



# City Research Online

## City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Butt, S., Widdop, S. and Winstone, E. (2016). The Role of High Quality Surveys in Political Science Research. In: Keman, H. (Ed.), Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Political Science. (pp. 262-280). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. ISBN 9781784710811

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/17426/>

**Link to published version:**

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

---

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

## **The role of high-quality surveys in political science research**

**Sarah Butt, Sally Widdop and Lizzy Winstone**

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Surveys have become one of the most commonly used methods of quantitative data collection in the social sciences. They provide researchers with the means to collect systematic micro-data on the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of a range of individual actors including (but not limited to) the general public, voters, political activists and elected officials. The scope to collect comparable data in different settings makes them a particularly valuable tool for studying differences in attitudes and behavior across time and across countries. Surveys have provided empirical data and contributed to theory building across a range of topics in political science including: political culture (Almond and Verba 1963) and values (Inglehart 1977), electoral choice (Butler and Stokes 1969), political engagement (Verba and Nye 1972), social and political trust (Putnam 2000), and democratization (Evans and Whitefield 1995).

The primary means by which to capture ‘the ebb and flow of public opinion’ (Brady 2000, p. 47), survey evidence is also widely used by political actors besides academic researchers. Political polling is a ubiquitous feature of campaigns for public office at all levels, while policy makers use surveys to explore possible drivers of behavior and monitor public attitudes towards key issues. Surveys are also a major source of political information for journalists and the general public. They provide a crucial link between citizens and government and as such may help to shape the political landscape and to ensure the openness and transparency of governments. Atkeson (2010, p. 10) argues that ‘without survey research methods it would be nearly impossible to understand the public and its role and value in democratic governing’.

Since the introduction of surveys to the social sciences in the 1930s (see Heath et al. 2005 for more on the history of surveys), their availability has continued to spread. Surveys now have global reach, covering nearly every country in the world. There are a growing number of established surveys available as well as increased opportunities for researchers to collect their own data. The potential for using survey data to understand political attitudes, behavior and dynamics increases as survey methodology, data collection techniques and the statistical tools available for analysis evolve. Researchers are increasingly able to overcome one of the limitations of survey research – a reliance on correlational studies – and determine causality through the use of statistical techniques such as propensity matching and panel studies which allow for the use of quasi-experimental designs (Atkeson 2010). The practice of embedding experiments in social surveys is also becoming more common, enabling researchers to study the causal effect of different stimuli on political decision-making (Druckman et al. 2006). Growing opportunities for data linkage, combining survey data with contextual data from other sources, provide scope to explore societal influences on individual attitudes and behavior (Groves 2011).

As with any data collection tool, however, the quality of the inferences to be drawn from survey data are only as good as the data collection methodology employed. Good survey design should seek to minimize potential sources of error (bias) that can occur in all stages of data collection. The proliferation of academic, commercial and user-generated surveys available to political scientists – and the growing availability of alternative forms of data – makes it important to be able to distinguish the good from the bad. This is the case for those designing their own survey, for researchers making use of existing survey data for secondary analysis and for researchers wishing to use surveys as a vehicle for conducting experiments.

In this chapter we first define what a survey is and identify the essential features of survey data. We discuss what makes a good survey, taking the European Social Survey as a case study. We provide examples of other surveys likely to be of interest to political scientists and consider how survey data can be enhanced by combining it with other forms of data. We conclude by arguing that surveys remain critical to the study of political science, with other forms of data complementing, but not replacing, high-quality surveys.

## 2 WHAT IS A SURVEY?

Surveys can be distinguished by three main features, established by pollster George Gallup in the 1930s and broadly present ever since (Heath et al. 2005): targeting random samples of a defined population; use of standardized ‘closed’ questions to measure the attitudes and characteristics of respondents; and generation of quantitative data for statistical analysis.

Within this basic formulation there is wide scope for surveys to use different designs to address questions relevant to political science and other social science disciplines.

Examples of different types of surveys available and their potential uses are shown in Box 18.1.

