

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

AMERICAN ELECTORAL  
BEHAVIOR  
WORKSHOP

Arlington, Virginia  
Friday, February 14, 2003

Transcripts by BETA Reporting

1 PARTICIPANTS:  
 2 FRANK SCIOLI  
 National Science Foundation,  
 3 NORMAN BRADBURN  
 National Science Foundation  
 4 RICHARD LEMPERT  
 National Science Foundation  
 5 JIM GRANATO  
 National Science Foundation  
 6 NANCY BURNS  
 American National Election Studies  
 7 University of Michigan  
 8 DONALD KINDER  
 American National Election Studies  
 9 University of Michigan  
 10 MARK HANSEN  
 American National Election Studies  
 11 University of Chicago  
 12 RICHARD SINNOTT  
 University College, Dublin  
 13 CHRIS ACHEN  
 University of Michigan  
 14 JOHN THOMPSON  
 National Opinion Research Center  
 15 HENRY BRADY  
 University of California, Berkeley  
 16 DIANA MUTZ  
 Ohio State University  
 17 IAN McAllister  
 18 Australian National University

---

2 HAROLD CLARKE  
 University of Texas, Dallas  
 3 ANDRE BLAIS  
 University of Montreal  
 4 ROGER TOURANGEAU  
 University of Maryland  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8 CHUCK PIERRET  
 Bureau of Labor Statistics  
 9  
 ROBERT SANTOS  
 14 NuStats  
 15  
 16 \* \* \* \* \*  
 17  
 18

19  
20  
21  
22

---

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	WORKSHOP SCHEDULE:	PAGE
3	Introductions and Preliminary Considerations	
4		
5	The Current and Future State of National Election Studies	
6	Cross National Comparisons	
7	Future Substantive Concerns	
8	The Future of Information Collection	

9  
10  
11  
12                   \* \* \* \* \*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

1                   P R O C E E D I N G S

2   (9:00 a.m.)

3                   I N T R O D U C T I O N S A N D P R E L I M I N A R Y

4                   C O N S I D E R A T I O N S

5                   DR. SCIOLI: I'm Frank Scioli,  
6                   Program Director for Political Science. My  
7                   colleague Jim Granato and I have a few brief  
8                   remarks. First Happy Valentine's Day.

9                   DR. BRADY: I love you too, Frank.

10                  DR. SCIOLI: I get that all the  
11                  time. Before I forget, let me note that we  
12                  have a transcriber from  
13                  Services who will be doing a verbatim  
14                  transcription of what we say here. If there  
15                  is anything you would like not to become  
16                  part of the public record, do not say it.

---

1 Thank you for your willingness to provide commentaries  
2 on relatively short notice -- incisive,  
3 thoughtful, provocative -- and we hope this  
4 will be very useful to us as we plan for the  
5 next decade of studies in the area of  
6 American electoral behavior.

7 For Jim and me this is the best  
8 part of our job. There are a lot of things  
9 that are not fun, and we won't go over that  
10 right now. But this is the real stimulating  
11 part of working at the National Science  
12 Foundation and it has sustained me for quite  
13 awhile now -- bringing folks like  
14 yourselves, knowledge experts,  
15 methodologically, substantively, and to give  
16 us your best advice on how we can proceed  
17 over the next decade.

18 Our objective is to produce a  
19 report and to produce an announcement which  
20 will guide a competition for the next round  
21 of American electoral behavior studies. As  
22 many of you know, we have supported the

---

1 American National Election Studies. In a  
2 minute everyone will introduce themselves,  
3 Nancy, Don, and John Mark Hansen from ANES  
4 are here.

5 ANES has an award at present, 2  
6 more years of support. In the interim we're  
7 going to do our best to produce an  
8 announcement for a competition and we hope  
9 it will reflect the best and brightest ideas  
10 that you give us and that we've received  
11 from other sources.

12 We will listen very carefully to  
13 your advice and we will do our best to  
14 incorporate your suggestions, and  
15 suggestions we get from the community, and a  
16 whole array of ideas we have about electoral  
17 studies generally and the American National  
18 Electoral Studies project specifically.

19 Let me introduce first Norman  
20 Bradburn, our Assistant Director. For Jim  
21 and me it has been a singular pleasure to  
22 work with him over the past 3 years. He has

---

1 been extremely supportive of all of our efforts in political science. He, of course,  
is tremendously knowledgeable about the survey enterprise and about American  
National Election Studies in particular. It has been a pleasure to have him as a

9 supporting mentor for us. Most recently Rick Lempert, our  
10 Division Director, joined the division in August, 2002. He  
11 too is first and foremost a scholar and a  
12 leader and has been extremely supportive in  
13 what we're doing in political science and  
14 our efforts to launch this workshop.

15 In order to do a workshop in NSF  
16 you must have support of the leadership or  
17 it simply can't come off. The fact that  
18 they are willing to be here today and to  
19 listen and to participate fully, naturally,  
20 is also testimony to their interest in the  
21 study of electoral behavior and in their  
22 support of the political science program.

So, please just a brief hello from

---

1 everyone at the table beginning with Norman  
2 and then we will turn it over to Norman for  
3 some broader remarks.

4 DR. BRADBURN: Oh, okay. Thank  
5 you all for coming. I'll say some things  
6 later about situating this particular thing  
7 but just for right now, good morning and  
8 thanks for coming.

9 DR. LEMPert: I learned how wise  
10 it is to echo what Norman says. I will echo  
11 and I'll simply tell you that as Frank said,  
12 I'm division director for socioeconomic  
13 science. I still feel recently arrived but  
14 it's now about 8 months from the University  
15 of Michigan where I am in the law school and  
16 the sociology department.

17 DR. SINNOTT: Richard Sinnott from  
18 University College, Dublin. Basically,  
19 thank you for the invitation. I had some  
20 involvement in much less elaborate, I  
21 suspect, central discussions that took place  
22 in the British ESOC that led to some

---

1 reorganization of the British election  
2 study.

3 In addition to which we have  
4 just -- well, in the last 2 to 3 years --  
5 got funding for the first ever Irish  
6 national election study and in the course of  
7 designing that we looked very closely,  
8 obviously, at what had been done in the  
9 United States but also what had been done in  
10 other countries. So, it's great to be here

11 to kind of listen to your reflections on all  
12 of that.

13 DR. ACHEN: I think I'll just say  
14 that I'm Chris Achen, the University of  
15 Michigan.

16 DR. THOMPSON: Good morning. I'm  
17 John Thompson from NORC. I've only been at  
18 NORC for about 7 months. Before that, I  
19 spent quite a bit of time at the U.S. Census  
20 Bureau primarily involved in survey  
21 methodology and the Decennial Census.

22 DR. BRADY: Henry Brady at the

---

1 University of California at Berkeley. I'm  
2 head of the Survey Research Center there. I  
3 was once at NORC as well. I fondly remember  
4 that experience. I've worked on the  
5 Canadian Election Study and some work on  
6 political participation and other topics.

7 DR. HANSEN: I'm Mark Hansen from  
8 the University of Chicago. I'm here as the  
9 Chair of the Board of Overseers, National  
10 Election Studies.

11 DR. BURNS: Nancy Burns,  
12 University of Michigan, and I'm, since 1999,  
13 principal investigator of the American  
14 National Election Studies.

15 DR. KINDER: Don Kinder, I'm from  
16 the University of Michigan also. My job is  
17 to try to keep up with Nancy Burns which is  
18 futile, as you'll see in detail.

19 DR. MUTZ: Diana Mutz, Ohio State  
20 University.

21 MR. McAllister: Ian McAllister,  
22 Australian National University, one of a group

---

1 that runs the Australian Election Survey.

2 DR. CLARKE: Yes, my name is  
3 Harold Clarke from the University of Texas  
4 at Dallas and the University of Essex in  
5 East Anglia and I'm pleased to see the  
6 Canadian representation. I think altogether  
7 including Henry, and Andre, and myself,  
8 there's what, seven or eight Canadian  
9 National Election Studies representatives.

10 DR. BRADY: The real national  
11 election studies.

12 DR. BLAIS: Andre Blais,  
13 Department of Political Science at

14 University of Montreal.  
15 MR. TOURANGEAU: I'm Roger  
16 Tourangeau. I'm the director of the Joint  
17 Program in Survey and Methodology at the  
18 University of Michigan and I'm a senior  
19 research scientist at the University of  
20 Michigan.  
21 DR. SCIOLI: Please introduce  
22 yourself.

---

6 MR. PIERRET: I'm Chuck Pierret.  
7 I'm from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the  
8 principal -- the director of the National  
9 Longitudinal Survey.  
12 DR. SCIOLI: Also a member of the  
13 ANES board and our colleague --  
14 MS. WHITE: Pat White, NSF program  
15 director, sociology.  
16 DR. SCIOLI: Pat is the overseer  
17 program director for the General Social  
18 Survey which as you probably know is in the  
19 sociology program. Norman?  
20 DR. BRADBURN: Okay. Well I  
21 thought I'd start off by trying to give you  
22 a sort of -- well, cut the context for this

---

1 workshop in terms of kind of the larger  
2 picture of what's going on at NSF.  
3 I actually haven't seen the paper  
4 this morning but if -- we had testimony on  
5 our '04 budget yesterday and Representative  
6 Boehlert who is chairman of the Science  
7 Committee said that they were going to pass  
8 the Omnibus Budget bill later in the day.  
9 Did they do it? I don't know. Okay.  
10 That will provide NSF with a  
11 rather larger increase than the President  
12 had recommended in '03 and I think the  
13 preliminary figures that I had seen for our  
14 budget would be an increase in '03 because  
15 we're half way through '03 or slightly  
16 over 13 percent. As you also probably know  
17 last year the Congress passed an NSF  
18 reauthorization bill which called for  
19 doubling the NSF budget in the next 5 years  
20 which means, in case you don't your  
21 arithmetic, a 15 percent a year increase in  
22 order to accomplish that.

---

1 Now, of course we're starting --  
2 there is also the question of what year  
3 you're taking as the base. In the proposed  
4 budget in '04 where the President's  
5 budget -- which is what we were talking  
6 about yesterday -- there is a proposal for  
7 a 9 percent increase over the '03.

8 As Representative Boehlert kindly  
9 pointed out to Dr. Marburger, that means  
10 with this passing of the '03 budget, that  
11 doesn't look so good anymore and wouldn't  
12 the Administration like to come in with an  
13 amendment to their proposal.

14 He didn't say, no, we're not going  
15 to do that but he didn't say, yes, we are  
16 going to do that either. So, I don't  
17 know -- we're sort of optimistic that in  
18 fact there will be some kind of adjustment  
19 to the President's '04 submission which  
20 would be an increase.  
21 But the general trend, as I'm sure  
22 you read around in the various news and

---

1 other things is that NSF at the moment is in  
2 the enviable position of being perhaps the  
3 only -- certainly the only science agency  
4 and perhaps the only agency that's in the  
5 discretionary spending part of the federal  
6 budget that is looking to have rather  
7 substantial increases over the next few  
8 years.

9 Now, of course we don't know how  
10 that will actually -- what it will actually  
11 result in. For one of the things that I  
12 have come to learn to my great pain is that  
13 sometimes large numbers when you get down  
14 into it and you see the kind of suggestions  
15 Congress has about how to spend the money,  
16 it turns out not to be quite as free at  
17 least and nice as one would like.

18 So, I haven't seen the language  
19 yet for the Omnibus Bill so I don't quite  
20 know what 13 and some odd percent is going  
21 to mean for us. I have a little inclination  
22 that it's not going to actually be as good

---

1 as it looks. But, still it's positive  
2 rather than negative which is what a number



3 of agencies around town are facing.

4 But in any case, if you just --  
5 without thinking what the actual numbers  
6 might turn out to be -- we are in a position  
7 where we need to be thinking about what --  
8 if we do get these increased resources how  
9 we would best allocate them. What I see  
10 this particular workshop as being is a kind  
11 of intersection of two sort of general  
12 planning efforts that we have going.

13 The one, the obvious one which is  
14 the, you might say the manifest topic of  
15 this workshop is, what should we be doing  
16 over the next 10 years in research related  
17 to electoral politics. I think although I  
18 didn't check with Frank on the thing, I  
19 think our investment in the general field --  
20 within the Political Science Program, our  
21 investment in sort of electoral politics,  
22 particularly American electoral politics is

---

1 probably the single biggest investment that  
2 we make.

3 Certainly, the American National  
4 Election Study is one of the biggest  
5 investments we make in the Political Science  
6 Program.

7 The other element is one that has  
8 been talked about at various times and it's  
9 not exactly orthogonal to this but it's  
10 certainly strongly related. That's  
11 examining what sort of infrastructure  
12 support we should have for the social  
13 sciences more generally. That -- aside from  
14 own kind of concern for that given the kind  
15 of background I have and so forth, is given  
16 further impetus by the National Science  
17 Board which has undertaken a review of  
18 infrastructure needs for the sciences  
19 generally, not just social but across all of  
20 NSF for the next decade.

21 We all put in outlines of things  
22 that we thought would be needed. It's -- in

---

1 substance it's just a wish list but it did  
2 have impetus for me anyway to sort of try to  
3 think about how we ought to be thinking sort  
4 of structurally about infrastructure.

5 But, just again to give you the

6 first kind of cut is that the broad report,  
7 which is up in draft form -- if anybody  
8 wants to look it's on the Web site, I think  
9 under the National Science Board not NSF.  
10 It was out for comment. I think the comment  
11 period is probably closed but anyway you can  
12 see what the draft is.

13 They -- I think at the moment NSF  
14 spends something on the order of magnitude  
15 of 25 percent or maybe a little less on  
16 infrastructure. The report is going to urge  
17 that we increase that somewhat. Not  
18 dramatically, but maybe more on the order of  
19 magnitude of 27, 28 percent or something  
20 like that.

21 The best -- I did a little quick  
22 calculation of what SPE now spends on

---

1 infrastructure, broadly defined and it's  
2 around -- it's in the low '20s, somewhere  
3 around about 22 percent, if I remember. So,  
4 in light of the Board's, if the Board has a  
5 policy and that sort of thing, we'll  
6 probably want to increase that as proportion  
7 of the total. So -- and of course as the  
8 total goes up.

9 Let me tell you about the way I've  
10 been thinking about infrastructure and then  
11 you can see how some of the big surveys fit  
12 into that.

13 As you may remember we had two  
14 separate infrastructure competitions  
15 in 2000, 2001, I think. We have not done  
16 that again although the question comes up  
17 whether we should have a separate  
18 competition or not. We haven't made any  
19 firm decision about that.

20 But, in looking over what we  
21 funded under those two things plus some  
22 other things that we have been funding, it

---

1 seems to me that there are kind of four  
2 categories of infrastructure that we  
3 support.

4 The one, of course, which you are  
5 most familiar with and interested in  
6 presumably is our new data collections or  
7 data platforms of various sorts of which  
8 ANES is one, the GSS is one, the PSID is

9 one, the International Social Science  
10 Program which is a kind of add on the GSS  
11 which gets money out of the International  
12 Division in our directorate are sort of  
13 examples and I think perhaps all there are.  
14 I didn't -- but certainly they are all the  
15 big ones and they have been going for many,  
16 many years.

17 As you probably well know, I  
18 certainly knew before I got here, NSF as an  
19 organization kind of waxes and wanes on the  
20 question of continuity of things. There are  
21 sort of swings in which there is suddenly  
22 great pressure to do new things and sort of

---

1 give up the old things, and then there are  
2 swings which say, oh, continuity is a great  
3 thing.

4 One of the interesting things  
5 after I had seen this, the PSID was renewed,  
6 I think about a year ago so we've had that.  
7 While I was surprised and I'll say  
8 delighted, actually from my point of view,  
9 one of the Board members said, well -- he  
10 was the lead Board reviewer on the PSID on  
11 the Board -- said, Oh, one of the great  
12 things about NSF is that it can keep a great  
13 series going and will stay in a field for a  
14 long time.

15 So I thought that was -- that was  
16 interesting. Now unfortunately that Board  
17 member has finished his term and is no  
18 longer on the Board but if this ever becomes  
19 a problem again I will try to resurrect  
20 that.

21 The second category are shared  
22 facilities of various sorts, what are coming

---

1 to be called collaboratories of various  
2 sorts, one of which is -- I don't know  
3 exactly how you'd describe it, but in my  
4 notes it's called the Experimental Survey  
5 Lab.

6 But, essentially allowing many  
7 investigators to work through the what do  
8 you call it? The --

9 DR. MUTZ: Timeshared experiments.

10 DR. BRADBURN: Timeshared  
11 experiments. Okay. There is another one

12 that we've financed at, I think it's  
13 Virginia, University of Virginia, which is  
14 sort of a game theory that is, again, a  
15 shared facility across investigators. Not  
16 only -- and they're developing kind of  
17 wireless game theory kinds of things so you  
18 could take -- do balloting experiments and  
19 things like that in the field. They are  
20 interested particularly in getting  
21 anthropologists to take these other cultures  
22 and do some of the replication of things

---

1 that have been done in this country in other  
2 cultures.  
3       Probably the biggest and easiest  
4 one to think about as infrastructure are  
5 data archives which are the research data  
6 centers which we do at the Census Bureau and  
7 a number of our universities and consortia  
8 of universities, is one example.  
9       But, what's interesting that I  
10 hadn't realized until I got here was that  
11 there are also -- aside from data in the  
12 sense that you and I traditionally think  
13 about, there are other kinds of things which  
14 now to some extent go by the name of digital  
15 libraries. For example, archives of FMRI  
16 images of the brain or a genetic database  
17 which we are financing at a consortia of  
18 universities. So there are other -- but the  
19 notion of large databases, of different  
20 kinds of databases -- for instance they did  
21 one on languages, of disappearing languages  
22 for instance, this is another big kind of

---

1 infrastructure.  
2       Finally there is a sort of like,  
3 traditionally, sort of other which I think  
4 about as special facilities to promote the  
5 development of some sort -- something new in  
6 social sciences. We're forming a center for  
7 spacial social sciences at Santa Barbara  
8 which is doing development of techniques for  
9 doing spatial analysis for program  
10 statistics and so forth, a lot of mapping  
11 and bringing GIS technology together with  
12 the social data.  
13       Another type is the National  
14 Consortia of Violence Research which is

15 housed at Carnegie-Mellon but it's a  
16 consortia of universities that is now  
17 primarily developing capacity in the field  
18 of violence research. So they're doing a  
19 lot of training, a lot of archive  
20 development and other things as well as some  
21 research. But it's seen more as a kind of  
22 facility to develop capacity to do things in

---

1 the future.  
2 So, that gives just kind of an  
3 overview of where we are or the kinds of  
4 things we're thinking about with regard to  
5 infrastructure. Now, what we need obviously  
6 to do is to review the adequacy of what  
7 we're doing, what will we need in the  
8 future. One of the things I hope, you'll  
9 think, you'll give us advice us on is what  
10 is needed in the future, needed in the  
11 different kinds of ways.

12 One is, what kinds of -- I mean,  
13 obviously, what kinds of theories, problems  
14 in the field are developing and need to be  
15 incorporated into -- or how they would  
16 influence work in electoral politics? What  
17 new tools are there?

18 We spent -- as you probably know  
19 NSF's sort of strategic areas are divided  
20 into people, ideas, and tools. While  
21 infrastructure is primarily what gets done  
22 in the tools category, there are other kinds

---

1 of things which are simply technology kinds  
2 of things --things that are made possible  
3 because of information technology  
4 developments or perhaps somewhere in the  
5 future nanotechnology developments and so  
6 forth.

7 What kind of data affect -- what  
8 do we need that could affect what we're  
9 doing? Data in two senses, not only new  
10 data but also in the archive sense, that is  
11 bringing together data sets of various sorts  
12 as in the research data centers which draw  
13 primarily on census data but also bring in  
14 other data from say, government statistics  
15 and so forth.

16 I'm very pleased that Chuck is  
17 here from BLS because one of the great

18 resources in the world is the data that BLS  
19 has not only in the surveys that they  
20 sponsor through the Census Bureau but the  
21 NOSY in its various forms over the years.  
22 So, and then on the other side are

---

1 the old problems that have actually been  
2 solved or if not solved at least sort of hit  
3 a dead end or where not much new is going on  
4 and maybe we should be moving investments  
5 out of that into some other.

6 So, it's a very broad agenda and I  
7 hope you won't be constrained essentially by  
8 any narrow definition of what the task is  
9 today. Because all of these things are of  
10 interest to us and in our planning we need  
11 to be as open and broad as we can be because  
12 it's very difficult even in an expanding  
13 economy there is never enough money to do  
14 everything everybody wants to do.

15 So we've got to think about, you  
16 know, how we allocate our resources in the  
17 way that, you know, spreads across all the  
18 different fields, supports the most exciting  
19 fields, doesn't do justice to the  
20 traditional fields but it is always -- the  
21 bias here would be towards, I would say, the  
22 cutting edge of things and not so much

---

1 routine science. Okay. I'll stop there.  
2 DR. SCIOLI: Rick Lempert?  
3 DR. LEMPert: Well, I want to add  
4 my wishes for a Happy Valentine's Day to  
5 Frank's. I don't know whether it was love  
6 of the ANES or surveys or the Foundation  
7 that has brought you to the heart of Code  
8 Orange country today. Good thing I don't  
9 have an apple in my hand.

10 But, I am really very grateful to  
11 you, particularly those who have come from  
12 quite a distance, other countries, to help  
13 us get the benefit of your knowledge. Here  
14 we do consider Berkeley another country -- I  
15 mean, at least we get involved in Canadian  
16 Election Studies.

17 I also want to thank Jim and Frank  
18 for doing just a marvelous job organizing  
19 the workshop. When you come here, you know,  
20 this is transparent. Things seemed to be

21 going well and it wasn't too hard getting  
22 here. When you're behind the scenes and you

---

1 watch people dealing with all sorts of  
2 issues and problems and organizations,  
3 you're aware of the tremendous effort that  
4 has gone into the planning of this, from  
5 thinking about who to invite, to getting  
6 tickets issued at the last minute, and the  
7 like.

8 Frank, Jim, you did a terrific job  
9 so thank you very much. Frank I should note  
10 has all the marks of this old and wise  
11 division director, one of which you don't --  
12 of a program director. You don't trust your  
13 division director to remember anything you  
14 told him.

15 I went to Frank last night and  
16 said, what would you like me to say. He  
17 said, well, say that one of the purposes of  
18 this is to develop this announcement for the  
19 recompetition. I know that's the first  
20 thing Frank told you is the purpose of what  
21 this is about which, of course, reminded me

22 of what I was supposed to say. That's very

---

1 good.

2 I was reading through the essays  
3 that you all wrote last night and I was  
4 struck not just by the thoughtfulness,  
5 intelligence, and effort, but a little bit  
6 by the change of perspective in an  
7 interesting way that has come to me as I  
8 took this job here.

9 When I was in the -- you know, the  
10 world most of you are in, the academic  
11 world, I thought of the Foundation when I  
12 thought about it as a source of funds, as  
13 something that gave to me, gave to the  
14 university. It just hit me reading these  
15 essays of how much we receive from the  
16 community and I thought about, you know, the  
17 time and if we had to pay consulting fees,  
18 and the cumulative experience. I realized,  
19 you know, this is very much a two way  
20 street. So, again, thank you for being  
21 here.

---

2 DR. LEMPert:

3 There's one thing I want to add in  
6 terms of what's going on in the Foundation  
7 to what Norman has told you because it's  
8 affected my thinking and why I'm interested  
9 in this meeting.

10 In many ways it's a terrific time  
11 to be a social scientist at the National  
12 Science Foundation. There is a sense of  
13 true respect at the highest levels for the  
14 social sciences and a commitment to build  
15 the social sciences which longtimers tell me  
16 has seldom been here.

17 One manifestation of this is that  
18 for the first time in the history of the  
19 Foundation we have what's called a  
20 Foundation wide priority area in the  
21 planning, and indeed the budget was passed  
22 yesterday, actually with some money. That

---

1 is -- although it's Foundation wide the  
2 heart of it is in the social sciences. It's  
3 designed to promote social science  
4 approaches to scientific learning. It's  
5 called the Human and Social Dynamics or for  
6 short, HSD Priority Area.

7 I'm not going to go into what it's  
8 about in detail although I'll be happy, if  
9 any of you are interested, to tell you more  
10 about it during breaks. But, I do want to  
11 say a bit about the relationship of this  
12 conference to some of the concerns in that  
13 priority area which we hope to be investing  
14 large sums of money in.

15 The virtue of having a Foundation  
16 wide priority area is, at least in theory,  
17 the Foundation -- and in practice -- the  
18 Foundation gives you money beyond what you  
19 would have in your budget, not just by  
20 allocating it to your directorate but also  
21 other directorates contribute to fund joint  
22 work at the intersection of different

---

1 disciplines in the priority areas. So, we  
2 have contributions to our priority area from  
3 the people in information sciences,  
4 biological sciences, physical math sciences,  
5 et cetera.



6           Strictly speaking, this gathering  
7 is unconnected to the priority area. It was  
8 planned before the dimensions of the  
9 priority area were clear. It doesn't depend  
10 for funding on the level of allotments to  
11 the HSD priority. But, instead, it is as  
12 you all know, a project which our Political  
13 Science Program has seen worthy of investing  
14 in for a substantial number of years and is  
15 in the process of considering issues  
16 relating to future funding when the current  
17 ANES grant expires.

18           As Frank told you one of the  
19 reasons they set up the workshop is to  
20 develop a creative invitation for the next  
21 round of the NAC competition. But anyways  
22 the workshop and the ANES itself relates to

---

1           our new priority area.

2           First the priority area is  
3 motivated by a sense that the time is ripe  
4 for significant breakthroughs in  
5 understanding human activity through the  
6 social and behavioral sciences. We have new  
7 technologies. We have new methods, new  
8 talent, I think. All of which are leading  
9 to a stronger social science, allowing us to  
10 better understand what people are now  
11 recognizing is truly the hard science which  
12 is the science of how humans act and react.

13           I think there are few social  
14 activities more important to understand than  
15 the workings of our democracy, and in  
16 particular, the signature feature which is  
17 the combination of free elections and the  
18 subsequent peaceful transfer of power that  
19 they seem around the world to legitimize.

20           Many of the papers prepared for  
21 this workshop describe and discuss the kinds  
22 of new methods or approaches to social

---

1           understanding that our priority area is  
2 designed to foster across the social and  
3 behavioral sciences.

4           The second way, in which as I read  
5 these and thought about this conference or  
6 this workshop that what's going on is  
7 connected to the priority area is that our

8 priority area contains six areas of  
9 emphasis.

10 One of them as Norman has just  
11 told you at some length is building social  
12 science infrastructure. The data we collect  
13 through large scale surveys like the ANES,  
14 the PSID, the GSS, and others have really  
15 been for many years now essential  
16 infrastructure in our field. It's not just  
17 political science but across the social  
18 sciences.

19 We see this, for example, in the  
20 report that Don and Nancy -- and maybe it  
21 was Nancy prepared on the ANES that  
22 concludes with a list of studies that build

---

1 on ANES data. You can do the same with the  
2 PSID, or the GSS, ranging from graduate  
3 student theses or even master's or  
4 bachelors, honors degrees up through, you  
5 know, very important prize winning books.  
6 So much of the best works in our field  
7 builds on these infrastructures.

8 The hope is the priority area will  
9 mean a substantial infusion of new money  
10 over the next 5 years and a substantial  
11 investment in innovative data sources --  
12 among other things, a real building of the  
13 infrastructure.

14 My own perspective, to be candid  
15 since I came here, is that it is about time.  
16 Surveys are one of my primary concerns and  
17 were when I arrived although you know this  
18 much better than I do because you're  
19 specialists. I'm not. It's certainly my  
20 sense that a large infusion of money is  
21 needed, not just to take advantage of new  
22 technologies and new ways of collecting

---

1 data, but to maintain the quality of our  
2 existing longitudinal and repeated  
3 cross-section surveys.

4 Survey costs as you find out when  
5 you're researching, you approach it at my  
6 university, ISR, and say what would it cost  
7 me per interview to do this survey? They  
8 give you this number, which, you know you  
9 thought was the cost of the study and it's  
10 like a per survey number or something.

11           They have risen -- they have  
12 increased dramatically over the past few  
13 decades and I think they have increased  
14 faster than the funds available to pay for  
15 them, at least in the case of surveys which  
16 like the ANES strive to attain the very  
17 highest social science qualities. They are  
18 very much a public good. There is no  
19 private return to the investment.

20           We see things like surveys going  
21 from year to year to every other year,  
22 sample sizes diminishing, modalities of

---

1           questioning changing to ways that may be  
2 less expensive but bring with them special  
3 problems. So, it's at least my belief that  
4 we have to find a way to invest more in our  
5 survey data bases and bring in innovative  
6 technologies.

7                       I mean, some of things we've done  
8 through things like multiple imputation like  
9 is to use technological fixes. But we can't  
10 keep that up forever.

