

## Authors

Christopher Blattman  
The University of Chicago

Julian Jamison  
University of Exeter

Margaret Sheridan  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

### Measuring the measurement error: A method to qualitatively validate sensitive survey data\*

Christopher Blattman    Tricia Gouwa    Julian Jamison  
Katherine Rodrigues    Margaret Sheridan<sup>†</sup>

June 11, 2014

#### Abstract

People may under-report sensitive and risky behaviors such as violence or substance abuse in surveys. Misreporting correlated with treatment is especially worrisome in causal analysis. We develop and test a survey validation technique that uses intensive qualitative work to check for measurement error in random subsamples of respondents. Trained local researchers spent several days speaking with and observing respondents within a few days of their survey, validating six behaviors: four potentially sensitive (crime, drug use, homelessness, gambling) and two non-sensitive (phone charging and video club expenditures). Subjects were enrolled in a randomized trial designed to reduce poverty and anti-social behaviors. We find no evidence of underreporting of sensitive behaviors, partly because (we discovered) stigma in this population is low. Non-sensitive expenditures were underreported, however, especially by the control group, probably because of strategic behavior and recall bias. The main contribution is a replicable validation method for observable, potentially sensitive behaviors.

<sup>\*</sup>*Acknowledgments:* For comments we thank Nod Black, Dan Costange, Macarlen Humphreys, Don Green, Cyrus Samii, and participants at the NYU 2014 CEPS conference. This study was made possible through the financial support of the National Science Foundation (SES-1317506), the World Bank LOGICA Trust Fund, the GLM LJC Programme of DFID and EEA, a Vanguard Charitable Trust, and the American People through the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) DCEA/CMH office. The contents of this study are the sole responsibility of authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employers or any of these funding agencies or governments. Finally, for research assistance we thank Esley Bunch Jr., Natalie Carlson, Camille Doring, Macklele Enarinos, Yanguan Guo, Rufus Kaprelio, Jason Kellie, Rebecca Littman, Richard Peck, Catherine Peon-Hedrick, Joe St. Clair, Joseph Sengo Jr., Helen Smith, Abel Wabwani, Prince Williams, and John Zogny through Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA).

<sup>†</sup>*Blattman* (corresponding author): Columbia University SIPA and Political Science, 420 W 118th St., New York, NY 10027 (cblattman@columbia.edu); *Gouwa*: The World Bank, 1818 H St NW, Washington, DC 20433 (j.gouwa@gmail.com); *Jamison*: Office of Research, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 1700 G St NW, Washington, DC 20552 (julian@cfpb.com); *Rodrigues*: Columbia University SIPA, 420 W 118th St., New York, NY 10027 (kar2109@columbia.edu); *Sheridan*: Harvard Medical School/Boston Children's Hospital, 1 Autumn Street, AU 528, Boston, MA 02215 (margaret.sheridan@childrens.harvard.edu).

Electronic copy available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2445048>

# Measuring the measurement error: a method to qualitatively validate sensitive survey data

People may under-report sensitive and risky behaviors such as violence or substance abuse in surveys. Misreporting correlated with treatment is especially worrisome in causal analysis. We develop and test a survey validation technique that uses intensive qualitative work to check for measurement error in random subsamples of respondents. Trained local researchers spent several days speaking with and observing respondents within a few days

of their survey, validating six behaviors: four potentially sensitive (crime, drug use, homelessness, gambling) and two non-sensitive (phone charging and video club expenditures). Subjects were enrolled in a randomized trial designed to reduce poverty and anti-social behaviors. We find no evidence of underreporting of sensitive behaviors, partly because (we discovered) stigma in this population is low. Nonsensitive expenditures were underreported, however, especially by the control group, probably because of strategic behavior and recall bias. The main contribution is a replicable validation method for observable, potentially sensitive behaviors.

June 11, 2014