

Directed Readings Course: Brian Ezeonu
Survey Design and Analysis
Spring 2021 | Time: TBD | Haley 8024

Instructor:	Soren Jordan	Email:	scj0014@auburn.edu
Office:	Haley 8024	Phone:	334.844.6265
Office Hours:	Zoom ID: 7720942787: By appointment (email me)		

Overview, Objectives, and Outcomes

This is a Ph.D.-level directed readings and research course. We will be reviewing some literature together that you have considered individually before, and we will exploring some new literature together. The goal of this course is for both of us (but mostly Brian) to learn more about classics and advances in survey design, with the explicit goal of designing an instrument for data collection at the end of the semester (explained below).

Learning outcomes: by the end of the course, you should have read a variety of original research on survey design, know the strengths and pitfalls of various question types, and designed your own survey for data collection for your dissertation.

Expectations

As a Ph.D. class, we're under a little different schedule of expectations and commitments. We'll meet once every two weeks (at least), at least ten times over the semester. Meeting days and times will be agreed upon and scheduled by the two of us. You should expect most meetings to be on Mondays. In addition, email, telephone, and Zoom will also be used as needed to facilitate communication and to ensure student progress. Each week, I expect you to have the readings completed. I'd also recommend making summaries of the readings.

I expect you to come prepared to talk about (a) the theory, data, and findings of each assigned reading, (b) the implications of that reading for your own research, and (c) an updated copy of the survey you envision writing.

Required Materials

All of the texts are articles available from the Auburn University Library. I will not post the articles to **Canvas** unless the library doesn't provide access; learning how to acquire the full text of an article is an essential skill in graduate school. I included the DOI of every article: it will point you to the article's website if you "resolve" it at www.doi.org. All of the articles are ungated if you access them on Auburn's Wifi network. If you're at home, you can still get the full text by logging into the library and searching for the journal. If you cannot find one of the articles, let me know, and I'll make it available on **Canvas** or email.

Assignments

The course is divided into the following components:

Weekly summary synthesis of readings	30%
Participation (actually talk about the readings)	10%
Practice coding and analyzing data	20%
Completed draft of survey instrument in Qualtrics	40%
<hr/> Total	<hr/> 100%

I would not fret too much about this, as I've already mentioned that my expectation is that all graduate students make A's, especially in substantive classes.

The main product you are responsible for is designing the questions, response categories, and survey for your dissertation data collection. It must then be implemented in Qualtrics.

Boilerplate syllabus information follows. The reading schedule is at the end.

Makeups and Grades

Writing assignments and homework assignments must be turned in, electronically, on the day assigned. Makeup examinations will only be offered to those with a University excused absence, which can be found at tinyurl.com/au-st-pol. It is your responsibility to ensure that your absence is covered by the University, and it is your responsibility to comply with all policies. These policies require that you notify me of your absence prior to the date of absence if such notification is feasible, but within one week from the missed class. Your makeup examination must be scheduled within two weeks of this notification (though I recommend much, much earlier). If I need additional information on your absence (doctor's notes, for instance), you must provide this additional documentation within one week of the last date of the absence. Note that this policy also allows for makeup examinations for reasons deemed appropriate by the instructor. If you do not have a University excused absence, and you are going to miss an examination, it is much easier for me to work with you if you notify me promptly, especially if you can provide some sort of documentation.

Student Academic Honesty

Auburn University is a institution committed to integrity and honor. It is your job as a University citizen to uphold those values. I will not tolerate any cheating or plagiarism, broadly defined as using unauthorized aids during examinations or attempting to represent someone else's work as your own. You are not as sly as you think you are. With hundreds of heads facing forward, it is extremely easy to tell who is working alone and who is not. Be aware that academic dishonesty can lead directly to failing the course and being referred to the Academic Honesty Committee. Penalties include expulsion from Auburn, as per Chapter 1202 of Title XII. For additional information visit tinyurl.com/au-st-pol.

Emergency Contingency

If normal class is disrupted due to illness, emergency, or crisis situation, the syllabus and other course plans and assignments may be modified to allow completion of the course. If this occurs, an addendum to your syllabus and/or course assignments will replace the original materials.

Students with Disabilities

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please electronically submit your approved accommodations through AU Access and make an individual appointment with me during the first week of classes (or as soon as possible if accommodations are needed immediately). If you have not established accommodations through the Office of Accessibility, but need accommodations, make an appointment with the Office of Accessibility, 1228 Haley Center, 844-2096 (V/TT).