11                      So, I feel very strongly about  
12 this and hope to be paying considerable  
13 attention over the next few years, or the  
14 next year -- I mean, I'm a year and 4 months  
15 now -- to the construction of survey data  
16 resources

---

4           DR. LEMPert: To get back to the  
5 business of the day, which seems to be,  
6 everybody we wish you a Happy Valentine's  
7 Day.

8                      One of the things that we're doing  
9 is to think more deeply about surveys of all  
10 sorts. Indeed we have coming up, Roger  
11 Tourangeau is actually the organizing  
12 person, a workshop that's going to be held  
13 in the Foundation on March 28th and 29th  
14 that is sort of going to be carrying on in a  
15 sense work that we're going to be discussing  
16 here, but again conceived independently.

17                      Its central concern is over time  
18 surveys, both panel and repeated  
19 cross-section surveys, and the special  
20 issues that arise in trying to maximize  
21 values of both continuity and innovation as  
22 well as challenges posed to all surveys, but

---

1 perhaps in special ways with special  
2 abilities to deal with them to your over  
3 time surveys by such things as declining  
4 response rates, increasing difficulty of  
5 making telephone contacts, and the like.

6 I hope that is going to be sort of  
7 now the second of a series of workshops that  
8 are going to examine issues on what we can  
9 be doing to create innovative survey  
10 resources. In my own private agenda the  
11 three areas I'm interested in going over the  
12 next few years are one, thinking seriously  
13 about organizational surveys. Second,  
14 thinking about the special problems of  
15 international surveys and coordinating with  
16 international databases, and third thinking  
17 about the various kinds of innovative  
18 surveys like time use surveys and the like.

19 I want to conclude on a note of  
20 substance, at least substance that stood out  
21 for me as I read the papers prepared for  
22 this workshop. There were two issues in my

---

1 reading that struck me as particularly  
2 interesting and important which I look  
3 forward to hearing discussed.

4 The first actually relates to a  
5 misreading which I long had of the acronym  
6 ANES or NES. Before I came here and was  
7 corrected repeatedly by my program officers,  
8 I thought it stood for American National  
9 Election Survey. I had to be told several  
10 times for it to stick that it stood for  
11 American National Election Studies.

12 But, I think my misunderstanding  
13 is quite understandable. Because if you  
14 look at what signifies the ANES it is the  
15 set of over time surveys and the data that  
16 is archived from them.

17 Several papers however talk about  
18 ways of going beyond the current survey in  
19 understanding elections, voter  
20 participation, and electoral politics. I'm  
21 intrigued by the possibility of making this  
22 in a much more truer sense national studies

---

1 which would, of course, include the survey

2 but would include complimentary coordinated  
3 studies that can give us a better handle in  
4 understanding the American voter and  
5 American politics.

6 I see this issue surfacing in  
7 papers and would be interested in hearing  
8 discussion about that and also about the  
9 relative priority of that for resources as  
10 part of a larger next round of American  
11 National Election Studies.

12 The other issue that stood out for  
13 me in reading the papers was the emphasis on  
14 getting a better grip on causality and the  
15 value if not the essentiality of panel  
16 studies, including very long term panel  
17 studies as our concern moves well beyond  
18 description -- which it already has, of  
19 course -- but to issues of causality and in  
20 particular change over time, both within  
21 individual change and across individual  
22 change.

---

1 I'm very interested in hearing  
2 more about the desirability of adding a  
3 panel, a regular panel and a long term panel  
4 component to ANES and how that should relate  
5 to other components, and what the potential  
6 tradeoffs in terms of costs and benefits  
7 will be.

8 So these are my quick reflections  
9 on what you have done and what you've  
10 stimulated in me for the day and half ahead.  
11 I hope to be here for most of it. Again,  
12 welcome and thank you for coming.

13 DR. SCIOLI: Jim will make remarks  
14 in a second and then I'll introduce our  
15 first group of commentaries.

16 DR. GRANATO: Well thank you all for  
17 agreeing to participate in this, the American  
18 Electoral Behavior Workshop.

19 You represent a national  
20 and international contingent of scholars who  
21 are best situated to advise the NSF  
22 Political Science Program's efforts to  
23 devise a 10 year plan on the future study of  
24 American electoral behavior.

25 To begin, it is important to  
26 acknowledge the contributions of the  
27 American National Election Studies, the  
28 ANES. It has been a central vehicle for

29 studying American electoral behavior. No  
30 one can question the obvious benefits that  
31 the ANES has provided for most of the  
32 past 50 years. Yet recognition of this fact  
33 should not beget forgetfulness of what  
34 constitutes the central mission of the NSF  
35 Political Science Program.

21 The work of the Political Science  
22 Program rests on the principle that the NSF

---

1 is uniquely situated to assert, even  
2 reassert scientific leadership within the  
3 scholarly community. This is based in large  
4 part on the extensive consultation with our  
5 community of scholars, such as yourselves.

6 Your thoughtful essays have raised  
7 a number of questions, each of which  
8 deserves discussion during this workshop and  
9 after. From this interaction, the future  
10 study of American electoral behavior will  
11 come to rely on a platform, a data source,  
12 that not only can lead to new theoretical  
13 breakthroughs but which is also flexible  
14 enough to incorporate theoretical  
15 breakthroughs that, as yet, have not been  
16 extensively tested.

17 What should be remembered is that  
18 scholars in the future will be able  
19 to ask and answer questions of great  
20 importance depending on the breakthroughs in  
21 data acquisition today. Failure to innovate  
22 and improve data quality means future  
23 scholars will be forced to rely on  
24 crude proxies such as dummy variables or

---

1 abandon a specific research inquiry  
2 altogether. This cannot be allowed to  
3 happen.

4 The excellent essays presented here and  
5 a good deal of research shows the task ahead  
6 is filled with uncertainty regarding the  
7 factors that contribute to validity and  
8 replication.

9 This uncertainty, while not  
10 insurmountable, does present an appreciable head wind.  
11 In the face of this uncertainty  
12 and in carrying out the upcoming tasks, the  
13 Political Science Program will be governed  
14 by the principle of calculated risk. This

15 should be understood to mean the avoidance  
16 of developing future design attributes that  
17 are difficult to implement unless there is  
18 good prospect, as a result of such usage, in  
19 an overall design that enhances theoretical  
20 and empirical breakthroughs at a cost  
21 the Political Science Program can bear.

21 DR. SCIOLI: We're going to break  
22 for lunch at the time designated on the

---

1 schedule and you're going to leave and go  
2 over to our food court and bring it back and  
3 mix informally. Henry, says, how many times  
4 we're going to have to have that sushi, for  
5 goodness sake. We have dinner reservations  
6 at Tutto Bene, Valentine's Day, up the  
7 street and it's within walking distance. If  
8 you're not able to make it let either Jim or  
9 me know and we'll cancel one of the seats or  
10 however many are necessary.

11 To be over careful, those of you  
12 who read the Post this morning, there is a  
13 snow alert besides the -- a late alert. We  
14 will meet tomorrow morning and we're  
15 investigating what the consequences of the  
16 snow alert mean if you're forced to stay  
17 over for additional time. We'll let you  
18 know that as we proceed through the day.

19 Please save your badges. Tomorrow  
20 morning it's going to be critical to gain  
21 entrance to the building because it's  
22 Saturday and the normal routine has to be

---

1 altered just a little bit. Security will be  
2 down there and will ask for your badge. It  
3 may ask for a photo ID as well. Any  
4 question about any of the those  
5 announcements? Oh, I'm sorry and please --

6 MR. SANTOS: Rob Santos.

7 DR. GRANATO: Rob Santos joined  
8 us.

9 MR. SANTOS: Coming late,  
10 naturally.

11 DR. GRANATO: Rob, why don't you  
12 introduce yourself?

13 MR. SANTOS: Oh, sure. Robert  
14 Santos. I'm at NuStats in Austin, Texas.  
15 For a number of years, more than I would  
16 probably like to admit, I was at the Survey

17 Research Center as director of survey  
18 operations and had an opportunity to work  
19 with many of the people here on the National  
20 Election Surveys.  
21 I do want to clarify, the person  
22 downstairs asked to return the badge. So,

---

1 we do not return the badge?  
2 DR. GRANATO: Tomorrow.  
3 MR. SANTOS: Okay. Thank you.  
4 DR. GRANATO: I assume they're  
5 fearful that you'll misplace it and then  
6 they, you know, have to --  
7 MR. SANTOS: Do another one.  
8 DR. GRANATO: Yeah, do another one  
9 and get approval et cetera. Well, thank you  
10 for joining us. Other housekeeping  
11 questions? Okay. We want to kickoff then  
12 with a collaborative statement from Nancy,  
13 Don and Mark Hansen. They have a half hour  
14 and then will lead the discussion, questions  
15 and answers. So the first topic is the  
16 current and future state of national  
17 election studies and Nancy and Don are the  
18 co-PIs on ANES at the University of Michigan  
19 and we're delighted that you're going to  
20 lead off.  
21 THE CURRENT AND FUTURE STATE OF  
22 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

---

1 DR. KINDER: We drew straws and I  
2 lost so I'll lead off. It occurred to me  
3 that I should cede my 10 minutes to Rick  
4 Lempert. That was a delicious and inviting  
5 introduction I think to the topic for us.  
6 For starters, I'd like to thank  
7 the Political Science Program, Jim and Frank  
8 the higherups for sponsoring this workshop  
9 and bringing us all together, this  
10 interesting and distinguished group, and for  
11 paying for our transportation. It was  
12 pretty dicey yesterday some of you may know.  
13 I think Jim and maybe Norman and others  
14 spent time yesterday trying to make my  
15 social security number run through a sensor.  
16 DR. SCIOLI: Colin Powell got it  
17 straightened out.  
18 DR. KINDER: I thought it was  
19 Cheney. I heard Cheney. Anyway, thank you



20 for that. I'm sorry that you had to do  
21 that. Anyway we're delighted to be here and  
22 to participate in this conversation.

---

1 My assignment leading off is, in  
2 very broad terms, justification. Why should  
3 the National Science Foundation support a  
4 National Election Study? So, the big  
5 question here is just that. Why NSF should  
6 support a National Election Study. The  
7 first section of our paper is organized  
8 around a series of questions and I will  
9 follow that device here in my remarks.

10 The hope is that -- we have  
11 something useful to say -- but that it will  
12 provoke a discussion among all of us.

13 The first question is, why study  
14 elections? The answer is, not to put too  
15 fine a point on it, elections are important  
16 in much the same way Rick was saying  
17 earlier, that elections, as Robert Dahl once  
18 wrote, are critical techniques. Elections  
19 provide incentives for governments to  
20 respond to the interests and aspirations of  
21 common citizens and the mechanism of change,  
22 peaceful change, when governments fail to

---

1 respond.

2 In the democratic system elections  
3 are a primary point of contact between  
4 citizens and their government. How does the  
5 link function and how well does it function?  
6 Those questions have been at the center of  
7 what NES has been up to over the years and  
8 you could say, we say it, NES has made  
9 possible an intensive empirical  
10 investigation of democratic politics that is  
11 unparalleled in place and time.

12 NES over the years has taken up a  
13 series of topics, we name some of them, that  
14 are all familiar to us, I suppose. The  
15 primacy of partisanship, the role of  
16 interests and ethics in opinion choice and  
17 behavior, why it is that some Americans take  
18 part in politics and many do not, a story of  
19 resources, skills, and mobilizing moments,  
20 and much more.

21 We say that over the past half  
22 century national election studies carried

---

1 out in the United States, especially, but  
2 other places as well, increasingly have  
3 provided the scientific foundation for  
4 deepening our understanding of the  
5 democratic experience. So, we say. We say  
6 that our understanding has deepened, that we  
7 have an understanding that is richer and  
8 more sophisticated, that our questions are  
9 finer grained and more subtle than they used  
10 to be, and that synergistic connections have  
11 been made.

12 We say that and we can defend it  
13 but we don't have time to defend it at the  
14 moment. You know, it is sort of abstract  
15 and even platitudinous but we have examples  
16 we could present. It's a bit of preaching  
17 to the choir. Maybe we don't have to do  
18 that in this room. But, the argument needs  
19 to be made eventually and we'd be prepared  
20 to talk about how to make the argument in  
21 the question and answer that follows.

22 So, partly and primarily NES's

---

1 contribution has been you could say to  
2 science but also, and simultaneously, and in  
3 some ways inevitably to society. That there  
4 is kind of applied contribution to NES that  
5 comes from the results of basic science  
6 informing ongoing debates about democratic  
7 practice. So, they affect how we think  
8 about the value of political parties, the  
9 effects of campaign finance reform, the  
10 conduct of the mass media, the possibilities  
11 for more deliberative politics, and more.

12 NES takes up, we say, central  
13 questions for science and for society and  
14 that's why the appetite for national  
15 election study data is large and growing.  
16 We document this in the appendix we attach  
17 at the end of our memorandum. There is  
18 lots, and lots, and lots of work that relies  
19 on NES data: Books, seminal books,  
20 conference papers, articles, articles in the  
21 very best journals, and dissertations, all  
22 show the same upward trajectory.

---

1 Beyond this, this concentration of

2 research attention, theoretical application,  
3 which comes primarily from political  
4 science, we suggest in our memorandum that  
5 there is a way to think about elections in a  
6 different way that broadens their appeal  
7 across the social sciences.

8 We say elections can be thought of  
9 as coordinating events of a particular sort.  
10 We mean a variety of things by that. But  
11 the principal thing we mean by it is that  
12 millions of citizens making comparable,  
13 nearly identical choices, virtually  
14 simultaneously.

15 If you think about elections in  
16 that way, which we invite you to, then  
17 elections can become a site or a locus for  
18 research on processes that are of more  
19 generic importance. Elections can become a  
20 laboratory for the investigation of  
21 processes of perception, comprehension,  
22 choice, strategy, collective action. Now,

---

1 those are prominent concerns for political  
2 science, of course. But, they reach across  
3 the social sciences, to psychology,  
4 sociology, and economics.

5 Whereas it is true that  
6 economists, and sociologists, and  
7 psychologists have participated in the  
8 design of the studies over the years and  
9 certainly have made use of NES data on a  
10 pretty regular basis, we would like to go  
11 further in that direction and this is one of  
12 the points where the discussion might be  
13 especially useful here at the outset.

14 That is, we would like to see the  
15 National Election Study broaden its horizons  
16 and of a theoretical and conceptual sort.  
17 That might mean bringing points of view more  
18 directly into the planning and design of the  
19 studies that have not been so central to  
20 those activities in the past. It also has  
21 implications for design if one thinks about  
22 elections as major coordinating events.

---

1 We'll say more about that, Mark and Nancy  
2 will, a little later on this morning.

3 A second question is, why study  
4 elections with sample surveys? We claim in

5 our memo that there is a near perfect fit  
6 between the character of elections on the  
7 one hand and the method of the sample survey  
8 on the other, that in the study of  
9 elections, the sample survey is the right  
10 tool.

11 That leaves lots of things still  
12 to decide even if we agree about that. For  
13 the most part my guess is, we do agree about  
14 that, but still have serious choices to make  
15 about sampling, and load, and design, about  
16 cross- sections, and about ruling  
17 cross-sections, and about panels, and about  
18 the integration of experiments within  
19 surveys, and about the instrumentation and  
20 measurement. Nothing is really settled or  
21 only one thing is settled once we assert the  
22 primacy of sample surveys in the study of

---

1 elections.

2 The point to note that we draw  
3 your attention to in the memo is this. That  
4 as we make those choices, and we'll -- the  
5 conversation today will be helpful in that  
6 regard, in setting out how we ought to think  
7 about such choices -- as we make those  
8 choices we can draw on technical literatures  
9 that are really impressive in their depth I  
10 think, that the concentration of attention  
11 on the sample survey over the last 40 or 50  
12 years has meant that we know a great deal of  
13 a technical sort about sample design, about  
14 problems of coverage and non- response,  
15 about mood effects, about the integration of  
16 experimental and survey methods, about a  
17 psychological understanding of the survey  
18 response, about the formulation and  
19 placement of survey questions, and more.

20 Why a national study? We spend  
21 some time in our memorandum arguing that  
22 primarily for reasons of purpose and method

---

1 commercial and political polls are really no  
2 substitute for a national election study.  
3 We can talk about that later on. I choose  
4 not to rehearse those arguments right here.  
5 Instead I'd like to draw attention and  
6 emphasize another answer or a set of answers

7 really to the question of why the National  
8 Science Foundation should support a National  
9 Election Study.

10 Here the interest is in what we  
11 mean by, national, in particular there. Let  
12 me emphasize just two points. We actually  
13 say a little bit more about this in the  
14 memorandum, but two points for now. By  
15 national now in this respect we mean a  
16 widespread participation in the planning and  
17 design of the studies. In fact the mandate,  
18 the original mandate of the National Science  
19 Foundation to NES was partly and importantly  
20 to transform the Michigan Election Studies  
21 into a truly national resource.

22 What that meant is that scores of

---

1 social scientists, not just a handful, from  
2 a variety of disciplines, not just political  
3 science, should participate in every facet  
4 of the research program from definition of  
5 core data, to innovations in study content,  
6 design, and instrumentation. We think  
7 that's very important.

8 We think NES has done pretty well  
9 in that respect and that's an important  
10 feature for any national election study of  
11 the future.

12 Secondly, on this point we'd like  
13 to emphasize that a truly collaborative  
14 national study generates intellectual  
15 capital that benefits individual scholars  
16 and that improves the disciplines of social  
17 science more generally. Collaboration in  
18 the national project creates an environment  
19 for learning. It spurs healthy competition.  
20 Participation in study planning is a kind of  
21 intensive, high octane post-graduate  
22 seminar.

---

1 If you talk to people who have  
2 been involved on the NES Board or on NES  
3 planning committees, they will report this  
4 very faithfully. It's true for me. I  
5 realized in a document that we prepared for  
6 today that I've been involved in one way or  
7 another in the National Election Study  
8 since 1979, a horrifying thought, to me at

9 least, and maybe to the rest of you too.  
10 You know, I've been in fancy  
11 universities and fancy places like this. I  
12 participated in lots of high octane faculty  
13 seminars. But, the one that has meant the  
14 most to me, and this is true of lots and  
15 lots of people, scores of people, is the  
16 seminar that runs in the planning and design  
17 of a National Election Study. Over the  
18 years, NES has produced human capital of a  
19 high sort, training for social science in a  
20 general sort of way.  
21 Okay, finally, for me at least, in  
22 one form or another NES has been in business

---

1 for 50 years or so. If my arithmetic is  
2 right the 2002 study which was funded  
3 entirely from private sources, is the 25th  
4 in a series. So, the pointed question here  
5 is, with so many election studies already in  
6 hand, why do more? The answers there are  
7 actually -- the required answers there are  
8 elaborate and detailed. I only have time  
9 this morning to be snappy and cryptic.  
10 But, in three ways. We have three  
11 snappy and cryptic answers to the question  
12 about why do more. The first is that  
13 sustaining NES and sustaining the NES time  
14 series makes basic research on political and  
15 social change possible. Posing comparable  
16 instrumentation to comparable samples at  
17 regular intervals means that we can  
18 undertake analysis of the life history of  
19 issues or investigate the partisan  
20 realignment of the American South or analyze  
21 the disintegration of the New Deal party  
22 system. None of that is possible without

---

1 NES or something like NES marching out in  
2 the future.  
3 Our second reason goes to the  
4 dynamism of the social sciences and the  
5 generation of new ideas. NES was born  
6 before Downs wrote what he wrote about issue  
7 voting, or before Key wrote what he wrote  
8 about partisan realignment, before Verba and  
9 Nie wrote what they wrote on participation,  
10 before Kramer wrote what he did on  
11 economic voting.

12           There are new ideas being  
13 generated now, even as we speak. They need  
14 to be tested and refined in general and NES  
15 has proven to be a powerful venue for that  
16 kind of test.

17           Finally, thirdly, NES on into the  
18 future provides a powerful platform for the  
19 assessment of what you could call natural  
20 experiments. We've been in the United  
21 States visited by two conspicuous natural  
22 experiments recently. One, the

---

1           unprecedented and completely unanticipatable  
2 near Constitutional crisis that followed  
3 the 2000 election and, of course, the  
4 terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

5           Those were galvanizing,  
6 mesmerizing, interrupting events,  
7 coordinated events in a way that stopped  
8 life as we knew it and drew the attention of  
9 the nation to this one aspect of our shared  
10 community life.

11           Now, to provide a sober and  
12 sophisticated understanding of the enduring  
13 political consequences that emerge from  
14 events like that you need something that  
15 looks very much like the National Election  
16 Study. You need comparable measurement to  
17 comparable samples, before such events  
18 intrude and then afterwards.

19           So, those are some of the reasons  
20 that we wanted to put on the table for why  
21 something like the National Election Studies  
22 needs to go forward into the future. Mark

---

1           now is going to talk about what is required  
2 to make that real.

3           DR. HANSEN: Thank you again for  
4 the invitation. I think all of us on the  
5 National Election Study Board see this  
6 conference as being something of a watershed  
7 event. The National Science Foundation took  
8 over responsibility for the funding of the  
9 project some 25 years ago now and this  
10 really is kind of an opportunity to take a  
11 look at 25 years of the National Election  
12 Study and ask, well what kinds of  
13 adjustments do we want to make and what do  
14 we want to do going forward from here?

15           So, I think it's very much a  
16 watershed event, not only for National  
17 Science Foundation and for the National  
18 Election Study but also for political  
19 science and the social sciences more  
20 generally.  
21           I thought I would begin in talking  
22 about what these requirements might look

---

1           like to put some concerns that the -- or  
2 sort of questions that occurred to the Board  
3 out of a conversation with Jim Granato at a  
4 Board meeting last summer, the kind of --  
5 sort of kind of issues that I think are  
6 involved in thinking about changing, making  
7 changes in the National Election Study, and  
8 then moving forward in the National Election  
9 Study.

10           So, I want to read a bit from a  
11 letter that I sent to Jim in July. Just to  
12 sort of put a few issues on the table about  
13 sort of the conduct of the study and how it  
14 runs. I want to focus on three of those  
15 questions that we brought up with Jim in  
16 particular.

17           The first is, should we think of  
18 the American National Election Studies as a  
19 program or a process? That is, at one  
20 extreme we might think of the election study  
21 as a program which is designed and specified  
22 by the principal investigators in advance

---

1           where the Board's role is simply to assist  
2 in the implementation of that program.

3           At the other extreme, the National  
4 Election Study might be conceived of as a  
5 process, a process that is responsive to the  
6 most current scientific ideas in the  
7 community where the Board's role is to set  
8 direction by the choices among the ideas.

9           I'd say right now that the  
10 American National Election studies is  
11 something of a hybrid, that they look more  
12 like a project on matters of study design  
13 and they look more like a process model on  
14 matters of content. So one question is,  
15 what is the right balance point between a  
16 conception of a project versus the  
17 conception of a process? Does the American



18 National Election Study currently set the  
19 right balance or should it be moved in one  
20 direction or the other?

21 Another way of putting the  
22 question is to what extent can and should

---

1 the study anticipate the direction of  
2 science and the political circumstances that  
3 would provide opportunities for the  
4 investigation of important substantive  
5 questions and what are the implications of  
6 the balance that is struck both for the  
7 Board, the principal investigators for the  
8 research communities, and for the Foundation  
9 itself?

10 A second question that we found  
11 vexing over time and we continue to think is  
12 quite important is the balance between  
13 continuity and innovation in the National  
14 Election Study. This is a constant point of  
15 contention around the American National  
16 Election Studies. It really strikes at the  
17 heart of the mission of the National  
18 Election Studies as a national resource.

19 As a Board we believe that we have  
20 a responsibility to maintain continuity but  
21 it's also a responsibility -- it's been  
22 frustrating, especially in an era where

---

1 budgets have been tight and where we haven't  
2 been able to do as much as we would like.  
3 We certainly have members of our research  
4 community who would like to see more  
5 continuity. We get that in the reviews on  
6 the project. We also have members of our  
7 community who would like to see more  
8 innovation. We get those reviews as well.

9 So we think it would be very  
10 helpful to discuss this issue explicitly and  
11 decide in a self-conscious way what balance  
12 would be most of use to the social  
13 scientific research community.

14 Finally, another kind of issue of  
15 the way the study is run, is what are the  
16 American National Election Study's research  
17 communities? At the very beginning of the  
18 study and certainly leading up to the point  
19 where the National Science Foundation took  
20 over responsibility for the study, the

21 American National Election Study was  
22 primarily in service of a research community

---

1 that was concerned chiefly with electoral  
2 behavior. Through the years, and not  
3 without controversy, both within the  
4 research community and more broadly, the  
5 American National Election Study has  
6 expanded its focus to meet the needs of  
7 scholars who study public opinion.

8 Now, of course, there are many of  
9 us, including many of us on the Board, who  
10 believe that the National Election Study  
11 should undertake to serve research  
12 communities that study institutions, state  
13 politics decision- making, information  
14 processing, and so on. So one chief  
15 question, I think, for this group is what  
16 are the benefits to the study and to the  
17 social sciences in reaching out to each of  
18 these communities? What are the prospects  
19 for success? What are the tradeoffs in  
20 service? Finally, are there interesting  
21 design packages that might be used to serve  
22 multiple communities more readily than we've

---

1 been able to serve those multiple  
2 communities in the past with the kinds of  
3 designs we have?

4 So, those are some questions that  
5 I think would be very helpful, I think both  
6 to the current group that is responsible for  
7 the American National Election Studies but  
8 also I think in thinking about the project  
9 as it moves forward.

10 Being a national resource, a study  
11 that is a national resource, we think, has  
12 responsibilities that come with it. So, I'd  
13 like to also repackage some of what we said  
14 in the memo to talk a little bit about what  
15 we see as the responsibilities of a national  
16 resource, a study that is a national  
17 resource.

18 The way I'd like to organize it is  
19 to say, well, what are the central  
20 requirements if the study is to have great  
21 scientific value? That's really asking two  
22 questions. The first is what do we want in

---

1 the outputs? Okay, what should the product  
2 look like?

3 What processes will produce what  
4 we want as a product? So I'm going to sort  
5 of organize this into three points.

6 The first is that I think we can  
7 agree that a study that is a national  
8 resource ought to produce data that are  
9 useable, that are broadly useable. I think  
10 that there are several requirements that  
11 stem from that. The data should be clean.  
12 They should be accessible and they should be  
13 well documented. I think that this has been  
14 quite a strength of the American National  
15 Election Study through time is that they are  
16 quite accessible and they are quite well  
17 documented so people know how the study was  
18 done. People have access to that kind of  
19 information.

20 The second element of the data  
21 that are useable is data that is comparable  
22 in method through time. There are sort of

---

1 two pieces to this. The first is that there  
2 be no surprises for the user community, the  
3 user community not suddenly discover that 5  
4 point scales have been shifted to 7 point  
5 scales, and other sort of nasty surprises.  
6 So that there is a kind of a dependability  
7 to the study and the community has  
8 confidence that when changes have been made,  
9 they've been made in a very careful way and  
10 a way that's been also to investigate the  
11 way in which those changes might affect some  
12 of the data.

13 The second element of  
14 comparability and method through time is to  
15 have data that are comparable between one  
16 study and another to minimize discoveries in  
17 essence that are merely part of ----

18 Finally, I think a third  
19 requirement for data that are useable is  
20 data that are rich in accompanying content.  
21 There are many arguments out there for the  
22 value of core content that when one has core

---

1 items that are carried consistently through  
2 time the performance of those items is  
3 known. There are particular research

4 communities that come to be dependent upon  
5 particular content on the study. As I've  
6 indicated before, there are demands of NSF  
7 reviewers and others in the community for  
8 continuity in the study.

9 But we think that the strongest  
10 argument for core content that's carried  
11 consistently is the way in which consistent  
12 availability of content makes analysis  
13 possible. Innovative content can be  
14 designed confident in the knowledge that  
15 other variables will be there to fill out  
16 any specification, to explore results, to  
17 test for robustness, and so forth. This is  
18 one chief reason why the American National  
19 Election Study is more broadly used than,  
20 say, media polls because there is this  
21 additional content that is there and can be  
22 used for a wide range of analyses.

---

1 A second quality of the output  
2 from the study that we want surely is that  
3 we have data that are of high quality. This  
4 it seems to us brings with it two  
5 responsibilities. The first is that the  
6 procedures in the front end of the study,  
7 everything from the drawing of the sample to  
8 the conversion of reluctance, to the  
9 effective training of interviewers, the  
10 monitoring of interview quality, all of that  
11 has to be in place so that the data that  
12 come out the other end actually are useful  
13 and are of high quality.

14 So, there is quite a lot of sort  
15 of boring administration that goes along  
16 with producing a study that is going to have  
17 high quality out the back end.

18 Secondly, the requirement that a  
19 study produce high quality data means  
20 that -- particularly in a survey context  
21 means that the data -- that the instrument  
22 be tested for validity and reliability. As

---

1 we all know around this table, measurement  
2 error is endemic to social sciences and it's  
3 especially so in individual level data such  
4 as we get from surveys.