### **Box 1: Types of surveys**

- **Cross-national surveys** - Carried out in multiple countries to understand how attitudes and behaviour vary according to differences in culture, institutions or economic conditions. Examples: World Values Survey; European Social Survey; European Values Survey.
- **National time-series** - General social surveys conducted in a specific country often contain variables likely to be of interest to political scientists. Data are available over time, allowing analysis of trends. Examples: US General Social Survey (since 1973), German General Social Survey – ALLBUS (since 1980); British Social Attitudes

Survey (since 1983).

- **Election surveys** - Conducted around the time of national elections in many countries, these seek to explain election outcomes and voter behaviour by collecting information on vote choice and participation, attitudes towards election issues and government performance. Examples: American National Election Studies (since 1952), Swedish National Election Studies (since 1956); British Election Study (since 1964).
- **Surveys of political subgroups** – Further our understanding of the dynamics of political representation and the interplay between political elites, activists and the public. Examples include surveys of political party members/activists (Seyd and Whiteley, 2004) and candidates for political office and elected officials (Walczack and van der Brug, 2013).
- **Panel studies** - Collect data from the same individual at multiple time points to explore changes in attitudes and behaviour. Can focus on the effect of particular events e.g. election campaigns or track respondents over many years to study political socialisation. Example: Belgian Political Panel Study 2006-2011; European Election Study Panel 2014

Researchers have the option of conducting secondary analysis of existing data sets, many of which are freely available to download, or of conducting a bespoke survey.

Collecting your own data makes it possible to tailor the survey design to your research questions. Survey data can now be collected quickly and relatively cheaply via Internet survey tools such as SurveyMonkey<sup>1</sup> while online panels such as the LISS panel in the Netherlands<sup>2</sup> and the GESIS panel in Germany<sup>3</sup> allow researchers to include their own questions on established surveys. However, there are potential limitations to online surveys, for example, participants may not be fully representative of the population, as well as challenges associated with designing your own questionnaire (see later in this chapter). Using data from a pre-existing survey may provide the best option for accessing high-quality data.

Regardless of the type of survey being conducted or the research question(s) it is intended to address, a good survey aims to achieve:

<bt>representativeness – data are representative of the population of interest allowing researchers to use it to draw robust conclusions about the entire population;

<bt>reliability – any differences observed in data collected across different respondents reflect genuine differences in attitudes or behavior rather than being the result of the way the data are collected; and

<bt>validity – the survey accurately measures what it is intended to measure.</list>

This depends on minimizing the various sources of error that can occur at all stages of data collection including errors associated with population coverage, sampling, non-response and measurement (Biemer and Lyberg 2003; Groves et al. 2009).

We discuss below how survey design can influence the level of survey error and the extent to which survey data can be considered representative, reliable and valid. We illustrate the discussion with examples of survey best practice taken from the European Social Survey (ESS).<sup>4</sup> Established in 2001, the ESS is a biennial cross-national survey of public attitudes and opinions. Data are collected from a representative sample of adults aged 15 and over in between 20 and 30 countries each round. Consisting of a core questionnaire that remains the same in every round alongside round-specific rotating modules, the face-to-face survey covers many topics of interest to political scientists, including: satisfaction with democracy, political trust, citizen engagement and attitudes towards immigration. The ESS aspires to the highest standards and is widely regarded as having raised the bar in terms of methodological rigor and transparency in cross-national research (Groves et al. 2008).

The ESS is not the only example of a good survey. Details of other high-quality international surveys which may be of interest to political scientists are given in Appendix

18.1. We focus on cross-sectional, cross-national studies with some time-series availability since these provide breadth of coverage and rich data for comparative research.

### 3.1 Sampling

One way to ensure that survey data are representative is to conduct a census of the population. However, for reasons of practicality and cost, it is much more common to survey a sample of the population.

Probability sampling is the most robust approach to minimize errors associated with sampling. Respondents are sampled at random from the population of interest and cannot be substituted, that is, if the target respondent is unavailable or unwilling to participate, they cannot be replaced with someone else. This ensures that each member of the survey population has a known non-zero chance of being selected to participate and enables data users to estimate sampling error and assess the accuracy of survey estimates. The ESS requires that a random sample of all adults aged 15 and over and resident in private households is drawn in each country. To avoid coverage error that is, to ensure everyone in the population has a chance of being selected, where possible the sample is drawn using an accurate and complete sampling frame such as a population register or comprehensive list of all postal delivery points. In the absence of a suitable frame, carefully specified procedures are used to ensure representativeness (see Häder and Lynn 2007 for more on ESS sampling procedures).

