

## U. Miami Survey Methodology: Questions to statistics to mini-reports.

As part of the [human subjects research](#) WE1S conducted at two of its campuses to complement its text-mining study of media coverage of the humanities, the WE1S team at the University of Miami received [IRB](#) permission to conceptualize, conduct, and analyze a survey of undergrads and non-undergrads on their campus.



### Survey Design:

Delivered via the [Qualtrics](#) surveying platform, our survey included questions about respondents' educational experience, opinions, and relationship with the humanities as well as their demographic background. The survey had two main branches of questions: one for undergrads and one for non-undergrads on campus (including staff, faculty, administrators, and graduate students). Depending on respondents' answers, some questions further branched to follow-up queries.

**Results and Visualizations:** 312 undergrads and 236 non-undergrads answered the survey, for a total of 548 respondents<sup>1</sup>. Qualtrics automatically provides statistics and visualizations for survey results. However, since none of our respondents completed the survey in its entirety, each question (for both surveys) was answered by a different number of respondents equal to or less than the total participants. To present consistent statistics referring to a constant pool of participants, therefore we retrieved the raw data from

<sup>1</sup> Our "[collection cards](#)" (data sheets summarizing respondent data) briefly describe the demographics and educational background of our two groups and compare them with the official data provided by University of Miami. More detailed information is provided in our "[mini-reports](#)."

Qualtrics and created visualizations ourselves. For each question, we calculated the percentages of answers for both groups of participants, including the percentage of people who did not answer a given question. For branching follow-up questions (not asked of all participants), we recalculated the statistics for the total number of *expected* respondents. In general, this allowed us directly to compare statistics from different questions and to create accurate corresponding visualizations. Results from questions requiring text-based answers were grouped and hand-coded manually. Team members also occasionally used [Voyant Tools](#) to study correlations between words and create word clouds. Any exceptions to this procedure are clarified in our mini-reports.

**Mini-Reports:** We organized survey results in groupings by topic and population group, and then recorded our analyses and observations about these results in a mini-report for each such results group.

(See [U. Miami Human Subjects Research – Mini-Reports](#).) Mini-reports contain

- **Statistics** (preceded by the phrase *Total Respondents: x out of y*, where "y" is the number of expected respondents for each question)
- **Visualizations** (when available)
- **Interpretation of data and comparison with other mini-reports** (when possible).

Compiling the mini-reports helped us synthesize large amounts of data in a quick and accessible form.

### Resources

- Francesca Battista and Ashley Hemm, "[U. Miami Campus Survey: Research and Fun with the 'Canes!'](#)" (2020)
- [Survey Questions, U. Miami](#)