5 So, when survey time is a scarce  
6 resource, it's essential that we know how

7 survey items perform, the extent to which  
8 they measure the construct for which they're  
9 intended, the extent of random error. So  
10 while we know performance -- we should know  
11 what the performance of the content is, and  
12 we should make available to community what  
13 we know about the performance of these  
14 items.

15 So even if our user community  
16 doesn't care a whit about measurement error,  
17 and sometimes we wonder whether they care at  
18 all about measurement error, it's something  
19 that a national resource, like the American  
20 National Election Study should care a great  
21 deal about.

22 Finally, I think as a requirement

---

1 of a national resource, we want data that  
2 reflect the best ideas and most vibrant  
3 research programs in the social sciences.  
4 So we need devices for the input from the  
5 research community so that the research  
6 community can participate in the study  
7 design and the research community can  
8 participate in the content of the study.  
9 There are several avenues that have been  
10 used before: The Board of Overseers, the  
11 planning committees, both in the production  
12 studies and in the pilot studies.

13 In short, participation in a  
14 national resource should not be by  
15 invitation only. It should be broadly  
16 available to researchers.

17 Secondly, to enable the best ideas  
18 to come forth, there must a conception in  
19 the study as being cooperation in the  
20 production of a public good where the data  
21 are available to all and available in the  
22 same timetable as they are available to the

---

1 people who have been involved in the design  
2 of the study. So, there should not be  
3 privileged access to the data.

4 Finally to make the study one that  
5 produces data that reflects the best ideas  
6 in the social sciences, I think it also  
7 requires the expert assistance in  
8 development and implementation.

9 Broad community access is

10 essential if the data are to reflect new  
11 ideas in the field. But, access on its own  
12 is not enough. There will be little  
13 innovation if people with good ideas are  
14 left to their own devices in turning those  
15 ideas into the designs and implementation  
16 that work. In looking at the essays, it's  
17 striking how much of the outreach to new  
18 research communities is outreach to  
19 communities that have little experience and  
20 oftentimes little knowledge of survey  
21 research. So, innovation in the study is  
22 going to require expertise not only from the

---

1 principal investigators and the Board but  
2 also from a skilled staff that knows about  
3 the craft of survey research.  
4 DR. BURNS: So, I want to thank  
5 you all as well. I'm pretty excited to hear  
6 the conversation that is going to develop  
7 over the next bunch of hours.  
8 What I want to do is sketch a  
9 portfolio for coordinated studies that I  
10 think could make for an awfully interesting  
11 future for the National Election Study.  
12 The portfolio has three different  
13 goals. First off it's committed to  
14 continuity and coordination cross studies.  
15 I think that's one of the best ways to  
16 leverage the best of the past and the future  
17 of ANES data. So, that's the first thing.  
18 Second, is about process. Seeking  
19 to broaden the intellectual contributions to  
20 the study, to bring in new subfields, to  
21 bring in new disciplines.  
22 Then the third thing is kind of

---

1 about substance. It wants to enhance the  
2 platform for contributions to science by  
3 building on the natural experiment of  
4 elections. So, these three things. I'm  
5 going to spend a little bit of time on each  
6 one of them.  
7 So, the first one continuity and  
8 coordination. So, repeating questions  
9 across time and space, bringing our  
10 comparable -- building comparable samples  
11 over time, linking studies across context.  
12 All of these things, I think, offer

13 scientific opportunities and offer new uses  
14 of both old and new data. The emphasis here  
15 is on leveraging the power of any particular  
16 data set. So, an isolated data set is fine  
17 and all but it's not nearly as good as one  
18 that's coordinated and can be leveraged.  
19 Without the coordination and  
20 continuity you miss replication. You miss  
21 chances to try out ideas in multiple  
22 contexts inside multiple coordinating events

---

1 and on, and on, and on. You can keep  
2 building the list.  
3 It seemed to me that there was  
4 widespread consensus among the essays on the  
5 value of continuity. That it would be kind  
6 of a waste of a valuable scientific  
7 opportunity to design a future NES without  
8 coordination and continuity.  
9 The second sort of innovation is  
10 about a process for scientific advancement.  
11 So this is kind of building on what Don and  
12 Mark put on the table. The idea here is  
13 that scholars from a range of disciplines  
14 have found the data useful.  
15 They've even sometimes served as  
16 advisors to the study proposing  
17 instrumentation, shaping the study bias,  
18 service on the Board. But, the value of the  
19 coordinating event is just a lot greater  
20 than the advantage that neighboring  
21 disciplines have been able to take of the  
22 study.

---

1 So, I think the conversation  
2 should be broadened to extend more fully  
3 across the social sciences. So, putting  
4 economics, political science, sociology,  
5 psychology, and so on side by side -- and  
6 not on the idea that one should adjudicate  
7 among them, rather to make for a new  
8 creative potential, new ways to build  
9 scientific human capital.  
10 That exciting conversation where  
11 disciplines don't just, you know, borrow  
12 pieces from one another, but rather make new  
13 things out of their conversations which is  
14 something that Kathleen McGraw talked about  
15 in her essay, isn't something I think that

16 could just happen. It probably has to be  
17 cultivated in some of the ways that Mark  
18 talked about. People have to see that this  
19 would be valuable and that this coordinating  
20 event provides a unique opportunity for  
21 social science and then they have to pick up  
22 the methodological training to do this work

---

1 well.

2 Probably then this means a serious  
3 extension effort on the part of the future  
4 NES, creating methodological skills, helping  
5 scholars see the intellectual payoff in  
6 putting their ideas into this conversation.  
7 This might mean a new form of pilot study,  
8 for example, so that new scholars coming  
9 into the study can develop instrumentation  
10 within the project. So, a serious outreach  
11 effort -- or, the language I like to use is,  
12 extension. So an extension program.

13 The third innovation is about  
14 creating new platforms for scholars to use  
15 to take advantage of the features of this  
16 natural experiment that the nation carries  
17 out on a regular basis. The notion here is  
18 a portfolio of coordinated studies all in  
19 the service of increasing the leverage  
20 scholars have and of broadening the kinds of  
21 questions that scholars can ask of this  
22 data.

---

1 I'm going to put on the table and  
2 kind of echo our memo on a few things that  
3 might or might not be the direction that we  
4 want to go but they are kind of conversation  
5 starters. It would be interesting to know  
6 what folks think about these things.

7 So, one part, not surprisingly, of  
8 this portfolio is the time series. We've  
9 talked about why that's a pretty crucial  
10 part of the portfolio. A time series with  
11 comparable samples, comparable mode, and so  
12 on. Otherwise, as several of you made clear  
13 in your memos, it's not a time series.

14 Then some cool design innovations  
15 to enhance the value of the laboratory, to  
16 broaden the disciplinary reach of the study.  
17 First off -- and again, these are  
18 suggestions or ideas, beginning conversation  
19 points, one might want to build leverage on



20 the coordinating event within the event  
21 itself. So, one might incorporate rolling  
22 cross-sections with large daily replicates

---

1 all carried out within the campaign.  
2 Henry and Andre outline a range of  
3 interesting questions that that would  
4 enable. There are some really interesting  
5 things about this design. You'd be able to  
6 notice details of coordination, responses to  
7 campaign events, and the like. So, you'd  
8 get a kind of fine-grained look at the  
9 process of coordination.

10 Since the pre-election component  
11 of the ANES has been carried out via similar  
12 but somewhat less expensive design features,  
13 features relatively easy to carry out in a  
14 face-to-face study -- things like square  
15 take, relatively even take, multiple  
16 replicates, and so on, the data could be  
17 aggregated over the pre- election period to  
18 compare these data with data from earlier  
19 NES studies.

20 A downside to this design is that  
21 it doesn't open up a huge amount of space  
22 for a new form of multi-disciplinary

---

1 conversation. So while there would be new  
2 content, there would probably be a good  
3 sized chunk of old content because each data  
4 study probably needs to carry the same  
5 instrumentation.

6 So I think you'd probably -- if  
7 you wanted to go this route, you would want  
8 to combine this with other parts of a  
9 portfolio.

10 A second kind of piece of a  
11 portfolio is something that you all raised a  
12 number of times in your memos, often in  
13 response to Laura's and Jake's paper on  
14 leveraging electoral variance. In this part  
15 I have a bunch of questions for you.

16 So, the idea here is that a  
17 national representative sample is really  
18 wonderfully useful but there are some big  
19 things it doesn't do well because the cases  
20 come from -- the cases from a particular  
21 geographic location don't represent that  
22 particular geographic location. Instead

---

1 they join together to represent the nation  
2 as a whole.

3 So, for example, people turned  
4 pretty insistently to the Senate election  
5 study carried out in the late '80s and  
6 early '90s because of its self- representing  
7 sample with states. There are questions.  
8 Laura and Jake talk about a design that  
9 creates self-representing samples of  
10 Congressional Districts and maybe that's  
11 what you would want because it makes for an  
12 easy link to the institutional literature on  
13 the House of Representatives.

14 But, to the extent that the  
15 concern is electoral politics, you'd also  
16 want to notice that there are only a handful  
17 of competitive races among the 435 House  
18 elections and so the design might invest a  
19 lot of money in chasing 20, or 30, or 40  
20 competitive districts. So one would want to  
21 think about that?

22 An alternative and it's one we put

---

1 forward in our memo for discussion would to  
2 be aim for state representing of our  
3 samples, either of all states or a good  
4 range of states.

5 This would give scholars the  
6 ability to connect a range of institutional  
7 configurations and thus institutional  
8 theories to individual thought and actions.  
9 So, you'd get state legislatures, legal  
10 institutions, bureaucracies, and so on.  
11 Scholars, as you know already, of  
12 legislatures and bureaucracies have started  
13 recently to take advantage of the really  
14 interesting variance that exists already  
15 across states to test all manner of  
16 institutional theories.

17 That variance doesn't exist in a  
18 cross- section in Congress and sometimes it  
19 doesn't even exist in a 50 year time series  
20 in Congress. So, it's something to think  
21 about.

22 This kind of state idea also seems

---

1 like a natural site for scholars from across

2 disciplines to come together to build a new  
3 and more synthetic understanding -- that  
4 combines the study of institutions with the  
5 study of individual thought and action.

6 The third thing we need, perhaps,  
7 is to make it easier to compare the  
8 coordinating period with other different  
9 coordinating periods, the quiet times  
10 outside elections. So, decision making  
11 around or within 9/11, around the 2000  
12 election, around the 2002 election, a quiet  
13 time for example.

14 We've put on the table an idea  
15 that draws on Kish's notion of  
16 independent rolling cross- sections in off  
17 years. It's sort of a continuous monitoring  
18 study with some respondents empanelled from  
19 the Presidential years studies, perhaps, to  
20 increase leverage on individual change.  
21 There are lots of ways this would be  
22 interesting -- complicated but interesting.

---

1 If folks were empanelled from Presidential  
2 year face-to-face studies, then these  
3 studies might be able to be carried out by a  
4 less expensive mode than face-to- face  
5 because they would already have a little bit  
6 of practice with the instrument.

7 If these independent rolling  
8 cross-sections incorporated state  
9 representative over samples that I just  
10 mentioned, then the data could be easily  
11 aggregated by geography and the data could  
12 be easily aggregated by a range of different  
13 kinds of social and political groups to  
14 enable different kinds of subgroup and  
15 institutional analysis.

16 These independent cross-sections,  
17 especially if panels are embedded in them  
18 would be great for capturing a kind of  
19 comparative study of coordinating events,  
20 comparative natural experiments.

21 The final part of this is that you  
22 would probably have a small bit of content

---

1 to enable clean comparisons with the  
2 Presidential year studies and clean  
3 comparisons of different kinds of  
4 coordinated events and different kinds of

5 quiet times.

6 But, you'd also have space on  
7 these studies, I think, to carry brand new  
8 content and thus to provide opportunities  
9 for multi-disciplinary leveraging, again, of  
10 the kind that McGraw talked about. One part  
11 of the portfolio would focus on the  
12 coordinating event then and one would focus  
13 on other times so that the coordinating  
14 event itself could come much more crisply  
15 into focus, both within and across  
16 individuals.

17 Of course, there are lots of other  
18 incredibly valuable things to do and you've  
19 put lots and lots of those on the table.  
20 So, exploiting more of the experimental and  
21 video potential of CAPI along the lines  
22 for example that Hudson and Malitino (?)

---

1 have developed, incorporating measures of  
2 response latencies.

3 One thing Diana mentioned,  
4 bringing more and more contextual data into  
5 the NES -- in the 2002 NES we're going to --  
6 we'll have because contextual data have  
7 gotten easier, and easier, and easier to  
8 pull into our studies, we're going to be  
9 able to put about 100 institutional  
10 variables on the 2002 NES and that's kind of  
11 exciting.

12 We always incorporate basic geo  
13 codes but for reasons of privacy and  
14 confidentiality those are released via  
15 special access but one could go further down  
16 that route as well.

17 All in all I think these meetings  
18 will be pretty exciting. They serve the  
19 goals that I talked about earlier. They  
20 leverage the best of past and future NES  
21 through continuity and coordination,  
22 broadening the intellectual contributions of

---

1 the study to bring new subfields and new  
2 disciplines in to shape the study and  
3 enhance the platform for contributions to  
4 science by building leverage on the natural  
5 experiments of elections.

6 But these are beginning ideas and  
7 so it will be great to hear what you have to

8 say.

9 DR. SCIOLI: Okay. Thanks. We'll  
10 let you guys entertain the commentaries.  
11 But, please, questions, comments. Go ahead  
12 Henry.

13 MR. SCIOLI: Could I -- Could I  
14 ask a question before Henry? You can  
15 reflect on this. I just wanted to pick up on  
16 Rick's statement about being admonished or  
17 trained to say, National Election Studies  
18 rather than National Election Survey. Would  
19 you reflect a bit on the difference? What's  
20 connoted by that difference? Because, I  
21 mean, we talk about the general social  
22 survey and we talk about the panel study and

---

1 dynamics. But in your remarks, Nancy  
2 particularly, you sort -- I mean what came  
3 across was the centrality of a particular  
4 survey.

5 But, presumably thinking about it  
6 as studies has some other meaning and some  
7 operations and maybe it's back to Mark's  
8 distinction between whether it's a project  
9 or a process but I'd like to -- I'd like to  
10 get a bit more feeling about how you -- and  
11 others too I mean, think -- what is connoted  
12 by that difference?

13 DR. HANSEN: I suspect that the  
14 designation is in some sense an historical  
15 accident that at the time that NSF took over  
16 the financial responsibility for the project  
17 there were a whole series of these, I  
18 guess 25 of them already at that point, each  
19 of which was called the 1952 study, the 1956  
20 study, and so on. Studies became sort of  
21 the operative term in it.

22 But, I think -- one of the things

---

1 that I think a lot of us on the Board think  
2 would be quite exciting would be if in fact  
3 it were possible to make the Presidential  
4 pre-post say as part of a portfolio of  
5 projects many of them perhaps survey but  
6 also perhaps joined in a coordinated fashion  
7 to things that other scholars are doing.

8 For instance, because the 2002  
9 Midterm study was not funded, there were  
10 several of us on the Board who, as you know,

11 hurriedly put together a proposal which was  
12 unsuccessful for a kind of a stand alone or  
13 separate 2002 study where the idea is that  
14 this would be something where we would try  
15 to pull in as many of the Congressional  
16 scholars as possible and talk about it as a  
17 national representation survey.

18 That kind of model might be  
19 extended still further where it wouldn't  
20 just be a survey study but might be joined  
21 with other activities by that group of  
22 scholars. In occurred to me in the course

---

1 of writing that, for instance, that this  
2 might be a step along the way to a sort of  
3 a 40 years later study that would look a lot  
4 like Bauer, Poole, and Dexter's study of the  
5 making of trade policy in the 1950's and  
6 the 1960's which was joined with elite  
7 interviews in Congress, following around  
8 lobbyists on Capitol Hill, and so on.

9 So I think what's exciting about  
10 the future is that in fact we might be  
11 able to sort of join what has been a  
12 traditional survey study into sort of a  
13 variety of related activities as well.

14 DR. BRADY: I want to reiterate  
15 what was said about how important the ANES  
16 has been and how much I really appreciate  
17 the efforts these folks and other folks have  
18 put in over the decades on this project.  
19 It's a lot of work and they are really to be  
20 commended for what they have done.

21 There's two things I want to  
22 mention which are sort of related. One is,

---

1 I didn't hear a lot of talk about  
2 substantive areas that you thought the ANES  
3 should be focused on.

4 My memo actually spends a lot of  
5 time saying here's where I think ANES has  
6 done really well. Here's where I think they  
7 have contributed but maybe not as much.  
8 There are a variety of reasons for that, one  
9 of which is you can't do everything. So I  
10 wasn't by any means trying to say, well,  
11 gee, they should have done all these things,  
12 but. Then here's some areas where I think  
13 that not much has been done at all. Then I

14 even tried to identify some areas where I  
15 thought maybe more should be done and I  
16 thought it was sort of a natural outgrowth  
17 of things that had been done.

18 Then the second thing I want to  
19 mention that's related to that is just --  
20 and it gets to some of the talk here about  
21 organization and how you get a process going  
22 where you involve people. It seems to me

---

1 that if there are some substantive areas  
2 which are really important, part of the  
3 problem is to try think of how you get  
4 people from those substantive areas involved  
5 in the process such that you really do make  
6 a big splash.

7 It seems to me NES has been most  
8 successful when they've gotten, say, the  
9 Congressional, the House of Representatives  
10 actual community involved and done studies  
11 on that, the primaries, people who study  
12 primaries involved, or the people who study  
13 the Senate.

14 So, how can you do that? I think  
15 it's been done pretty well in the past. One  
16 idea might be that you should adopt  
17 something like the GSS model of modules or  
18 something like that that would really make  
19 an even bigger focus on an area and say,  
20 look, you're going to get not just a few  
21 questions but you're going to get a  
22 whole 10, 20 minutes or something like that

---

1 on the survey. But you've obviously got to  
2 come up with a good design and a good  
3 approach. But, if you do, then we'll really  
4 devote a lot of time and effort to this.

5 One of the reasons I think this is  
6 important is that I worry about if we're  
7 talking about designs but before I want to  
8 think of a design I want to think of the  
9 questions I want to answer. I don't want to  
10 have a design in search of questions. I  
11 want to have questions that will then have a  
12 design tailored to them.

13 So organizational issues I think  
14 do interact with substantive issues and I  
15 hope that we talk a lot about those issues  
16 here because I think they are very central

17 to making the ANES even more successful than  
18 it has been.

19 DR. BURNS: So, I'd like to say  
20 just say two sentences and then pass it off  
21 to the other two here. With respect to the  
22 substantive areas, we -- in our memo what we

---

1 were trying to do was put on the table in a  
2 sense, "meta" substantive areas.  
3 So, it seems one accounting of the  
4 development of some parts of political  
5 science and social science more broadly, you  
6 know, kind of focuses on behavior and then  
7 focuses on institutions, and then now, isn't  
8 it interesting that finally we have the  
9 opportunity to build theories of  
10 institutions and theories of behavior that  
11 actually seriously take into account the  
12 theoretical building blocks of institutional  
13 theory and the theoretical building blocks  
14 that need to -- or that inform thinking  
15 about thought in action.

16 That seems actually to me at  
17 least -- but this is, you know, my argument,  
18 you know, not a general one. It seems to me  
19 that this is completely under exploited  
20 space in social science and this would a  
21 wonderful laboratory for enabling that sort  
22 of thing.

---

1 Then the other part about the  
2 coordinating event, that pushes for kind of  
3 more votes on decision-making, information  
4 processes, drawing in more cognitive  
5 science, that sort of thing. Again, a kind  
6 of facilitating thing -- not to presume that  
7 this is exactly the direction -- this, that,  
8 or the other. But there are other -- I  
9 mean, some of you all put other ideas on the  
10 table that maybe, you know, long run  
11 socialization was really the, you know, kind  
12 of the direction to go and that's where a  
13 lot of the promise could be.

14 So, I wanted to say that and then  
15 I wanted to say just again, two sentences  
16 about the -- about modules. To the extent  
17 that the resource is -- it seems to be that  
18 the resource is especially valuable if those  
19 modules are integrated, if it's a



20 conversation.  
21 If there are separate modules and  
22 you buy a little piece that seems not --

---

1 just to my mind not quite as good as an  
2 integrated one where folks come to have  
3 conversations that they would have never had  
4 if they were to put an independent piece  
5 onto a study. I mean there are many  
6 incredibly good venues for that sort of  
7 thing.

8 We've been doing more modules as  
9 the funding situation has changed and so NSF  
10 had supported a piece of the 2000 study and  
11 we ran around and collected funds for the  
12 rest of the 2000 study and that enabled  
13 more, you know, kind of developed modules to  
14 be added. You know, space for developed  
15 modules.

16 The 2002 study was all private  
17 funding and that's got -- we are committed  
18 to a core so it's got the core and then it  
19 has got a range of different modular pieces.  
20 So, that's --

21 DR. BRADY: Well, tell us -- how  
22 has that worked? I mean, has that been

---

1 successful? Do you think there are problems  
2 with it? Is it --

3 DR. BURNS: So, there are good  
4 things and bad things. The good things are  
5 that it's, you know, a cool space to push an  
6 idea a good way. You know private  
7 foundations have incredibly quick turnaround  
8 times and so product consultation, we do as  
9 much as we can but it's not as -- the  
10 product consultation is trimmed down a whole  
11 lot.

12 So what we've been trying to in  
13 the model for the 2002 study was we built  
14 one of the modules by building in  
15 collaboration with someone outside of the  
16 Board, with Larry Bartels, to go to Russell  
17 Sage to build a module. But again, we were  
18 fortunate that Sage and Carnegie both had us  
19 present ideas and in, you know, big settings  
20 where, you know, economists, and socialists,  
21 and social welfare folks were all working on  
22 ideas of inequality and gave us lots of

---

1 feedback.  
2 But, that's pretty different from  
3 people proposing instrumentation and, you  
4 know, a long run discussion with the Board,  
5 and so forth.

6           So, it's a -- we imagine good  
7 things will come of it but it was an agenda  
8 that was more centrally directed. So,  
9 that's, you know, got some down sides.

10 Okay? Well, but I just talk too much, so  
11 you all should --

12           DR. KINDER: You did just fine.

13           DR. HANSEN: One of the  
14 conversations that we had around this quick  
15 proposal for the Midterm Study was -- was to  
16 think well, should be think about a  
17 situation where, say the Presidential Study  
18 and the Midterm Studies are decoupled from  
19 each other?

20           Where the Presidential Study  
21 emphasizes continuity, that it sort of  
22 builds on that 50 year time series in a very

---

1 consistent way. But, where the Midterm  
2 study might be made into a vehicle for  
3 different research communities through time  
4 so that in 2002 it might be people who  
5 wanted to investigate the impact, say, of  
6 the policy agendas of the new President on  
7 the way in which people view Congress. So,  
8 it would be sort of taken over by the  
9 representation of people who study Congress.

10           But the 2006 study might be a  
11 study, say, of gubernatorial election  
12 dynamics. So you can kind of imagine a sort  
13 of mixing where -- and you know, we were  
14 kind of casting about for ways to --both to  
15 sort of broaden the substantive focus of the  
16 study but also to say, you know, well,  
17 maybe -- maybe, there is an opportunity in  
18 this new funding environment.

19           DR. THOMPSON: Can I ask a  
20 question? How do you see the funding laid  
21 out over the next 10 years? Do you see the  
22 possibility of getting some increased

---

1 funding or staying basically level with, you

2 know, adjustments for inflation or what?

3 I mean -- you know, I mean I think  
4 that's important to think about when you're  
5 thinking about innovations in the study. Do  
6 you see that there is going to be some  
7 modest increase in funding to look at some  
8 new innovations or do you have to find  
9 innovations within basically sort of a flat  
10 funding level? Or --

11 DR. BRADY: I hope there is more  
12 funding. I want to just jump in here. I  
13 mean, I think that it's been underfunded the  
14 last 6 years, I really do. Just to say  
15 something that would sound controversial. I  
16 think there's got to be more. I hope that's  
17 one of the things that comes out of here.  
18 Let's start deciding that we're going to  
19 fund this at a level so we can get done the  
20 things we want to get done.

21 MR. TORENGEAU: I would second  
22 what Henry said is, you know, given that

---

1 some of the ideas in several of the papers,  
2 things like continuous monitoring or some  
3 kind of longitudinal component -- you know,  
4 it seems like those are two of the most  
5 promising additions -- would require  
6 substantial new investment unless the  
7 existing time series were to be abandoned.  
8 I don't think anybody wants that.

9 It seems like the only way those  
10 innovations would actually be innovated  
11 would be to, you know, to increase, you  
12 know, greatly increase the resources  
13 available to the election studies.

14 DR. SCIOLI: Rick?

15 DR. LEMPert: A similar but  
16 different question. I want to preface it by  
17 making clear that there is no implicit  
18 suggestion. It's just to clarify thinking.  
19 Clearly when one has a 50 year time series,  
20 that has a great value of what one has and  
21 everything that is planned is based on it.

22 But, I am curious if it's possible

---

1 to do this thought experiment kind of on  
2 your feet. Suppose there were no 50 year  
3 time series. Suppose one were just today  
4 having a meeting to plan a National Election

5 Studies and you did plan what you thought  
6 for the amount of money that was available  
7 the best kind of study. Then after you had  
8 done that you discovered this archive which  
9 had this 50 year time series.

10 How much of what you planned in  
11 terms of methods and questions would have  
12 been in that archive and would have actually  
13 been asked? How much of what you were doing  
14 and ways you were doing it would be new and  
15 would be tapping different areas?

16 DR. HANSEN: It's a difficult  
17 thought experiment because so much of where  
18 we are today has been shaped by those  
19 studies of the past.

20 DR. LEMPert: I understand.

21 DR. HANSEN: So, I think one  
22 answer to it is that there would be a

---

1 substantial overlap simply because the 50  
2 years has been so important to getting us to  
3 where we are today.

4 DR. LEMPert: Yeah, I am sure  
5 there would be anyway because the  
6 substantive questions of today relate to  
7 substantive questions we had yesterday.  
8 But, I am trying to get a hold as one  
9 thinks  
10 about this balance between innovation and  
11 continuity, if we didn't have this dependent  
12 in a sense decision to make, what kinds of  
13 things would we nonetheless find, we would  
14 just reinvent, and what things that we may  
15 well want to continue, because we have the  
16 time series, we wouldn't want to continue if  
17 we -- both in methods and in content -- if  
18 we were just starting today?

19 MR. SANTOS: Actually, I wanted to  
20 jump in here because this, in a way, relates  
21 to some of the comments I made in my essay.  
22 I actually wonder, not that I'm a  
substantive expert in any of this, whether

---

1 the questions or the focus would be on  
2 elections per se as opposed to the formation  
3 of political attitudes, their maturation,  
4 and then the end result behavior of  
5 elections.

6 In that sense that would actually,

7 if one focused on that, would not only have  
8 a component looking at election behavior but  
9 also between elections what's going on. It  
10 would feed in to some of the comments you  
11 made in terms the quiet years and things of  
12 that sort.

13 I was wondering whether that going  
14 beyond, looking -- the focus on the election  
15 years is something in terms of establishing  
16 research questions and sort of a program of  
17 research would be something that we could  
18 discuss here. Because that would have clear  
19 implications to the design recommendations.

20 DR. HANSEN: Right. But, the  
21 question here is decomposable into at least  
22 two parts. One is about design, and one is

---

1 about content, and this last little  
2 discussion has been design. Let me just say  
3 a bit about that.

4 Granted that the thought  
5 experiment is difficult to carry out. It  
6 seems to me that it wouldn't be surprising  
7 if the design we had created looked pretty  
8 different than the design we inherited in  
9 some respects. But there would be -- and it  
10 might look rather like what Rob just  
11 suggested -- that there would be more or  
12 less continuous monitoring across time but  
13 with special -- I would think -- attention to  
14 these elections as pivotal Democratic  
15 moments.

16 You know I can't imagine that we  
17 would not pay special attention to that even  
18 in a continuous monitoring design. You  
19 know, there might be panels built into that  
20 in the way that we've been talking. They  
21 might even have long term qualities to them.  
22 But, there would be a feature that -- at

---

1 some technical level the details of the  
2 design would be different.

3 But, it would be very surprising  
4 to me and disheartening to me, I suppose, if  
5 we didn't think we were beginning a time  
6 series. That is, there would be a  
7 commitment to the analysis of political and  
8 social change over the long haul and so that  
9 would mean that we would be self-conscious

10 about -- whatever it is that we were  
11 starting now, there would be the obligation  
12 to continue that on into the future.

13 DR. BRADY: You know in a way Rick  
14 this experiment has been done in Canada when  
15 Andre Blais, and me, and Richard Johnston  
16 and Jean Crete got the Canadian Election  
17 Studies we said we're going do something  
18 entirely new. We did do a new design,  
19 although I might say we actually purloined  
20 it from the 1984 continuous monitoring that  
21 ANES had done -- although we did it on a  
22 daily and not just a weekly basis which was

---

1 a big step.

