

Survey Methodology

Gabriella Levy

Instructor: Gabriella Levy (gabriella.levy@duke.edu)

Office Hours:

Course Overview:

This course is aimed at graduate student in Political Science. In the first half of the course, students will learn the principles of survey design, including sampling, survey mode, and questionnaire design. They will also learn how to consider the tradeoffs inherent in designing surveys with limited funds. The second half of the course will focus on a variety of survey experimental techniques, ranging from vignettes to surveys combined with RCTs to eye tracking. We will finish the course with a study of survey ethics and the practicalities of fielding a survey. Readings in this class draw on the subfields of Methodology, Comparative Politics, American Politics, and International Relations. Students will conduct a replication and extension exercise as well as complete a research project or proposal.

Required Readings:

You are expected to come to class having read the pages assigned for that day. All journal articles are available online via Duke's access to a wide range of academic journals. There is also one required book for this course:

Robert M. Groves, Floyd J. Fowler, Mick P. Couper, James M. Lepkowski, Eleanor Singer, and Roger Tourangeau. *Survey Methodology*. Wiley-Interscience, second edition, 2009.

Assignments:

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>How it will be assessed</i>	<i>Date</i>
Participation	20	Attendance & participation in weekly classes	Every week
Replication Exercise	30	Replicate and extend a recently published paper which uses surveys; hand in a 7-10 page write up explaining why you chose the extensions you undertook and what the results were	Week 6
Final Paper	50	A 15-25 page research project (or proposal) which 1) describes a research question and why it is important; 2) introduces a theory to answer the question; 3) either uses pre-existing survey data to test these hypotheses OR details a proposed methodology to collect and analyze the original survey data	One week after the last class

Policies:

You are expected to not only attend but to actively participate in class. If you must miss class, please provide me with documentation of the reason for the absence in order for it to be excused. Each student can take one unexcused absence without a penalty, and all further unexcused absences will result in a 5% reduction of the class participation grade. Similarly, if you need an extension on an assignment, please reach out to me as soon as possible. I will accept late assignments for which I have not granted an extension, but each day that the assignment is late will result in a 5% reduction on the grade. All essays should be double-spaced, with 12-point Times New Roman font and 1-inch margins.

If you would like me to review a graded assignment, I will happily do so. Please submit your requests in writing. You must wait 48 hours between the time you receive the graded assignment and when you contact me. I reserve the right to raise or lower your grade.

I expect you to comply with the Duke Community Standard. You can find details at <https://studentaffairs.duke.edu/conduct/about-us/duke-community-standard>.

Resources and Support:

1) My goal is to create a learning environment that supports a diversity of thoughts, perspectives, experiences, and identities.

- The topics that we're covering in this class are often difficult, not just intellectually but also emotionally. While I expect rigorous discussion and even disagreement in the course of our class discussions, I ask that you engage in discussion with care and empathy for the other members in the classroom. I will not tolerate insults; gender or racial slurs; or any other form of bullying, intimidation, or hate speech. I expect all members of this class to contribute to a respectful, welcoming, and inclusive environment for every other member of this class.
- If you have a name and/or set of pronouns that differ from those that appear in your official records, please let me know!
- If you have already registered with the Student Disability Access Office, please meet with me early in the course to discuss, plan, and implement your accommodations in this course.

2) Resources:

- a. I recommend that students take full advantage of the Thompson Writing Program's Writing Studio (<https://twp.duke.edu/twp-writing-studio>) as well as the office hours of myself and the TAs for the course.
- b. Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) (<https://studentaffairs.duke.edu/caps> or 919-660-1000) can help students who are having difficulties managing stress, adjusting to graduate school, feeling anxious or depressed, or more.

Schedule:

Section 1: Surveys

1) Week 1: Why use surveys?