Any requests or arrangements made with the instructor in person must be followed up with an official email request for documentation. If you believe you may need an accommodation, it is your responsibility to secure it before the first exam.

Copyrighted Materials

The lectures, presentations (including slides), readings, and exams for this course are copyrighted, so you do not have the right to copy and distribute them. This includes recording class lectures.

Course Outline

Meeting 1: Measuring Complex Concepts

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2008. “The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting.” *American Political Science Review* 102(2): 215-232. DOI: 10.1017/S0003055408080210
- King, Gary, Christopher J. L. Murray, Joshua A. Salomon, and Ajay Tandon. 2003. “Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research.” *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 567-583. DOI: 10.1017/S0003055403000881
- Merkle, Eric. 2020. “Anti-Intellectualism, Populism, and Motivated Resistance to Expert Consensus.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 84(1): 24-48. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfz053
- Tourangeau, Roger and Tom W. Smith. 1996. “Asking Sensitive Questions: The Impact of Data Collection Mode, Question Format, and Question Context.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60(2): 275-304. DOI: 10.1086/297751
- Wuttke, Alexander, Christian Schimpf, and Harald Schoen. 2020. “When the Whole Is Greater than the Sum of Its Parts: On the Conceptualization and Measurement of Pop-

ulist Attitudes and Other Multidimensional Constructs.” *American Political Science Review* 114(2): 356-374. DOI: 10.1017/S0003055419000807

Meeting 2: Recruiting Respondents (I)

- Berinsky, Adam J., Michele F. Margolis, and Michael W. Sances. 2014. “Separating the Shirkers from the Workers? Making Sure Respondents Pay Attention on Self-Administered Surveys.” *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3): 739-753. DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12081
- Boas, Taylor C., Dino P. Christenson, and David M. Glick. 2020. “Recruiting Large Online Samples in the United States and India: Facebook, Mechanical Turk, and Qualtrics.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 8(2): 232-250. DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2018.28
- Kennedy, Ryan, Scott Clifford, Tyler Burleigh, Philip D. Waggoner, Ryan Jewell, and Nicholas J. G. Winter. 2020. “The Shape of and Solutions to the MTurk Quality Crisis.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 8(4): 614-629. DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2020.6
- Loepp, Eric and Jarrod T. Kelly. 2020. “Distinction without a Difference? An Assessment of MTurk Worker Types.” *Research and Politics* 7(1): 1-8. DOI: 10.1177/2053168019901185

Meeting 3: Recruiting Respondents (II)

- Dutwin, David and Trent D. Buskirk. 2017. “Apples to Oranges or Gala versus Golden Delicious? Comparing Data Quality of Nonprobability Internet Samples to Low Response Rate Probability Samples.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 81(S1): 213-239. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfw061
- Lupton, Danielle L. 2019. “The External Validity of College Student Subject Pools in Experimental Research: A Cross-Sample Comparison of Treatment Effect Heterogeneity.” *Political Analysis* 27(1): 90-97. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2018.42
- Zhang, Baobao, Matto Mildenerger, Peter D. Howe, Jennifer Marlon, Seth A. Rosenthal and Anthony Leiserowitz. 2020. “Quota Sampling Using Facebook Advertisements.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 8(3): 558-564. DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2018.49

Meeting 4: Survey Experiments

- Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. “Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?” *American Political Science Review* 104(2): 226-242. DOI: 10.1017/S0003055410000092
- Coppock, Alexander. 2029. “Generalizing from Survey Experiments Conducted on Mechanical Turk: A Replication Approach.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 7(3): 613-628. DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2018.10

Meeting 5: Question Design I (Measuring “Opinions”)

- Brewer, Paul R. and Kimberly Gross. 2005. “Values, Framing, and Citizens’ Thoughts about Policy Issues: Effects on Content and Quantity.” *Political Psychology* 26(6). DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00451.x
- Dowling, Conor M., Michael Henderson, and Michael G. Miller. 2020. “Knowledge Persists, Opinions Drift: Learning and Opinion Change in a Three-Wave Panel Experiment.” *American Politics Research* 48(2): 263-274. DOI: 10.1177/1532673X19832543

- Guess, Andrew and Alexander Coppock. 2020. “Does Counter-Attitudinal Information Cause Backlash? Results from Three Large Survey Experiments.” *British Journal of Political Science* 50(4): 1497-1515. DOI: 10.1017/S0007123418000327
- Khanna, Kabir and Gaurav Sood. 2018. “Motivated Responding in Studies of Factual Learning.” *Political Behavior* 40(1): 79-101. DOI: 10.1007/s11109-017-9395-7
- Zaller, John and Stanley Feldman. 1992. “A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences.” *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 579-616. DOI: 10.2307/2111583

