

POLISCI 464: Survey Design and Implementation

Spring 2021

Tuesdays/Thursdays, 1:00-2:20pm

Meeting on Zoom

<https://canvas.stanford.edu/courses/137052>

Professor Soledad Artiz Prillaman

Email: soledadp@stanford.edu

Office Hours:

Professor Paul Sniderman

Email: paulms@stanford.edu

Office Hours: by appointment

Course Description

Surveys are one of the most important sources of data for political scientists. With the rise of field experiments, the design and implementation of surveys has become and even more critical component of a political scientist's tool kit. This course provides an overview of the tools needed to design and implement survey research and will also cover the fundamentals of survey and field experiments. In addition, this course will expose students to canonical and cutting-edge applications of survey research in the study of political behavior and public opinion. This course aims to interweave the methodological and the practical, preparing students to implement their own survey-based research projects while also engaging with the core political science research questions answered through survey research. The course will cover methodological issues such sources of bias, measurement theory and questionnaire design, sampling and non-response, and modes of data collection alongside practical issues such as field research and in-person data collection challenges, web-based data collection challenges, interviewer hiring, and data quality control measures. Over the quarter, students will develop a research design using survey research methods, including designing their own survey questionnaire and implementation plan. Students can expect to leave this course with not only a broad understanding of survey methodology but also a set of tools to deal with the practical implementation of surveys in the field.

Assignments

At the beginning of the course, you will identify a research question or research topic that you will explore through weekly assignments. Each week, you will submit a short 2-3 page "problem" response paper to the readings from that week. For each paper, you will receive a short prompt to guide your response paper and to help you relate the readings to your research question and topic. These response papers have two goals. First, they should identify the most important issues from the topics covered in that weeks' readings and proffer ideas to solve these issues within the context of your research topic. It is not, however, your responsibility to solve these problems. Second, the response papers will walk you through the design of your own survey and implementation plan such that by the end of the quarter you should have the outline of a survey research project. **These**

response papers comprise the only assignment for this course and each will be due on Canvas for the following week by Sunday night at 11:59pm.

Class Project

With surveys, as with most things, we learn the most by doing. In addition to your own research projects that you will explore in the assignments, we will also jointly work through a class project. This term, we have decided this class project will focus on measuring prejudice and bias and designing a study to evaluate how quotas may shape prejudice and bias. As a result, half of the readings for the course will be focused on substantive applications of the concepts to these topics. These readings will be useful examples of how surveys and experiments are utilized in canonical and cutting-edge research. Drawing on these examples, we will use class time to apply these skills and insights to collectively develop a survey project.

Course Materials

We will read large portions from the following book, which we will refer to as **FITF**, so you may want to purchase a copy.

Karlan, Dean, and Jacob Appel. 2016. *Failing in the Field*. Princeton University Press.

All additional readings will be made available on the Canvas site.

Course Structure

Each week, the class will meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Tuesdays: We will utilize Tuesday classes to understand core concepts and challenges with respect to survey design and implementation. **By Sunday no later than 11:59pm** before class on Tuesdays, you should submit a short 1-2 page problem response paper that draws on the readings from that week. The goal of these response papers is to identify the most important issues that week, not to resolve them. The first half of Tuesday's class will be spent discussing these issues with your classmates. The second half will be styled like a normal discussion seminar, where we will discuss the readings, the issues that you identified in your papers, and the ideas you generated in your in-class discussions.

Thursdays: We will utilize Thursday classes to apply these core concepts to our class project. Each week, we will work collectively, first in small groups and then as a whole, to progress and develop a survey project.

Course Schedule

Week	Date	Topic
1	3/30	Intro, survey ethics, and class projects
	4/1	Prejudice and discrimination
Part 1: Design of Surveys		
2	4/6	Issues of validity
	4/8	Measuring ethnic diversity
3	4/13	Social desirability and measurement of socially sensitive issues
	4/15	Measuring prejudice
4	4/20	Attentiveness and instrument design
	4/22	Pre-testing and cognitive interviewing
Part 2: Design of Experiments		
4	4/27	Survey experiments
	4/29	Survey experiments to measure bias
6	5/4	Field experiments
	5/6	Identifying the effect of quotas
7	5/11	Measuring experimental effects
	5/13	Measuring the effect of quotas
Part 3: Implementation		
8	5/18	Online samples
	5/20	In-person samples
9	5/25	Interviewing
	5/27	Interviewing in practice
10	6/1	Issues of data quality
	6/3	Practical challenges in running a survey

Using Zoom

This class will meet exclusively online through Zoom. On the course Canvas page, you will see a tab for Zoom. All of the zoom links for class meetings will be available here. To ensure the best online class environment, everyone is expected to:

- Participate with video turned on for all class meetings
- Join the class from a quiet location

If you believe you will have trouble with any of the above requirements or have concerns about your internet/computer access, please get in touch with the instructors.