- a. Groves, Chapter 1
- b. Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk. 2007. "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined." *Political Analysis* 15 (1): 1–20.
- c. AAPOR. 2016. "An Evaluation of 2016 Election Polls in the U.S. - AAPOR." AAPOR. <https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/Reports/An-Evaluation-of-2016-Election-Polls-in-the-U-S.aspx>.
- d. Lupu, Noam, and Kristin Michelitch. 2018. "Advances in Survey Methods for the Developing World." *Annual Review of Political Science* 21 (1): 195–214.

2) Week 2: Survey Error

- a. Groves, Chapter 2
- b. Seligson, Mitchell A. 2005. "Improving the Quality of Survey Research in Democratizing Countries." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (1): 51–56.
- c. Groves, Robert M., and Lars Lyberg. 2010. "Total Survey Error: Past, Present, and Future." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74 (5): 849–79.
- d. Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Eitan Hersh. 2017. "Validation: What Big Data Reveal About Survey Misreporting and the Real Electorate." *Political Analysis* 20 (4): 437–59.

3) Week 3: Sampling

- a. Groves, Chapters 3 & 4
- b. Mullinix, Kevin J., Thomas J. Leeper, James N. Druckman, and Jeremy Freese. 2015. "The Generalizability of Survey Experiments." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2 (2): 109–38.
- c. Yeager, David S., Jon A. Krosnick, LinChiat Chang, Harold S. Javitz, Matthew S. Levendusky, Alberto Simpser, and Rui Wang. 2011. "Comparing the Accuracy of RDD Telephone Surveys and Internet Surveys Conducted with Probability and Non-Probability Samples." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75 (4): 709–47.
- d. Consider the sampling approaches of:
 - i. Humphreys, Macartan, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2008. "Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil War." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (2): 436–55.
 - ii. Slack, Jeremy, Daniel E. Martínez, and Scott Whiteford. 2018. *The Shadow of the Wall: Violence and Migration on the U.S.-Mexico Border*. University of Arizona Press. → Chapter 1: "Research Methods"
 - iii. Wayne, Carly, and Yuri M. Zhukov. 2022. "Never Again: The Holocaust and Political Legacies of Genocide." *World Politics*, Forthcoming: 1–38.

- iv. Vinck, Patrick, Phuong N. Pham, Eric Stover, and Harvey M. Weinstein. 2007. "Exposure to War Crimes and Implications for Peace Building in Northern Uganda." *JAMA* 298 (5): 543–54.
- v. Afrobarometer. 2022. "Round 9 Survey Manual." Afrobarometer. <https://www.afrobarometer.org/surveys-and-methods/>.
- vi. DeBell, Matthew, Michelle Amsbary, Vanessa Meldener, Shelley Brock and Natalya Maisel. 2018. "Methodology Report for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study." American National Election Studies at the University of Michigan and Stanford University. https://electionstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/anes_timeseries_2016_methodology_report.pdf.

4) Week 4: Questionnaire Design

- a. Groves, Chapters 7 & 8
- b. Galesic, Mirta, and Michael Bosnjak. 2009. "Effects of Questionnaire Length on Participation and Indicators of Response Quality in a Web Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73 (2): 349–60.
- c. Smith, Tom W. 1987. "That Which We Call Welfare by Any Other Name Would Smell Sweeter: An Analysis of the Impact of Question Wording on Response Patterns." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51 (1): 75–83.
- d. Pérez, Efrén O. 2009. "Lost in Translation? Item Validity in Bilingual Political Surveys." *The Journal of Politics* 71 (4): 1530–48.
- e. Peterson, Erik, Sean J. Westwood, and Shanto Iyengar. 2021. "Beyond Attitudes: Incorporating Measures of Behavior in Survey Experiments." In *Advances in Experimental Political Science*, edited by James N. Druckman and Donald P. Green, 239-256. Cambridge University Press.