Quota sampling is a commonly used, quicker and cheaper alternative to probability sampling. Unlike under probability sampling, interviewers have some flexibility in recruitment; provided that they interview the right mix of people to meet a set of pre-determined quotas – based for example on gender, age or employment status - they are free to select respondents (Smith 2008). They do not need to spend time persuading reluctant



respondents or making multiple calls at an address to contact a specific individual; they can simply conduct the interview with individuals who are willing and available. The achieved sample is seemingly representative because it is similar in composition to that of the population with respect to the quota characteristics (ibid.). However, the fact that interviewers are free to select the most willing and available respondents – who are likely to have different characteristics from individuals who are harder to reach – increases sampling error and the risk that the data collected are biased.

### 3.2 Response Rates

For survey data to be representative of the underlying population, it is important to minimize any errors or bias that may occur as a result of survey non-response. In recent years it has become more difficult to contact and to persuade people to participate in surveys (Stoop et al. 2010). Although not necessarily the case, lower response rates make it more likely that participants have different characteristics compared with non-participants and hence that the characteristics of those who actually participate in the survey (the achieved sample) no longer accurately reflect those of the underlying population. Bias can result if the characteristics under-/over-represented among actual respondents are related to the attitudes and behaviors the survey is designed to measure. The ESS exerts a lot of effort to minimize non-response error. Countries are set a demanding response rate target of 70 percent and, although this may not be achieved, are expected to get as close to this as possible. Countries are also asked, where possible, to monitor respondent characteristics during fieldwork and target particular hard-to-reach groups to try and ensure that the final sample achieved is as balanced as possible.

### 3.3 Questionnaire Design

The reliability and validity of survey instruments can be improved, and measurement error reduced, by good questionnaire design. There are a number of different approaches to question design available to researchers looking to measure complex concepts effectively via surveys. Survey questions can be used to ask about behavior or facts; about knowledge and about attitudes (Bradburn et al. 2004). Survey questions may be open or closed. Closed questions that require respondents to choose from a pre-determined set of response options are more frequently used in survey research. Open questions, where respondents answer in their own words, are more costly to administer and analyze but can provide more flexibility.

Whatever the type of question being asked, there are some general principles that good questionnaire designers should observe in order to avoid bias (see Box 18.2).

**Box 2. Principles of questionnaire design - Krosnick and Presser (2010 p.264)**

1. Use simple, familiar words (avoid technical terms, jargon and slang)
2. Use simple syntax
3. Avoid words with ambiguous meanings, i.e. aim for wording that all respondents will interpret in the same way
4. Use wording that is specific and concrete (as opposed to general and abstract)
5. Make response options exhaustive and mutually exclusive
6. Avoid leading or loaded questions that push respondents toward an answer
7. Ask about one thing at a time (avoid double-barrelled questions)
8. Avoid questions with single or double negations

Using questions previously developed and tested by other researchers can be a good way of ensuring valid and reliable measurement. Questionnaires developed for social surveys are generally an open resource and researchers are free to replicate the measures they contain. It is, however, important to bear in mind that items shown to work in one context (country and time period) may not be transferable to other contexts. There are question banks available that can be searched to find suitable items on different topics previously fielded in other

surveys.<sup>5</sup> All questionnaires fielded as part of the ESS (translated into all relevant languages) are available to download from the ESS website, alongside detailed information about their development.

### 3.4 Pre-testing

One way to enhance the quality of questions and minimize measurement error is to test draft questions. Pre-testing can establish whether a question is likely to be understood by respondents, whether it is understood consistently across different respondents, that is, is reliable, and is understood as intended, that is, is valid (Presser et al. 2004). The ESS conducts several types of qualitative and quantitative pre-testing. Expert review – where specialists in both survey methodology and the relevant substantive topic critique a draft question – is used throughout the design process. Cognitive interviewing is also used, whereby respondents are asked a question as if they were in a real survey interview and then either verbalize their thought process or are probed on their understanding and how they selected an answer (see Willis 2005). Quantitative pre-testing is carried out by including draft questions on omnibus surveys that is, buying questionnaire space on a commercial quota survey for testing purposes, and by running a pilot survey. The data generated is used to identify items with high item non-response – which may suggest a question is too difficult or sensitive for respondents to answer – or skewed distributions, which might indicate a lack of variation in opinion on a topic. Quantitative pre-tests also provide scope for more detailed statistical analysis allowing the relationships between variables to be explored and providing insight into whether the draft questions are measuring the desired concepts.