Course Policies

Attendance Policy

Attendance is mandatory. If something does come up that will inhibit your ability to attend class, such as illness, other obligations, or conflict with a religious observance, please email us to discuss possible accommodations.

Late Assignment Policy

Assignments submitted after the deadline will not be accepted unless an accommodation/extension was agreed to ahead of the deadline. Please email us at the earliest possible time if there is any foreseeable reason an assignment may not be able to be submitted by the deadline.

Academic Accommodation

Students who may need an academic accommodation based on the impact of a disability must initiate the request with the Office of Accessible Education (OAE). Professional staff will evaluate the request with required documentation, recommend reasonable accommodations, and prepare an Accommodation Letter for faculty dated in the current quarter in which the request is being made. Students should contact the OAE as soon as possible since timely notice is needed to coordinate accommodations. The OAE is located at 563 Salvatierra Walk (phone: 723-1066, URL: <http://oae.stanford.edu>).

Course Expectations

What you can expect from us

We are here to guide your learning and will challenge you to actively engage in the course and to grow as scholars. We will strive for an inclusive and collaborative classroom and welcome any suggestions for improvement. We will do our best to give you the tools, feedback, and support to succeed. There is a lot of material that we will not be able to cover given time constraints. We aim to motivate students to seek out more information on such topics and will provide additional resources to do so. We highly encourage everyone to visit us in office hours or to set up a meeting, even if you don't feel that you have questions. We want to get to know you and support you in this learning experience!

What we expect from you

We expect you to take an active role in your learning by coming to class prepared and being ready to share your ideas through discussion with your classmates. To get the most out of the class, you should be prepared to share your ideas, ask questions, and listen actively. Each member of this class has different ideas and perspectives that will enrich the experience for everyone else, so we expect you to be respectful and thoughtful in your interactions. Please let us know ways to improve the effectiveness of the course for you personally or for other students or student groups.

Detailed Schedule

PART 1 – DESIGN OF SURVEYS

Tuesday, March 30: Introduction: Objectives and Class Projects

Thursday, April 1: Prejudice and Discrimination

- Aronson, Elliot, and Diane Bridgeman 1979. “Jigsaw Groups and the Desegregated Classroom: In Pursuit of Common Goals,” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 5: 438-446.
- Bertrand, Marianne, and Esther Duflo. 2017. “Field experiments on discrimination.” *Handbook of economic field experiments*. Read only sections 1 and 2, pages 310-344.
- Paluck, E.L., Porat, R., Clark, C., & Green, D.P. 2021. “Prejudice reduction: Progress and challenges.” *Annual Review of Psychology*. 72:533-560

Tuesday, April 6: Issues of Validity

- Cronbach, Lee J., and Paul E. Meehl. 1955. “Construct Validity in Psychological Tests.” *Psychological Bulletin* 52(4): 281–302.
- Cronbach, L. J. 1989. *Construct validation after thirty years*. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Intelligence: Measurement, theory, and public policy: Proceedings of a symposium in honor of Lloyd G. Humphreys* (p. 147–171). University of Illinois Press.
- Whitt, Sam, and Rick K. Wilson. 2007. “The dictator game, fairness and ethnicity in postwar Bosnia.” *American Journal of Political Science* 51.3: 655-668.

Thursday, April 8: Measuring Ethnic Diversity

- Alesina, Alberto, et al. 2003. “Fractionalization.” *Journal of Economic growth* 8.2: 155-194.
- Posner, Daniel N. 2004. “Measuring ethnic fractionalization in Africa.” *American journal of political science* 48.4: 849-863.

Tuesday, April 13: Social Desirability and Measurement of Socially Sensitive Issues

- Tourangeau, Roger, and Ting Yan. 2007. “Sensitive Questions in Surveys.” *Psychological Bulletin* 133(5): 859–83.
- Krysan, Maria, and Mick P. Couper. 2003. “Race in the live and the virtual interview: Racial deference, social desirability, and activation effects in attitude surveys.” *Social psychology quarterly*: 364-383.
- Adida, Claire, et al. 2019. “Response bias in survey measures of voter behavior: Implications for measurement and inference.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 6.3: 192-198.

