**SURVEY CONSTRUCTION AND VALIDATION (ASCJ 650)**

 **Spring 2017**

**Dr. Sheila Murphy**

**Annenberg School for Communication**

**201 Kerckhoff Hall (KER 201, Mail Code 0281)**

**734 West Adams Blvd.**

**Los Angeles, California 90089-7725**

**Phone: 213-740-0945**

**Office hours: 1-3 on Thursdays or by appointment**

**Email:** smurphy@usc.edu

**Learning objective of this course**:

This course is designed to familiarize students with the fundamental principles of survey construction and validation. With respect to survey construction topics covered will include format (online, phone, face-to-face, mail, and mixed method), sampling, question wording, cultural tailoring, response option format, order, and avoiding acquiescence bias and breakoffs. In addition students will learn how to pilot and statistically validate scales.

**Required Texts:**

Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J. Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, Singer, E., and Tourangeau, R. (2009). Survey Methodology, Second Edition. Hoboken, New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons.

 ISBN: 978-0470465462

Blair, E. and Blair, J. (2015). Applied Survey Sampling. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

 ISBN: 978-1-4833-3433-2.

Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2014). Internet, Phone, Mail and Mixed Mode Surveys: The tailored design method, 4th Edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

 ISBN: 978-0470465462

DeVellis, R. F. (2016). Scale Development: Theory and Applications. (4th Edition). Applied Social Research Methods Series (Volume 26). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

#####  ISBN: 9781412980449

**Recommended but not required:**

Converse, J. M. & Presser, S. (1986). Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.

McNabb, D. (2014). Nonsampling Error in Social Surveys. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

 ISBN: 978-1-4522-5742-6.

**Academic Integrity Policy:**
The Annenberg School for Communication is committed to upholding the University’s Academic Integrity code as detailed in the SCampus Guide.  It is the policy of the School for Communication to report all violations of the code.  Any serious violation or pattern of violations of the Academic Integrity Code will result in the student’s expulsion from the Communication major or minor, or from the graduate program.

**ADA Compliance Statement**
Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester.  A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP.  Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible.  DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.  The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-0776.

**Course Requirements:**

**1. Attendance** --- As we only meet once a week, and much of the material from lecture does not overlap with that of the text, attendance is crucial. If you are absent more than once you must make an appointment to see me or risk losing credit for the course.

**2. Reading assignments** — The lectures presume you have done the assigned reading prior to coming to class. The lectures will make much more sense if you have done the background reading ahead of time.

**3**. **Weekly assignments**. — Ten assignments each focusing on one aspect of survey construction or validation will be due at the beginning of the following class. Each will be worth 3% of your overall grade for a total of 30%.

**4. Midterm** — A 10-12 page (not counting references and appendices which will contain your survey instrument) research proposal will constitute 30 % of your overall grade. This should include a literature review and method section (and a draft of your proposed survey instrument in the appendix). The topic is up to you but must be cleared with me beforehand.

**5. Final paper —** Students will administer their proposed survey on a small number of individuals from their target population. At least one original scale must be analyzed for validity. These preliminary results will be added to your revised research paper (in the results section). In the traditional discussion section please discuss limitations and future directions you might take with your survey. The entire survey instrument should be included in an appendix.

This final research paper should roughly follow the format of an APA research article (intro, methods, results, a discussion section interpreting your findings) and be approximately 15 -20 pages in length (excluding references and appendices) and is worth 30% of your final grade.

**6. In class presentation** — Students will prepare and present a 10 minute Powerpoint summary of their survey results and the validation of their original scale. This presentation will account for the final 10% of your grade in the course.

**Assignments:**

Please note that all assignments are to be typed (double-spaced) in 12-point Times Roman font, with 1 inch margins. Be sure to proofread your paper carefully to ensure that it is free of grammatical and spelling errors. If a paper contains 10 or more grammar or spelling errors it will receive a grade of F. (If you are not a native English speaker it is recommended that you have a native English speaker look over your paper for grammar. The content of the paper, however, must be yours alone.) There will also be substantial penalties for assignments turned in after the deadline. An “incomplete” will be given only in an emergency.

**Cheating and plagiarism:**

Any individual found to have copied the work or ideas of others without appropriate citation will receive an F in this course and will be recommended for expulsion from the University.