Pre-testing is particularly important in a cross-national context where the risk of introducing measurement error is increased owing to differences in language and culture across countries. The ESS pre-testing takes place in several countries, allowing differences in

translation and culture to be taken into account. National coordinators who manage implementation of the survey in each country also review how well questions might work in their country (Prestage and Humphreys 2013).

### 3.5 Achieving Equivalence

To make valid and reliable comparisons between data collected across different groups of respondents and minimize measurement error, it is critical that all survey respondents receive the same stimulus and interpret the meaning of questions in the same way. This is known as the principle of equivalence (Jowell 1998). Simply presenting all respondents with an identical question may not be sufficient to achieve equivalence given that different respondents may understand the same question in different ways. Equivalence can be an issue for any survey owing to the inevitable heterogeneity of respondents in terms of vocabulary or levels of education. However, it is often a particular concern for cross-national surveys and surveys repeated over time, as the meaning of questions can vary from one country or time point to another.

A question may be understood differently in different countries for several reasons. A concept's relevance may vary depending on the institutional, policy or cultural context. For example, a question measuring attitudes toward direct democracy may be less readily understood by respondents in countries where referendums rarely take place compared with those in which they are common (Winstone et al. 2016). Researchers often face a choice between trying to formulate questions which are sufficiently general to apply in all countries and providing country-specific adaptations. The latter may improve measurement at the national level but preclude direct cross-national comparisons (Smith 2004). A question may also be understood differently due to the way it is translated. It might be that the 'translated word or phrase has acted as a slightly different stimulus from the one intended' (Jowell 1998

p. 4). The ESS adopts rigorous procedures to try to ensure translations use functionally equivalent words and phrases. A parallel ‘ask the same question’ approach – where all countries translate the same questions taken from a central source questionnaire – is used in combination with a committee based approach to translation, following translation, review, adjudication, pre-testing and documentation (TRAPD) procedures (Harkness 2007).

### 3.6 Mode

Choice of mode – whether the survey is self-administered via mail or the Web or administered by interviewers face to face or over the telephone – can introduce survey error, and hence affect the representativeness, reliability and validity of the data collected in a number of ways (Roberts 2007).

Face-to-face surveys such as the ESS are considered to be the gold standard for achieving a representative sample of the population. Modes reliant on technology, particularly online surveys, risk introducing coverage error if not everyone in the population of interest has access to the technology in question. There may also be a greater risk of sampling error with self-administered surveys; in the absence of an interviewer present to monitor who actually completes the questionnaire, postal or online surveys may simply be completed by the most willing or first-available individuals rather than a truly representative cross-section of the population. Finally, response rates are generally lower for self-administered surveys compared with face-to-face surveys.

Self-administered modes may, however, help to reduce measurement error and improve the reliability and validity of the data. Particularly with questions that are sensitive, in the presence of an interviewer respondents may adjust their responses to avoid embarrassment, to present a positive image of themselves or to give an answer they feel the interviewer wants to hear, for example, falsely claiming to have voted in the last election to

appear as a better citizen. Relying on interviewers also carries a risk of introducing interviewer effects into the data (De Leeuw 2008). If one interviewer asks a question differently to another, this could affect the reliability and validity of the data collected. Fielding questions prone to social desirability bias or interviewer effects via self-administered modes may help to improve measurement. Where interviewers are used, as on the ESS, interviewer training and briefing is crucial to ensure standardized interviewing and minimize interviewer effects.

### 3.7 Availability

Designing a high-quality survey can be complex, costly and time-consuming. It is therefore worth taking advantage of the wealth of existing surveys, whose data are often freely available for secondary analysis. Data from national surveys can often be accessed via national data archives. Similarly, data from large-scale cross-national or international projects are often readily available. The ESS makes all its data available via its website.<sup>6</sup>

However, free data does not necessarily mean good data. The best data sources also provide access to documentation about the survey undertaken. This might include the questionnaire and other materials used by the interviewer plus information about sample design, response rates, mode, when fieldwork was conducted and by whom. Surveys such as the ESS go one step further and publish known deviations about the data following the premise that imperfections should not be concealed from potential users (Jowell et al. 2007). Data users should be provided with a full picture of how a survey was conducted and are able to make an assessment of the quality of a survey as a source of data.

