

## *Survey Feedback & Suggestions for Improvement*

Each member conducted the survey to about eight people in person. We randomly chose students in Hunt Library throughout the week, and had printed copies of surveys. This is different from our intended approach of sending out email-and-web surveys, but the purpose of the pretest was to get a more personalized feedback from respondents. Out of the 11 people who initially refused our surveys 7 people ended up filling the survey out when we told them that we will enter them in to a bigger pool of people for a lottery to win \$50. The 4 people who had refused even after this were busy with work deadlines and they said that if caught on any other day, they would have certainly filled up the surveys as the issue was pertinent to them. Collectively, we were able to get 33 responses, with great feedback and comments.

this is fine -  
great for a  
pretest.

great

One comment that we received many times is that the survey looked choppy. While this is not a main issue for us as we will be conducting the surveys online via survey websites, it was an important comment for us. Particularly, as the surveys will not be conducted face-to-face, we will need to create some introductory paragraph with detailed instructions for completion.

In tallying up the results for the pretest, we realized that the survey can be broken down into smaller components: demographics, background information on pizza preferences, comfort and service of the pizzeria, proximity and accessibility of the pizzeria, and the quality of the pizza from the pizzeria. While information in the demographics and background information components are more difficult to compare and combine, the responses for the items in the other components are easier to compare.

For instance, the questions that ask the subject to answer from a scale of “none” to “completely” or from “unimportant” to “important” have been broken down into a five-point system so that 1 point refers to “none” or “unimportant”, and 5 refers to “completely” or “important.” Also, the feedback from the last submission of the survey was incorporated into the survey conducted in the pretest. One thing that we should look into more carefully is the ordering of the questions to match up the components (see attached Excel file, if necessary). The excel sheet has also subcategorized questions based on comfort, service, etc, that will be useful when we start tabulating results.

In summary, we were happy with the overall feedback as people felt that potentially incorporating an additional pizza location in the dining system is a very relevant issue. By structuring the questions as in the attached excel, we can get over the “choppiness” of our survey and give the respondents an idea of what we intend to gain from the survey at the same time create a flow. We have added some more pizza locations choices, based on common ones that we did not include, changed the wording of a few questions such that it was more general and even added questions to clarify and follow up on some others, which only provides us with further information.

**Group H: Atishé Chordia, Stafford Brunk, Tony Poor, Henry Wu, SeungJin Park**