other scales.



Below is a graph showing the differences between the mean values:



We also looked at the variance of the scales between web and CATI. Below is a plot of the variance of the scales in each mode.



There are some interesting differences in the variance of the scale scores. Overall web scores seem to have a slightly lower variance than CATI scores. Scale 5, "early release of life sentence" shows the largest difference. Scale 6, "changes to the Australian gun laws" is close behind.

An index was calculated between 1 and 100 to try to establish the **strength** of opinion between Web versus CATI on each topic. An index of 1 represented ANTI the topic and 100 PRO the topic. Statements were first grouped into topics and then categorized according to if they were pro/anti each topic.

The final index table and graph is detailed below:

	Total	Web	CATI	Web - CATI
RESPONDENTS	524	4 2	62 26	2 0
Categories				
Capital Punishment	43.3	7 42.	07 44.6	7 -2.6
Abortion	58.5	9 60.	42 56.7	5 3.67
Immigration	67.1	8 67	. 9 66.4	6 1.45
Aboriginal Issues	50.9	7 51.	63 50.3	1 1.31
Euthanasia	71.6	9 72.	65 70.7	3 1.93
Lifestyle	35.7	7 35.	89 35.6	5 0.24
Big Business	48.6	3 51.	62 45.6	5 5.97



Interestingly, overall the web rating were slightly more positive in terms of being PRO the statements rated, which is different from the scale values.

Open End Responses

It was found when coding the four open-ended questions there was a vast difference with the **amount** of information given in the Web versus CATI and the **type** of responses given. Every open-ended response was categorized into a *type* of response. The categories are as follows:

DK/Ref - this would be if the Respondent stated they did not know or would not/refuse to comment.

Strong - this would be if there was emphasis in the form of uppercase amongst lowercase exclamation marks, swearing, sarcasm.

Story - this would be if the Respondent gave an example in response to the question.

3+ Lines - this would be if there were 3 or more lines in the comment.

2 Lines - this would be if there were 2 lines in the comment.

 $\ensuremath{\textbf{Short}}$ - this would be if the response was one line or less.

The following table and graph below details the differences between these types of responses in Web versus CATI.

	Total	Web	CATI		Veb - CATI
RESPONDENTS	524	4	262	262	0
Diagnostic Total					
SHORT	1134	4	462	672	-210
2 LINES	85	3	403	450	-47
3+ LINES	39	6	303	93	210
STORY	15	C	79	71	8
STRONG	12	6	104	22	82
Don't know/Refused	2	1	3	18	-15



It is clear that there is a trend for the responses from the web to be longer than the responses in CATI. There is a marked difference in the strength of the responses in the web, respondents are more expressive than under CATI. The most interesting differences seem to be at both ends of the scale: the *SHORT* and *3*+ *LINES* response categories. Perhaps more than three lines is the optimum comment length for respondents, and one line for interviewers?

Strong language

We use the term "Strong language" to describe forceful language in expression of respondent opinions the open ended questions. Since the majority of the interviewers in CATI entered the verbatim comments from the respondent in uppercase, it was more difficult to distinguish strong

language, so the interviewer removed this key element of expressiveness. We did feel that relative to CATI, web open ends tended to be more forcefully expressed.

Interviewer filtering

The text below gives an example of where there was interviewer filtering. There were instances in CATI where the comment was entered as if the Interviewer was detailing what the respondent said, rather than the exact response from the respondent.

EG Lifestyle Statement- "I would much rather work fewer hours and earn less money"

Response:

"WORKS PART TIME AND BELIEVES SHE NEEDS THE MONEY SHE EARNS"

Response:

"WHILST MONEY IS NOT EVERYTHING, SHE HAS PERSONAL SATISFACTION IN THE WORKPLACE, MAKES HER HAPPY, ACCOMPLISHING THINGS, PUTTING IN MORE HOURS = MONEY = ABLE TO TRAVEL. HAVE LUXURIES IMPROVE MY LIFESTYLE"

Order of reasons different between Web and CATI

Since the order of responses based on highest to lowest can have an impact on the decision-making process, we decided to code the open-ended responses and compare Web versus CATI. We found that the order and type (ie PRO versus ANTI) across topics and web versus CATI were indeed different.

TOP 4 Reasons...<u>Gun Laws</u>

<u>Statement:</u> "The changes to Australian gun laws were a good thing."

