

**Research Methods (HDFS 3390),  
Alan Reifman, Texas Tech University  
Exam 2 Review**

---

- Same format, number of items, etc., as Exam 1
- Make sure to read assigned online articles!
  
- Topics
  - **Maximizing Accuracy of Self-Reports**
    - Different types of inaccuracy (intentionally lying, inattentive responding, memory limits, acquiescence, order effects)
    - Importance of social desirability in intentionally false responses
    - Ways to combat intentionally false responding (social desirability scale, contradictory answers, bogus pipeline, bogus items, private vs. in-person responses, etc.)
    - Ways to combat other sources of inaccuracy (infrequency items, Timeline Follow-Back, etc.)

**SAMPLE ITEM**

One way to combat lying in self-reported substance use is for the researcher to obtain a biological specimen (e.g., saliva, hair), tell the respondent the specimen will be tested for substances (and hence there's no point in lying!), but never actually test the specimen. This approach is known as:

A. Full biochemical verification	B. Bogus pipeline	C. Bogus items	D. Experimenter trickery
----------------------------------	-------------------	----------------	--------------------------

- **Data-Collection Modes**
  - Old-fashioned (self-administered/mail questionnaire, face-to-face interview, telephone interview)
  - Advantages and disadvantages of SAQ, face-to-face, & phone (see "Good overview..." document linked to lecture notes)
  - More modern methods (online, smartphone, mixed methods such as mostly face-to-face but letting respondent type in answers to sensitive questions) and their advantages and disadvantages
  - Miscellaneous: question wording (e.g., "homosexuals" vs. "gay men and lesbians"); progress indicators

SAMPLE ITEM

Which method tends to produce the highest rate of agreement to participate in a survey?

A. Personal/face-to-face	B. Self-administered/mail	C. Landline phone	D. Online/smartphone
--------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	----------------------

○ **Observational Research**

- Similarities and differences with self-report
- Naturalistic observation (“fly on the wall,” in natural “habitat”)
- Participant observation (researcher joins in as member of the group being observed; either secret/covert or announced/overt)
- Controlled lab observation (couples or families given task to work on or discuss; raters code behaviors, such as number of smiles or interruptions)
- Ethical issues (especially in some of the studies out in the real-world)
- Suggestions for getting participants to act naturally when they know they are being observed

SAMPLE ITEM

[Made-up example] A researcher studied up-close what it was like to be a “Deadhead” (fans who traveled around to Grateful Dead concerts) by wearing tie-died shirts and mingling with actual Deadheads at concerts (telling everyone he/she was a researcher). This would be an example of:

A. Naturalistic observation	B. Participant observ. (covert)	C. Participant observation (overt)	D. Controlled lab observation
-----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

○ **Sampling**

- Population (large, all members) vs. sample (subset)
- Survey a sample (more efficient than surveying entire population), but draw conclusions about population
- Two main methods: **simple random** (lottery) and **systematic** (interval jumping); both require a list of population members (as close as possible, California driver’s license list to survey Californians 16 and older)
- All listed members of population must have **equal probability** of being selected into sample
- “Coverage”: Degree to which sampling frame matches actual population

- **Margin of error**
  - Even the most carefully done survey will be off a little from population “true value” of whatever you’re studying (e.g., percent of Americans who’ve ridden Uber/Lyft)
  - MoE (e.g., +/- 3) gives you likely range of what result would be if you could survey entire population (e.g., 52% support for a political candidate in a sample would suggest 49-55% in population)
  - MoE gets smaller as sample gets larger, but 1,000 seems most appropriate sample size balancing off precision (low MoE) with cost of more interviews
- **Multistage Cluster Sampling: When you don’t have a sampling frame of individuals with some characteristic (e.g., college students), go where they’re clustered**
- **Sample weights: Bring demographic percentages in your sample into alignment with Census (population)**
- **Non-probability samples (described in reading); more limited conclusions than with probability sampling, but lets you learn something about your survey topic**

**SAMPLE ITEM**

Starting with a list of people in your population of interest, giving each person an ID number, and then selecting a subset to participate via a lottery is which kind of sampling?

A. Multistage cluster	B. Non-probability	C. Systematic	D. Simple random
-----------------------	--------------------	---------------	------------------