Thursday, April 15: Measuring Prejudice: Explicit vs Implicit, Subtle vs Overt

- Payne, B. Keith, Jon A. Krosnick, Josh Pasek, Yptach Lelkes, Omair Akhtar, and Trevor Thompson. 2010. "Implicit and Explicit Prejudice in the 2008 American Presidential Election," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46: 367-374.
- Gilens, Martin, Paul M. Sniderman, and James H. Kuklinski. 1998. "Affirmative Action and the Politics of Realignment." *British Journal of Political Science* 28(1): 159–83.
- Clayton, Katie, Jordan H. Horillo, and Paul M. Sniderman, "The Validity of the IAT and AMP as Measures of Racial Prejudice," ms.

Suggested:

- Corneille, Olivier, and Mandy Hütter. 2020. "Implicit? What Do You Mean? A Comprehensive Review of the Delusive Implicitness Construct in Attitude Research." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 24 (3): 212-232
- Carlana, Michela. 2019. "Implicit stereotypes: Evidence from teachers' gender bias." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 134.3: 1163-1224.
- Lowes, Sara, et al. 2015. "Understanding ethnic identity in Africa: Evidence from the implicit association test (iat)." *American Economic Review* 105.5: 340-45.

Tuesday, April 20: Attentiveness and instrument design

- Alvarez, R. Michael, Lonna Rae Atkeson, Ines Levin, and Yimeng Li. 2019. "Paying Attention to Inattentive Survey Respondents." *Political Analysis* 27(2): 145–62.
- Berinsky, Adam J., Michele F. Margolis, Michael W. Sances, and Christopher Warshaw. Forthcoming. "Using Screeners to Measure Respondent Attention on Self-Administered Surveys: Which Items and How Many?" *Political Science Research and Methods*.

Thursday, April 22: Pre-testing and Cognitive Interviewing

- Presser, Stanley, Mick P. Couper, Judith T. Lessler, Elizabeth Martin, Jean Martin, Jennifer M. Rothgeb, and Eleanor Singer. 2004. "Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questions," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68(1): 109–30.
- Fowler, Floyd J. 1995. *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*. Ch 5, "Presurvey Evaluation of Questions", 104–37. Thousand Oaks: Sage. Available online from HathiTrust; access at <https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/3060381>.

PART 2 – DESIGN OF EXPERIMENTS

Tuesday, April 27: Survey Experiments

- Sniderman, Paul M. 2018. "Some Advances in the Design of Survey Experiments." *Annual Review of Political Science* 21: 259–75.
- EGAP 10 Things to Know about Survey Experiments. <https://egap.org/resource/10-things-to-know-about-survey-experiments/>

- 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.
- Clifford, Scott, Geoffrey Sheagley, and Spencer Piston. 2021. “Increasing Precision without Altering Treatment Effects: Repeated Measures Designs in Survey Experiments.” *American Political Science Review* (2021): 1-18.

Thursday, April 29: Survey Experiments to Measure Bias

- Schwarz, Susanne, William Hunt, and Alexander Coppock. 2018. “What have we learned about gender from candidate choice experiments? A meta-analysis of 30 factorial survey experiments.” *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Sniderman, Paul M., Pierangelo Peri, Rui J. P. De Figuerdo, and Thomas Piazza. 2001. “The Switch Experiment,” in *The Outsider*, Princeton University Press, p. 57-53.

Tuesday, May 4: Field Experiments

- Duflo, Esther, Rachel Glennerster, and Michael Kremer. 2007. “Using randomization in development economics research: A toolkit.” *Handbook of development economics*: 3895-3962.
- FITF p. 1-50.
- Blattman, Chris. 2013. “How to pick a dissertation topic (and why it should not be a field experiment).” <https://chrisblattman.com/2013/02/12/how-to-pick-a-dissertation-project-and-why-it-should-not-be-a-field-experiment/>
- Teele, Dawn Langan. 2014. “Reflections on the ethics of field experiments.” *Field experiments and their critics: Essays on the uses and abuses of experimentation in the social sciences*: 115-140.