Web Reasons:	
1.	Less guns around will restrict usage 21%
2.	Guns unnecessary 14%
3.	Less risk of mass/ 'spur of the moment' massacres 12%
4.	Less accidents 10%
CATI Reasons:	
1.	Less guns around will restrict usage 23%
2.	Not change anything as criminals will be still able to get guns 12%
3.	Controls who has access to guns 11%
4.	Guns unnecessary 9%

For the **Gun Laws** statement we can see that the top four web reasons for their rating were all progun laws, but the CATI introduced an anti-gun laws reason as it's second highest, with only two reasons the same for both web and CATI.

TOP 4 Reasons...<u>Abortion</u>

Statement: "Abortion is murdering an unborn child"

Web Reasons:	
1.	It's the mother's decision 16%
2.	Abortion is better if the child will be unwanted 12%
3.	Need to review each individual circumstance 10%
4.	Life starts outside the body 9%
CATI Reasons:	
1.	It's the mother's decision 12%
2.	The fetus is a human being and alive, so it's wrong to abort 11%
3.	Fine to abort if there are birth defects/very sick 7%
4.	Abortion is better if the child will be unwanted 6%
For the Abortic	on statement, again we can see that all top four web reasons were pro-gun laws, but

For the **Abortion** statement, again we can see that all top four web reasons were pro-gun laws, but the CATI introduced an anti-gun laws reason as it's second highest.

We can see that there were only two similar reasons for web and CATI which is the same trend as the gun-laws scenario.

TOP 4 Reasons...Voluntary Euthanasia

Web Reasons:	
1.	It's the individual's right to control the end of their life – freedom of choice 46%
2.	Fine if there is no glimmer of hope/terminally ill/chronic pain and suffering 37%
3.	Quality, not quantity, of life important 13%
4.	Keep dignity before death 10%
CATI Reasons:	
1.	Fine if there is no glimmer of hope/terminally ill/chronic pain and suffering 40%
2.	It's the individual's right to control the end of their life – freedom of choice 38%
3.	Quality, not quantity, of life important 8%
4.	Don't want friends and relatives to watch and suffer 8%

For the **Voluntary Euthanasia** statement we can see that three reasons are the same for both web and CATI, but the order is different. However, all four reasons for web and CATI are PRO Voluntary Euthanasia, with only the fourth reason differing between the two. This is consistent with the index previously reported, where it was PRO and very close between Web and CATI (ie 72.65 and 70.73 respectively).

TOP 4 Reasons...Lifestyle

<u>Statement:</u> "I would much rather work fewer hours and earn less money"

Web Reasons:	
1.	Need money – pay bills/mortgage/retirement 22%
2.	Work is my life/important/enjoy working 18%
3.	More money needed to improve lifestyle and become more comfortable 14%
4.	Able to spend more time with family and children 12%
CATI Reasons:	
1.	Need money – pay bills/mortgage/retirement 19%
2.	Work is my life/important/enjoy working 15%
3.	Able to spend more time with family and children 11%
4.	More money needed to improve lifestyle and become more comfortable 9%
For the Lifesty	le statement we can see that all four reasons are the same for Web and CATL but the

For the **Lifestyle** statement we can see that all four reasons are the same for Web and CATI, but the third and fourth reasons are in a different order. Again, this is consistent with the index, where it was quite anti-lifestyle, with very little difference between the two modes (ie Web = 35.89; CATI = 35.65).

Discussion and Conclusions

For the rating scale values there we found a small variation of scale between the Web and CATI presentation depending on subject matter. The topic areas where there was some divergence were:

Euthanasia Capital punishment Life Style and Big business

Why these ? Not an easy question to answer. Euthanasia and capital punishment are both emotive issues dealing with life and death. It may be an effect due to the comprehension of the question? But it does seem clear that the assumption that the rating values will always be the same between CATI and the Web is not valid. It is quite possible that using a greater range than our five point scale would increase any differences between the two modalities of presentation and this is something that should be noted. There also seems to be a difference in the variation between Web and CATI. The ranges of responses given are slightly different between the two, not huge, but are still there. Looking at our positive index, we see that the web is slightly higher in most cases, especially with the topic of capital punishment. Certain issues we have mentioned above can also trigger a difference in the scale value, so some care should be taken to check that the effect is not present. Overall it seems that there is an effect but is often subtle where it manifests itself.