## 4 COMBINING SURVEY DATA WITH INFORMATION FROM OTHER SOURCES

Researchers' understanding of individual attitudes and behaviors can greatly be enhanced by combining survey data with information from other sources. Such data linkage can, for

example, provide valuable information about the context in which individuals operate and help to explain variation across space and time.

There is a wide range of pre-existing contextual information available which can be matched to survey data at national or sub-national level including data on political institutions, regime performance, electoral outcomes and economic indicators. Chapter 15 in this volume discusses such data and provides examples of readily available data sources.

Increasingly, established surveys provide users with data sets in which the survey data are already linked to a variety of contextual data. The ESS, for example, makes a variety of demographic, economic and political information available. This can be linked to the survey data at different levels of geography using the nomenclature of territorial units for statistics (NUTS) classification devised by Eurostat for producing European Union (EU) regional statistics (Rydland et al. 2007). One potentially important source of contextual information for political scientists is information on the content of media coverage. The amount and tone of media coverage of particular events, including (but not limited to) election campaigns, has the potential to influence individual attitudes and behavior, and differences in media coverage may help to explain differences in outcomes across countries or across time (see, for example, Vliegenthart et al. 2008). To enable researchers to study and control for such media effects, the ESS makes information on the topics and tone of media coverage available alongside the main survey data.

The contribution that surveys have made to political science – and social science more generally – over the past 80 years is undeniable. Demand for the types of insight surveys can provide is higher than ever. In many respects, there has never been a better time to use surveys given the number of high-quality data sets available and the continued development of new statistical techniques allowing more sophisticated analysis of these data.

However, surveys also face uncertainty as they try to adapt to a changing society and the emergence of new technology (Couper 2013). The cost of delivering high quality surveys is rising whilst participation rates are falling (Groves 2011). The Internet has made it possible to collect large amounts of data quickly and cheaply. However, there are concerns that opt-in web panels cannot provide data of comparable quality to other surveys (Callegaro et al. 2014).

The challenges facing survey research, together with the growing availability of data from other sources, raises the question of whether there is a continued need for surveys. ‘Big data’ automatically generated as a result of government administration, commercial transactions and social media now swamp the availability of survey data (Mayer-Schönberger and Cukler 2013). Savage and Burrows (2007, p. 891) contend that ‘where data on whole populations are routinely gathered as a by-product of institutional transactions, the sample survey seems a very poor instrument’.

However, while the growth in what Groves (2011) terms ‘organic data’ undoubtedly offers opportunities to researchers, such data also face a number of limitations which means they cannot compete with ‘designed’ survey data on the key attributes of representativeness, reliability, validity or availability. Some of the main limitations associated with organic data include: incomplete coverage, that is, unrepresentativeness given that certain types of people are more likely to use Twitter or store loyalty cards; possible measurement bias in data originally intended for a different purpose (do people tell the truth on Facebook for



example?); lack of consistency in the way data are generated, especially a lack of continuity over time as technology changes; and the proprietary nature of data which may be available to researchers only at high cost, if at all (Couper 2013). User-generated organic data are a useful addition to, rather than a replacement for survey data. Specifically designed sample surveys will continue to provide insights into the thoughts, aspirations and behaviors of large populations in ways that data tracking naturally occurring behaviors are unlikely ever to capture (Groves 2011).

The amount and types of data available – from surveys and other sources – will continue to expand. It is essential that those involved in survey data collection adhere to the principles of good survey design, thereby ensuring that sources of error are minimized and the key strengths of surveys as a source of valid and reliable data representative of the population of interest are maintained. They must also fully document the process and, wherever possible, make the data and documentation freely available to other researchers so as to maximize their value. At the same time, there is an obligation on data users to think critically about their choice of data and select the data source that is most suitable for answering their research questions. We hope that the issues and examples highlighted in this chapter will help with this task.