5) Week 5: Survey Mode

- a. Groves, Chapter 5
- b. Coppock, Alexander. 2019. "Generalizing from Survey Experiments Conducted on Mechanical Turk: A Replication Approach." *Political Science Research and Methods* 7 (3): 613–28.
- c. Keeter, Scott, Courtney Kennedy, Michael Dimock, Jonathan Best, and Peyton Craighill. 2006. "Gauging the Impact of Growing Nonresponse on Estimates from a National RDD Telephone Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70 (5): 759–79.
- d. Bush, Sarah Sunn, and Lauren Prather. 2019. "Do Electronic Devices in Face-to-Face Interviews Change Survey Behavior? Evidence from a Developing Country." *Research & Politics* 6 (2): 1-7

6) Week 6: Dealing with Data (**note: replication due**)

- a. Groves, Chapters 6 and 10
- b. Lall, Ranjit. 2016. "How Multiple Imputation Makes a Difference." *Political Analysis* 24 (4): 414–33.

- c. Miratrix, Luke W., Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Alexander G. Theodoridis, and Luis F. Campos. 2018. "Worth Weighting? How to Think About and Use Weights in Survey Experiments." *Political Analysis* 26 (3): 275–91.
- d. Abadie, Alberto, Susan Athey, Guido Imbens, and Jeffrey Wooldridge. 2017. "When Should You Adjust Standard Errors for Clustering?" w24003. NBER Working Papers. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Section 2: Survey Experiments

7) Week 7: Framing & Priming

- a. Hartman, Todd K., and Christopher R. Weber. 2009. "Who Said What? The Effects of Source Cues in Issue Frames." *Political Behavior* 31 (4): 537–58.
- b. Callen, Michael, Mohammad Isaqzadeh, James D. Long, and Charles Sprenger. 2014. "Violence and Risk Preference: Experimental Evidence from Afghanistan." *The American Economic Review* 104 (1): 123–48.
- c. Lenz, Gabriel S. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (4): 821–37.
- d. Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2013. "Counterframing Effects." *The Journal of Politics* 75 (1): 1–16.
- e. Hiscox, Michael J. 2006. "Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing." *International Organization* 60 (3): 755–80.

8) Week 8: Factorial and Vignette Experiments

- a. Hainmueller, Jens, and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2015. "The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes toward Immigrants." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 529–48.
- b. Sagan, Scott D., and Benjamin A. Valentino. 2017. "Revisiting Hiroshima in Iran: What Americans Really Think about Using Nuclear Weapons and Killing Noncombatants." *International Security* 42 (1): 41–79.
- c. Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. "Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?" *The American Political Science Review* 104 (2): 226–42.
- d. Auerbach, Adam Michael, and Tariq Thachil. 2018. "How Clients Select Brokers: Competition and Choice in India's Slums." *American Political Science Review* 112 (04): 775–91.

9) Week 9: Approaches to Decreasing Social Desirability Bias

- a. Blair, Graeme, Kosuke Imai, and Jason Lyall. 2014. "Comparing and Combining List and Endorsement Experiments: Evidence from Afghanistan." *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (4): 1043–63.
- b. Blair, Graeme, and Kosuke Imai. 2012. "Statistical Analysis of List Experiments." *Political Analysis* 20 (1): 47–77.

- c. Rosenfeld, Bryn, Kosuke Imai, and Jacob N. Shapiro. 2016. “An Empirical Validation Study of Popular Survey Methodologies for Sensitive Questions.” *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (3): 783–802.
- d. Nanes, Matthew, and Dotan Haim. 2020. “Self-Administered Field Surveys on Sensitive Topics.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1–8.
- e. Kuhn, Patrick M., and Nick Vivyan. 2022. “The Misreporting Trade-Off Between List Experiments and Direct Questions in Practice: Partition Validation Evidence from Two Countries.” *Political Analysis* 30 (3): 381–402.