Reviewing open end responses we see a much clearer difference. Web respondents give far longer responses than CATI respondents. It is evident from the open ended text that the interviewer as intermediary in this process could be the main cause of this. Interviewers will tend to pre-code and paraphrase the respondent's responses. There is also the fact that respondents will probably express themselves differently in a spoken, rather than a "written" mode. The web questionnaire gave more opportunity for respondents to think in an unhurried way. With a CATI interview there is always the feeling that a timely response be given to keep up the cadence of the conversation. Conversations must flow, and even if no probing occurs there is an inevitable acceptable delay before the respondent feels they should respond with something.

The question is: given that there is more information (or at least more text) in the web open ends, is it relevant? Is longer open ended text better "quality" data. The quality of the data can be evaluated by how useful it is, a short response is not necessarily worse than a long one if it is more accurate. Does the web encourage more "noise" in open ends which ultimately reduces the quality of the data? We aren't able to evaluate this in this study, but it does need to be investigated. Is the extra coding cost of longer open ends worth it? Should attempts be made to reduce the amount of open ended text that can be entered in web surveys to make it conform more to CATI?

Of course in our study we did not probe in the CATI part of study and we would not doubt have had richer open ends if we had. The reason we did not is that it is hard to exactly define an equivalent mode of questioning in Web to reproduce the concept of verbal probing.

It isn't really very surprising that there are some differences between the web and CATI studies. There are very few similarities between the two modalities.

Here is a table showing some of the differences between web, self administered paper and CATI surveys.

Modality	Interviewer ?	Level of Technology	Input mode
CATI	Yes	Simple	Verbal
Web	No	High	Typed/Click
Self Admin Paper	No	Very Simple	Written

CATI and web are not very similar, the most glaring difference is that there is no interviewer in web surveys. CATI and web do share one characteristic: the questions are presented on a computer screen for administration. Web survey software tends to have been derived from CATI survey software, but that isn't a reason to expect that the data collected on the web will be the same as that collected using CATI.

The most significant difference is the input mode: verbal versus typed. The web lends itself to careful consideration of responses where there are no implicit time pressures and this is not the case with CATI.

Multi-mode mode and hybrid studies (where two or more modes are used for the same survey for a single respondent) are becoming more popular. Any effects due the different modalities have to be carefully weighed. Miller (2000) points out that multiple mode studies should take into account modes and "avoid 'check all that apply' questions, drop down boxes, visual metaphors of scales and single scrollable screens"

Miller is trying to eliminate the interface differences that affect responses. This is fine, but then there are some advantages that the web may have over CATI or paper (i.e. graphics) which are a positive benefit.

So finally, are web surveys the same as CATI ? No, but then again they are very different modalities, so it is hardly surprising that there are some differences. Web surveys are like dynamic paper surveys.

The way opinions are expressed is different between the two, and this will lead to some differences. CATI promotes more spontaneous expression in the context of a conversation, perhaps the web gets closer to the core semantics. The question is which of these is more useful to market research.

An updated version of this paper and the final presentation will be found at the link

http://www.cognetive.com.au/MRSA2000.htm

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank very much Sweeney Research in Melbourne Australia for funding the CATI component of this study. The web component was performed by CogNETive Pty Ltd.

References:

Miller, Jeff 2000, Paper presented at ARF & ESOMAR conference on Online Media Measurement Paris, France.

Some Interesting verbatims...

Below are some examples of interesting verbatims that contrast the differences between the web and CATI studies.

Question: Gun Laws

"The changes to the Australian gun laws were a good thing"

Web....

The sole function of a gun is to kill. There should be a control on this - whether people or animals are the targets.

I have a close friend who owns a farm and he had many automatic and semi-automatic weopons for use on his farm and when he went hunting. He was not careless with guns unlike many crooks who use guns to danger innocent people's lives. The changes to the gun laws mean that the crooks have won in terms of making it easier for them to endanger innocent people. John Howard is a dope!

CATI....