## NOTES

1. [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com).
2. [www.lisdata.nl](http://www.lisdata.nl).
3. <http://www.gesis.org/en/services/data-collection/gesis-panel/>.
4. [www.europeansocialsurvey.org](http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org).
5. <http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/other-providers/question-banks.aspx>.
6. [www.europeansocialsurvey.org](http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org).

## FURTHER REFERENCES

De Leeuw, E., J. Hox and D. Dillman (2008), *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, New York: Taylor and Francis.

De Vaus, D. (2013), *Surveys in Social Research*, 6th edn, London: Routledge.

ESOMAR/WAPOR guide to opinion polls and published surveys:

<http://wapor.org/esomarwapor-guide-to-opinion-polls/>

Groves, R., F.J. Fowler, M. Couper, J. Lepkowski, E. Singer and R. Tourangeau (2009) *Survey Methodology*, 2nd edn, New York: Wiley.

Jowell, R., C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald and G. Eva (2007), *Measuring Attitudes Cross-Nationally: Lessons from the ESS*, London: Sage.

## REFERENCES

Almond, G. and S. Verba (1963), *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Atkeson, L. (2010), 'The state of survey research as a research tool in American politics', in J.E. Leighley (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behaviour*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biemer, P. and L. Lyberg (2003), *Introduction to Survey Quality*, New York: Wiley.

Brady, H.E. (2000), 'Contributions of survey research to political science', *Journal of Political Science and Politics*, **33** (1), 47–57.

Bradburn, N., S. Sudman and B. Wansink (2004), *Asking Questions: the Definitive Guide to Questionnaire Design – for Market Research, Political Polls and Social and Health Questionnaires*, San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.

- Butler, D. and D. Stokes (1969), *Political Change in Britain: Forces Shaping Electoral Choice*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Callegaro, M., R. Baker, J. Bethlehem, A. Goritz, J.A. Krosnick and P. Lavrakas (eds) (2014), *Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Couper, M. (2013), 'Is the sky falling? New technology, changing media and the future of surveys', *Survey Research Methods*, **7** (3), 145–56.
- De Leeuw, E. (2008), 'Self-administered questionnaires and standardized interviews', *The Sage Handbook of Social Research Methods*, London: Sage, pp. 235–313.
- Druckman, J.N., D.P. Green, J.H. Kuklinski and A. Lupia (2006), 'The growth and development of experimental research in political science', *American Political Science Review*, **100** (4), 627–35.
- Evans, G. and S. Whitefield (1995), 'The politics and economics of democratic commitment: support for democracy in transition societies', *British Journal of Political Science*, **25** (4), 485–514
- Groves, R.M. (2011), 'Three eras of survey research', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, **75** (5), 861–71.
- Groves, R.M. J. Bethlehem, J. Diez Medrando, P. Gundelach and P. Norris (2008), *Report of the Review Panel for the European Social Survey*, Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.
- Groves, R.M., F.J. Fowler, M. Couper, J. Lepkowski, E. Singer and R. Tourangeau (2009), *Survey Methodology*, 2nd edn, New York: Wiley.
- Häder, S. and P. Lynn (2007), 'How representative can a multi-nation survey be?', in R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, and G. Eva (eds), *Measuring Attitudes Cross-Nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*, London: Sage, pp. 33–52.