10) Week 10: Surveys Attached to Bigger Research Designs

- a. Kalla, Joshua L., David E. Brookman, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2021. “Field Experiments with Survey Outcomes.” In *Advances in Experimental Political Science*, edited by James N. Druckman and Donald P. Green, 239-256. Cambridge University Press.
- b. Olken, Benjamin A. 2010. “Direct Democracy and Local Public Goods: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia.” *American Political Science Review* 104 (2): 243–67.
- c. Gottlieb, Jessica. 2016. “Greater Expectations: A Field Experiment to Improve Accountability in Mali.” *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (1): 143–57.
- d. Balcells, Laia, and Gerard Torrats-Espinosa. 2018. “Using a Natural Experiment to Estimate the Electoral Consequences of Terrorist Attacks.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (42): 10624–29.
- e. Desposato, Scott W., Gang Wang, and Jason Y. Wu. 2021. “The Long-Term Impact of Mobilization and Repression on Political Trust.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(14): 1-28.

11) Week 11: Some Cool Techniques

- a. Clifford, Scott, Geoffrey Sheagley, and Spencer Piston. 2021. “Increasing Precision without Altering Treatment Effects: Repeated Measures Designs in Survey Experiments.” *American Political Science Review*, 1–18.
- b. Roccato, Michele, and Cristina Zogmaister. 2010. “Predicting the Vote through Implicit and Explicit Attitudes: A Field Research.” *Political Psychology* 31 (2): 249–74.
- c. Renshon, Jonathan, Julia J. Lee, and Dustin Tingley. 2017. “Emotions and the Micro-Foundations of Commitment Problems.” *International Organization* 71 (S1): S189–218.
- d. Jenke, Libby, Kirk Bansak, Jens Hainmueller, and Dominik Hangartner. 2021. “Using Eye-Tracking to Understand Decision-Making in Conjoint Experiments.” *Political Analysis* 29 (1): 75–101.
- e. Lindstädt, René, Sven-Oliver Proksch, and Jonathan B. Slapin. 2020. “When Experts Disagree: Response Aggregation and Its Consequences in Expert Surveys.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 8 (3): 580–88.

Section 3: Other Considerations

12) Week 12: Ethics

- a. Groves, Chapter 11
- b. Berry, Sandra H., and Patrick P. Gunn. 2014. "Conducting Research on Vulnerable and Stigmatized Populations." In *Hard-to-Survey Populations*, edited by Roger Tourangeau, Brad Edwards, Timothy P. Johnson, Kirk M. Wolter, and Nancy Bates, 368–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- c. Seligson, Mitchell A. 2008. "Human Subjects Protection and Large-N Research: When Exempt Is Non-Exempt and Research Is Non-Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41 (3): 477–82.
- d. Desposato, Scott. 2018. "Subjects and Scholars' Views on the Ethics of Political Science Field Experiments." *Perspectives on Politics* 16 (3): 739–50.
- e. Davis, Justine and Martha Wilfahrt. 2022. "Enumerator Experiences in Violent Researcher Environments" Working Paper.

13) Week 13: Practicalities

- a. Groves, Chapter 9
- b. Mneimneh, Zeina N., William G. Axinn, Dirgha Ghimire, Kristen L. Cibelli, and Mohammad Salih Alkaisy. 2014. "Conducting Surveys in Areas of Armed Conflict." In *Hard-to-Survey Populations*, edited by Roger Tourangeau, Brad Edwards, Timothy P. Johnson, Kirk M. Wolter, and Nancy Bates, 134–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- c. Driscoll, Jesse. 2021. "Thinking Like a Manager." In *Doing Global Fieldwork: A Social Scientist's Guide to Mixed-Methods Research Far from Home*, pages 135-165. New York: Columbia University Press.
- d. The Writing Center, UNC. n.d. "Grant Proposals (or Give Me the Money!)." *The Writing Center • University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* (blog). Accessed June 6, 2021. <https://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/grant-proposals-or-give-me-the-money/>.
- e. Schubiger, Livia and Gabriella Levy, 2022, "IRB submission, Duke University, Explaining Civilian Support for Political and Criminal Armed Groups."