2 But in terms of content, we just  
3 stole a whole lot stuff. The traits, the  
4 emotions, the 100 point scales, the 7 point  
5 scales, party identification. I could go on  
6 and on. We stole a lot of that stuff. We  
7 didn't do trust. You know if trust had  
8 never existed in the American National  
9 Election Studies, I don't think that would  
10 be a bad thing. I don't mean trust in the  
11 studies I mean the questions about trust.  
12 But that's just my own personal bias.

13 MR. TOURANGEAU: But certainly not  
14 trust in the system?

15 DR. BRADY: Right. But in a way I  
16 think we did that and we realized that we  
17 just found an enormous amount of tremendous  
18 use in what the ANES had done in terms of  
19 instrumentation but we did have a different  
20 design. Although, again, purloined from  
21 ANES.

22 DR. CLARKE: Well, Henry a lot of

---

1 that stuff was already in the Canadian  
2 Election Studies, having been a former PI.  
3 Where they come from, of course is the fact  
4 that Phil Converse was the PI on the very  
5 first study done in 1965.

6 DR. BRADY: Right. Yes. I didn't  
7 mean to say we were the first --

8 DR. CLARKE: The lineage of the  
9 ANES goes way back as it does in the British  
10 studies and so many of these.

11 DR. BRADY: Right.

12 DR. CLARKE: Well the thought

13 experiment is really, really difficult. I  
14 mean, what question would we want to answer?  
15 If we're still focusing on the act of voting  
16 and on election outcomes which, of course,  
17 are not the same thing, then I would suspect  
18 that there would be a lot of design things  
19 would flow from that right away.  
20                   Much harder would be the  
21 theoretical perspective because our  
22 theoretical perspectives have evolved out of

---

1 this interaction, this terrace game we've  
2 played for 50 years with the studies. So  
3 that part of the thought experiment to me  
4 Rob is really, really difficult.

5           DR. BRADY: I didn't mean to imply  
6 that we were the first people to put some of  
7 those types of questions on the Canadian  
8 Election Study. I just meant to say that  
9 when we decided we'd do it anew, we found  
10 ourselves falling back again to those  
11 questions even though we did a quite  
12 radically new design.

13           MR. TOURANGEAU: There are things  
14 you'd almost certainly do differently though  
15 because of technological drift. You know  
16 the world is a different place than it  
17 was 50 years ago. People weren't doing  
18 telephone studies 50 years ago. So, you  
19 might have given more attention to that.  
20 There is a preponderance, I think, because  
21 of statistical developments -- longitudinal  
22 designs are lot more popular than they

---

1 were 50 years ago.  
2           So, there could be some things  
3 you'd do differently, not because the  
4 choices made, you know, were wrong 50 years  
5 ago but simply because we live in a  
6 different world. That isn't necessarily a  
7 compelling argument to change them.

8           SPEAKER: Right.  
9           MR. TOURANGEAU: You know the  
10 benefits of the time series may outweigh the  
11 gains from these technological advances.

12           DR. CLARKE: On the other hand I  
13 was just -- one of the things I've been  
14 reading is going back and looking at some of  
15 the recommendations that people were making

16 about the study of electoral behavior  
17 nearly 50 years ago.  
18 In this regard there is a very  
19 interesting essay that some of at least the  
20 older people here, I'm one of them of  
21 course, by Peter Rossi called, Four  
22 Landmarks in Voting Behavior Research, which

---

1 was published in a collection of essays in  
2 American Voting Behavior in 1959.  
3 One of the things that's striking,  
4 you know, the actual technology aside in  
5 terms of the details, to me was the emphasis  
6 of things that we -- at least I see in  
7 several of the essays here of the need to  
8 study change, the need -- and then  
9 technically in terms of developing panels.  
10 Some of the other things Henry and  
11 Dan and others work on -- context, bringing  
12 parties -- he says, let's bring parties back  
13 in. This is 1959. So, in a sense, you  
14 know, some of the stuff has, you know, a  
15 familiar quality and there is a sort of a  
16 cyclical dimension to this that I found  
17 really interesting. I went back, I said  
18 this is -- I remember this essay from  
19 graduate school, let's go back and see what  
20 this guy was saying you know, in terms of if  
21 he was here today, you know, what would he  
22 be saying?

---

1 DR. ACHEN: I think one thing too  
2 that's changed from the early days is that  
3 it's just too hard to just put ourselves  
4 back in the situation when NES started and  
5 to remember just how little factual  
6 information we had at that point.  
7 I teach now a course with a  
8 colleague on the history of political  
9 science and if you read people writing in  
10 the '30s, Merriam and others, they're  
11 just desperate to know what the facts on the  
12 ground are. Are there really people out  
13 there who will say things like, well, I'm a  
14 Republican but I'm going to vote Democratic  
15 this year? Is that even a possibility? Or  
16 is your party ID how you're voting this  
17 year? So on and so forth.  
18 What do people say when they're



19 asked questions about their opinions about  
20 the President? Do they have some? Do they  
21 line up with how they're going to vote? Do  
22 they not? In that kind of a world with this

---

1 dearth of purely factual information, I  
2 think when these studies were designed it  
3 was relatively easy to have people sit  
4 around the table and say, yes, this is  
5 something we ought to do.

6 They didn't care what their  
7 theoretical divisions were at that point.  
8 They just had to get the facts straight.  
9 That task has, you know, with the usual  
10 qualifications, largely been accomplished.  
11 We're now in a situation where we have  
12 genuine theoretical divisions, where there  
13 are schools of thought that think more of  
14 one, less of another, and so forth. Those  
15 are reflected in the essays as quite  
16 properly they should be.

17 But, there is I think now, if we  
18 were designing now, there would be greater  
19 emphasis on, what are the bottlenecks within  
20 each of these schools of thought and how  
21 might the survey be directed to help with  
22 those?

---

1 That said, one wants to remember  
2 that the reason we know what these  
3 bottlenecks are is that we have done the NES  
4 for 50 years and we have all had this  
5 information and we've made a lot of  
6 progress. So, by my lights at least, there  
7 is a question about how we'd design if we  
8 were starting over. My guess is it would be  
9 pretty heavily descriptive. That isn't  
10 necessarily helpful for thinking about what  
11 we ought to do now. I think our problem now  
12 is a little different.

13 DR. SCIOLI: How critical is the  
14 core to the discipline of political science  
15 in 2003, 04, 05, 06? You may say the  
16 obvious or you may say the superlative.

17 DR. BURNS: So, I mean, one thing  
18 is it depends on whether you think other  
19 variables are handy to have around for any  
20 kind of innovative analysis that you'd be  
21 interested in doing. So, having two

1 else, whether that by itself would be okay  
2 or whether in fact, I mean to say -- a point  
3 that Mark made, whether in fact you need a  
4 rich array of other, you know, I guess, well  
5 variables, to think about, alternative  
6 theoretical perspectives, that sort of  
7 thing.

8         The other thing is, it kind of  
9 depends on how, I think, it kind of depends  
10 on how one imagines using data in  
11 cross-section, data in multiple cross-  
12 sections, and panel data. I know -- I mean,  
13 I don't know, Inequality is some 700 pages  
14 long. I made up that number but it is some  
15 big huge number.

16         SPEAKER: Some big number. I  
17 think I read them all.

18         DR. BURNS: Right. It's 700 pages  
19 long because it's not a single coefficient.  
20 Right? It works deeply into those data, all  
21 over parts of those data to build an  
22 argument that comes from being -- and that's

---

1 partly what the core enables is for people  
2 to kind of look at it this way, and then  
3 look it that way, and then if this true then  
4 these five things really ought to be true.  
5 But, if these five things aren't true, well,  
6 then that's helpful to know. You know,  
7 that's one of the hallmarks, for example of  
8 voice inequality and it's enabled by a thing  
9 like core.

10         DR. BRADY: Could you just do  
11 something? Just how many minutes are really  
12 devoted to core right now. I mean, let's  
13 define what we mean here by core. My sense  
14 is that --

15  
16         DR. BRADY: Yeah, okay. It's not  
17 an easy question. But it would help to know  
18 roughly just how many minutes and what we  
19 mean by core because my sense is that  
20 actually there's a lot of space in here for  
21 innovation. But I may be wrong.

22         DR. BURNS: Yeah.

---

1 DR. BRADY: Pick a number.  
2 DR. BURNS: No, in a different  
3 moment I would know the answer like  
4 instantly.  
5 So, the 2002 study is 60 minutes. The 2000  
6 study is 130 minutes. The 130 minute  
7 study? I'm going to venture a  
8 number and then I --  
9 DR. KINDER: I have a number in my  
10 head.  
11 DR. BURNS: Then you say it.  
12 DR. KINDER: No, no. You say it  
13 and I'll tell you whether we're in the right  
14 neighborhood.  
15 DR. BURNS: Okay. I'm thinking  
16 it's about half.  
17 DR. KINDER: No, I think it's a  
18 little more than half but I think that's the  
19 right neighborhood.  
20 DR. HANSEN: But there are -- it  
21 should be said, there are two kinds of core  
22 in the conception of the Board. There are

---

1 the items that get carried in every study  
2 and then there are ones that get -- that  
3 sort of go in and out depending upon what  
4 seems to make sense at the time.  
5 DR. BRADY: That core includes the  
6 socio-demographic and all that stuff  
7 obviously.  
8 DR. HANSEN: Yes.  
9 DR. BURNS: Absolutely.  
10 DR. BRADY: So that's a lot of  
11 room.  
12 DR. HANSEN: Yes.  
13 DR. BURNS: Yeah.  
14 DR. BRADY: I mean that's a whole  
15 other study by what I usually do with the  
16 telephone. I mean, it's like three studies  
17 if it's 135, 130 minutes or so. So, you've  
18 got a study and a half there left over.  
19 DR. BURNS: Right. Right.  
20 DR. HANSEN: Well and one of  
21 the -- one of the difficulties I think in  
22 fleecing the core, because we're constantly

---

1 confronted with this tradeoff, between, you  
2 know, if we ask more core, we ask less new

3 stuff. We're constantly confronted with  
4 this but you know while there are some  
5 political constraints on cutting the core  
6 because there are particular research  
7 interests that have built interest around  
8 certain items --

9 DR. BRADY: Trust.

10 DR. HANSEN: It's also the case  
11 that we're always -- the core is there to  
12 support the other kinds of analyses. So, in  
13 some sense, the new content has value  
14 because there is this other existing content  
15 to go along with it.

16 So the difficulty in cutting the  
17 core is there is oftentimes -- the new  
18 content isn't just one thing. It's  
19 oftentimes six or seven different things.  
20 Then the question is, what do we need to go  
21 along with that? That has really been, I  
22 think a chief difficulty in thinking about

---

1 where we would trim back the core.

2 MR. SANTOS: Is core currently  
3 defined by the questions that have appeared  
4 for 50 years or is it things that have  
5 entered into it?

6 DR. BURNS: No, there is a --  
7 every time the survey is about to go in the  
8 field we have -- we keep lists because you  
9 want to know what things have been asked  
10 every time. I think Frank before my time  
11 you were at these meetings. We work on --

12 DR. SCIOLI: Um. Um. Um.

13 (Laughter)

14 DR. BURNS: As a group. So that  
15 the idea is to -- we have these very broad  
16 categories of variables that are called the  
17 core. We put a call out to the community  
18 and ask for feedback. But, often the  
19 feedback isn't all that elaborate, shall we  
20 say. It's more --

21 DR. HANSEN: Does core mean that  
22 it has been asked at least in one previous

---

1 NES?

2 DR. BURNS: Oh, core means  
3 something different than that. Core is --  
4 I'm sorry. It means a theoretical space, a  
5 conceptual category.

6 MR. SANTOS: Okay.  
7 DR. BURNS: It doesn't mean a  
8 question.  
9 MR. SANTOS: Got it.  
10 DR. BURNS: It's totally not a  
11 question. It's a conceptual space, a kind  
12 of category of intellectual investigation.  
13 So it's this category and what happens  
14 inside that category is -- well, whether the  
15 categories ought to stay the same categories  
16 is debated.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 So the categories themselves are  
22 debated and then after that then we go

---

1 through and just smash through the questions  
2 because at the end of the day the time on  
3 the instrument is too precious to carry  
4 something just because.  
5 But, you know, there are some  
6 things that, you know, facilitate -- I mean,  
7 you also don't want it to be -- core to be  
8 defined by the research interests of the  
9 folks on the Board, diverse as those  
10 research interests are. So, fortunately the  
11 folks on the Board read pretty broadly and  
12 so can imagine well, that's how they would  
13 use it, and oh, well that's how they would  
14 use this question.  
15 Well if you  
16 have this question and that question you can  
17 enable -- excuse me -- advances in this,  
18 that, or the other. I don't know if that  
19 helps you to think about it.  
20 MR. SANTOS: That's great.  
21 DR. SCIOLI: Andre.  
22 DR. BLAIS: Well, I'm not sure if

---

1 there is that much space left. Because you  
2 have the core but also there are questions  
3 that you have to ask because of  
4 particularities of the election. I mean, in  
5 Canada for instance, if there is all of a  
6 sudden a new leader with deep religious  
7 beliefs, you've got to ask new questions  
8 about religion. If there is a new issue

9 coming up and you want to, you know, make  
10 sense of the election, you've got to add  
11 these questions, whatever your theoretical  
12 point of view.

13 So, I'm not sure that the room  
14 space is that much because there is core and  
15 then there is new issues that come up in the  
16 election that you cannot afford not to ask  
17 if one of your purpose is also, you know, to  
18 be able to address the questions that  
19 journalists, or sociologists, or historians  
20 will ask you about it.

21 DR. BRADY: That's 65 minutes  
22 Andre. That's a lot of time unless I'm

---

1 doing my arithmetic wrong. That's a lot of  
2 time.

3 DR. MUTZ: I wonder if you could  
4 talk more about what the process is like of  
5 just saying what will fill that remainder of  
6 time that's non-core.

7 DR. BURNS: So, there is a  
8 planning committee. First what we do is we  
9 ask for suggestions from the research --  
10 well, in years past we had pilot studies as  
11 well to innovate and to bring in, you know,  
12 new voices and tryout new instrumentation to  
13 get some -- you know, it seems irresponsible  
14 to carry instrumentation that might fail in,  
15 you know, in the few minutes that we have on  
16 an election study. So, you want to try this  
17 stuff out in advance to a live audience and  
18 so forth.

19 Anyway, so in years past we had  
20 that. But now have -- we don't have that.  
21 We have individual researchers sending in,  
22 oh, we'd really like for you to do this or

---

1 that or the other thing.

2 They are developed. You know,  
3 they are just two sentences. So that's  
4 maybe not quite as helpful. So the Board  
5 does the work of flushing that out. Then  
6 sometimes they're more elaborate.

7 Then -- excuse me -- we compose --  
8 we start this discussion in February among  
9 the Board and then we continue the  
10 discussion right after that with a planning  
11 committee.

12           The planning committee is composed  
13 of some folks who are on the Board and then  
14 folks who are out and about who might have,  
15 you know, kind of cool new things to add, or  
16 different perspectives, or know about  
17 instrumentation, you know, in other places.  
18 Before Steven joined the Board, for example,  
19 he was on the planning committee just before  
20 that. Don Green. I mean a bunch of  
21 people were on that 2000 planning committee.  
22 So that's a large -- not a huge group of

---

1 people, maybe 15 people.  
2           So then what happens is we as the  
3 PIs try to build as much -- offer as much  
4 information for the folks who are going to  
5 show up in a room for two days to argue  
6 about what the content ought to be and part  
7 of that is the information we get from the  
8 community. But again, usually, and this is  
9 partly informing our notions of extension,  
10 usually that information is, you know, you  
11 couldn't just implement it. You have to do  
12 some work to fill that out.

13           So, Don and I run around and try  
14 to fill that out. Board members themselves  
15 run around and try to, you know, fill out  
16 pieces of things, think about research  
17 agendas that could be facilitated. Then we  
18 spend, you know 2 days in a -- it's actually  
19 a battle, which is great. It's a really  
20 lively but no personal stakes sort of  
21 argument for 2 days. Then out of that, you  
22 know, we have an instrument.

---

1           You know, at the very end when the  
2 thing goes into the field sometimes it runs  
3 too long and so there are decisions that  
4 have to be made among the PIs, and any  
5 members of the Board that can be involved,  
6 and the person that's running the planning  
7 committee. Like Bob Huckfeldt ran  
8 the 2000 planning committee for example. I  
9 don't know, does that fill it in?

10           DR. MUTZ: Yeah, I know. Part of  
11 the reason I asked is cause it strikes me  
12 we're talking about two very different kinds  
13 of innovation. From my involvement in the  
14 pilot studies, for example, it seemed our

15 task was innovation but geared to improving  
16 core measurement technique.

17 That's different from innovation  
18 to innovate that doesn't have anything to do  
19 with the core necessarily. So, it seems to  
20 me we need to separate those functions in a  
21 way because they are different. I mean one  
22 is far more constrained by the time series

---

1 and so forth than the other is. So those  
2 two have kind of been mushed together in my  
3 mind over time. But I think they may need  
4 to be differentiated.

5 DR. BURNS: I should say, I mean  
6 one just question that we've been, you know,  
7 kind of grappling with over the last -- it's  
8 been awhile. Don and I since we've been PIs  
9 haven't had pilot studies, I mean haven't  
10 had the funding for pilot studies. So we've  
11 done little, you know, test runs of things  
12 and so forth with private foundation money.  
13 But we haven't done pilot studies. It's  
14 where the space of the innovation gets to  
15 come from.

16 So you know we try again pretty  
17 hard to make sure that the instrumentation  
18 is going to work if it goes on the study,  
19 that it will offer comparison, that sort of  
20 thing. So it's been just to say a little  
21 tricky to figure out where those spaces are  
22 going to be and you ---- is going to offer

---

1 up a lot of, you know, full possibilities  
2 for that.

3 DR. BRADY: Isn't it fair to say,  
4 too that in fact if you compared a '50s  
5 instrument with today's instrument, except  
6 for party ID, likes and dislikes, and maybe  
7 a few other things, probably trust, there  
8 have been many changes. I mean there have  
9 been a lot of changes that the instrument  
10 would just not look the same? I mean we  
11 have gone from -- we have different kind of  
12 issue scales. We have all sorts of new  
13 stuff. So, it's not like the core is what  
14 was done in the 1950s. It's just not the  
15 case.

16 DR. HANSEN: Although it has  
17 accumulated through those innovations,



18 issues, questions, the candidate traits.  
19 DR. BRADY: Yeah, yeah.  
20 DR. BRADBURN: I think you've  
21 answered the question I was going to ask but  
22 let me just -- so let me say what the answer

---

1 is and if I'm wrong about this question of,  
2 what is core?  
3 Because what I was going to ask  
4 was when you think of core is it because in  
5 analysis of continuity you're interested in  
6 changes in marginals or interested in  
7 continuity about relationships. I assume  
8 it's the latter.  
9 Because in the GSS, there's  
10 another core but there the core is meant  
11 very much to keep the questions the same, or  
12 if you change them, change them in ways that  
13 you can preserve a trend line and marginals  
14 because that's one of the big purposes of  
15 that.  
16 So this, to me, gives me a wholly  
17 different view of the notion of what core is  
18 which on the surface at least would suggest  
19 that there's -- if core really means some  
20 concept, let's say, and there the continuity  
21 task I would think is keeping the  
22 equivalence of the concept measurement, not

---

1 the wording or things like that. Which in a  
2 way, I think, would give you, I think, more  
3 room for innovation. Maybe that's what  
4 Diana was talking about, that kind of  
5 innovation.  
6 DR. KINDER: I think it's the same  
7 logic as cross-national research.  
8 DR. BRADBURN: Right.  
9 DR. KINDER: Where the interest in  
10 exploration is to get equivalence on concept  
11 not on the details of it. There is -- I'm  
12 sorry. Just one more thing that I wanted to  
13 interject about core.  
14 It's more complicated than you  
15 think in that core also entails a kind of  
16 commitment not just to content or to  
17 categories of intellectual endeavor as Nancy  
18 was saying, properly so, but to data  
19 collection. It entails a commitment to a  
20 kind of sampling and a kind of mode, at

21 least in the absence of demonstrations  
22 experimental or statistical fixups, that

---

1 relationships won't be altered by mere  
2 shifting of mode or sample from one study to  
3 the next.

4 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah, although I  
5 think the mode problem should be less  
6 problematic if you're not concerned  
7 primarily with the marginals.

8 DR. KINDER: Yeah, you'd think but  
9 I'm not sure that's right.

10 DR. BURNS: Yeah, the results  
11 haven't -- you know, the 2000 study we ran  
12 that mode experiment and it's surprising how  
13 much the difference in mode eats into  
14 relationships.

15 DR. BRADBURN: Well were they  
16 really trying to change the way -- the way  
17 you measure the concept to take into account  
18 the mode?

19 DR. BURNS: Yes. The idea was  
20 best practices side by side.

21 DR. BRADBURN: Okay.

22 DR. LEMPert: Nancy, I just want

---

1 to follow up a remark you made that you  
2 don't have funds for pilot studies.

3 DR. BURNS: Uh-huh.

4 DR. LEMPert: What have the  
5 implications of that been? Have there been  
6 questions or concepts you have not explored  
7 because you thought it was so necessary to  
8 pilot them that you couldn't go in? If  
9 you've asked questions without pilots have  
10 you found some things have kind of blown-up  
11 and you haven't been able to make sense of  
12 them? Or is this just kind of been very  
13 smooth and you wonder why you ever spent  
14 money on pilots in the first place?

15 DR. KINDER: I think the problems  
16 are invisible to us. My guess is that it's  
17 been something of a disaster because pilots  
18 are this space that NES creates to generate  
19 ideas on the expectation that should those  
20 ideas pan out they'll end up in the National  
21 Election Study. That's a huge incentive for  
22 people to think seriously both about

---

1 measurement, which you want to put in a  
2 different category which is fine by me, but  
3 also the innovation which has to do with  
4 entirely new instrumentation or a new way of  
5 thinking about something.

6 In the absence of panel studies --  
7 or pilot studies, excuse me, that path has  
8 really been cut off. I think it's a very  
9 serious liability for the refreshment and  
10 replenishment of NES as a kind of venue for  
11 especially new ideas.

12 DR. LEMPert: How much money are  
13 we talking about? I mean suppose we said  
14 that we really want to put back in the pilot  
15 without losing anything. How much money are  
16 we talking about?

17 DR. KINDER: You can do them  
18 for \$2,000, maybe less than that. I mean --  
19 to me, I mean this is an argument we don't  
20 always win. But, to me, the intellectual  
21 payoff from pilot studies is enormous. It's  
22 the most efficient thing we do by way of

---

1 spending for intellectual payoff.

2 DR. BRADY: For that amount of  
3 money, Don, how many pilot studies? Is that  
4 one?

5 DR. KINDER: I was thinking one.

6 DR. BRADY: One for \$100,000?

7 DR. KINDER: Yeah. You know  
8 it's 5-600 cases. There are re- interviews  
9 typically of people who have already  
10 participated in full-blown NES studies so we  
11 have all that material on them already.

12 MR. SANTOS: I hate to ask, but  
13 how many regular NES cases would 100,000  
14 bucks buy?

15 DR. KINDER: Not as many as we'd  
16 like.

17 DR. BURNS: The problem is in --

18 MR. SANTOS: Well, if it's not a  
19 lot so you're still getting like percent of  
20 the sample size then one could transfer the  
21 funds over to --

22 DR. HANSEN: The difficulty though

---

1 is then the sample size has been trimmed,  
2 and trimmed, and trimmed, and trimmed, and

3 trimmed already --

4 MR. SANTOS: So, it's now at a  
5 minimum?

6 DR. HANSEN: So, by the time the  
7 funding for pilot studies disappeared, there  
8 was real concern that it had reached a point  
9 where sort of we needed every last case in  
10 the production study.

11 DR. BRADBURN: But, just to --  
12 you've got an operational issue. I mean  
13 there are different ways of doing pilot  
14 studies. You can do a number of short  
15 focused ones or it sounds like what you do  
16 is package a lot of developmentals into one  
17 sort of pretty much altogether, like the  
18 final product but with a smaller sample  
19 size.

20 DR. BURNS: Yeah we did one -- I  
21 was thinking I mis-spoke a second ago. We  
22 had a version of a pilot study our first

---

1 year. We got funding from Russell Sage to  
2 do a study of social capital and to rework,  
3 reconfigure measures of social capital and  
4 social trust.

5 DR. BRADY: Social trust is okay.  
6 It's trust in government I have trouble  
7 with.

8 DR. KINDER: You haven't read our  
9 technical report. It's not.

10 DR. BRADY: Well, then good.

11 DR. BURNS: It's not okay at all.

12 So that was -- it was a special topic. So  
13 we used -- it was less extensive because it  
14 was focused on, you know, one set of  
15 questions, empaneling the folks from before  
16 so you had a long battery of questions to  
17 add to.

18 MR. SANTOS: Was there ever any  
19 consideration given to taking the regular  
20 NES and forming a module that represents  
21 say 10% of the total time and devote that to  
22 what would normally go into the pilots?

---

1 That didn't work, huh?

2 DR. KINDER: No, I'm just wracking  
3 my brain thinking whether we ever had that  
4 conversation. We've talked about  
5 restoration of pilot studies in various

6 forms, and we've talked about modularizing  
7 NESs in the way that GSS has without  
8 settling anything on either front. But I  
9 don't think we've talked about the two  
10 things together.

11 DR. BLAIS: In the old days,  
12 again, to give you a little historical  
13 background, somebody might correct me if I  
14 wrong, but I think a lot of -- early on for  
15 piloting with the NES, they used something  
16 called the Detroit Area Study. They used to  
17 take at least a lot of the sort of question  
18 wording ideas they wanted to try out and  
19 work with it locally.

20 So, I think sort of the larger  
21 point being, depending on what you want to  
22 do with the pilot, there may well be

---

1 substantial economies you can achieve  
2 whereas in other cases in which you think  
3 you need representation, of course it  
4 becomes a very expensive enterprise.

5 DR. BURNS: One of the questions  
6 that you asked a minute ago was what do we  
7 do given that we don't have these, how do we  
8 do the innovation? So what we've been doing  
9 is small adaptations of, you know, existing  
10 batteries of questions. Not necessarily  
11 questions that we've asked but questions  
12 asked around.

13 We've drawn on since beginning  
14 in 2000 -- we expanded, for example, our  
15 battery of non-electoral participation and  
16 we're fortunate to have both the  
17 participation study and then the  
18 study that came before that -- to use  
19 that to kind of do a lot of reliability work  
20 with that and then figure out which would be  
21 the things that one would want to carry. So  
22 that instrumentation is on 2000 and on 2002.

---

1 So we've, you know, done the  
2 things that we would have done anyway but  
3 the kind of radical developments haven't --  
4 there is not a mechanism to enable right  
5 now.

6 MR. SANTOS: Maybe you could  
7 capture a little piece of the GSS, use that  
8 for the pilot.

9 DR. SCIOLI: Let me get back just  
10 for a second to this question that  
11 incorporates Rick and John Lennon. Imagine  
12 there is no core. I'm thinking that a lot  
13 of the arguments we hear at the program  
14 level that the core -- you know, from the  
15 modest, to it's critical to careers, and  
16 theoretical advancement will stop if the  
17 core is not present.

18 Having heard comments about the  
19 conceptual frameworks in which the core  
20 actually operates, technically then the  
21 community could evaluate whether one set of  
22 conceptual frameworks is better than

---

1 another. So there is no conceptual  
2 framework that trumps any other and in some  
3 of the papers I had the feeling that there  
4 were items that, you know, if it's the  
5 scales or whatever, if they weren't present  
6 then we really kind of truncated any future  
7 progress or any legacy of intellectual  
8 development that we have.

9 I'm imagining a group of people  
10 sitting around a table like this looking at  
11 five proposals from different groups and  
12 saying, well, gee, this group of conceptual  
13 frameworks is very exciting. It doesn't  
14 include more than 5 percent of what was on  
15 the last ANES. I mean it has all the  
16 demographic stuff, the party ID, but beyond  
17 that.

18 Now, you know, what would happen  
19 in the discipline, political science-wise?  
20 Chris? Or Henry since you're, you know.

21 DR. BRADY: I'll let Chris. Chris  
22 is always smarter on these things.

---

1 DR. ACHEN: Well, I don't know how  
2 smart. But I think it's important to  
3 remember that the core isn't just somebody  
4 out there at, you know, West Nail Polish  
5 Tech who has been studying trust in  
6 government for 50 years. It's also just  
7 having a continuous set of questions over  
8 time that you can exploit for all kinds of  
9 other reasons.

10 So, I was looking a couple of  
11 years ago, for example, at this question

12 of -- it's so common in the formal  
13 literature on loss functions -- Are loss  
14 functions quadratic, or linear, or whatever?  
15 We don't know anything at all about this.

16 I decided to see whether I could  
17 exploit something in the NES. I wound up  
18 using the abortion question because it's got  
19 four positions on the scale. the reason that  
20 works is that it's been asked the same way  
21 every year with the exception of this little  
22 shift in 1980. Even in that year I think

---

1 several of us wrote in and said, when you --  
2 because they changed the wording slightly --  
3 when you change it, be sure to overlap the  
4 old question and the new question. They did  
5 that. So, you can just run this thing right  
6 through the whole period. I had not the  
7 slightest interest in the abortion question  
8 per se.

