For each of the cases 1-3 given below, discuss in groups and try to reach agreement on answers to each of the 3 questions that follow.

**Case 1**

1. This study is using what amounts to a convenience sample though it would probably like to give the impression that the success stories are typical or modal instances. Notice the point of probability sampling is usually to limit unintended biases creeping into the study. Here, the bias is very much intended!
2. Males and females in the 30–50 age group.
3. This sample is very limited in generalizability because the chosen cases will certainly not be typical and the entire population of people who would like to lose weight in this age group will not be represented. In other words, this one is rigged (only “success stories” are considered; only those who complete the program are considered).

**Case 2**

1. This “study” is clearly attempting to rig the results through the sampling procedure. We might label the strategy a purposive non-probability sample attempting to appear to be something much more representative.
2. They would like the apparent generalizability to be the population of “taxpayers” in the state.
3. The sample is limited to those surveyed: tavern patrons who smoke.

**Case 3**

1. This study is using a purposive sampling strategy to reach a population that might be difficult to access in other ways.
2. The population would be women in general with the particular illness in question.
3. The sample will include the target population, but possible biases will include those who have access to and use computers (maybe an educationally more advantaged subgroup but also possibly those who are more isolated or more physically limited and don’t have access to live support groups), and women who are inclined to participate in peer support (maybe more psychologically minded).