B/C MY NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOURS WERE SHOT AND KILLED BY SOMEONE THEY PISSED OFF - I JUST THINK ITS REALLY BAD THAT ANYONE CAN HAVE ACCESS TO A WEAPON NEEDLESSLY - PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN SUBURBIA HAVE NO NEED OF GUNS

YOU'VE GOT FARMERS AND NORMAL HOUSEHOLDS AND YOU CAN'T DEFEND YOURSELVES FROM PEOPLE WHO COME TO KILL YOU. BUT DOESN'T AGREE WITH KIDS SHOOTING. SHOULD BE THERE FOR PROTECTION AND SECURITY AS LONG AS LOCKED FROM KIDS AND HAVE NO BULLETS

I'M A FARMER AND YOU HAVE TO CONTROL PESTS EG. RABBITS/IF YOU HAVE TO APPLY FOR A GUN YOU CAN LOSE HEAPS OF STOCK//

THERE ARE PEOPLE STILL GETTING SHOT, STABBED AND RUN OVER

Question: Abortion

"Abortion is murdering an unborn child"

Web....

If a feutus is miscarried, or stillborn, you would be labelling the mother a murderer.

Because an unborn child is unborn , therefore, not a part of the real world, therefore, the mother's considerations are the most important.

Abortion is the individual choice an individual or couple should make depending on the circumstances that surround the initial pregnancy. Points to note; 1. Should a child be brought into this world where they would lack the basic fundamentals of rearing a child through poverty and struggle. 2. Rape? how would you expect a women to face that child every day and not relive the moment in her life whereby she was violated without consent. Plus if that women was to have a partner more than one person would be affected!!!!!

(whether she is 18 and at high school or 45 with six children under 15). There would be nothing worse than going back to the back yard abortions of past years.

An unborn child is a foetus and a potential child, not a child. An analogy is an acorn is not an oaktree.

CATI....

IT DEPENDS ON THE STAGE OF GESTASTION AND THE DEFINITION OF A HUMAN BEING - I DO NOT BELIEVE A FETUS IS A PERSON IN THE FIRST TRIMESTER.

BECAUSE A FOETUS HAS NO RIGHTS

BELIEVE THAT LIFE BEGINS AT CONCEPTION/LIFE IS SACRED FROM THAT POINT/TO TERMINATE A LIFE AT ANY STAGE IS MURDER/.

I'VE SEEN ABORTIONS AND I'VE SEEN THER BABY TRY TO BREATHE

Voluntary Euthanasia

"Voluntary Euthanasia means the right to die with dignity"

Web....

Because I am 70 and would like the right to control the ending of my life. I have had chronic pain for 40 years and am on morphine with no end in sight. When I have had enough ZI would like to chose.

We all die sooner or later. I have known several people who have died of cancer (and also two dogs). The end was inevitable, but much less painful for my dogs.

Someone who died in any of the world wars did die with dignity. The dignity for fighting for themselvs, thier families and thier country. A perso who chooses to die by Voluntary Euthanaisa is not dying with dignity. In fact they are dying as failures.

People who are suffering in pain now have the option to go peacefully. What do we do to a dog if the are in pain or suffering. We put them down. We all value pets lives as much as we value our own. What is the difference???

Life belongs to the individual. Quality of life is more important

I feel that every creature has the right to wander off into the bush and lay down and die or be killed by predators. Unfortunately it seems that in our civilised state of mind some people seem to have forgotton that we are still creatures and when things get to a point that pain and suffering is too high, many of our civilised thought processes revert to the more basic patterns and that is what we want to do die by our our choice at a place and time of our choice.

Just take a walk around Nursing Homes or visit elderly people in the last days of their life and see the despair in their eyes and assess their quality of life. Terminally ill people who suffer constant pain and have no quality of life should, if they choose, have the right to die with dignity.

Sometime dignity is all a person has left

We lets our pets die with dignity but not our families, how backwards are we?

I believe that quality of life is as important as quantity of life. I believe that a person being artificially kept alive by the use of machines should have the right, provided they are in full control of their mental faculties, to decide that they don't wish to continue living. Safeguards would be crucial in ensuring that the decision was entered into freely by the patient.

My father in law was dying of Pulminary Fibrosis (his lungs had hardened, and he could hardly breathe). Instead of being able to grant him his dignity, we had to nurse him with respite care. He was the most vibrant and intelligent man I have met, and to see him in this state, and to hear him BEG his doctor to be allowed to go in peace and dignity was heart-breaking. If someone is terminally ill, and makes their OWN decision that this is what they want, then they should have the choice. When someone is NFR (Not For Ressucitation), their wishes are respected...why not someone who KNOWS that their pain will not diminish, and that they will be trapped in a body wracked with pain? The old addage If your dog was like this, you would put them to sleep.. is so true. Why should we be unable to decide for ourselves what happens to US?