**Schedule of classes:**

**1/12**

**Week 1: Reliability and Validity: Determining what you need to know and how to find out.**

 This week’s lecture will be dedicated to conveying the importance of having a clearly defined goal guiding your research. Issues of internal, external, face, construct, concurrent, predictive and convergent validity will be discussed.

Required reading:

 Chapter 1 & 2 of Survey Methodology (p.1-65)

 Chapter 1 in Dillman et. al.

Recommended but not required:

Chapter 1 Schuman and Presser (p.1-14)

Carmines, E. G. and Zeller, R. A. (1979). Reliability and Validity Assessment. Thousand Oaks,

 CA, Sage.

**1/19**

**Week 2: Measurement**

The purpose of this lecture is to introduce students to the relative benefits of open versus close-ended response options as well as the advantages of various levels of measurement (nominal, ordinal, interval and ratio). Finally, we will discuss the issue of nonattitudes and whether the use of response time measurement in surveys is a reliable indicator of attitude strength

Required reading for Measurement:

 Chapters 6 Survey Methodology (p.183-211).

Chapters 1, 2, 4 of Dillman et. al.

Other recommended reading:

Chapters 6-7 Schuman and Presser (p.161-199).

Ch. 2 Converse & Presser (p.23-74)

Bassili, J. (1996). The how and why of response latency measurement in telephone surveys. In N. Schwarz & S. Sudman (Eds.), Answering questions (pp. 319-346). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krosnick, J. A., & Abelson, R. P. (1992). The case for measuring attitude strength in

 surveys. In J. M. Tanur (Ed.), Questions about questions (pp. 177-203). New York:

 Russell Sage

Schwarz, N., & Bohner, G. (2001). The construction of attitudes. In A. Tesser & N.

 Schwarz (Eds.), Intraindividual processes (Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology,

 pp. 436-457). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Bassili, J. (2001). Cognitive indices of social information processing. In. A. Tesser & N.

 Schwarz (Eds.), Intraindividual processes (Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology;

 pp. 68-87). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Dovidio, J. F., & Fazio, R. H. (1992). New technologies for the direct and indirect

 assessment of attitudes. In J. M. Tanur (Ed.), Questions about questions (pp. 204-237).

 New York: Russel Sage.

Krosnick, J. A., & Schuman, H. (1988). Attitude intensity, importance, and certainty and

 susceptibility to response effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 940-

 952.

**1/26**

**Week 3:**  **Question wording**

Required reading:

 Chapter 7 Survey Methodology (p. 217-255)

 Chapters 5, 6 and 7 Dillman et. al.

Recommended:

Chapters 3-5 & 11 Schuman and Presser (p. 79-158, p. 275-294)

Chapter 1 Converse & Presser (p.1-14)

**2/2**

**Week 4: Potential biases: Order effects, acquiescence bias, social desirability, and interviewer effects in attitude measurement**

This week will introduce students to possible biases that can invalidate survey responses

and possible ways to counteract them.

Required Reading for Biases:

 Chapters 7 and 9 in Survey Methodology (p. 291-325)

 Chapter 2 and 7 in Dillman et. al.

 Schwarz, N. (1994). Judgment in a social context: Biases, shortcomings, and the logic of conversation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 26, 123-162.

Other recommended reading:

Chapter 8 & Appendix D of Schuman and Presser (p. 203-228 and 341-342)

DeMaio, T. J. (1984). Social desirability and survey measurement: A review. In C. F.

 Turner & E. Martin (Eds.), Surveying subjective phenomena (Vol. 2, pp. 257-281). New

 York: Russell Sage.

Bishop, G., & Smith, A. (2001). Response order effects and the early Gallup split-ballots.

 Public Opinion Quarterly, 65, 479-505.

Krosnick, J.A. & Alwin, D. F. (1987). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response

 order effects in survey measurement." Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, 201-219.

**Issues of memory, self-report and indirect measures.**

We review how knowledge about our own behavior is represented in memory and how the structure of autobiographical memory influences what we can recall and how well we can date events in our lives. We also discuss the Experience Sampling Method (ESM) that avoids recall problems altogether by collecting concurrent reports at random moments in time but is expensive and places considerable burden on researchers as well as respondents and the Day Reconstruction Method (DRM) which provides a “cheaper” approximation to ESM. Finally, we discuss the pros and cons of “proxy” reporting where a single household member reports on the behavior of all members.