9 But a lot of people have done  
10 things like that. So, I think having a long  
11 running set of items that have been asked  
12 the same way over a long period of time is  
13 important in ways that you don't think of  
14 when you think that it's core and it's the  
15 same old people, studying the same old  
16 question, the same old way. That's not  
17 necessarily the case.

18 DR. BRADY: If you're studying the  
19 New Deal Coalition having the government  
20 guarantee jobs question repeated. I mean,  
21 in some ways it's a bizarre question. It  
22 has one end which is about we should have

---

1 government guaranteed jobs for everybody  
2 and I don't know that anybody has proposed  
3 that ever in this country. But  
4 nevertheless, the question seems to work.  
5 It seems to get at a New Deal dimension.  
6 It's been great to have because you can look  
7 at over time what's happened to sort of New  
8 Deal sentiments.

9 DR. HANSEN: I think the key thing  
10 I see is core is the ability to go back to  
11 the data and to analyze new questions using  
12 the old data. That is, you know, in some  
13 sense innovation, in sort of talking about  
14 innovation we're very much sort of future

15 focused. What should be the new content?  
16 What should be the new ideas that get  
17 carried on the survey?  
18 But another element of innovation  
19 is innovative use of the data that already  
20 exists. A lot of that has been made  
21 possible because there has been consistency  
22 through time in what's been carried on the

---

1 survey.

2 DR. SCIOLI: Well, we won't  
3 resolve these issues now. But thanks very  
4 much for your candor. Let's take a break.  
5 And -- assuming these will be themes that  
6 run through all the discussions -- and  
7 return in 15 minutes for the next set.

8 (Recess)

9

10

11

12 CROSS NATIONAL COMPARISONS

13 DR. SCIOLI: Okay, let's continue  
14 and we're going to -- oh, okay.

15 Cross-National Comparisons. Andre can you  
16 summarize your comments, please? Then we'll  
17 go to Harold, and Ian, and Richard.

18 DR. BLAIS: Yes. First, thanks so  
19 much for inviting me. It's a real pleasure  
20 to perhaps share thoughts about how we  
21 should do election studies.

22 First of all I'd like to mention

---

1 that this is the Canadian Election Study.  
2 There is no "National" in Canada because  
3 we're still debating whether we are a  
4 nation, two, or three. So the best solution  
5 is to drop the word, "National," for the  
6 time being at least.

7 DR. BRADY: I knew you were going  
8 to do that Andre. I just knew you would.  
9 There's a lot of politics here guys, in case  
10 you want to know.

11 DR. BLAIS: I mention here that  
12 election studies have been done since 1968.  
13 In fact, it's since 1965. I wasn't quite  
14 sure whether the -- what's the council? --  
15 the Research Council founded it or not. I  
16 think it was probably founded by a Royal  
17 Commission but I don't know. But basically,



18 there have been election studies since 1965.  
19 So, it's 10 elections out of 11. There have  
20 been election studies for each of the last 8  
21 elections.

22 The election studies have been

---

1 funded under the Major Collaborative  
2 Research Initiatives program which funds  
3 major projects over a 5 year period. These  
4 projects typically involve huge research  
5 teams, basically usually about a team of  
6 about 20 researchers coming from about 10  
7 universities and crossing usually about 3  
8 or 4 disciplines.

9 These are the competitors with the  
10 Canadian Election Study. There will be  
11 typically --in every year there is a new  
12 competition. There will be about 30  
13 projects, letters of intention submitted.  
14 Usually, about 10 of these projects will be  
15 deemed to be interesting enough for a second  
16 stage of the competition. The person in  
17 charge of these projects will present  
18 detailed proposals. At the end of the  
19 process, which starts in January and ends in  
20 December, usually five of these projects get  
21 funded.

22 At least in the last four election

---

1 studies, in each time there was an election  
2 study. But, of course there is no guarantee  
3 at all that there will be an election study  
4 because there is no special fund being set  
5 apart for election studies. So, we are  
6 competing with others.

7 There is the one case in 1972  
8 where there was no election study and in a  
9 few instances there were also a couple of  
10 proposals coming from different teams.

11 There was a huge problem with the  
12 timetable. The last two elections in which  
13 I was the principal co-investigator I was  
14 really bad lucky. The 1997 study got funded  
15 in January 1997 and the election was called  
16 in April. In 2000, a snap election was  
17 called in October, it took place in  
18 November, and was funded in December. I  
19 will tell you exactly how we got the money  
20 at the end but there was an election study.

21                   The MCRI program is very much  
22                   geared to fund what are called excellent,

---

1                   new frontier, cutting edge, whatever. So,  
2                   basically the focus is very much on  
3                   innovation. So, if -- I guess the  
4                   co-investigators who prepare proposals have  
5                   this very much in mind. We've got to  
6                   demonstrate that the new study will be the  
7                   best ever, better than anywhere in the  
8                   world, that it will of course build on what  
9                   we already know, but that it will be  
10                  extremely new knowledge being produced by  
11                  the team.

12                  The SHRCC I guess is also very  
13                  keen on international collaboration. That's  
14                  why we have been involved in the CSES  
15                  project in which ANES was also very much  
16                  involved. We've also initiated another  
17                  project involving nine countries about the  
18                  impact of leaders in elections in which  
19                  Australia is also involved.

20                  The total budget that we had for  
21                  the last 2000 election study gives you some  
22                  perspective of the amount money involved.

---

1                   It's about \$1 million (US) for a 5 year  
2                   period. Basically there is also this  
3                   problem of timing here which is, for  
4                   instance there is a new team now applying  
5                   for the next election study. If they get  
6                   the money, they will start getting money  
7                   next year and then there will be two  
8                   election studies going on for a certain  
9                   period of time, for a couple of years.

10                  The program gives money not only  
11                  to collect the data. In fact, it's a  
12                  relatively small factor in the whole budget.  
13                  The program is very keen about student  
14                  training and dissemination of research. So  
15                  this is why a large fraction of the budget  
16                  goes to graduate students, post-docs, and  
17                  also to fund travel for co- investigators'  
18                  travel expenses, the organization of  
19                  workshops and seminars. I will say a few  
20                  words about that in a minute.

21                  The design is basically  
22                  since 1988, it's a campaign telephone voting

---

1 cross-section with about 3500 respondents.  
2 Then telephone re- interview after the  
3 elections and also a mail out questionnaire  
4 to all of those who still want to  
5 collaborate with the project. We also do  
6 content analysis of television news which  
7 are part of what, well, at least the teams  
8 have been proposing in the last --  
9 since 1988.

10 The most original component is, of  
11 course, the campaign rolling cross-section  
12 and this is why much of the focus of our  
13 analysis has been on the impact of campaigns  
14 and also on priming effects. We've been  
15 lucky enough, especially in 1988 in which  
16 there was a very, very substantial change  
17 during the campaign -- it has been less the  
18 case in the most recent election-- but  
19 still, in each and every instance we've been  
20 able to document the substantial presence of  
21 campaign effects.

22 Region is a huge concern in

---

1 Canada. First the set of choices differs in  
2 Quebec and the rest of the country. We've  
3 got to perform different analysis of Quebec  
4 and the rest of the country because there is  
5 one party which does not have candidates  
6 other than Quebec, candidates only in  
7 Quebec. Which means that in all analysis,  
8 almost all analysis we do a separate  
9 analysis of Quebec and the rest of the  
10 Canada. Even outside Quebec we often  
11 perform separate analysis of vote choice in  
12 Ontario and the West because the regional  
13 cleavage is so strong.

14 We are very much concerned about  
15 sample size. We started at 2,500 but we  
16 basically ended up in the post-election with  
17 about 3,000. In the last proposal we  
18 proposed to double the size, the sample  
19 size, to 7,000 and we would have done so if  
20 the Prime Minister wouldn't have decided to  
21 call a snap election which prevented us from  
22 doing so because we wouldn't have had the

---

1 grant to do it. This is I think a very

2 clear indication that we are concerned with  
3 large ends. In fact we want to increase the  
4 sample size and we find it very, very  
5 difficult, I guess to deal with the  
6 relatively small sample sizes that you have  
7 in the U.S.

8 We are also very interested  
9 generally in the impact of the media. So  
10 this is why we have devoted quite a bit of  
11 time in doing some analysis, content  
12 analysis, but also of respondents' reactions  
13 to the news. So we've tried some innovative  
14 work on that point.

15 I should perhaps also mention that  
16 I think the new team that will be proposing  
17 the next election study is also now  
18 proposing to do provincial election studies  
19 on top of the federal election study so the  
20 same kind of interest I see here about  
21 different complexes of institutions is also  
22 present.

---

1 DR. BRADY: In all the provinces,  
2 Andre?

3 DR. BLAIS: In a few provinces.

4 DR. BRADY: Not PEI, for example.

5 DR. BLAIS: Not all of them. We  
6 also -- the panel component, we have a short  
7 term panel because we have pre and post.  
8 So, we have a panel but we don't have long  
9 term panels. I think this is probably one  
10 of the main shortcomings of Canadian  
11 election studies. I think it's pretty sad  
12 that we haven't had long term panels in the  
13 recent past.

14 We haven't had candidate  
15 questionnaires which I think also -- which  
16 you have, for instance, in Australia. Which  
17 I think is also a short coming. We've been  
18 in touch with teams which were intending to  
19 do candidate questionnaires. We've been  
20 linking and there are some common questions  
21 but I think it would be much better if they  
22 had been coordinated and fully integrated

---

1 and that's probably one thing that we should  
2 think about.

3 Also I want to mention that in  
4 Canada we have two questionnaires. One

5 English, one French, which might seem  
6 obvious. But we are working, always working  
7 on the two questionnaires simultaneously.  
8 So we when work on the question, we do both  
9 French and English questions. I'm sure that  
10 Henry will remember some of the very  
11 interesting --

12 DR. BRADY: It gave us very decent  
13 questionnaires.

14 DR. BLAIS: Yes. We had a very  
15 lengthy discussion about leader traits and  
16 how to translate these leader traits into  
17 French. I had to convince my colleagues  
18 that in French it is probably okay to be  
19 indecent -- perhaps on Valentine's Day it  
20 might be acceptable. But, people cannot be  
21 decent. You are indecent -- or I don't know  
22 exactly. But, the problem of translation is

---

1 really, really remarkable and it's extremely  
2 difficult to come up with similar questions.  
3 We have to agree on the two versions of the  
4 questionnaires when we work on them --

5 DR. BRADY: But also Andre you  
6 remember your other questions. Would you  
7 drink a decent wine? He asked us.

8 (Laughter)

9 DR. BLAIS: So, these are some of  
10 the questions that we've been working on.  
11 In terms of substantive contributions as I  
12 mentioned, a clear focus on campaign  
13 dynamics. This has been, I think the  
14 emphasis in all of the recent election  
15 studies. A great interest in impact of  
16 media, though my personal, I guess, verdict  
17 on this is that the findings have been  
18 somewhat equivocal. This is my personal  
19 verdict, perhaps people will not quite  
20 agree.  
21 A great interest in the role of  
22 information in elections, in the 1997

---

1 election study in particular and also  
2 the 2000. There are a lot of questions  
3 about information, different kinds of  
4 information and so on. I think this -- we're  
5 still working on this question. I think  
6 this is very important.

7 A major concern with measurement

8 issues and with experiments. Of course, the  
9 telephone helps on that front. We've been  
10 doing quite a bit of experiments all the way  
11 through, especially with questions of party  
12 identification.

13 Questions on strategic voting.

14 That's a case, I think, where the  
15 inspiration came from probably the U.S. and  
16 also this was premised, I think on  
17 expectations. So we've been benefitting  
18 from these panel studies. We have used the  
19 old, I guess, questions about perceptions of  
20 various parties' chances of winning. I  
21 still have some doubts about these questions  
22 but I think these are the best in the world

---

1 and thanks to the U.S. for this.

2 Finally the question for turnout.

3 It's now a hot topic in Canada because  
4 turnout has declined very substantially.

5 Turnout was 61% in the last election.

6 Basically the Canadian Election Studies  
7 include very few questions on turnout. We  
8 find it very difficult to be able to  
9 integrate. The analysis of vote choice on  
10 one hand and the decision to vote or not to  
11 vote on the other hand seems to be two  
12 different kinds of questions.

13 That's another limitation of the  
14 election studies though recently what we've  
15 done is pooling all the election studies  
16 since '65 to try to disentangle life cycle  
17 and generation effects. That I think is --  
18 I think is an interesting approach.

19 In terms of governments and  
20 accountability perhaps I would just stress  
21 the last point which is that the funding  
22 agency, SHRCC strongly urges us to

---

1 disseminate findings to the interested  
2 public. So, we know that if we want to get  
3 funded we've got to please them. To please  
4 them is to basically make sure, you know,  
5 the election study will be, you know, known  
6 to the interested public.

7 So, right after the election we  
8 write pieces for the newspapers. We launch  
9 our book in the press club. We have links  
10 with the journalists. We have journalists

11 on our advisory board. Last year we  
12 organized one big workshop in Toronto at the  
13 time of the CPSA mostly for registrants to  
14 show them how to utilize the Canadian  
15 election study. That's a very important  
16 part of our program. We want to make sure  
17 that as many people as possible do utilize  
18 the election study.

19 In Canada then the impetus is very  
20 much on innovation. In fact, continuity is  
21 a problem for us. We've got to be competing  
22 with other teams and the usual -- There are

---

1 two criticisms. First, it's only political  
2 scientists. Why don't you integrate  
3 sociologists, historians, economists, and so  
4 on? Then, you know, why -- the second  
5 question is why another election study?  
6 These are the questions which we are asked  
7 and that's why it's making it more and more  
8 difficult to get funded because you've got  
9 to show every time that this is the best  
10 one, this is very important, and that it  
11 will discover very interesting new things.

12 Either way, the teams that compete  
13 must come up with some innovations. So,  
14 this time, for instance, the new team is  
15 proposing a combination of federal election  
16 studies with provincial election studies,  
17 and on top of that comparison with  
18 Australia, Germany, I think that study is  
19 supposed to be linked to Australia, Germany,  
20 and another federation to look at  
21 specifically the impact of accountability on  
22 vote choice. So, it has to be a special

---

1 theme, a special innovation, and there is  
2 very little emphasis on continuity. In  
3 fact, if we do too much continuity, we might  
4 be less likely to be funded.

5 DR. SCIOLI: Thank you. Harold,  
6 can you in 10 minutes tell us --

7 DR. CLARKE: Oh, we're not going  
8 to get a chance to ask some questions?

9 DR. SCIOLI: No, let's wait until  
10 we hear the --

11 DR. CLARKE: As I indicated  
12 earlier on the election studies that are  
13 done in countries like Great Britain, I

14 think Australia it's true it's well, and  
15 certainly in Canada, owe a large  
16 intellectual to the American National  
17 Election Studies and in particular to  
18 principal investigators such as Converse in  
19 particular who -- and Don Stokes who were  
20 instrumental in founding the ANES research  
21 program.  
22 I have over the years worked as

---

1 both a PI for the Canadian studies but more  
2 recently for the BES, British Election  
3 Study. Again the distinction between study  
4 and survey is one that's made. But,  
5 certainly the British election study has  
6 largely been a survey based project, much  
7 like the ANES.  
8       Historically it began at Nuffield  
9 College with the famous collaboration  
10 between David Butler and Donald Stokes which  
11 produced a series of three national election  
12 studies in 1964, 1966, and 1970. They are a  
13 very well known book, Political Change in  
14 Britain.  
15       Their research has really set the  
16 agenda for all subsequent work in terms of  
17 the nature of the surveys, the kinds of  
18 questions that have been asked, the various  
19 intellectual debates that have gone on.  
20       During the 1970s the study moved  
21 to the University of Essex under the  
22 direction of Ivor Crewe and Bruce Solvac

---

1 with close collaboration by Jim Alt  
2 as well. Then in the 1980s it went back to  
3 Nuffield and then more recently back to  
4 Essex where I've been involved.  
5       A few words on sort of nuts and  
6 bolts of funding because I think it's a  
7 very, very important consideration. The BES  
8 has been funded over the years by something  
9 called the ESRC, the Economics and Social  
10 Research Council which is the British  
11 equivalent of the National Science  
12 Foundation for social science research.  
13       There is no guarantee from one  
14 election cycle to the next that there will  
15 be a British Election Study. Free  
16 competition is the norm as well. So, that



17 if in fact the ESRC puts out a notification  
18 for a competition, it will be indeed be  
19 exactly that. In 2001 that's exactly what  
20 happened and the team from Essex, of which  
21 I'm a part, was -- you know, was successful  
22 in that competition.

---

1 One of the things, again a  
2 practical point, but one which is I think of  
3 considerable moment for the planning and  
4 execution of a study is that the  
5 notification of award in the British context  
6 tends to come quite late in the life of a  
7 Parliament or in what, you know, the life of  
8 Parliament, of course we really don't know.

9 But it tends to come in at least  
10 the third year or maybe even a little later  
11 and that causes, you know, understandable  
12 problems for the planning and execution of  
13 the project, in particular now, since as I  
14 found out to my chagrin that we have to have  
15 upwards of a 6 month period to comply with  
16 tendering rules of the European Union.

17 So we had to go out and solicit  
18 bids and they have a way of doing this,  
19 making publicly -- you know, public notice  
20 that we will entertain bids from survey  
21 firms, and so forth. But, then we have to  
22 wait --these things close for 6 months --

---

1 and react to them. That's a real problem.

2 In terms of the amount of funding,  
3 and again, in very sharp contrast to the  
4 Australian study that we will soon hear  
5 about, our funding was approximately \$1.2  
6 million, the base funding, and then there  
7 was some top up after that, with  
8 approximately 85 percent of that amount,  
9 being quite different from the Canadian  
10 case, going to the field work.

11 All we had in terms of  
12 infrastructure really were a couple of small  
13 offices in the Government Department at  
14 Essex. Maybe you've been there, you know  
15 these are small offices. We hired two  
16 research -- really graduate students.  
17 You're supposed to call them research  
18 officers over there. But there were two  
19 senior graduate students to work on the

20 project as well as a part-time secretary to  
21 keep us out of jail, to keep the finances  
22 straight and so forth, and a little bit of

---

1 travel money so that we could go back and  
2 forth to work on the project.  
3 Design features generally and  
4 briefly. The British Election Studies from  
5 the beginning, the centerpiece has been the  
6 post-election in-person interview with a  
7 representative. National sample. The ESRC  
8 mandated in 2001 that any successful team  
9 would have to maintain that as a centerpiece  
10 of their design. So, even if you wanted you  
11 couldn't go off and do Internet study. You  
12 couldn't do a telephone study. As a  
13 centerpiece you had to maintain -- you could  
14 do other things within the funding limits,  
15 but you had to do this. Indeed, we did.  
16 The second thing is historically,  
17 like Andre has mentioned in the Canadian  
18 case, the ends have been large in the  
19 British survey. For the last three surveys  
20 they've been all up above 3,500, a little  
21 less in ours -- we were 3219. But compared  
22 to the American ANES, these are very large

---

1 ends indeed.  
2 Another and I think extremely  
3 valuable component of this I have found as  
4 we have worked through our research is right  
5 from the very beginning with the  
6 intellectual agenda set by Butler and  
7 Stokes, there has been a real strong  
8 interest in individual level dynamics. So  
9 there are several very valuable multi-wave  
10 panels. Most of these have been  
11 inter-election but some have, you know, from  
12 one -- re-interviewing people across  
13 election cycles but there are inner election  
14 components as well.  
15 In this regard, I think it's  
16 important to note that this effort has been  
17 significantly enhanced by work at the Centre  
18 for Research in Economic and Social Trends  
19 at Nuffield during the 1990s where they have  
20 done a series of very large and impressive  
21 inter-election panels even on a yearly  
22 basis.

---

1 I found these data to just be  
2 terrific additions to the BES. They really  
3 dovetailed the BES and significantly -- you  
4 heard the leverage earlier this morning from  
5 the Michigan team -- and they certainly do,  
6 these studies really leverage your ability  
7 to understand in the election surveys per  
8 se.

9 We've got a variety of other bells  
10 and whistles that we've added. Most --  
11 in 2001 I think the most notable would be an  
12 attempt to try to follow the line of  
13 research initiated by Henry and Andre and  
14 Dick Johnston with a rolling cross-sectional  
15 telephone survey with the post-election  
16 interview trying to actually -- actually in  
17 the end implement and estimate a graph like  
18 Henry has developed. Although I might  
19 disagree with it, that's another  
20 conversation. But, we tried to do that  
21 research basically, to have that component  
22 and we were able to bring that into our

---

1 study.

2 Consultation exercises? Yes.  
3 Like in terms of how we set up our  
4 instrument, like what's the core and what do  
5 you put in, and what do you take out. We  
6 had two consultation exercises in  
7 preparation for -- as part of our  
8 development of the 2001 survey instruments,  
9 one at the University of Sheffield and a  
10 second one at the University of Essex.

11 How did we make our choices? We  
12 made our choices in a pretty ruthless sort  
13 of way. We decided that what our  
14 centerpiece intellectually would be in 2001  
15 was that it was high time, we thought, to  
16 really try to address some of the relative  
17 explanatory power and utility of major  
18 theories of electoral choice that have been  
19 around for a long time.

20 These are the questions that you  
21 get from outsiders. They say, well what  
22 have you guys, like what you have learned

---

1 lately? Like, what's the value of this

2 study? Why is this study taking us anywhere  
3 further than the, you know, really excellent  
4 work that was done in The American Voter or  
5 Political Change in Britain. Do you guys  
6 really know anymore or, like, what's going  
7 on here?

8         So we really tried to do this and  
9 we used a -- we said, okay, let's take an  
10 inventory of these major theories. We all  
11 know them pretty well. This is what we  
12 teach. This is what we research. When  
13 we're deciding what gets into the survey  
14 instruments and what will have to go, it's  
15 what will provide us with really good  
16 instrumentation to address these theories in  
17 a fair way.

18         So, that everybody -- you know,  
19 all these different theoretical  
20 perspectives, or the several that we could  
21 accommodate, had really good measures in  
22 there. So we could really go after this.

---

1 That has to do with electoral choice mainly  
2 in terms of voting for Party A or Party B.

3         Another thing, though, we did and  
4 very much along the ideas that Andre was  
5 talking about, was to pursue the question of  
6 turnout. In the British context, turnout  
7 has always been assumed. If you go back to  
8 Butler and Stokes you will find there is not  
9 a single individual level analysis of  
10 turnout.

11         To be sure turnout is recognized,  
12 particularly in their context, differential  
13 turnout across social classes is recognized  
14 as a determinable election outcome  
15 potentially. But, if you go looking for  
16 like who votes and who doesn't, you're  
17 looking for a regression, you're not going  
18 to find it.

19         So given what we knew was going on  
20 in the British context and elsewhere, we  
21 said, hey we're going to make this an  
22 important component. We're game. We're

---

1 going to take rival theories, including the  
2 civic volunteerism model, Henry, and some  
3 others, several others. We're going to put  
4 researchers in a position where they can

5 horse race these models using, you know,  
6 appropriate kinds of techniques within the  
7 limits of survey methodology.

8 Okay. What did we find? I  
9 won't -- that's on page 4, we'll let that go  
10 for now. Dissemination of findings. We  
11 took it as an imperative, like, this is  
12 something you should do is to provide these  
13 data very quickly. As soon as we could get  
14 our data out to researchers, they're going  
15 to be there.

16 So what we did even during -- and  
17 again, we're under, we have this sort of  
18 thing like talk to the community. In  
19 Britain it's really important to talk to  
20 what they call multiple user communities,  
21 which are the press, you know, students,  
22 whatever.

---

1 To this end during the -- every  
2 morning I got up at 6:30 in the morning and  
3 would make up the -- would update these  
4 graphs for the rolling cross-sections during  
5 the election campaign. We worried a little  
6 bit about this. Maybe we'd be sued by a  
7 party that wasn't doing so well. In fact,  
8 that actually happened in New Zealand. But  
9 we decided to go ahead and try it.

10 So every day you could get up on  
11 the BES Web site and you could look at the  
12 evolution of party support as our rolling  
13 cross-section was revealed.

14 Then after the election was over  
15 and we had the data in hand, we, you know,  
16 very quickly put together a useable -- I  
17 spent an entire summer sitting at home  
18 basically doing this. Putting our data sets  
19 together and getting them up on the Web,  
20 having them available. The election was in  
21 June. The data sets were available in  
22 mid-September. They were useable versions,

---

1 not the final archive versions. But they  
2 were useable versions of a lot of the stuff  
3 that we had gathered.

4 We also then went to something  
5 called the EPOP meeting, Elections Public  
6 Opinion and Parties which is the British --  
7 it's the equivalent of the Voting &

8 Elections group for the APSA. They had  
9 their meeting in September and we handed out  
10 CDs to everybody and had a workshop on, you  
11 know, where we were with the study.

12 Then later, of course, we had gone  
13 ahead and archived, prepared the official  
14 version with the Essex archive, which is a  
15 mandated thing to do, and put in all the  
16 accompanying documentation, the technical  
17 stuff that people want for the historical  
18 record.

19 So, that's where we are on the  
20 British Election Study. There is no  
21 guarantee that there will be another one. I  
22 would emphasize here in terms of a planning

---

1 sort of exercise in the ANES that this is  
2 one of the things, of course, that's very  
3 worrisome. We don't even know and now there  
4 hasn't even been an announcement of a bid.  
5 Will there be a -- like can you guys like --  
6 we're going to try to do one again but we  
7 just go ahead and start putting things  
8 together hoping, and actually making some  
9 entreaties as people are here, of course. I  
10 think we should do this but there is no  
11 guarantee.

12 DR. SCIOLI: Thank you, Harold,  
13 for condensing a lot of information into a  
14 short period of time and we apologize for  
15 having you do that. Ian.

16 MR. McAllister: Thanks very  
17 much. Well I'd just like to add my  
18 appreciation for the opportunity to  
19 participate in this exercise because we're  
20 doing a very similar thing in Australia in  
21 the moment so it's very timely.

22 Well in comparison to the ANES,

---

1 the BES, and most other election surveys, we  
2 are a relatively recent survey operation.  
3 We commenced our first survey in 1987.  
4 Since then we've conducted seven surveys,  
5 one covering a referendum. But, there were  
6 three earlier academic surveys of political  
7 opinion in 1967, '69, and '79.

8 Just getting on to Harold's point  
9 about the legacy of the ANES, one of the  
10 principal investigators in '67 was Donald

11 Stokes who took with him the ANES and then  
12 his experience with Political Change in  
13 Britain and so on. So, we have effectively  
14 been living within this framework right back  
15 from the 1960s.

16 One of the things we do in the  
17 survey is routinely include a candidate  
18 component into this study. We regard it as  
19 important to include candidates for the  
20 simple reason that we believe that it's very  
21 difficult to understand the dynamics of  
22 political choice unless we understand elite

---

1 strategies.

2 So we do a candidate survey  
3 completely integrated with the mass voter  
4 survey. That allows us to address a whole  
5 series of questions about representation,  
6 about campaign effects and strategies, and  
7 so on. But also it allows us to look at  
8 things like legislative recruitment, elite  
9 socialization, and so on.

10 In terms of funding, the very  
11 first study was funded by a consortium of  
12 Australian universities. Subsequent studies  
13 have been funded by the Australian Research  
14 Council, the equivalent of the NSF. It's  
15 done on a one off basis. There is no  
16 guarantee the survey will be carried out.  
17 We have to put up a proposal which is  
18 intellectually rigorous to conduct the  
19 survey to address some particular problem in  
20 political science. You'll see the various  
21 topics we've chosen since 1987 have really  
22 been an attempt to try and do that.

---

1 The most recent survey in 2001 was  
2 on challenges to governance and we're just  
3 working on the current proposal which is on  
4 the, our theme is around the decline of  
5 political parties.

6 Like the other surveys we make our  
7 data available on a public basis as soon as  
8 it's collected.

9 In terms of the methodology we  
10 use, we're perhaps the only National  
11 Election Survey which uses a post-election  
12 mail self-completion survey. We do that for  
13 a variety of reasons, mainly cost. But as

14 I'll explain later for other reasons as  
15 well.  
16 The main perceived disadvantage of  
17 a mail self-completion survey is a low  
18 response rate. Fortunately, we don't get a  
19 low response rate here and you'll see from  
20 the table on page 2, we get a response rate  
21 which varies in the mid-50s through to the  
22 low 60s. But it has been declining since we

---

1 started and it's declining at the rate of  
2 about 1 percent at each federal election we  
3 conduct the survey in.

4 But even so, in the 2001 survey we  
5 got a response rate of 55.4 percent which is  
6 probably better than a lot of personal  
7 interview surveys these days.