This is one step away from suicide and could also, in some cases, result in murder. There have been cases where people one day want to die and a little time later want to live. There are also cases where children, spouses and relatives have tried to murder an individual. This would give such people another means to achieve the result they want.

CATI....

I JUST THINK IT IS - BETTER TO LIVE ON YOUR FEET THAN DIE ON YOUR KNEES

NOT TOO AGREE WITH VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIS IS TO ROB A PERSON OF THEIR RIGHTS

PURELY BECAUSE, THE PEOPLE WHO ARE AGING WITH LIFE ENDING ILLNESSES HAVE LIVED THEIR LIFE AND SHOULD HAVE THEIR DIGNITY. DON'T WANT TO BE A BURDEN. THE LOSS OF THEIR INDEPENDENCE.

I SAW MY MOTHER WHO HAD AN OPERATION AND HER LEG WAS GOING TO GANGRENE AND SHE WAS INCONTINENT....SHE'S 87...AND THE DOCTOR PROLONGED HER LIFE...MY MOTHER WAS IN PAIN AND IT WAS WRONG. I HAVE BEEN A STRONG ADVOCATE EVER SINCE.

BETTER TO DIE THANTO BE A VEGETABLE

IF YOU GO DOWN THAT PATH, IT LEADS TO MANIPULATIVE FAMILY TO ENCOURAGE THE ELDERLY TO END THEIR LIVES IN ORDER TO GET THEIR MONEY, ECT.

Lifestyle

"I would much rather work fewer hours and earn less money"

Web....

Work is my life. I went through a state of depression partly due to the fact that my right to work was taken away by the medical profession. Working fewer hours simply bred frustration in me. If I work harder now, I realise, I can make my later life more comfortable.

I need the money

If I were a rich person then I would agree with the statement, but, as I am not rich, I would rather, at this point in time in my life, work longer for the money...... money makes the world go 'round

The more I work, the more money I have, the more I can afford for my family, the more we will enjoy our life, the happier we are. Happiness and family are the most important things in life.

Quality of life is important to me, and that involves more time with people I love and less at work. To quote a poster I've seen No man on his death bed ever wished he'd spent an extra hour at work .

This is a lazy man's motto. Not applicable to hard working class.

Balance. You have to be able to work, rest and play. And if achieving some kind of balance by compensating a few more dollars each week, then so be it. What use is extra money if you are in no position to enjoy it. By that token, if earning less money means being able to be a greater support to your family, friends and yourself then it is worth a lot more than some extra money in you pocket.

I like money. I get bored when I'm not busy. And I feel like I can contribute something to the Australian economy.

unfortunately, my family like to eat - as well as enjoy a reasonablestandard of living - earning less is not really an option for me. Now, work a bit more and earn more......another story!

Quality of life has become more important as I've become older

Apparently most people work harder than the ancient Roman slave used to. As a society we are losing qualitity of life by selling out to career and money because we are afraid of not having enough. In reality there are enough resources to feed, clothe and house everybody on the planet. If we are contained by our own greed and fear then what hope does the next generation have of breaking out? Why do relationships fail so frequently? etc.

If everyone had this attitude, nothing would ever get finished. We all (jokingly) say it-because we are all greedy and want full-time money for part-time work

CATI....

BECAUSE I HAVE TEENAGERS/.

B/C IT SHOULD GIVE SOMEONE ELSE THE CHANCE TO WORK THE HOURS THAT I DONT WANT TO....I GREATLY BELIEVE IN JOB-SHARING AND WOULD RATHER TAKE LESS MONEY THAN SEE SOMEONE UMEMPLOYED.

I BELIEVE IN WORKING HARD FOR THE MONEY.....HARD DAYS WORK AND A GOOD PAY CHEQUE.

IT IS A DEFINITION OF A LAZY SOCIETY

WHILST MONEY IS NOT EVERYTHING, SHE HAS PERSONAL SATISFACTION IN THE WORKPLACE, MAKES HER HAPPY, ACCOMPLISHING THINGS, PUTTING IN MORE HOURS = MONEY = ABLE TO TRAVEL, HAVE LUXURIES IMPROVE MY LIFESTYLE

I WOULD RATHER WORK MORE HOURS AND EARN MORE MONEY