Required reading:

Chapter 7 in Survey Methodology. (p.217-255)

Slater, M. D. (2016). Combining content analysis and assessment of exposure through self-report, spatial, or temporal variation in media effects research. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 10(2-3), 173-175.

Vraga, E., Bode, L., & Troller-Renfree, S. (2016). Beyond self-reports: Using eye tracking to measure topic and style differences in attention to social media content. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 10(2-3), 149-164.

Other recommended but not required reading:

Chapters 7 to 9 of Sudman, Bradburn, & Schwarz (p.163-197)

Loftus, E. F., & Marburger, W. (1983). Since the eruption of Mt. St. Helens, has anyone

 beaten you up? Improving the accuracy of retrospective reports with landmark events.

 Memory & Cognition, 11, 114-120.

Strube, G. (1987). Answering survey questions: The role of memory. In H.J. Hippler, N.

 Schwarz, & S. Sudman (Eds.), Social information processing and survey methodology (pp.86 - 101). New York: Springer Verlag.

Ross, M. (1989). The relation of implicit theories to the construction of personal histories.

 Psychological Review, 96, 341-357.

Barsalou, L. W. (1988). The content and organization of autobiographical memories. In

 U. Neisser & E. Winograd (Eds.), Remembering reconsidered: Ecological and traditional

 approaches to the study of memory (pp. 193-243). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blair, E., & Burton, S. (1987). Cognitive processes used by survey respondents to answer

 behavioral frequency questions. Journal of Consumer Research, 14, 280-288.

Conway, M. A. (1996). Autobiographical knowledge and autobiographical memories.

 In D. C. Rubin (Ed.), Remembering our past: Studies in autobiographical memory (pp.

 67-93). New York: Cambridge University Press

Menon, G. (1994). Judgments of behavioral frequencies: Memory search and retrieval

 strategies. In N. Schwarz & S. Sudman (eds.), Autobiographical memory and the validity

 of retrospective reports (pp. 161-172). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Belli, R. (1998). The structure of autobiographical memory and the event history calendar:

 Potential improvements in the quality of retrospective reports in surveys, Memory, 6, 383-406.

Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). A

 survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The Day Reconstruction Method

 (DRM). Science*,* 306*,* 1776-1780.

Stone, A.A., Shiffman, S.S., & DeVries, M.W. (1999). Ecological momentary

 assessment. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (eds.), Well-being: The

 foundations of hedonic psychology (pp. 61-84). New York: Russell-Sage.

Belli, R., Shay, W.L., Stafford, F.P. (2001). Event history calendars and question list surveys: A direct comparison of interviewing methods. Public Opinion Quarterly, 65, 45-74.

Freedman, D., Thornton, A., Camburn, D., Alwin, D., & Young-DeMarco, L. (1988).

 The life history calendar: A technique for collecting retrospective data. In C.C. Clogg

 (Ed.), Sociological Methodology (Vol. 18, pp. 37-68). San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.

Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: Evidence for an accessibility

 model of emotional self-report. Psychological Bulletin, 128, 934-960.

Schwarz, N., & Wellens, T. (1997). Cognitive dynamics of proxy responding: The

 diverging perspectives of actors and observers. Journal of Official Statistics, 13, 159-179.

Mingay, D. J., Shevell, S. K., Bradburn, N. M., & Ramirez, C. (1994). Self and proxy

 reports of everyday events. In N. Schwarz & S. Sudman (Eds.), Autobiographical memory and the validity of retrospective reports (pp. 235-250). New York: Springer Verlag.

Sudman, S. Bickart, B., Blair, J., & Menon, G. (1994). The effect of level of participation

 on reports of behavior and attitudes by proxy reporters. In N. Schwarz & S. Sudman (Eds.), Autobiographical memory and the validity of retrospective reports (pp. 251-266).

**2/9**

**Week 5: Survey Sampling and Design**

This week will cover distinctions between various probability and nonprobability sampling techniques (simple random, stratified random and quota, snowball, and convenience) as well as design (cross-sectional, longitudinal and experimental).