8 The reasons we get a relatively  
9 high response rate are several. One is that  
10 we have a very accurate sampling frame. The  
11 sample is drawn from the rolls that the  
12 Australian Electoral Campaign produced,  
13 computerized rolls. That's done on a  
14 rolling basis so it's constantly updated and  
15 it's generally very reliable. The electoral  
16 roll is also compulsory as well. So people  
17 actually have to enroll if they are eligible  
18 to vote.

19 We send everybody an individually  
20 addressed and signed letter explaining the  
21 purposes of the study and the questionnaire,  
22 guarantee of confidentiality and so on. We

---

1 do that to arrive with them on the Monday  
2 after polling which is on the preceding  
3 Saturday.

4 The second thing we do which is  
5 very important to the response rate is that  
6 we send all of the respondents a thank you  
7 reminder postcard one week after the  
8 original mailing. The purpose of that  
9 postcard is to remind people if they haven't  
10 returned the questionnaire to do so. What  
11 we find is, a lot of people simply put the  
12 questionnaire on the mantelpiece or they say  
13 they'll do it after they take the kids to  
14 school or something like that. Of course,  
15 they don't. But their general intention is  
16 they will respond to it.



17                   We find that the thank you  
18 reminder postcard is worth about 15 percent  
19 on the response rate. After that, about 3  
20 weeks after that postcard we send a second  
21 follow-up of all non-respondents, we send  
22 them a questionnaire, and so on. Then one

---

1 of the surveys in 1987, we actually did a  
2 fourth follow-up which was simply a  
3 postcard. We find that that didn't really  
4 work very well. It was worth about 3  
5 percent on the response rate and a major  
6 amount of aggravation because we got even  
7 more phone calls of people complaining about  
8 our thing. So, in fact, we've never  
9 actually done it ever since.

10                   Now, I've had an argument with  
11 various other people that run national  
12 election surveys about why we get such a  
13 high response rate and their view is that it  
14 is a compliant political culture, it just  
15 something that happens in Australia. We  
16 actually think it's a bit more than that.  
17 In fact, if you do a mail questionnaire then  
18 you can actually get a very good response  
19 rate.

20                   DR. BRADY: But, you also have a  
21 good list.

22                   MR. McAllister: Yes, we have a good

---

1 list.

2                   DR. BRADY: You start from a very  
3 good list of addresses so you can do the  
4 random sampling. That's no small thing.

5                   MR. McAllister: No, no. That's  
6 right. That's right. But I've had this  
7 argument with John Curtis (?) who used to  
8 run the British Election Survey but he's  
9 never taken up my challenge to actually run  
10 a mail survey and find out what his response  
11 rate would actually be. I'm sure a lot of  
12 that is financial.

13                   I won't go into the candidate  
14 survey in a lot of detail. Again, what  
15 we've done in terms of the methodology is to  
16 sample all major candidates from major  
17 political parties. The crucial thing there  
18 is to get a letter from the party officers  
19 too say it's a bona fide survey. That

20 results in getting a response rate, mid-60s  
21 up to about 70 percent.  
22 You'll notice on page 3 in the

---

1 most recent candidate survey the response  
2 rate was just 57 percent. The reason for  
3 that was we didn't get a letter from one of  
4 the major political parties. That was a  
5 result of my having a row with the party  
6 leader about some university restructuring I  
7 was doing and he wouldn't -- he was not  
8 forthcoming with the letter. But justice  
9 was done. His party wasn't elected and he  
10 lost his leadership position.

11 (Laughter)

12 MR. McAllister: We might get a  
13 letter from them next time.

14 We haven't had the resources to  
15 conduct a panel survey or a campaign survey  
16 as a lot of the other national election  
17 surveys have done.

18 What we did in 2001 was an on-line  
19 survey. I was in Britain at the time of the  
20 general election. I saw the BES on-line  
21 poll conducted by UGOV. I was quite  
22 impressed by the potential of this and we

---

1 did a similar operation in Australia during  
2 the course of the election campaign which  
3 was also conducted by the British company  
4 UGOV.

5 What we found was, as was the case  
6 in Britain, it was the most accurate  
7 campaign poll conducted during the course of  
8 the whole election. It was within 1 percent  
9 of the actual result. Now we did find that  
10 the online respondents were different from  
11 offline respondents in the sense that they  
12 were young, they were better educated, and  
13 all the things we'd expect. But, when we  
14 analyzed whether or not there was a mode  
15 effect, we found that there wasn't.

16 So, effectively on-line  
17 respondents were the same as off-line  
18 respondents who had Internet access. I think  
19 that's very important because it certainly  
20 may be 10 years away from using an on-line  
21 to do a regular national election survey.  
22 But, I think the real potential of on-line

---

1 polls are in doing rolling cross-sections  
2 during the course of the campaign.

3 They are incredibly cheap to do.  
4 They're very fast. You can get a large  
5 number of respondents and so on. I think  
6 the on-line poll is something we should be  
7 looking at instead of doing a rolling cross  
8 campaign section by the use of a telephone.  
9 We'll be doing a major exercise in on-line  
10 polling the next Australian federal  
11 election.

12 To summarize, the major advantages  
13 in terms of the methodology we have are  
14 three-fold. Firstly, cost efficiency. Our  
15 survey runs at about \$10-12 US per interview  
16 because we're using a mail questionnaire.  
17 All up our survey costs about \$30-40,000 US  
18 which I guess would be about the  
19 entertainment allowance for the NES for one  
20 year. But it's highly cost efficient when  
21 compared to telephone and personal interview  
22 surveys.

---

1 Secondly, we have very good  
2 comprehensive coverage. It means we can  
3 sample in every federal constituency across  
4 the country at exactly the same price. So,  
5 for example, we can sample in an outback  
6 cattle station, maybe 800 kilometers from  
7 the nearest settlement. That costs us  
8 exactly the same as sampling in an  
9 inter-city metropolitan area.

10 It means that we don't have to  
11 stratify. We can sample in every  
12 constituency and that has implications for  
13 matching that with the candidate survey. It  
14 means that the sampling frame, as Henry  
15 says, is very reliable.

16 Two disadvantages that are  
17 frequently mentioned are response bias, the  
18 fact that we have a very large number of  
19 immigrants in the population who are  
20 non-English speaking born means that there  
21 is some risk they will be under sampled.  
22 Our explorations into this would suggest

---

1 not, or at least not to any significant  
2 degree.

3           There is also a risk that  
4 individuals other than the person who is  
5 nominated on the latter will respond to the  
6 questionnaire. Again, there has been  
7 research on this and it suggests that it's  
8 not a major problem. You get similar  
9 effects in high source surveys where you get  
10 two or three people in a room sitting with  
11 an interviewer.

12           The second perceived disadvantage  
13 is that we have a long fieldwork period.  
14 The survey is normally in the field right  
15 about 8 weeks, sometimes up to 10 weeks.  
16 It's possible that voters' recall weakens  
17 and other political events sometimes come to  
18 contaminate the voters' opinions.

19           Again, we don't find that. We've  
20 compared the responses of people who have  
21 responded in the first week or two to people  
22 that have responded at the very end of the

---

1 fieldwork and that doesn't seem to be a  
2 particular problem. Thanks.

3           DR. SCIOLI: Thank you, Ian.  
4 Richard, you're competing with lunch. Don't  
5 let that inhibit you.

6           DR. SINNOTT: I take it that's  
7 confirmation that I have 10 minutes.

8           DR. SCIOLI: Yes, sir.

9           DR. SINNOTT: I'm going to  
10 continue along the line I started when I  
11 prepared the note for this conference and  
12 that is I'm going to talk about turnout.

13           I could talk about the Irish  
14 Election Study. As I said, we did one in  
15 relation to the 2002 election but my feeling  
16 is that we were neophytes and learners in  
17 that regard and in fact we went to a lot of  
18 trouble beforehand to take account of  
19 lessons from the British Election Study, the  
20 American Election Study and the Dutch  
21 Election Study. There's no point now in my  
22 sort of now completing that circle and

---

1 coming back and giving advice or describing  
2 our experiences.

3           I chose to focus on the turnout  
4 issue because I think it has fairly  
5 substantial implications for what I would

6 describe as a program of election research,  
7 as opposed to an election study or more  
8 particularly an election survey.

9 It's obviously an extremely  
10 difficult and yet fascinating behavioral  
11 problem as to why some people vote and why  
12 other people don't vote and would be worth  
13 studying in that regard if that were the  
14 only implication.

15 But obviously also to a  
16 substantial extent more than electoral  
17 choice, it has major policy implications.  
18 It's a major policy problem and one that  
19 poses very real challenges in terms of how  
20 we understand and how we respond to what  
21 already many people have referred to as  
22 declining turnout rates in many countries.

---

1 Not in all countries, but in many  
2 well-established democracies.

3 The other reason for looking at  
4 turnout is that it is more amenable to  
5 comparative research than electoral choice  
6 because electoral choice is so context  
7 specific in so many ways. But turnout is a  
8 much simpler dependent variable. That's a  
9 major advantage but I would go further than  
10 that. I would say not only is it amenable  
11 to comparative research, it can only be  
12 tackled by means of comparative research.

13 I'd like to develop that point a  
14 little bit. I think perhaps one of the  
15 unfortunate legacies of the kind of  
16 basically pedagogical distinction in  
17 American universities is between American  
18 politics and comparative politics and I  
19 think that still influences. Basically I  
20 don't think we are sufficiently comparative.  
21 That certainly applies in the case of the  
22 study of turnout.

---

1 I mean if we were to be purely  
2 scientific we would -- you'd say you cannot  
3 study a topic like turnout without doing it  
4 comparatively because so many of the  
5 variables that affect it are systemic  
6 variables. Unless you've got systemic  
7 variation -- you can get some systemic  
8 variation as Nancy mentioned within -- by

9 doing state samples in the American context.  
10 But the real systemic variation is the  
11 cross-country variation. I'd like to  
12 develop that point a little bit.  
13 I mean there is a danger I think  
14 ---- I also think that the time is right for  
15 research in this and other comparative ----  
16 and certainly for a European- American  
17 cooperation, and one would like to think  
18 that an organization with the experience and  
19 the strength of the National Science  
20 Foundation would take a lead in that regard.  
21 Because I think the lead would be  
22 reciprocated, particularly in the context of

---

1 the EU framework programs for research.  
2 Just to develop a little bit, and  
3 I'm not going to go into great detail. But  
4 I just want to develop the idea a bit to  
5 make the point, or to underline the point  
6 that research in this area must be  
7 comparative.  
8 One of the most striking things  
9 that I have seen written, or certainly one  
10 of the shortest, most striking things that I  
11 had seen written about turnout, was  
12 Aldrich's statement that turnout is a  
13 low-cost, low-benefit activity.  
14 The implications of that are that  
15 turnout is influenced by a wide range of  
16 variables. In fact, a postdoctoral  
17 researcher, Lyons, who has been working with  
18 me in this area, and he's got an inventory.  
19 It's something like in excess of 100  
20 propositions you can make, and you can  
21 document the turnout is influenced by this,  
22 turnout is influenced by that, turnout is

---

1 influenced by that.  
2 We have a proliferation problem, a  
3 proliferation of variables in regard to the  
4 study of turnout. It was sort of thinking  
5 about that that led me to think how would  
6 you categorize, or what kind of typology  
7 could you come up with that would reduce  
8 some of this variety to manageable  
9 proportions?  
10 The starting place for the  
11 typology that I've suggested in the short

12 note I've circulated, is actually a typology  
13 relating to the dependent variable. It  
14 surprises me, the extent to which this  
15 typology has not -- or this distinction has  
16 not figured in the literature. That's the  
17 distinction between circumstantial and  
18 voluntary abstention.

19 That really only comes out from an  
20 open-ended question about why did you not  
21 vote. Now, I know there are all sorts of  
22 difficulties and problems of rationalization

---

1 in responses to a question like that. But  
2 it seems to me that it is a key question to  
3 ask, because the explanation of  
4 circumstantial abstention -- and there are  
5 genuine explanations, and there are policy  
6 issues in relation to what accounts for  
7 circumstantial abstention.

8 But it's a different problem.  
9 It's a radically different dependent  
10 variable. You can then -- that distinction  
11 leads on to a distinction between  
12 facilitation and mobilization. This is I  
13 think a broadening of the concept of  
14 mobilization, in one sense, with apologies  
15 to Mark Hansen, because you made use of that  
16 concept in a specific sense.

17 But I think the concept is capable  
18 of being broadened, and that's what we try  
19 to do in the typology that I circulated with  
20 the paper.

21 In thinking -- and this comes to  
22 the fundamental point, why this research

---

1 needs to be comparative -- in thinking about  
2 facilitation variables and mobilization  
3 variables, the key thing is to realize that  
4 they both exist at two levels. At a  
5 systemic level and at an individual level.

6 It's precisely the need to connect  
7 those two levels that drives you toward the  
8 view that the study of turnout has a  
9 problem -- and this probably can be extended  
10 to all aspects of electoral behavior. I  
11 think it applies particularly to the turnout  
12 problem, that the study of turnout simply  
13 must be cross-systemic, and that is  
14 hopefully underlined in that part of the

15 note that I circulated, and in the  
16 accompanying figures and tables. Or in  
17 particular, in the figures.

18       Coming over on the plane, one of  
19 the temptations that PowerPoint gives rise  
20 to is that you revise your paper as you're  
21 heading for the conference, particularly if  
22 you're stuck in an uncomfortable steerage

---

1 class seat on a transatlantic flight, and  
2 you can just about fit, in the space between  
3 the seat in front of you and yourself, your  
4 laptop.

5       I did that, and I've circulated  
6 some changes. But I'm not going to go into  
7 those. I think the fundamental point that I  
8 want to illustrate is the very simple one  
9 that this very fundamental, very policy  
10 relevant aspect of electoral behavior is a  
11 challenge to us all. The response to that  
12 challenge must be comparative research.

13       My conclusion, then, would be that  
14 the National Science Foundation, in looking  
15 at research on electoral behavior -- and  
16 what I detect is a very strong commitment to  
17 continue to look at electoral behavior as a  
18 major research area -- should actually be  
19 very ambitious. It shouldn't just be  
20 saying, how do we improve the existing  
21 National Election Study model. You know,  
22 agonizing about the dilemmas of maintaining

---

1 continuity and the core versus innovation  
2 and all of that.

3       It should actually lead to a next  
4 level, and say it's not just that we need a  
5 National Election Study. But within a  
6 program in research in this area spread over  
7 a 10-year period, we need National Election  
8 Studies. I think it was Harold who said, or  
9 perhaps it was Andre, that the study of  
10 turnout may well be a problem that requires  
11 a different study from the National Election  
12 Study.

13       That my argument or my response to  
14 the discussion so far this morning, is that  
15 what the National Science Foundation should  
16 be doing is considering the whole range of  
17 possible fundamental problems in regard to



18 elections and electoral behavior, of which,  
19 coming from my perspective, turnout is a  
20 major one. But other ones have been  
21 signaled this morning. It shouldn't be  
22 trying to squeeze them all into a single

---

1 national election survey, but should say  
2 yes, the National Election Survey must be  
3 preserved and developed, but other responses  
4 must also be developed.

5 My argument, in conclusion, would  
6 be that that research be comparative, that  
7 researchers be very ambitious in what they  
8 propose to the National Science Foundation;  
9 that as I certainly detected this morning  
10 from the remarks of Richard Lempert and  
11 Norman Bradburn, that it seems to me that I  
12 could detect a potentially positive response  
13 to that kind of ambitious thinking.

14 Finally that obviously, if you  
15 want to be comparative, you have to have  
16 comparative partners. But my perception and  
17 my experience of the funding situation in  
18 Europe, particularly at the European level  
19 as we say -- in other words, at the level of  
20 the European Union -- is such that that kind  
21 of an initiative might well draw a positive  
22 response. Thank you.

---

1 DR. SCIOLI: Thank you. I think  
2 what we might do is invite you to go over  
3 and pick up some lunch so no one gets  
4 grumpy, or grumpier, and come back. Perhaps  
5 we can discuss the commentaries over lunch.  
6  
7

8 (Whereupon, at 12:32 p.m., a  
9 luncheon recess was taken.)  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

---

AFTERNOON SESSION

(1:07 p.m.)

SPEAKER: There are some things from which the representativeness is just simply not quite as important, some kinds of questions and studies. Or just to be honest, it's better than nothing. That's a better way to think about it for some research.

SPEAKER: There may be an issue in the U.S. That's ---- other countries related to the level of literacy of some of the populations we're trying to look at. I don't know if you have dealt with that issue, but you do have to set the written questionnaire at a certain relatively low literacy rate in order for it to work.

Otherwise, you can get answers, but you don't know if the folks really understood what was being asked.

MR. McAllister: We've looked at that in the Australian context. In terms of

---

representatives of non-English speaking groups and so on, they're slightly under-represented, but not to any great extent. There's been other research done by the government in terms of the census and things like that.

They really don't find any huge effect. Particularly also, you're dealing with people who are voters, who have become citizens. They tend to have lived in the country maybe 15, 20 years before they've become a citizen. But it's normally a huge problem for voting research.

In terms of the census and other government surveys, they quite often do translations into Italian and Greek, and so on.

DR. HANSEN: Has there been the opportunity to do evaluation of what kinds of items work in this context, and what kinds don't, and what the effect of this particular mode is, relative to asking

---

1 people questions in a face-to-face context?  
2 Has there been evaluation that's arisen out  
3 of this?

4 DR. SCIOLI: Let me interrupt for  
5 one second. The discussion is focusing on  
6 using mail back questionnaires.

7 MR. McAllister: There's a large  
8 literature on that in POQ and a variety of  
9 other places looking at reliability and  
10 validity of mail surveys. I looked at that  
11 some years ago, but I can't say offhand what  
12 the main findings were.

13 We find that in terms of asking  
14 things in the mail survey, there's really  
15 relatively few restrictions on what you can  
16 do, except in things that might involve show  
17 cards or something. So you've got to  
18 have -- and of course you can't have skips  
19 either, because that's always problematic.

20 We even asked a political quiz, to  
21 find out levels of political knowledge in  
22 the population. My colleagues in the

---

1 election survey said it wouldn't work,  
2 because you wouldn't know exactly who was  
3 filling it in, and so on. We actually  
4 copied it substantively, or the format  
5 substantively, from the '97 British Election  
6 Survey.

7 In fact, it showed exactly, or  
8 almost exactly the same level of political  
9 knowledge in Australia as there is in  
10 Britain. So obviously, what it was doing,  
11 if other people were filling it in, it was  
12 measuring the political knowledge within the  
13 high ---- public correlates.

14 SPEAKER: The worry is more that  
15 they'll look up the answer.

16 DR. MUTZ: Yes, that's right.

17 SPEAKER: They'll look up the  
18 answer. But obviously, they're not.

19 MR. McAllister: You're assuming  
20 great diligence on the part of the  
21 respondents.

22 DR. ACHEN: You should have seen

---

1 the Australian respondents before they  
2 looked up the answer.

3 DR. BURNS: This is just an

4 information question. I was trying to think  
5 about how, you know, question order effects  
6 and priming effects, and that sort of  
7 thing -- they're pretty, you know, standard.  
8 So the idea then would be to put into the  
9 mail survey only things you'd be pretty darn  
10 sure it wouldn't be subject to those kinds  
11 of effects, because otherwise you'd be in  
12 trouble, and you would never be able to sort  
13 that out.

14 MR. McAllister: No, I think  
15 that's right.

16 DR. BURNS: Because that's why you  
17 do the randomization in the caffeine caddy,  
18 is to sort that out.

19 DR. BRADY: You can do a  
20 experiments of course, you can do random  
21 half and things like this. Not everybody  
22 has to get the same questionnaire. But

---

1 fundamentally, once they've got an  
2 instrument in front of them, they've got it.  
3 I mean, that's it.

4 DR. BURNS: Right. Exactly.

5 DR. BRADY: They can order --  
6 maybe they can answer from the back or the  
7 front, whatever they feel like doing.

8 DR. ACHEN: Generally, the mail is  
9 seen as superior on that score. It's as if  
10 the mail abolished order, because people can  
11 look ahead and change their answers more  
12 readily, and so on. So, from the point of  
13 view of eliminating question order effects,  
14 the mail is generally seen as superior.

15 DR. BRADBURN: Can I ask, if you  
16 have questions that are subject to order  
17 effects, to put them in the mail, please?

18 DR. BRADY: But again here, let's  
19 not -- I mean, one of the strengths of the  
20 NES is certainly that you have real concern  
21 with your instrumentation, and so on and so  
22 forth. But let's not let the best be the

---

1 enemy of something here sometimes.

2 Part of the problem here is this  
3 tremendous constraint on time. It might be  
4 that one way you can buy a little bit of  
5 time is to say, okay, we're going to have a  
6 mail back, and you will get this to people.

7 That might help you.  
8 I mean, put the damn trust  
9 question on the mail back. Okay?  
10 SPEAKER: It always comes back to  
11 trust with you, Henry.  
12 SPEAKER: We'll let you send that  
13 letter out.  
14 DR. CLARKE: That's exactly the  
15 motivation for the mail back. It's clear we  
16 couldn't, as they say, you know, get this  
17 poured into a pint pot. To accommodate  
18 similar things that we really want to have  
19 some information on, we go ahead and do the  
20 mail questionnaire. Exactly why. Henry  
21 it's exactly what you said. We made the  
22 judgment something was better than nothing.

---

1 DR. BLAIS: We haven't discussed.  
2 I mean, this is obvious in Canada we do this  
3 forever. I mean, it's cheap. It helps a  
4 lot. Why not do it?  
5 SPEAKER: I'm curious how much  
6 mail Australians and Canadians get on an  
7 average day. We're getting 25 pieces now a  
8 lot of days. I'm just not clear about how  
9 well --  
10 SPEAKER: Well again, you know,  
11 it's worth -- I'm just going for worth a try  
12 some times, given the cost.  
13 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, one tactic,  
14 though -- and I think that's what Henry  
15 actually had in mind. This has been used in  
16 the GSS, is that you leave a questionnaire  
17 behind. The conditional probability that  
18 they'll fill it out, given that they already  
19 did a lengthy interview, is quite high,  
20 often more than what you get in a straight  
21 mail survey, in part because people don't  
22 throw it in the trash.

---

1 You know, they see it, it's out in  
2 the open, and so on.  
3 SPEAKER: Plus there's a large  
4 literature, too, in terms of how to boost  
5 the response rates. Everything from what  
6 color paper you use, to -- what color paper  
7 you use, to providing various kinds of  
8 financial incentives. In some ways ----  
9 POQs for all this kind of stuff.

10 DR. THOMPSON: I think that in the  
11 United States, if you didn't do something  
12 like drop it off when you leave it, if you  
13 just did a cold mail survey with all the  
14 kinds of things you could do, you'd be lucky  
15 to get anything much more than somewhere in  
16 the mid-fifties. That would probably be  
17 pushing it.  
18 Based on the experiences that I  
19 had at the Census Bureau, I think right now  
20 the American community survey is getting  
21 somewhere between 50 and 55 percent.  
22 They're allowed to use a mandatory message

---

1 too, which helps.  
2 They're doing an experiment this  
3 year, I believe, where they're dropping the  
4 mandatory aspect. So that will be really  
5 interesting to see what happens when they  
6 drop that.  
7 DR. SCIOLI: How long is the GSS  
8 questionnaire, Roger? Do you know?  
9 MR. TOURANGEAU: The basic  
10 questionnaire, I guess, varies between an  
11 hour and an hour and a half. Norman might  
12 know, too.  
13 DR. THOMPSON: It's a 90 minute.  
14 MR. TOURANGEAU: Is it now --  
15 DR. THOMPSON: The whole  
16 questionnaire is 90 minutes. I think half  
17 of it, 45 minutes, is what they consider  
18 core, and then half of it is --  
19 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, that's the  
20 other idea, I think.  
21 DR. SCIOLI: Then the mail back.  
22 How long would it take?

---

1 MR. TOURANGEAU: I think they've  
2 done, like, half-hour questionnaires. But  
3 the other -- again, if the issue is  
4 constraints on how you can cram more  
5 content, I mean, this is one good technique.  
6 Another trick that GSS uses -- I don't know  
7 if they still use it. But it's -- they use,  
8 like, a balanced, incomplete block design,  
9 for you experimental design mavens.  
10 Basically, there are I think four  
11 modules, one of which is constant. Then  
12 everybody gets two of the three that are not

13 constant. So -- and all those pairs. You  
14 know, there's three pairs of the two modules  
15 appear equally often. So you could estimate  
16 co-variances between any pair of items.  
17 You know, but the sample sizes are  
18 reduced for those co-variants.  
19 MR. SANTOS: Do they mix in the  
20 mode as part of the allocation scheme, so  
21 you might go to module, either in the  
22 questionnaire or in the mailing?

---

1 MR. TOURANGEAU: No. The mail  
2 back thing has always been an add-on, to the  
3 best of my knowledge. You know, a client  
4 will come in and say I want 15 minutes on  
5 the GSS. They won't do that, but they will  
6 do this.

7 But those are two -- both those  
8 methods, certainly matrix sampling or module  
9 sampling and, you know, leaving people  
10 something, are good ways to cram in extra  
11 content and help with response rates.

12 DR. SCIOLI: What would be your  
13 reaction if somebody pushed you on the Board  
14 to do 45 minutes face-to-face max, and 45  
15 minutes mail back? I'm just curious.

16 DR. KINDER: Somebody on our  
17 Board?

18 DR. SCIOLI: Yes. I mean, if it  
19 were -- I mean, somebody coming and saying  
20 hey, I heard, I was at a meeting, and this  
21 is what they do, in Canada, and this is what  
22 they do in Australia, this is what they do

---

1 in Ireland.

2 If the instrument is now 130  
3 minutes, and you were to cut the instrument  
4 to 45 minutes face- to-face, and make it  
5 another 45-minute questionnaire --

6 DR. BRADY: But Frank, you don't  
7 really save that much by reducing the length  
8 of an interview. The problem is getting  
9 there and getting the person. Once you've  
10 got them, you want them to sit there all day  
11 with you.

12 DR. BRADBURN: The marginal  
13 minutes.

14 DR. BRADY: The marginal minute  
15 cost is very low.

16 DR. BRADBURN: Nancy, what do you  
17 do? 135 minutes?  
18 DR. BURNS: We do a before and  
19 after the election. So in a Presidential  
20 election --  
21 DR. BRADBURN: Oh, not in one?  
22 DR. KINDER: No, no, no.

---

1 DR. BRADY: So it's 65 in each  
2 city, but I think 65 is quite doable.  
3 Cutting back would be --  
4 DR. BURNS: Right.  
5 MR. SANTOS: How long are the mail  
6 questionnaires that you guys use?  
7 DR. CLARKE: 12 pages in our case.  
8 The most recent one.  
9 MR. SANTOS: Yes, but, you know  
10 eight-point font?  
11 DR. CLARK: No. Big font. Like  
12 big, like here's a crown. You can fill this  
13 out, you know.  
14 MR. SANTOS: But how long does it  
15 take to answer them?  
16 MR. McAllister: It takes  
17 about 30 minutes if they go right through it  
18 properly. We have to do it in multiples of  
19 fours, not to waste space. So 24 is the --  
20 MR. SANTOS: I'm surprised that  
21 they would stay with it that long.  
22 MR. McAllister: Well, there's

---

1 colleagues of mine who have gone up  
2 to 60, 70 pages and have had a response rate  
3 run about 50 percent.  
4 DR. BRADY: This is a very dull  
5 country.  
6 (Laughter)  
7 MR. McAllister: Perhaps the  
8 solution is to introduce compulsory voting  
9 everywhere, and then everybody becomes  
10 compliant if you comply with that requirement.  
11 DR. LEMPert: I mean it seems to  
12 me that role for mail, might be expanding  
13 the sample, as opposed to cutting back on  
14 the survey of the existing sample.  
15 SPEAKER: Yes, that's exactly the  
16 point. That's clearly the motivation for



17 this kind of stuff.  
18 DR. SCIOLI: Expanding the sample  
19 or expanding the content in the current  
20 sample? Or both?  
21 SPEAKERS: Both.  
22 DR. LEMPERT: In this country, it

---

1 would be very hard to expand the sample  
2 using mail. Because you don't have good --  
3 you don't know who lives where and so the  
4 costs of having to register it--  
5 DR. HANSEN: There you get into  
6 cross mode issues as well.  
7 DR. BRADBURN: You know it's  
8 really capitalizing on the fact that you  
9 already cooperated and you'll do more.  
10 MR. TOURANGEAU: The way you could  
11 use it to beef up the sample is you could  
12 take some retired sample, and then mail it  
13 to them, or something like that. Where you  
14 do have a set of addresses and like that.  
15 It isn't a very good standalone  
16 methodology in the United States, because of  
17 the frame problem. There's no good list of  
18 addresses, basically.  
19 DR. SCIOLI: You would have to  
20 have done it sufficiently recently that the  
21 addresses are still pretty good.  
22 Could I ask a question of all of

---

1 the international contingent. I thought I  
2 heard -- and at least certainly I know in  
3 the British case -- that the funding goes to  
4 a group of principal investigators, and then  
5 that group selects either through another  
6 competition, and so forth, the survey  
7 organization that actually carries out the  
8 survey.  
9 In all these countries, is that  
10 distinct?  
11 DR. BLAIS: In Canada that's the  
12 case.  
13 MR. McAllister: More or less.  
14 DR. CLARKE: I know it is in  
15 Britain.  
16 DR. BRADY: Yes, definitely.  
17 DR. SCIOLI: So actually, in  
18 Britain, then, the PI group, where it's  
19 located, moves around or had at least a

20 pendula if not --  
21 DR. CLARKE: It's moved a couple  
22 of times. Yes.