- Harkness, J. (2007), 'Improving the quality of translations', in R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, and G. Eva (eds), *Measuring Attitudes Cross-Nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*, London: Sage, pp. 79–93.
- Heath, A., S. Fisher and S. Smith (2005), 'The globalisation of public opinion research', *Annual Review of Political Science*, **8**, 297–333.
- Inglehart, R. (1977), *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jowell, R. (1998), 'How comparative is comparative research?' Economics and Social Research Council, Centre for Research into Elections and Social Trends, Working Paper No. 66, September.
- Jowell, R., R. Fitzgerald, C. Roberts and G. Eva (2007), *Measuring Attitudes Cross Nationally*, London: Sage.
- Krosnick, J.A. and S. Presser (2010), 'Question and questionnaire design', in J.D. Wright and P.V. Marsden (eds), *Handbook of Survey Research*, 2nd edn, Bingley: Emerald Group, pp. 263–313.
- Mayer-Schönberger, V. and K. Cukier (2013), *Big Data: A Revolution that Will Transform How We Live, Work, and Think*, London: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Presser, S., J. Rothgeb, M.P. Couper, J.T. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin and E. Singer (eds), (2004), *Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Prestage, Y. and A. Humphreys (2013), *SAGE Research Methods Cases: The European Social Survey*, London: Sage.
- Putnam, R. (2000), *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Roberts, C. (2007), 'Mixing modes of data collection: a methodological review', Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) National Centre for Research Methods Briefing Paper NCRM/008, ESRC, Southampton.
- Rydland, L.T., S. Arnesen and A.G. Østensen (2007), 'Contextual data for the European Social Survey: an overview and assessment of extant sources', Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Bergen.
- Savage, M. and R. Burrows (2007), 'The coming crisis of empirical sociology', *Sociology*, **41** (5), 885–99.
- Seyd, P. and P. Whiteley (2004), 'British party members: an overview', *Party Politics*, **10** (4), 355–66.
- Smith, T. (2004), 'Developing and evaluating cross-national survey instruments', in S. Presser, J.M. Rothgeb, M.P. Couper, J.T. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin and E. Singer (eds), *Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires*, New York: Wiley, pp. 431–52.
- Smith, P. (2008), 'Is random probability sampling really much better than quota sampling?', Ipsos MORI internal research paper, unpublished.
- Stoop, I., J. Billiet, A. Kock and R. Fitzgerald (2010), *Improving Survey Response Lessons Learned from the European Social Survey*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Verba, S. and N. Nie (1972), *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Vliegenthart, R., A.R. Schuck, H.G. Boomgaarden and C.H. de Vreese (2008), 'News coverage and support for European integration, 1990–2006', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, **20** (4), 415–39.
- Walczak, A. and W. van der Brug (2013), 'Representation in the European Parliament: factors affecting the attitude congruence of voters and candidates in the EP elections', *European Union Politics*, **14** (1), 3–22.

Willis, G.B. (2005), *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Winstone, L., S. Widdop and R. Fitzgerald (2016), 'Constructing the questionnaire: the challenges of measuring attitudes towards democracy across Europe', in M. Ferrin and H. Kriesi (ed), *How Europeans View and Evaluate Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 21–39.

## APPENDIX 18.1

Table 18A.1 Cross-national surveys available for secondary analysis

Survey	Coverage	Mode	Topics of interest	Data available (at September 2016)	Websites (at September 2016)
<i>Global</i>					
World Values Survey	>180 countries	Face to face or telephone (in remote areas); internet and mail (in exceptional circumstances)	Examples from 2010–14: priorities for country; desired characteristics for society and democracy; interest in politics; political action; voting – local and national elections; perceptions of corruption in elections	1981–84; 1990–94; 1995–98; 1999–2004; 2005–09; 2010–14	Information and Data: <a href="http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp">http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp</a>
Comparative Study of Electoral systems	>50 countries	Face to face, telephone or self-completion; also combination of telephone and self-completion or face to face and self-completion	Vote choice; evaluations of candidate, party, current and retrospective economic performance and of the electoral system itself. District level data for each respondent. System level data on aggregate electoral returns, electoral rules and formulas, and regime characteristics	1996–2001; 2001–06; 2006–11; 2011–16	Information: <a href="http://www.cses.org/">http://www.cses.org/</a> Data registration: <a href="http://www.cses.org/verify.htm">http://www.cses.org/verify.htm</a>