Required reading:

 Blair and Blair Applied Survey Sampling text

Chapters 3 & 4 Survey Methodology (p.69 -139)

Chapter 3 in Dillman et al.

**2/16**

**Week 6: Survey Modes**

 Students will be introduced to the relative strengths and weaknesses of face-to-face interviews, phone, online and mail surveys.

Required reading:

 Chapter 5 in Survey Methodology.(p.150-179)

 Chapters 8-11 in Dillman et. al.

Schwarz, N., Strack, F., Hippler, H.J., & Bishop, G. (1991). The impact of administration

 mode on response effects in survey measurement. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5, 193-

 212.

Recommended reading:

Bourque, L. B. & Fielder, E. P. (2003) How to conduct telephone surveys (2nd edition). The Survey Kit Volume 4, Sage.

Bourque, L. B. & Fielder, E. P. (2003) How to conduct self-administered and mail surveys (2nd edition). The Survey Kit Volume 3, Sage.

Oishi, S. M. (2003) How to conduct in-person interviews for surveys (2nd edition). The Survey Kit Volume 5, Sage.

 Chapter 10 of Tourangeau, Rips & Rasinski (2000). The psychology of survey response.

 New York: Cambridge University Press.

**2/23**

**Week 7: One-on-one meetings (sign up) NO CLASS**

Please send Research Questions and Hypotheses ahead of time (and how each construct will be measured).

**3/2**

**Week 8: Tailoring surveys for a multicultural audience.**

Culture and ethnicity play a major role in our lives. This lecture will incorporate a summary of the empirical evidence on ethnic differences in survey research.

Required reading:

Chapter 12 in Dillman et. al.

Smith, T. W. (2003). Developing comparable questions in cross-national surveys.

 In J. Harkness , F. van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), Cross-cultural survey methods New York: Wiley. (p. 69-92).

Schwarz, N. (2003). Culture-sensitive context effects: A challenge for cross-cultural surveys.

 In J. Harkness , F. van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), Cross-cultural survey methods New York: Wiley. (p. 93-100).

Braun, M. (2003). Errors in comparative survey research: An overview.

 In J. Harkness , F. van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), Cross-cultural survey methods New York: Wiley. (p. 137-156).

Gudykunst, W.B. & Lee, C. M. (2002). Cross-cultural communication theories. In Handbook

 of International and Intercultural Communication. (2nd edition), Gudykunst and Mody, Eds., (p.25-50).

Other recommended reading:

Gudykunst and Kim, Chapters 3-5and 7-14.

Harkness , J., van de Vijver, F., & Mohler, P. P. (Eds.) (2003). Cross-cultural survey

 methods. New York: Wiley.

Johnson, T.P., & Van de Vijver, F. (2003). Social desirability in cross-cultural research.

 In J. Harkness , F. van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), Cross-cultural survey methods (pp.195-204). New York: Wiley.

**3/9**

**Week 9: Midterms Due  *A literature review and method section (and a draft of your proposed survey instrument in the appendix*). NO CLASS**

**3/16**

**Week 10: SPRING BREAK NO CLASS**

**3/23**

**Week 11: Piloting your instrument**

We will discuss piloting techniques such as “talk alouds” or "cognitive interviewing." We describe the process and discuss the legitimacy of these techniques. Timing and trimming are also discussed.

RequiredReading:

 Chapter 8 of Survey Methodology (p.259-288)

Other recommended reading:

Ch. 3 Converse & Presser (p.79-107)

Chapter 10 of Sudman, Bradburn, & Schwarz

DeMaio T. J., & Rothgeb J. M. (1996). Cognitive interviewing techniques: In the lab and

 in the field. In N. Schwarz and S. Sudman (Eds.), Answering questions: Methodology for

 determining cognitive and communicative processes in survey research. San Francisco:

 Jossey-Bass.

Willis, G., DeMaio, T., & Harris-Kojetin (1999). Is the bandwagon headed to

 the methodological promised land? Evaluating the validity of cognitive interviewing

 techniques. In Sirken, M, Herrmann, D., Schechter, S., Schwarz, N., Tanur, J., and

Tourangeau, R. (Eds.) Cognition and Survey Research (pp 133-153). New York: Wiley.