Suggested:

- McDermott, Rose. 2002. “Experimental methods in political science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5.1: 31-61.
- Dittmann, R., & Paluck, E.L. 2015. Field Experiments. *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*.
- Glennerster, Rachel, and Kudzai Takavarasha. 2013. *Running randomized evaluations: A practical guide*. Princeton University Press.

Thursday, May 6: Identifying the Effects of Quotas

- Beaman, Lori, et al. 2009. “Powerful women: does exposure reduce bias?.” *The Quarterly journal of economics* 124.4: 1497-1540.
- Clayton, Amanda. 2018. “Do gender quotas really reduce bias? Evidence from a policy experiment in Southern Africa.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 5.3: 182-194.

Tuesday, May 11: Measuring Experimental Effects

- FITF p. 51-70.

- EGAP, 10 Things to Know about Survey Design. <https://egap.org/resource/10-things-to-know-about-survey-design/>
- Levy Paluck, Elizabeth. 2010. “The promising integration of qualitative methods and field experiments.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 628.1: 59-71.
- Tomz, Michael R., and Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2013. “Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace.” *American Political Science Review* 107(4): 849–65.

Thursday, May 13: Measuring the Effects of Quotas

- Chauchard, Simon. 2014. “Can descriptive representation change beliefs about a stigmatized group? Evidence from rural India.” *American political Science review*: 403-422.
- Mendelberg, Tali, Christopher F. Karpowitz, and Nicholas Goedert. 2014. “Does descriptive representation facilitate women's distinctive voice? How gender composition and decision rules affect deliberation.” *American Journal of Political Science* 58.2: 291-306.

PART 3 - IMPLEMENTATION

Tuesday, May 18: Online samples

- Coppock, Alexander, and Oliver A. McClellan. 2019. “Validating the demographic, political, psychological, and experimental results obtained from a new source of online survey respondents.” *Research & Politics* 6.1: 2053168018822174.
- Boas, T., Christenson, D. & Glick, D. 2018. “Recruiting Large Online Samples in the United States and India: Facebook, Mechanical Turk and Qualtrics.” *Political Science Research and Methods*.

Suggested:

- Broockman, David E., Joshua L. Kalla, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2017. “The design of field experiments with survey outcomes: A framework for selecting more efficient, robust, and ethical designs.” *Political Analysis* 25.4: 435-464.

Thursday, May 20: In-person samples

- Auerbach, Adam Michael, and Tariq Thachil. 2018. “How clients select brokers: Competition and choice in India's slums.” *The American Political Science Review* 112.4: 775-791.
- Sampling principles and weighting. Afrobarometer. <https://afrobarometer.org/surveys-and-methods/sampling-principles>

Tuesday, May 25: Interviewing

- Whyte, William Foot. 1982. "Interviewing in Field Research," in Robert G. Burgess (ed.), *Field Research: A Sourcebook and Field Manual*. London: George Allen and Unwin. pp. 111-122.
- Cammett, Melani. 2013. "Using proxy interviewing to address sensitive topics." *Interview research in political science*: 125-143.
- Chauchard, Simon. 2013. "Using MP3 players in surveys: The impact of a low-tech self-administration mode on reporting of sensitive attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77.S1: 220-231.

Thursday, May 27: Interviewing in Practice

No Class today. Instead, you are to conduct at least one interview.

Tuesday, June 1: Issues of Data Quality

- JPAL, Quality Control manual
- Cohen, Mollie J., and Zach Warner. 2020. "How to get better survey data more efficiently." *Political Analysis*.
- Gomila, R., Littman, R., Blair, G., & Paluck, E.L. 2017. Audio recording interviews to eliminate ongoing data-fabrication: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment in Nigeria. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

Suggested:

- IPA, Back Check Manual

Thursday, June 3: Practical Challenges in Running a Survey

- FITF: p. 84-93 and 105-124
- Hertel, Shareen, Matthew M. Singer, and Donna Lee Van Cott. 2009. "Field research in developing countries: Hitting the road running." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42.2: 305-309.
- Krause, Peter, et al. 2021. "COVID-19 and Fieldwork: Challenges and Solutions." *PS: Political Science & Politics*: 1-6.

Suggested:

- The rest of FITF.
- Paluck, E.L. 2009. Methods and ethics with research teams and NGOs: Comparing experiences across the border of Rwanda and Democratic Republic of Congo. In C. Sriram et al. (Eds.), *Surviving Research: Working in Violent and Difficult Situations*. Routledge.