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)	c.50 countries	Face to face or self-completion	Specific modules on citizenship (2004, 2014) and role of government (1985, 1990, 1996, 2006)	Annual survey: 1985–2014	Information: <a href="http://www.issp.org/index.php">http://www.issp.org/index.php</a> Data: <a href="http://www.gesis.org/en/issp/search-and-data-access/">http://www.gesis.org/en/issp/search-and-data-access/</a>
<i>European</i>					
European Values Study	47 countries	Face to face	Political interest; willingness to join in political actions; left–right placement; post-materialism; support for democracy	1981; 1990; 1999; 2008	Information and Data and: <a href="http://www.gesis.org/en/services/data-analysis/survey-data/rdc-international-survey-programs/european-values-study/">http://www.gesis.org/en/services/data-analysis/survey-data/rdc-international-survey-programs/european-values-study/</a>
European Quality of Life Survey	>34 countries	Face to face	Unpaid voluntary work in political party/trade union; participation in political activities; trust in institutions; political trust; quality of public services	2003; 2007; 2011–12	Information: <a href="http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/eqls/index.htm">http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/eqls/index.htm</a> Data: <a href="http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/availability/index.htm">http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/availability/index.htm</a>
European Social Survey	>30 countries	Face to face	Every survey: political interest; trust; efficacy; political participation; party allegiance and socio-political orientations; in 2002–03 – 43 questions on citizenship, involvement and democracy; in 2012–13 – 45 questions on understandings and evaluations of democracy	Biennial: 2002–03; 2004–05; 2006–07; 2008–09; 2010–11; 2012–13; 2014–15	Information: <a href="http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org">www.europeansocialsurvey.org</a> Data: <a href="http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/round-index.html">http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/round-index.html</a>
<i>European Barometers</i>					



Standard Eurobarometer	>30 countries	Face to face; telephone interviewing (in some countries)	Examples from 2013: political attitudes and behaviors – including life in the European Union; the Europeans and the financial crisis; EU 2020 objectives; EU citizenship and media use in the EU	Several times a year: 1974–2015	Information: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/">http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/</a> Data: <a href="http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/survey-series/standard-special-eb/">http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/survey-series/standard-special-eb/</a>
Central and Eastern Eurobarometer	>20 Eastern European countries	Face to face	Economic and political trends; evaluation of economic and democratic reforms; perception of Europe & the European Union and its role in Eastern Europe	Annually: 1990–97	Information and data: <a href="http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/survey-series/central-eastern-eb/">http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/survey-series/central-eastern-eb/</a>
Candidate countries – Eurobarometer	13 countries (all applied for 2001 EU membership)	Face to face	Political participation and trust in institutions; attitudes towards & information about the EU; European Parliament elections; attitudes towards and knowledge about the enlargement process; the future of Europe etc.	Yearly: 2000; 2001; 2004 and Several times a year: 2002 and 2003	Information and data: <a href="http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/survey-series/candidate-countries-eb/">http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/survey-series/candidate-countries-eb/</a>

<i>Global Barometers</i>					
Americas Barometer	26 countries – North, Central and South America and Caribbean	Face to face in all countries except Canada and the US who use an online panel	Left-right and liberal-conservative scales; community participation; political action; pride in political systems in country; political trust; democracy; social and political tolerance; corruption	Biennial: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012	Information: <a href="http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapp/index.php">http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapp/index.php</a> Data: <a href="http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapp/request-datasets.php">http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapp/request-datasets.php</a>
Afrobarometer	> 35 countries	Face to face	Public opinions on democracy, governance; social capital; participation; national identity	1999–2001; 2002–03; 2005–06; 2008–10; 2011–13; 2014-2015	Information: <a href="http://www.afrobarometer.org/index.php">http://www.afrobarometer.org/index.php</a> Data: <a href="http://www.afrobarometer.org/data">http://www.afrobarometer.org/data</a>
Asian Barometer	13 countries (3 rounds); 8 countries (1 round)	Face to face	Trust in institutions; social capital; political participation; electoral mobilization; citizen involvement and partisanship; regime legitimacy and citizen preferences for democracy; efficacy; citizen empowerment; system responsiveness; democratic vs. authoritarian values	2001–03; 2005–08; 2010-2012; 2013-2016	Information: <a href="http://www.asianbarometer.org/intro/program-overview">http://www.asianbarometer.org/intro/program-overview</a> Application form for data files: <a href="http://www.asianbarometer.org/survey/data-release">http://www.asianbarometer.org/survey/data-release</a>

<i>Global Barometers</i>					
(South) Caucasus Barometer	3 countries – Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia	Face to face	Socio-economic issues and political attitudes – including participation in political activities; perception of domestic politics; political trust in 17 different groups; issues facing the country; fair treatment by the government; freedom of speech; role of government; protest actions; voting	Annually 2008–15	Information: <a href="http://caucasusbarometer.org/en/about/">http://caucasusbarometer.org/en/about/</a> Data: <a href="http://caucasusbarometer.org/en/datasets/">http://caucasusbarometer.org/en/datasets/</a>