Crutcher, R. J. (1994) Telling what we know: The use of verbal report methodologies in

 psychological research. Psychological Science, 5, 241-244.

Payne, J. W. (1994). Thinking aloud: Insights into information processing. Psychological

 Science, 5, 241-248.

Wilson, T. D. (1994). The proper protocol: Validity and completeness of verbal reports.

 Psychological Science, 5, 249-252.

Conrad, F.G. & Blair, J. (2004). Aspects of data quality in cognitive interviews: The case of

 verbal reports. In S. Presser, J. Rothgeb, M. Couper, J. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin & E.

 Singer (Eds.) Questionnaire Development Evaluation and Testing Methods. New York:

 John Wiley and Sons, pp. 67-88.

**3/30**

**Week 12: NO CLASS Midterms returned and “pilot” other students surveys**

**4/6**

**Week 13: In class review of each other’s surveys.**

***PRIOR TO CLASS PILOT YOUR CLASSMATE’S SURVEYS ON 2 PEOPLE (preferably with no more than a high school education or less) and be prepared to discuss results and give written comments to both professor and classmates***

**4/13**

**Week 14: Scale Validation**

Issues of scale and measurement validation will be discussed and demonstrated in class.

Required reading:

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). Scale Development. Theory and Applications. (2nd Edition). Appliled Social Research Methods Series (Volume 26). Sage.

***Following week hand in:***

***1. Updated survey instrument.***

***2. Factor analyses validating all scales in your survey***

**4/20**

**Week 15: Comparison of survey options and costs.**

***Hand in:***

1. ***Updated survey instrument.***
2. ***PLEASE NOTE THAT IN ORDER TO VALIDATE YOUR SCALES YOU WILL NEED TO PILOT YOUR SURVEY TO AT LEAST 10 PEOPLE (at least two with a high school education or less).***
3. ***A write up of your observations and the implications for both your survey and your classmates.***

**4/27**

**Week 16: In class presentations and final paper due**

**In class presentation of final survey and statistical validation of your measures.**

**Include a discussion of changes that would be needed if you ran your survey in another culture.**

**Other General References:**

Below are some useful general reference volumes pertaining to cognitive and communicative

aspects of survey measurement:

Fink, A. (2013). How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Harkness , J., van de Vijver, F., & Mohler, P. P. (Eds.) (2003). Cross-cultural survey

 methods. New York: Wiley.

Hippler, H.J., Schwarz, N., & Sudman, S. (Eds.) (1987). Social information processing and

 survey methodology. New York: Springer Verlag.

Jabine, T.B., Straf, M.L., Tanur, J.M., & Tourangeau, R. (Eds.) (1984). Cognitive aspects of

 survey methodology: Building a bridge between disciplines. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Jobe, J. B., & Loftus, E. F. (Eds.) (1991). Cognition and survey measurement. Special issue of

 Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5, whole No. 3.

Kalton, G. (1983). Introduction to survey sampling. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Presser, S, et al. (Eds.) (2004). Methods for testing and evaluating survey questionnaires. New

 York: Wiley.

Saris, W.E. & Gallhofer, I. N. (2014). Deesign, evaluation, and analysis of questionnaires for survey research. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Schwarz, N. & Sudman, S. (Eds.) (1992). Context effects in social and psychological research.

 New York: Springer Verlag.

Schwarz, N. & Sudman, S. (Eds.) (1994). Autobiographical memory and the validity of

 retrospective reports. New York: Springer Verlag.

Schwarz, N. & Sudman, S. (Eds.) (1996). Answering questions: Methodology for determining

 cognitive and communicative processes in survey research. San Francisco: Jossye-Bass.

Schuman, H. & Presser, S. (1996). Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on question form, wording and context. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.

Sirken, M., Hermann, D., Schechter, S., Schwarz, N., Tanur, J., & Tourangeau, R. (Eds.) (1999).

 Cognition and survey research. New York: Wiley.

Sudman, S., Bradburn, N. M., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Thinking about answers: The

 application of cognitive processes to survey methodology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tanur, J. M. (Ed.) (1992). Questions about questions. New York: Russel Sage.

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L.J., Rasinski, K. (2000). The psychology of survey response. New York:

 Cambridge University Press.