Meeting 6: Question Design II (“I Don’t Know”)

- Jessee, Stephen A. 2017. “‘Don’t Know’ Responses, Personality, and the Measurement of Political Knowledge.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 5(4): 711-731. DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2015.23
- Krosnick, Jon A. et al. 2002. “The Impact of ‘No Opinion’ Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or an Invitation to Satisfice?” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66(3): 371-403. DOI: 10.1086/341394
- Luskin, Robert C. and John G. Bullock. 2011. “‘Don’t Know’ Means ‘Don’t Know’: DK Responses and the Public’s Level of Political Knowledge.” *The Journal of Politics* 73(2): 547-557. DOI: 10.1017/S0022381611000132

Meeting 7: Question Design III (Response Categories)

- Clifford, Scott, Yongkwang Kim, and Brian W. Sullivan. 2019. “An Improved Question Format for Measuring Conspiracy Beliefs.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 83(4): 690-722. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfz049
- Krosnick, Jon A. and Duane F. Alwin. 1987. “An Evaluation of a Cognitive Theory of Response-Order Effects in Survey Measurement.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51(2): 201-219. DOI: 10.1086/269029
- Petty, Richard E., Greg A. Rennie, and John T. Cacioppo. 1987. “Assertion Versus Interrogation Format in Opinion Surveys Questions Enhance Thoughtful Responding.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51(4): 481-494. DOI: 10.1086/269053
- Revilla, Melanie A., Willem E. Saris, and Jon A. Krosnick. 2014. “Choosing the Number of Categories in Agree-Disagree Scales.” *Sociological Methods & Research* 43(1): 73-97. DOI: 10.1177/0049124113509605

Meeting 8: Are Respondents Paying Attention?

- Alvarez, R. Michael, Lonna Rae Atkeson, Ines Levin, and Yimeng Li. 2019. “Paying Attention to Inattentive Survey Respondents.” *Political Analysis* 27(2): 145-162. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2018.57
- Aronow, Peter M., Jonathon Baron, and Lauren Pinson. 2019. “A Note on Dropping Experimental Subjects who Fail a Manipulation Check.” *Political Analysis* 27(4): 572-589. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2019.5

- Clifford, Scott and Jennifer Jerit. 2015. “Do Attempts to Improve Respondent Attention Increase Social Desirability Bias?” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79(3): 790-802. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfv027
- Kane, John V. and Jason Barabas. 2019. “No Harm in Checking: Using Factual Manipulation Checks to Assess Attentiveness in Experiments.” *American Journal of Political Science* 63(1): 234-249. DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12396

Meeting 9: Practical Design Concerns

- Clifford, Scott, and Jennifer Jerit. 2016. “Cheating on Political Knowledge Questions in Online Surveys.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80(4): 858-887. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfw030
- Clifford, Scott, Vijeth Iyengar, Roberto Cabeza, and Walter Sinnott-Armstrong. 2015. “Moral Foundations Vignettes: A Standardized Stimulus Database of Scenarios Based on Moral Foundations Theory.” *Behavior Research Methods* 47: 1178-1198. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-014-0551-2
- Couper, Mick P., Roger Tourangeau, Frederick G. Conrad, and Chan Zhang. 2013. “The Design of Grids in Web Surveys.” *Social Science Computer Review* 31(3): 322-345. DOI: 10.1177/0894439312469865
- Galesic, Mirta and Michael Bosnjak. 2009. “Destination Effects of Questionnaire Length on Participation and Indicators of Response Quality in a Web Survey.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73(2): 349-360. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfp031
- Pepinsky, Thomas B. 2018. “A Note on Listwise Deletion versus Multiple Imputation.” *Political Analysis* 26(4): 480-488. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2018.18
- Smyth, Jolene D., Don A. Dillman, Leah Melani Christian, and Michael J. Stern. 2006. “Comparing Check-All and Forced-Choice Question Formats in Web Surveys.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70(1): 66-77. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfj007
- Villar, Ana, Mario Callegaro, and Yongwei Yang. 2013. “Where Am I? A Meta-Analysis of Experiments on the Effects of Progress Indicators for Web Surveys.” *Social Science Computer Review* 31(6): 744-762. DOI: 10.1177/0894439313497468

Meeting 10: Qualtrics Basics

Meeting 11: Special Topics for Analysis