---

1 DR. SCIOLI: Then the survey group  
2 would move around or has --

3 DR. CLARKE: Yes. I'm not sure  
4 who did the field work in the Butler and  
5 Stokes era. But certainly when it was most  
6 recently at Nuffield which was from 1983  
7 through 1997, they consistently had Roger  
8 Jowell's survey firm doing the work.

9 My read on that work was very  
10 good. They did very good. If you had  
11 reservations about the BES, it wasn't --  
12 typically, it was not with regard to the  
13 quality of the fieldwork, the sampling and  
14 so forth. That -- and it had a consistency  
15 over time, too, which is good for obvious  
16 reasons.

17 In 2001, we had to take these  
18 bids, as I said. You know, we had these  
19 quotes, these sealed bids. We would have  
20 been very interested in getting a bid from  
21 Roger's outfit, from his survey firm. But  
22 it didn't come in, so we didn't have the

---

1 opportunity to consider them.

2 DR. SCIOLI: But wasn't he -- was  
3 he part of the PI group then?

4 DR. CLARKE: He is also part of  
5 the PI group. But they could have gone  
6 elsewhere. They didn't have to. I mean,  
7 you know, you'd think it's) inconceivable  
8 the PI would not take his own survey firm.  
9 But they're separate. It's clear that  
10 they're very -- I mean, it's mandated as  
11 separate. You could imagine writing up the  
12 outlines of a competition, and what the PIs  
13 would have to do.

14 Clearly now, we've made -- I don't  
15 know what it was like in the past. But it's  
16 clearly now in Britain that they separate  
17 these things out very distinctly, and they  
18 make you entertain bids. I mean, for  
19 obvious conflict of interest reasons, now,  
20 the way they did this before would not --

21 there's no way that if I had a survey firm,  
22 you know, obviously, I could choose my own

---

1 firm. I couldn't even enter a bid.

2 MR. SANTOS: During the first year  
3 of the switch, there was no appreciable  
4 house effect change?

5 DR. CLARKE: It appears not.  
6 We've been doing some -- you know, it may be  
7 hidden there somewhere that we haven't  
8 figured it out yet. Most of our effort --

9 MR. SANTOS: What you're looking  
10 for is the glaring one.

11 DR. CLARKE: Yes. There's  
12 nothing --nothing jumps out. I mean,  
13 there's an overall decline in response  
14 rates, this sort of secular trend that we've  
15 talked about before. It's true I think just  
16 about everywhere. But there's no sort of  
17 discernible bump that we can see.

18 The house that did our work, NOP,  
19 is a very well-respected survey firm, been  
20 around for a long time, and have been doing  
21 this kind of work. So, to the extent you  
22 say, you know, well, they're a good,

---

1 competent firm, if there are some house  
2 effects, maybe they'll unearth themselves.

3 We have been concerned so far, in  
4 terms of looking at those kinds of things,  
5 more about cross- sectional sort of mode  
6 differences, because we ran the telephone,  
7 the big telephone survey as well. The  
8 rolling cross-section.

9 We also did an Internet poll, as  
10 was mentioned, as well, just for free. It  
11 wasn't funded. It just turned out they said  
12 they'd do it for us, and we said hey, great.

13 So we have been studying those  
14 kinds of differences, and we'll do more.  
15 But the house effect thing is interesting.  
16 We haven't seen anything so far that you  
17 wouldn't attribute to sort of a secular  
18 trend.

19 I mean, if we had had a constant  
20 response rate of whatever, 70 percent or  
21 whatever, and then all of a sudden we come  
22 along with something in the mid- 50s, we'd

---

1 say oh wow, this may be, you know, it's  
2 really a house effect. These guys just  
3 can't get interviews, there's something  
4 going on here, or the response distributions  
5 look really different.

6 We haven't see any of that.

7 DR. SCIOLI: What's the overhead  
8 that you're allowed to build into your  
9 instrument and cost?

10 DR. CLARKE: Yes. I don't know,  
11 in general, what it would be. Like what the  
12 ESRC guidelines are. I know that they  
13 don't -- the University of Essex does not  
14 require you to do this. So, we did not. So  
15 all of our money, as I said, 85 percent went  
16 to field work, the remaining 15 percent went  
17 to some graduate students, and a little bit  
18 of travel, some stationery and so forth.

19 So it's quite different from here.

20 DR. SCIOLI: But then did they  
21 afford you space?

22 DR. CLARKE: Yes, they did. Well,

---

1 I mean, you haven't seen, have you been to  
2 Essex? I mean, you know. The contribution  
3 was valued, but was pretty marginal. A  
4 couple of small offices, really, for the  
5 research officers.

6 I know it's quite a different kind  
7 of deal. You know, over here, of course,  
8 you send things through grants  
9 administration, and the first thing, they're  
10 getting out their calculators, and you know,  
11 that's it. They want their 45 or 50 percent  
12 or whatever it happens to be.

13 That's not true in Britain, and  
14 Andre, it didn't used to be true in Canada.  
15 We didn't have any -- I don't know what the  
16 deal is now, in terms of having to give your  
17 university, you know, returns.

18 DR. BLAIS: I don't think there is  
19 no return as such. In fact, I think the  
20 university gets some percentage of all of  
21 the research funds that were given by SHRCC.  
22 Basically, all that money has been

---

1 reimbursed into the Canadian election --  
2 reinvested in the Canadian Election Study.

3 So the university has put -- does

4 put in some real money, in fact.

5 MR. SANTOS: Actually, that should  
6 be kept in mind in the context of the dollar  
7 amounts that you quoted earlier, because  
8 essentially those were direct cost dollars  
9 that you were ----

10 DR. CLARKE: Sure. Absolutely.  
11 The money we got, we spent on the surveys.  
12 I mean, this is it. That's really nice,  
13 because you could imagine what would have  
14 happened if, you know, as would be typical  
15 here, they took 50 percent off the top. Our  
16 ability to mount an -- we couldn't have done  
17 the in-person study at all. No way.

18 DR. BURNS: I have a question. I  
19 was thinking about your sense that you  
20 didn't have house effects, and so forth. I  
21 mean, we micro-manage survey implementation.  
22 So we're, you know, kind of -- our staff is

---

1 in there on a daily basis.

2 This time out, we did -- we went  
3 with another house. The micro-management  
4 went very high. We caught things, you know,  
5 early on that had we not been doing the  
6 micro-managing, we would have had house  
7 effects in 2002.

8 So how much -- I mean, how much  
9 money are we --

10 DR. CLARKE: That's a real worry,  
11 Nancy. I mean, it really is. We would  
12 love -- when I worked in Canada with  
13 Canadian Facts, we were doing the surveys  
14 back in the 1970s. With Gallup, with the  
15 telephone surveys in Britain. They let us  
16 get right in there and really be right with  
17 them, and work with them as close as we can.  
18 Not as close as you guys can, but very  
19 closely.

20 NOP was much more hands off. They  
21 just want -- basically said, okay, you know,  
22 we'll send you the data some day. We kept

---

1 pushing them, and very deliberately.

2 One of the things in particular I  
3 was worried about, was whether they could  
4 program the copy correctly. Because we have  
5 experiments, we've got all sorts of  
6 branching, and you know, the normal kinds of

7 things. I said they screw this up, this is  
8 like a big-time problem right away.

9 In fact, we were able to get the  
10 program and went through it, and we found  
11 some things, which would have really been  
12 disastrous if we had not gotten hold of  
13 them.

14 But clearly, I'd like to have a  
15 closer relationship with whoever the survey  
16 firm is. As I say, if we do another one of  
17 these or whoever does it, it looks like  
18 they're basically going to have to put out  
19 for bids. It's going to be very hard. If  
20 you've got a reputable firm, and they've got  
21 a good low bid, I mean, you're pretty well  
22 going to have to go with them. I mean, if

---

1 you don't go with them, you'd have to write  
2 some elaborate justification, you know, and  
3 so forth.

4 But no, it's a real concern.  
5 That's absolutely right.

6 DR. ACHEN: We went through this,  
7 you know in the APSR, with the Gerber Green  
8 turnout and it turned out that the firm they  
9 hired wasn't supervised day-to-day and oh,  
10 were those 2s, we thought those were 1s.  
11 You know, it was one of those things.

12 So they're going to get -- they  
13 got the wrong answer for some of the results  
14 in that survey and it just seems to me that  
15 close day-to-day administration is essential  
16 here.

17 DR. BLAIS: This is one of the  
18 reasons we've been basically going with York  
19 ISR because we have, you know, we have all  
20 kinds of accessibility. We can go there any  
21 time. We discuss with them every first day  
22 of the campaign, after they see how things

---

1 are going, and so on. I mean we know if  
2 there is a problem, they will tell us.

3 So, there is a bid but York has  
4 come up with the lowest bid in each of the  
5 four last election studies. In fact, last  
6 time only York put in a bid.

7 DR. BRADY: Yeah, Andre, remember  
8 Gallup was actually cheaper though, I think  
9 for the '92, '93. I'm pretty sure we had to

10 explain why we didn't go with Gallup, why  
11 instead we went with York. I'm pretty sure  
12 that's true.

13 DR. BLAIS: You're right.

14 DR. CLARKE: Another thing -- I  
15 might just sort of take this a little bit in  
16 a different direction but still on the  
17 comparative, in the comparative vein. This  
18 is along the lines of being able to get  
19 something, again, Henry, rather, you know,  
20 than everything. But we think the something  
21 was well worth doing.

22 That is, that we have tried to

---

1 coordinate what we were doing in the 2001  
2 BES with an ongoing month to month survey  
3 that we've been running with British Gallup  
4 since 1992 which was really motivated by  
5 reading MacKuen, Erickson, and  
6 Stimson and a few of the responses to  
7 that in terms of studying partisanship and  
8 the dynamics of partisanship.

9 That got us to develop a project  
10 with British Gallup which was originally  
11 free. They were willing to do this because  
12 Bob Wybrow, who ran British Gallup for  
13 many years, was a political science  
14 aficionado. So, we said, hey, would you  
15 run the BES standard party identification  
16 question plus a series of economic voting  
17 questions, and so forth, every month for us  
18 for the foreseeable future? He said, yeah,  
19 if you can give me just a little bit of  
20 money.

21 So, we started doing that. That  
22 had like really interesting payoffs in terms

---

1 of studying dynamics. We've got 130,000  
2 cases now and we're able -- with the sort of  
3 "official" election study questions on a  
4 number of key variables. So, we at least  
5 get by the question worrying debates which  
6 have been a prominent feature of the macro  
7 partisanship debate in this country. In  
8 terms of having a historical record -- we  
9 were talking about, like having the record.

10 One of the nice things, of course,  
11 is the level of temporal aggregation we've  
12 got is so much tighter. So if something

13 happens, a 9/11 happens or now going to war  
14 with Iraq and that, we'll be, you know,  
15 studying these things month-to-month and can  
16 articulate that with what's going on in the  
17 election study.

18 To fund that, we've had, you know,  
19 funds from ESRC and the NSF as well.

20 DR. BRADY: I have another  
21 question which is we've sort of been talking  
22 about the contracting and things like that.

---

1 One of the things Harold said intrigued me.  
2 You said there was a mandate of a post-  
3 election survey done in-person. I'm  
4 interested if some of the other election  
5 studies or study, sorry Andre, have had  
6 things like this.

7 Because I think one of the things  
8 the NSF might want to think about is having  
9 a RFP that goes out that sort of says, look,  
10 here's certain things you gotta do. Here's  
11 certain things we encourage you to do. Some  
12 of the things you gotta do might even  
13 include such things, I think, as to say, you  
14 got to keep the core to "x" number of  
15 minutes.

16 That may not be an easy thing to  
17 do but it might actually help folks to cut  
18 the core, that if there is thought that  
19 that's a necessary thing to do but it's been  
20 politically impossible.

21 I'm wondering if other election  
22 studies have had things like that other than

---

1 what Harold said or just maybe we could even  
2 know more about what Harold was talking  
3 about. Was that just all there was to it,  
4 or was there more to it, Harold?

5 DR. SCIOLI: Coincident with that  
6 or congruent with that, is there a board of  
7 overseers on any of the projects comparable  
8 to the ANES?

9 DR. CLARKE: We have a Board of  
10 Advisors that help us. You know you sort of  
11 pick people -- we picked them -- who were  
12 former principal investigators of national  
13 election studies or prominent survey  
14 research enterprises and brought them  
15 together at the University of Essex last --



16 you know, 2 years ago in the spring. But we  
17 don't have a board of overseers  
18 institutionally.

19 MR. McAllister: Our  
20 accountability is through the grant we  
21 receive as principal investigators of the  
22 grant from the agency. We have informal

---

1 discussions with people but we don't have  
2 any formal board, or advisory board, or  
3 board of overseers.

4 DR. BLAIS: We have an advisory  
5 board. Basically in 1997 we met with the  
6 advisory board a couple of weeks before the  
7 election was called. We had a first draft  
8 of the questionnaire and there was a 2 day  
9 discussion about the questionnaire  
10 basically. Because the design had been  
11 decided, the only discussion was about the  
12 questionnaire itself. Last time we didn't  
13 have the time to meet any board.

14 DR. SCIOLI: Henry's question?  
15 Sorry I didn't mean to step on it.

16 DR. CLARKE: In the British case  
17 we were not mandated on content and we did  
18 some substantial changes in content as my --  
19 I'm back to this again -- as my written  
20 remarks suggest.

21 But we were not mandated on that.  
22 It might be a good thing, it might not be as

---

1 well. But one of the things that surprised  
2 us was that they were very clear. They say,  
3 you guys got to do this study and it's got  
4 to be done this way. It was with the bid.  
5 They just said, if you're not going to do  
6 this, forget it.

7 DR. BRADY: Well, I'm just trying  
8 to think of ways you might help the National  
9 Election Study Board to solve some problems  
10 they may have had. Maybe I've identified a  
11 problem that's not a problem in their mind.  
12 I don't know. But we maybe need some candid  
13 discussion about whether something like that  
14 would be helpful to the Board to help them  
15 finally say, look, we got to throw out a lot  
16 of the stuff that's accumulated. Maybe  
17 there's no thought that's a problem. I  
18 happen to think there's got to be stuff in

19 there that we could throw overboard without  
20 doing tremendous damage to American  
21 political science.  
22 DR. SCIOLI: We're willing to take

---

1 the hit on suggesting that the design only  
2 has 40 minutes.  
3 DR. KINDER: Is that what you  
4 want, Henry?  
5 DR. BRADY: I don't know what I  
6 want. But, I think the Board should get  
7 together and maybe make some of these hard  
8 statements and sotto voce get it back to  
9 NSF. Something has got to happen here to  
10 make this work. That's one of the ways you  
11 might make it work.  
12 But to just hold out and say, no  
13 we can't cut anything from the core, the  
14 core is so critical -- that's just not going  
15 to work.  
16 DR. SCIOLI: We could ---- as a  
17 start --  
18 DR. MUTZ: Well, I was just going  
19 to say that I agree that that kind of  
20 approach might be helpful but I think part  
21 of it depends on, you know, on how big the  
22 pool is of funds we're talking about.

---

1 we talking about a zero sum game where we've  
2 got to cut back in order to have more  
3 innovation? Or, you know, what's the  
4 tradeoff here? That's a little difficult to  
5 know in the context we're in now.  
6 DR. HANSEN: I think it does  
7 depend too upon what the purposes of the  
8 study are, tat one kind of study it makes  
9 sense to put the core on a meat block and do  
10 a lot of things that are different. Another  
11 kind of study, the argument for continuity  
12 would be very, very strong. So, I'm not  
13 sure that you can really decide which of  
14 those options is the best, aside from an  
15 overall conception of where the study is  
16 going.  
17 DR. BRADBURN: Could I get --  
18 well, this will probably will come out in  
19 the course of the rest of it too.  
20 But I noticed in reading the  
21 papers that it seems like there is a kind of

1 was talking about, in which you sort of  
2 focus on one -- like a dependent variable,  
3 like turnout, I mean, maybe a complex one  
4 like turnout -- though some -- it seemed to  
5 me at different times -- had topics. They  
6 may have had lots of things but they had a  
7 focus that was at least for some portion of  
8 it compared to something which is an  
9 omnibus -- well, it's not quite an omnibus  
10 but it has sort of core plus, whatever the  
11 relevant people at that time think is the  
12 best sort of thing. But, there was no pre-  
13 specified type theme of this round.

14 The GSS, I think does tend to go  
15 to the kind of middle model. That is, they  
16 have a kind of core and then they have a  
17 sort of competition for whatever the module  
18 is going to be. Then there's a group that  
19 designs that module. So each round has a  
20 common and a specific interest.

21 So, one of the things I hope over  
22 the rest of the time and at the end we get

---

1 some sense as to -- something from running  
2 to we just study, you know, whatever -- some  
3 essential problem related to elections that  
4 sort of anchors one end. The other end, I  
5 guess is a kind of omnibus which tries to  
6 meet lots of -- you know, the broadest  
7 possible kind of constituency and may run --  
8 well, I say, that might run the risk of  
9 falling between stools for some people. But  
10 that's my bias I guess.

11 DR. BLAIS: It's also possible to  
12 have different proposals coming from  
13 different groups, different groups  
14 emphasizing different approaches. You know,  
15 one group, for instance, insisting more on  
16 continuity, the other group on innovation.  
17 Then to have a competition between the two  
18 groups, and, you know, make a tough decision  
19 only at the end.

20 DR. HANSEN: Or if the resources  
21 are there to have kind of -- as we were  
22 speaking this morning, of having a package

---

1 of options so that some could be quite  
2 highly focused and some could really  
3 emphasize the continuity in the study.

4 DR. LEMPert: I'm also interested  
5 in the possibilities and it doesn't have to  
6 be necessarily done through the survey, but  
7 this idea of studies that I broached. I'm  
8 thinking for example of economics and  
9 movement towards laboratory research within  
10 economics. I wonder if there is laboratory  
11 research that could be occurring in the  
12 course of an election campaign which would  
13 illuminate survey data and ways to think  
14 about things of that sort to innovate. So,  
15 the links are not the new modules but  
16 they're really whole new methods and  
17 approaches.

18 DR. MUTZ: Those kinds of studies  
19 have been done but they haven't been part of  
20 the NES at all. That's one thing that I  
21 guess I personally would like to see is the  
22 NES taking on more the characteristic of

---

1 studies and not being synonymous with the  
2 large national survey. Not that I don't  
3 think that part is important. I do and  
4 would want to see that continued.

5 But, with the kinds of questions  
6 we're asking, the kind of hands-on causality  
7 that we need, we aren't going to get it,  
8 especially with the variety of questions  
9 people want to address in a cross-sectional  
10 survey of the kind we have now.

11 So, I think in terms of  
12 progressing in different subject areas,  
13 having a multitude of design possibilities  
14 makes a lot of sense.

15 DR. LEMPert: Yeah, the issue for  
16 me is really one of synergies because the  
17 political science and sociology and  
18 economics, other programs can fund other  
19 research on elections. We are not limited,  
20 clearly the record of funding is not limited  
21 to just funding the ANES to understand  
22 American elections.

---

1 But the question is whether there  
2 would be synergies by having the group with  
3 this really terrific advisory committee and

4 others to develop a program which one does  
5 not get when you get individual researchers  
6 who are relatively unconnected coming in or  
7 don't know this.

8           Maybe there aren't. Maybe we're  
9 much better off letting hundred flowers  
10 bloom with one big cactus in the middle or  
11 something.

12           DR. MUTZ: But it would be neat if  
13 they could speak to each other. That is,  
14 they go on now but they don't talk to each  
15 other in important ways. So, if you took  
16 results from experimental studies and fed  
17 them directly into survey types of things,  
18 then, you know, that would create that kind  
19 of synergy, I think.

20           DR. SCIOLI: There is an  
21 intermediate model I suppose between having  
22 one kind of centralized, I mean, sort of

---

1 master group that tries to coordinate things  
2 and letting a hundred flowers bloom.

3           Many NSF programs that -- where  
4 there is kind of an overarching sort of  
5 theme. Now, then -- and you have sort of  
6 identified a certain number of grants or PIs  
7 under that theme. Then sort of have yearly  
8 meetings or some sort of mandated meetings  
9 of the PIs so that they keep -- first of all  
10 they know each other and they communicate  
11 with each other.

12           While you don't say, absolutely  
13 you've got to coordinate everything you do.  
14 At least, you sort of help facilitate a  
15 process of that going on. I mean, I think  
16 generally it goes on if people are  
17 encouraged to do it, and you know, there are  
18 no barriers to doing it.

19           DR. CLARKE: In Britain they have  
20 done this not with regard to election  
21 studies but with regard to other kinds of  
22 things. It would be of interest to people

---

1 in this room.

2           For example, by colleague Paul  
3 Whiteley has a program, what they call a  
4 program with the ESRC, the Participation in  
5 Democracy Program, which has 21 projects  
6 funded underneath that umbrella. They get

7 together -- we've gotten together now 4  
8 years in a row and discussed our projects  
9 and talked about, you know, possibilities  
10 for coordination and so forth. There are  
11 several programs running in the British ESRC  
12 on things with regard to institutional  
13 design, and the British Constitution, you  
14 know, a variety of different things along  
15 this line, Norman, this sort of halfway kind  
16 of model.

17 DR. KINDER: There is the problem  
18 of getting the model or mechanism for  
19 coordination down right. It may seem like  
20 an interesting example to look at, and what  
21 you just said, Norman, is appealing to me.  
22 All that would need to be worked out.

---

1 But I also wanted to associate  
2 myself very strongly with the idea of  
3 coordinated experiments with ongoing  
4 surveys. I think that that's a really  
5 splendid idea. Henry in his paper chastises  
6 us, though gently, for not doing enough  
7 experiments and I think that that's right.  
8 We probably don't do enough experiments.

9 Although doing experiments  
10 embedded in the survey is difficult because  
11 it means that you're mangling part of the  
12 survey that somebody feels is precious, even  
13 though from another point of view it looks  
14 like you're doing something interesting and  
15 illuminating.

16 So, we haven't been able to do or  
17 we haven't felt as though we could do as  
18 much experimentation of the substantive and  
19 theoretical sort that Henry wants us to do  
20 as we would like. But, being able to  
21 coordinate with experiments off-site, so to  
22 speak, that are in someway coordinated with

---

1 the ongoing content of the survey is a very  
2 exciting possibility, partly for the reasons  
3 that Diana suggested which is about  
4 inferences of causality. You know, the kind  
5 of standard advantage that experiments have  
6 in that respect.

7 But, there's another which is --  
8 which has to do with developments in  
9 experimental technology. That has to do

10 partly with the ability to represent iconic  
11 as well as verbal complex material for  
12 people as the nature of the campaign can be  
13 represented. You can turn CAPI around as  
14 they like to say.

15 Moreover, finally, developments in  
16 cognitive psychology about measurement of  
17 attitudes implicit or automatic, unconscious  
18 attitudes, it goes under various rubrics, is  
19 a very exciting development, I think, and  
20 one with portentous implications for how we  
21 understand public opinion, and the way  
22 public opinion -- what public opinion means.

---

1 So, this would be an opportunity to make a  
2 link in addition to the causality one. One  
3 about more subtle and indirect measurement  
4 that I think inevitably surveys have to  
5 confront. This would be a way to do it  
6 without going, you know, in too risky a  
7 direction too quickly.

8 DR. BRADBURN: It's too bad Pat  
9 White isn't here but I would allege some  
10 history or invent it if it's not true. But  
11 I need her to make sure it's true. But, my  
12 memory of the development of the General  
13 Social Survey over the last 30 years is that  
14 in the beginning -- or I know in the  
15 beginning because I was part of the  
16 methodological -- there was a methodological  
17 advisory group. I know that was there  
18 because I was a part of it.

19 We were trying to add on -- or do  
20 experiments with it and do methodological  
21 studies and so forth. Then we met a lot of  
22 resistance from the Board exactly for the

---

1 reason that Don mentioned. It mucks up  
2 the -- you know all these methodological  
3 things muck up what we want to get done. So  
4 they really sort of stopped doing it.

5 Then -- and then NSF came in, in I  
6 think the mid-80's -- I don't know, Roger  
7 you may know -- and sort of mandated that  
8 there had to be a methodological -- every  
9 time it went there had to be methodological  
10 experiments incorporated into the thing.  
11 There was a separate grant coincident with  
12 that that renewed that cycle and a lot of

13 split ballot experiments got in there.  
14 Then after that I think there was  
15 no separate methodological money. But it's  
16 interesting, I was talking to Tom Smith  
17 actually earlier this week because I was  
18 looking for an experiment -- a specific  
19 experiment.

20 He said, but they just stayed,  
21 they continued. It sort of turned the norm  
22 around so even though they don't have --

---

1 they're not under this injunction anymore  
2 they do each year continue to do  
3 methodological, I mean, at least split  
4 ballot experiments and some other kinds.  
5 But, it sort of changed the normative  
6 structure of the way it was being run so it  
7 can happen, I guess.

8 MR. TOURANGEAU: One of the great  
9 unimplemented ideas in survey research is to  
10 set aside some percentage of a survey sample  
11 for methodological experimentation. I guess  
12 the CIP has a methods panel. I know that  
13 there was an effort to try and create one  
14 for the NOSY.

15 DR. BRADBURN: The old -- the old  
16 NOSY had one.

17 MR. TOURANGEAU: But, it's --  
18 people love the idea but it seems to be very  
19 rarely implemented. But, this could be  
20 another opportunity to try.

21 DR. BRADY: But this is not just  
22 methodological, this is substantive. We

---

1 have to begin to think of these experiments  
2 and as like just a question. It's the  
3 probes we use and it's the way we actually  
4 figure out what's going on inside people's  
5 heads so they're all of a piece.

6 DR. MUTZ: Yeah, I want to second  
7 what Henry is saying in that when I said  
8 experiments, I wasn't talking about split  
9 ballot, you know, compared question wording  
10 types of things. I was talking about things  
11 that simulate laboratory experiments or  
12 actual laboratory experiments that have to  
13 do with things we care about in election  
14 research. In this case, it's not going to  
15 become part of the core survey. It's



16 something completely different. Especially  
17 with, you know, technologies like Knowledge  
18 Networks and so on and so forth, you can do  
19 experiments that involve stimuli, and so on  
20 and so forth, that are very similar to what  
21 you do in a laboratory.

22 So, I guess I think our use of the

---

1 term is different by virtue of whose  
2 speaking here. So, I would encourage it not  
3 to be methodological in fact because I think  
4 it's -- that would be appropriate in the  
5 context of improving the core questions and  
6 improving instrumentation of, you know,  
7 measuring various concepts.

8 But this has to be different or  
9 else it's going to end up being just more of  
10 that. This has to be explicitly for  
11 innovative purposes.

12 DR. KINDER: Well it's experiments  
13 of the sort that you're talking about that  
14 you were -- that set off the discussion.

15 DR. LEMPert: Right, exactly.  
16 Things that will increase the understanding  
17 of what has been going on in the campaign.

18 DR. KINDER: You don't have to  
19 choose between these by the way --

20 DR. MUTZ: Right.

21 DR. KINDER: If the experiments  
22 have compelling virtues of a methodological

---

1 or a substantive theoretical sense.

2 DR. LEMPert: Yeah there are  
3 limitations and there is a complementarity  
4 between the virtues of one and the  
5 limitations in the survey, so they should go  
6 together very nicely.

7 DR. SCIOLI: Okay. Sorry,  
8 Richard --

9 DR. SINNOTT: Just a quick comment  
10 on Norman Bradburn's question of a continuum  
11 from a highly specialized, highly focused  
12 research to an omnibus kind of an approach.  
13 Just two comments.

14 The European Social Survey is a  
15 major innovation at the moment in Europe.  
16 It involves -- I think it's 27 participating  
17 countries with, I think it's fair to say, a  
18 much more rigorous approach to questionnaire

19 design and to sampling than has been seen in  
20 any comparative European research to date.  
21 Its design, very deliberately, is  
22 that it's 50 percent core and percent

---

1 module. The idea is, if you have an hour  
2 long questionnaire, half of the 50 percent  
3 core is a consistently used set of attitude  
4 questions. The other half is the  
5 demographics. The idea is that this survey  
6 would be repeated every 2 years.

7 The way they think of the modules  
8 then is those are open for tender. In other  
9 words, groups are invited to submit  
10 documents for a 15 minute module on this and  
11 the idea is that these modules might be  
12 repeated, say, on a 6 year cycle or they  
13 might not depending on their success and  
14 depending on what other ideas came up.  
15 Because there is a very clear distinction  
16 between a continuing core survey and the  
17 modules.

18 It does strike me though that the  
19 core is going to run into precisely the same  
20 problem that in 6 years time people will be  
21 saying, why are we asking these questions?  
22 We're asking them because they're in the

---

1 core. People are saying, well, we don't  
2 want them, or whatever. It doesn't quite  
3 solve the problem. But that division  
4 between core and modular design is very  
5 explicit in that survey.

6 My other reaction to the  
7 discussion is that as I would see it anyway,  
8 the assumption about talking about  
9 additional studies like the proposal to have  
10 a focus on turnout or like the proposal to  
11 engage in experimental research related to  
12 campaigns and elections, it's very much  
13 based on the presupposition that this is an  
14 expanding program of research and is not  
15 just a reallocation of the resources devoted  
16 currently to the National Election Study.  
17 But, I suppose that goes without saying.

18 DR. SCIOLI: We have assiduously  
19 avoided Henry's 9:10 question about funding.  
20 Then it has come up a couple of more times.  
21 Let me comment that we were discussing the

1 that as the Political Science program has  
2 gone slightly up in its funding, the ANES  
3 funding has gone down considerably.

4 You heard Norman and Rick's  
5 comments this morning about the context in  
6 which we're considering this. Richard,  
7 we're not sure where the tradeoff will come.  
8 We may be asking -- we're going to ask  
9 realistically within the resources that we  
10 have at our disposal in the next year when  
11 we formulate the announcement. At present  
12 the waters are roiled and the budget climate  
13 is not very sure. That doesn't mean that we  
14 can't think about planning within the  
15 context of political science, within the  
16 context of social and economic science  
17 division and certainly in the directorate.

18 I mean, we want to be prepared if  
19 the federal budget structure changes  
20 dramatically. As program officers we  
21 would -- in Political Science  
22 particularly -- we would use all the logical

---

1 arguments that we could to call for more  
2 funding.

3 DR. BRADY: Frank, I just think  
4 it's really important too to make sure that  
5 when the RFP comes out there is enough money  
6 to do things that sort of minimally people  
7 think need to be done with the NES. I  
8 thought last time there wasn't.

9 I think that's one reason why -- I  
10 don't know how many proposals you got. I  
11 think it was two. I might be wrong on that.  
12 Maybe there was only one and maybe you can't  
13 even say how many there were. But, the -- I  
14 don't think there was a lot of competition.  
15 I think that's a true statement. I think  
16 it's because there simply weren't the  
17 resources there that people felt like this  
18 was a good opportunity to go off and put  
19 together a proposal to try to do something.

20 So, either you have enough  
21 resources or you say, you're going to sort  
22 of somehow restrict it in a way that

---

1 somebody could feel like they could come in  
2 without killing the time series. I mean, I  
3 think that's the great fear that people had  
4 last time, that if they put in a proposal  
5 that was truly, truly innovative, it would  
6 kill the time series and nobody wanted to be  
7 known as the person who killed the time  
8 series --

9 DR. SCIOLI: Well, we'll revisit  
10 that ---- tomorrow.

11 DR. BRADY: These guys at least  
12 tried to keep that intact which I give them  
13 credit for.

14 DR. SCIOLI: We'll revisit that  
15 tomorrow. We can't comment on the number of  
16 proposals but we know who the winner was.  
17 Let's turn to future substantive concerns  
18 and these things continue to recur.

19 Kathleen McGraw and Steven Durlauf  
20 were unable for personal reasons to attend.  
21 So, we have a little more time for  
22 Christopher Achen and Diana Mutz to share

---

1 their thoughts and then for give and take.  
2 So, Christopher you're listed first, if you  
3 don't mind.

#### 4 FUTURE SUBSTANTIVE CONCERNS

5 DR. ACHEN: I've gotten used to  
6 that with my last name over the years.

7 I'm in the position here in a lot  
8 of ways of representing what I think is a  
9 very large group of people which is the user  
10 community, those of us who don't do surveys  
11 ourselves or have only very peripheral parts  
12 in them but who make very heavy use of the  
13 data.

14 I guess what I'd like to do is not  
15 repeat my statement but just talk a little  
16 bit about, you know, how one might think  
17 about that set of people. I think we're  
18 very much in the position of the professors  
19 that Franklin Roosevelt once called in to  
20 give him some advice about one of his social  
21 programs. He said, what would be the right  
22 thing to do here? They said, well, taking

---

1 into account the budgetary and political  
2 realities -- we think. Roosevelt said, stop  
3 right there. Let me take into account the

4 budgetary and political realities. You tell  
5 me what would be best if none of that were  
6 an issue.

7 That's what I intend to do. I  
8 don't have to carry out one of these things.  
9 I don't have to fund it. So, I'm just going  
10 to run my mouth here about what I think  
11 would be exciting.

12 (Laughter)

13 DR. ACHEN: There were two things  
14 that I think tend to come up when people  
15 talk about what would be exciting and I  
16 think neither one of them is quite what I'd  
17 like to see. I was born in the middle of  
18 the Rocky Mountains and spent a fair amount  
19 of my early life there and we used to get  
20 dudes from the East coming out who would  
21 kind of stand there seeing the mountains the  
22 first time and their jaw would be hanging

---

1 down and their tongue would be hanging out.  
2 They'd say, look at them mountains.

3 There is a tendency to slip into  
4 that sometimes with the election studies  
5 too. You think, boy, that was an  
6 interesting race or that's an interesting  
7 class of elections. You know, look at them  
8 elections. We ought to go study that.

9 That I think was great in the  
10 early days when, as I said earlier  
11 descriptive information was largely missing.  
12 It's not, I think, where we ought to go now.  
13 The other idea that comes around a lot in  
14 these contexts is the -- is  
15 interdisciplinary studies of some kind.  
16 Bring in the unnamed people from the other  
17 disciplines and let's do some warm, wet,  
18 furry study that would incorporate these  
19 alternate perspectives.

20 I think that's probably not quite  
21 where we want to go either. What bothers me  
22 so much about the current state of our

---

1 knowledge is how limited it is. So, I have  
2 a stack of books about who voted for Hitler  
3 that is literally that high off the ground  
4 and the great problem is there were no  
5 surveys at that point.  
6 So, you know, what you'd like to

7 do on a desperately critically important  
8 question of that kind is be able to say to  
9 your undergraduates after you ask them how  
10 did Hitler come to power, and they say, well  
11 with guns, right? It was a coup, wasn't it?  
12 Munich, wasn't it? You say, no, he was  
13 elected fair and square. They say, gee, why  
14 did people vote for him? You say, why did  
15 people vote for him in one of the most  
16 sophisticated countries in the world at that  
17 time, is the real question. The answer is,  
18 we just don't have any idea.

19 I meant what I said. To be  
20 helpful on a situation like that when we  
21 don't have a lot of data, or take, you know,  
22 Huey Long who ran the state of Louisiana

---

1 using the, you know, National Guard and  
2 state police as his private gestapo,  
3 similarly, there are no data. You can extend  
4 this on and on as far as you like. We just  
5 don't have the theoretical machinery that  
6 would help us fill in where the data are  
7 missing.

8 I suspect that around this table,  
9 for all we know and have learned, and there  
10 is a lot of that, my guess is few if any of  
11 you would dispute that. So, my prejudice  
12 then is not cool new thoughts from adjacent  
13 disciplines, as much fun as those sometimes  
14 are, or amazing new technologies we haven't  
15 tried, fun as those might be, but rather  
16 what is the -- what are the current  
17 bottlenecks in the theoretical agenda that  
18 confront us?

19 There is more than one theoretical  
20 agenda represented here. Many of the little  
21 papers that we all wrote mentioned those and  
22 I won't be invidious by mentioning

---

1 particular ones. We all have theoretical  
2 points we want to make.

3 So, it seems to me it would be  
4 helpful too, in the course of this day and  
5 half, hard as it is because of the great  
6 complexity of administering these things,  
7 hard as it is to break off into this other  
8 thing that is more difficult and maybe  
9 pretty warm, and wet, and furry itself.

10 But, it seems to me pretty critical.  
11 One of the things I hear from the  
12 natural scientists I know is that it's hard  
13 to spend money on the social sciences  
14 because they just really in the end don't  
15 know what they're doing. Now sometimes you  
16 get this from people who aren't sure how  
17 many houses of Congress there are --  
18 DR. BRADY: Or physicists who have  
19 lost 95 percent of the matter in the  
20 universe.  
21 (Laughter)  
22 DR. ACHEN: Yes. So there is all

---

1 of that. There is all of that.  
2 DR. CLARKE: Give or take an order  
3 of magnitude.  
4 DR. ACHEN: We all know those  
5 jokes and the jokes about the economists and  
6 so on. But they're not -- they're not  
7 entirely without true content. I think we  
8 do struggle. It is a hard science.  
9 So somewhere in this day and a  
10 half, I think that a little time spent  
11 saying to ourselves, from within the various  
12 theoretical traditions that are represented  
13 around the table, what is an example of  
14 something people are fighting over where the  
15 theory kind of forks in the road there and  
16 where the current data we have available to  
17 us don't allow us to discipline our theories  
18 enough to know what to do.  
19 By my lights, when you do think  
20 about that, and I can think about some  
21 better than others obviously, and the rest  
22 of you will have to fill in from your own

---

1 points of view, but it seems to me that  
2 again and again you find that it's these  
3 horribly short time periods in which we see  
4 people. We're constantly taking these  
5 snapshots and then trying to fill in, you  
6 know, Gone With the Wind, in-between, at  
7 these long intervals in-between.  
8 So, you all read or saw at least,  
9 stayed with it as long as you could on the  
10 airplane before you fell asleep, my  
11 arguments about this. But, I really -- I

12 really feel that dynamics is pretty crucial  
13 here.

14 The second part of that is that  
15 getting people to -- getting people in our  
16 discipline to move to that is a substantial  
17 political problem, getting it paid for is a  
18 substantial financial problem. But, like I  
19 said, that's not my problem. I'm just going  
20 to put out the abstract argument and try to  
21 encourage us to give those theoretical  
22 questions a little time while we're here if

---

1 we can manage it.

2 DR. MUTZ: Okay. Some of the  
3 issues I had planned to bring up have  
4 already come up which I think is fortunate.  
5 But I want to start out by summarizing a  
6 little bit of what I'm hearing. I won't say  
7 it's a consensus because that would be a  
8 mistake. But there are some recurrent  
9 themes that seem to come up in various memos  
10 that were circulated that have to do with  
11 the substance.

12 I think probably this is the most  
13 difficult thing of all because to sit here  
14 now and plan what's going to be the  
15 substance of the NES 10 years from now does  
16 seem to me like a bit of an impossible task.  
17 We could do it but we'd be wrong anyway so  
18 I'm not sure it would be, you know, worth it  
19 to predict that.

20 But what we can do is set up the  
21 right kinds of platforms so that whatever  
22 the substance is we do want to study by then

---

1 we'll be able to do it and do it well.

2 What I read of the memos seems to  
3 be pretty much in agreement on the value of  
4 maintaining some kind of core. We may not  
5 know what the definition of core is per se,  
6 so we can differ on that. But the time  
7 series aspect on that has been very valuable  
8 to a lot of scholars.

9 But my own sense and I think the  
10 sense of many of the people in the room is  
11 that we do need to move toward a greater  
12 diversity of designs and approaches in order  
13 to move election research forward in some  
14 way.



15           Another thing that I think has  
16           come up in many people's comments is that we  
17           want to study a variety of things  
18           substantively. We may all have different  
19           ideas about what those are. But we want to  
20           study things for which some sort of long  
21           term panel design or rolling cross-sectional  
22           design would be very helpful.

---

1           You know, I found it  
2           interesting -- actually I think it was  
3           Chris's characterization of the NES as  
4           having emphasized social psychology a great  
5           deal in the past, because Kathleen McGraw's  
6           comments indicate that she has never used  
7           NES data. I actually think I've used it  
8           once or twice at most. So, I haven't been a  
9           major user.

10           Part of the reason is very similar  
11           to what you were saying. That is the  
12           inability to distinguish between even  
13           various socio-psychological theories based  
14           on NES data. It's just not an ideal design  
15           for purposes of doing that and that's no  
16           fault of the NES. It's inherent in the  
17           method that we've using to collect those  
18           data.

19           So, for that reason I haven't done  
20           a lot of work with NES data. But, I found  
21           myself getting very excited about the idea  
22           of these alternative designs and what we

---

1           might be able to do with them substantively  
2           if we had those kinds of data.

3           You know, in thinking about things  
4           like rolling cross-sectional designs, and  
5           panels, and so on and so forth, you know, I  
6           think it's easy to get carried away. We do  
7           have to think about a variety of issues that  
8           would come up. For example, my favorite  
9           being, as somebody who does individual level  
10           research for the most part, is to think  
11           about a panel where you could really get at  
12           change over time at the individual level and  
13           so forth.

14           But then again, I think about  
15           things like panel sensitization issues. If  
16           you have a panel followed for a long, long  
17           period of time and you're constantly asking

18 them questions about politics, they're going  
19 to respond differently. They're going to  
20 read the newspaper differently. They're  
21 going to do a lot of things differently.  
22 So, I don't think any one of these

---

1 particular things is cure all. But, I do  
2 see a lot of potential in these alternative  
3 types of methodological approaches. In  
4 fact, one of the ideas I mentioned in my  
5 memo was born over my concern over panel  
6 sensitization and trying to embed political  
7 questions in an already existing panel like  
8 the NES surveys. Because you can essentially  
9 bury the stuff in a lot of other questions  
10 that would take the emphasis away from  
11 politics.

12 So they wouldn't come away from  
13 the experience of every interview saying,  
14 you know, I'm going to be drummed to death  
15 again 2 years from now about my political  
16 knowledge, about my political attitudes, and  
17 so on and so forth and in that way avoid  
18 some of these methodological sensitization  
19 issues and yet still get the kind of data  
20 that would be ideally useful.

21 I guess in terms of talking about  
22 substantive concerns, in a way I evaded the

---

1 question in my memo because I feel like in  
2 the current political climate which I know  
3 you don't want to address, but in the  
4 current climate in the discipline trying  
5 to -- having NES aligned with or promoting  
6 any particular substantive area or  
7 theoretical model is going to be really a  
8 bad idea. Because the minute you do that  
9 you become extremely controversial and I  
10 think when you are first and foremost a  
11 public good that's not the direction you  
12 want to go.

13 So, you know, my own preference  
14 would be not to align it with that but  
15 rather to give people the vehicles that they  
16 need, the platforms that they need to study  
17 a wide variety of things and let that evolve  
18 as time goes by and elections change and so  
19 forth.

20 In terms of the main question that

21 I formulated for this particular section of  
22 our discussion, it actually is very much in

---

1 line with what Rick was saying about how the  
2 National Election Studies might be made into  
3 something that doesn't use one tool to  
4 address all questions even if it's not the  
5 best tool for addressing those questions.  
6 That is, you know, how do we move election  
7 studies away from being synonymous with a  
8 large cross-sectional sample, from being  
9 synonymous with a survey essentially? So,  
10 that is the study of elections in a way that  
11 is more synergistic than it is currently.

12 One question I myself couldn't  
13 answer is the NES supposed to be serving  
14 all scholars in political science who are  
15 interested in studying elections? I don't  
16 know the answer to that question. The  
17 history of the project and the way it  
18 evolved probably means it has never  
19 explicitly been answered. But, given the  
20 diversity of methodological approaches that  
21 are out there that people use to study  
22 elections, you know, that aren't

---

1 incorporated as part of this enterprise, I  
2 think that that integration could be done  
3 better.

4 A couple of the other of the  
5 issues that we were asked to address  
6 specifically I'll comment on. One was the  
7 study of networks and social interaction.  
8 This is something that I've done research on  
9 myself. I find it very interesting. I  
10 think it's, you know, too bad that the sort  
11 of sociological emphasis of some of the very  
12 earliest election studies has been lost.  
13 But in the context of the kind of instrument  
14 that the NES has worked with, I don't think  
15 you can do a good job measuring the  
16 social -- social networks in particular. It  
17 simply takes too large a battery of items  
18 and so forth to do a really good job with on  
19 any type of ongoing basis.

20 But I do think that we could bring  
21 back in some of that sociological emphasis  
22 by increasing access to -- especially the

---

1 ease of access to the kind of contextual  
2 data that you mentioned that you are  
4 integrating. Because I think the one  
5 study that I did that did involve NES data  
6 and I wanted to match up contextual  
7 information and so forth, it was just a  
8 tremendous amount of work because you have to  
9 go through the special access and all those  
10 sorts of things.

11 Again, this intersects with human  
12 subjects considerations. It happens for a  
13 lot of good reasons. Nonetheless, it's very  
14 discouraging for people who want to go off  
15 and study things like social context because  
16 it's so difficult, time consuming, to do it.

17 If one of my students comes to me  
18 and wants to do that with the NES data,  
19 well, unless they want to wait a year or  
20 something they're kind of out of luck  
21 because it takes a long time to do that and  
22 they also have to do the work themselves.  
23 So, if that were part of the release that

---

1 would be a big, I think, aid in encouraging  
2 people to do more contextual research when  
3 they're just linking it up with existing  
4 data of other kinds. So, I think that would  
5 be terrific to have in an easily accessible  
6 form.

7 Then finally, I wanted to comment  
8 on coming up with a better way to study  
9 campaigns and media in particular during  
10 campaigns. Because I think it's something  
11 that because it's difficult to do through  
12 self-reports and survey questionnaires we  
13 don't really have a good systematic study of  
14 that going on in the United States despite  
15 the fact that everyone seems to think that  
16 elections are entirely about media.

17 I think integrating that into the  
18 NES makes a lot of sense. By that I don't  
19 mean that I think the NES should go out and  
20 code everything they can get their hands on  
21 media-wise because I know what an impossible  
22 task that would be.

---

1 But given the kind of technology  
2 we have now I do think it would be possible  
3 now to develop a sampling scheme and so on

4 and so forth and to distribute things like  
5 CDs of the content that individual  
6 investigators can then use for their own  
7 research purchases.

8 Because doing that on your own as  
9 an investigator is, you know, virtually  
10 impossible in a systematic way and if we had  
11 that content of the campaign as part of the  
12 study on a continuous basis over time I  
13 think that would be very advantageous to  
14 advances in that area of research.

15 I was actually thinking while we  
16 were talking a few minutes ago that one of  
17 my questions on my qualifying exam when I  
18 was in graduate school at Stanford was  
19 redesign the National Election Study, assume  
20 unlimited budget. Yes. It's been a long  
21 time ago. I don't remember the specifics of  
22 everything I wrote about it but I do

---

1 remember that a central component was  
2 including the integration of information on  
3 candidates, information on the mass public,  
4 information on media and the communication  
5 environment, so that people could draw those  
6 things together.

7 We've really only had the public  
8 component on any kind of regular systematic  
9 basis and I think in the interests of sort  
10 of broadening what NES does, that would be a  
11 terrific thing to add on.

12 Again, I think -- I don't think we  
13 should do people's research for them. I  
14 don't think that we should step in and  
15 content analyze things for them and so  
16 forth. But I do think making the  
17 information available would go a long way  
18 toward encouraging research in that area and  
19 not every single scholar who wants to study  
20 something involved with media has to do  
21 their own separate study right now or their  
22 own separate collection of media content.

---

1 It's just not a very efficient way to learn  
2 more about these areas.

3 I'll stop there.  
4 DR. BRADY: On just panels. Both  
5 of you have recommended panels. I just  
6 wrote down quickly, I can think of a series

7 of panels of months, years, and decades that  
8 are out there. Months --the People's Choice  
9 I think was eight waves. There is  
10 Patterson's six wave. There is C3PO  
11 which was what, three of four waves but all  
12 on an order of months between them. Okay?

13 Then there's years. There's the  
14 CPS5660 which is three waves. Right? There  
15 is the 72 to 76 which is three waves. Then  
16 there's a British study out there which is  
17 like 8 to 11 waves. Some woman, I can't  
18 think of her name who has done something for  
19 eight years.

20 DR. CLARKE: Himmelway (?).

21 DR. BRADY: Exactly. Yeah, so  
22 that's over years. Then there's, of course,

---

1 the decades long political socialization  
2 study. What are you talking about? Is it  
3 months, years, decades? How many waves do  
4 you need?

5 DR. MUTZ: I was talking years but  
6 perhaps at, you know --

7 DR. BRADY: Every year?

8 DR. MUTZ: I hadn't gotten that  
9 specific. Give me a budget, I'll --

10 DR. BRADY: No, but I mean if you  
11 really have these -- Chris has some  
12 particular intellectual things and you have  
13 a model in mind I think. So, what's your  
14 time frame to estimate your model?

15 DR. ACHEN: Well, I don't think  
16 this is my model. One of the things I spent  
17 a fair amount of time on in my memo which  
18 you all saw was the necessity of this to be  
19 appealing to people from different,  
20 different theoretical perspectives.

21 But, I'm impressed by the PSID  
22 setup which is a big continuously rolling

---

1 thing. They rotate people in and out.  
2 They've got fresh cross-samples. Again, I  
3 discussed briefly exactly the issues that  
4 Diana just mentioned again and these have to  
5 do with both attrition and panel  
6 conditioning. Those are critical to doing  
7 that. But again, there is this gigantic  
8 body of experience and evidence with PSID  
9 about how to do that and how you take --

10 DR. BRADY: So, that's years.  
11 DR. ACHEN: It's years, yes.  
12 DR. BRADY: It's what, 10 or 11  
13 waves or something now? What is it?  
14 DR. ACHEN: I would just let it --  
15 yeah. I don't know exactly how long people  
16 should be in. It seems to me you might want  
17 different groups of people in for different  
18 periods. But, again, in an abstract world  
19 with no constraints, I would just start this  
20 thing off and let it run. People would  
21 rotate in and out on a continuing basis.  
22 There would always be people in there who

---

1 had been in for several years and so on.  
2 DR. LEMPert: Let me -- three  
3 unrelated points, quickly though. One, just  
4 on this last thing. In thinking about it,  
5 you know, you're all thinking about is as  
6 political scientists. Step back more  
7 broadly, think about this, for example, from  
8 the perspective, for example, of aging  
9 researchers.  
10 There you might want a lifetime  
11 panel to see how age itself is an  
12 independent variable. There is this sort of  
13 legend that people grow "more conservative"  
14 as they age. Do they or is it just changing  
15 life circumstances? One could carry this  
16 through to death really and maybe get some  
17 support from NIA in doing it.  
18 SPEAKER: You could probably go  
19 beyond.  
20 DR. BRADY: The socialization  
21 study has gotten support from NIA over the  
22 years.

---

1 DR. LEMPert: Yeah. In any case I  
2 think that one might want -- in terms of  
3 interdisciplinary without necessarily -- one  
4 might want to think of the interests of new  
5 disciplines that would be asking different  
6 questions of similar data.  
7 Second very quick point is, it  
8 just came across, I guess our e-mail about a  
9 week ago some people in South Carolina who  
10 have probably gotten a large private grant  
11 to put on a CD all of the media in the last  
12 South Carolina election and they are trying

13 to parlay this into kind of a national media  
14 center so maybe what you want is being done.  
15 But the core point I want to  
16 raise, I was stimulated by your comments,  
17 Diana and what someone else who also used  
18 the word, network, said, was well, you know,  
19 we can't do that because it's so complex.  
20 My question is, suppose it is networks? I  
21 mean, we're trying to understand elections.  
22 There is an awful lot going on in the social

---

1 sciences that says that network relations  
2 are crucial to understanding how information  
3 is disseminated, how it gets interpreted.  
4 If that is a large part of what is going on,  
5 should we be investing in NES if it's not  
6 looking at networks? I don't know if it is.  
7 So, the challenge that I see is  
8 not to -- like the ---- at a light say,  
9 okay, we're going to look here, where we  
10 know there's nothing. It's first of all to  
11 determine what is going on and if something  
12 is going on in networks, it may mean we have  
13 to invest more money. It may mean that we  
14 might as well pull our investment out  
15 because we can't afford to look at it. Or,  
16 it may mean we need new modules.  
17 How do we discover how important  
18 networks are, how they might be  
19 incorporated, and the like? I don't think  
20 we can simply say, let's write that off  
21 because we don't have the funding to do it.  
22 DR. MUTZ: Okay. Well, I was

---

1 going to say, my research says they are  
2 important so I would obviously like to see  
3 more data like that.  
4 But what is complex about it is  
5 that, you know, unless you're going to rely  
6 on self-reports of the main respondents of  
7 their network members preferences and et  
8 cetera, et cetera, you've got to interview  
9 not only the main respondents but you've got  
10 to interview the network members, and so on  
11 and so forth. There is a huge amount of  
12 attrition there and it's a big job. I mean,  
13 it would a huge amount devoted to that  
14 particular topic which would be fine with  
15 me.



16           But, what's going on for the most  
17 part is because those type of data are  
18 fairly few and far between, instead people  
19 use context measures to try to simulate  
20 social networks. Now, they're not the same  
21 thing because obviously we aren't able to  
22 get as close to people's networks as we'd

---

1           like with these types of aggregated data.  
2                        Yeah, no, it would be great to do  
3 if we could, but it would -- and it's one of  
4 those areas as I wrote in my memo that is  
5 very interdisciplinary right now. People  
6 from a wide array of disciplines are  
7 studying social networks toward very  
8 different ends.  
9                        DR. LEMPERT: Let me just sort of  
10 push something else which ties into another  
11 really nice initiative our Political Science  
12 Program has which is the EITM, the Empirical  
13 Implications of Theoretical Methods program.  
14                        One of the -- again as method,  
15 network analysis has had some substantial  
16 advances in, you know, the past decade or  
17 two. One of the ideas behind the EITM is to  
18 sort of create a dialogue between modelers  
19 and researchers.  
20                        Is there a possibility of actually  
21 getting a lot more if we in fact quite  
22 consciously use a kind of EITM model over

---

1           time so that we have relatively focused  
2 theoretical implications that we're looking  
3 for and then we expand the data base based  
4 on what we're finding? Could something like  
5 that be built into the election studies?  
6                        DR. MUTZ: I think it would be  
7 terrific. Whether it could be actually  
8 built into the election study depends on  
9 time available and you know --  
10                       DR. LEMPERT: Money and everything  
11 else.  
12                        DR. MUTZ: Yeah.  
13                        DR. LEMPERT: I'd love to be in a  
14 situation if you're committed, you could  
15 say, unlimited resources.  
16                        DR. CLARKE: I mean, to some  
17 extent good research always does that. If  
18 we're paying -- like we try to pay close

19 attention to alternative theoretical  
20 frameworks as I said earlier on and like,  
21 really close attention. In particular, some  
22 of the work Chris has done with regard to

---

1 learning models and updated and what are the  
2 implications of this or classic social, you  
3 know, psychological kinds of discussions and  
4 what have you.

5 So, I think that goes on. I think  
6 good research will be theoretically directed  
7 and, you know, I think that's always been  
8 the case. So you know, it will continue to  
9 be. You know things that get people excited  
10 on NSF panels are precisely the kinds of  
11 studies that do what you're suggesting.

12 So, you know, I think that's going  
13 to happen. I think we can feel pretty  
14 optimistic about that. I mean, the EITM  
15 program is really neat because it put this  
16 right out and gets everybody like -- usually  
17 the younger generation in particular are  
18 going to have skills, a combination of  
19 skills that older people haven't.

20 I think things will get much  
21 better in this regard. But, I think already  
22 they're pretty good. I mean the stuff that

---

1 I've ever seen, the NSF proposals that I've  
2 supported and so forth and that people get  
3 excited about on one of these panels are  
4 precisely these kinds of proposals.

5 DR. LEMPert: Let me -- I don't  
6 want to hog it but let me ask one more  
7 question that has been floating around in my  
8 mind, partly stimulated by a lunch talk we  
9 had yesterday by someone and I wish Chris  
10 had been there. Because his whole schtick  
11 was, forget theory. Historically, no matter  
12 where we look we never resolve our  
13 theoretical disputes and in fact the best  
14 way to a good theory is a good method or a  
15 good study.

16 From that perspective I am curious  
17 what are the questions, not that we want to  
18 answer from the study. Are there no new  
19 questions out there? I don't mean questions  
20 about deciding between theories. I mean  
21 questions about how voters are acting, the

1 had.

2 To what extent are the questions  
3 questions of we really know what's going on  
4 out there but we just have to go a little  
5 bit further to see whether this is being  
6 motivated by cognitive dissonance, or being  
7 motivated by conformity, or what have you?

8 Or, are there some real new  
9 questions that we want to know about the  
10 electorate, about voting patterns? I mean  
11 it seems to me the area of turnout, I'm not  
12 sure it's a theoretical, that we're at the  
13 stage, although there are obviously theories  
14 about allegiance and legitimacy and all of  
15 that. There may be lots of things we still  
16 don't know about turnout.

17 So, from that perspective, rather  
18 than being -- if innovation is -- and of  
19 course it's not either or by any means, I  
20 don't mean to suggest that. But, if  
21 innovations were motivated not by the search  
22 for resolving theoretical conflict but by

---

1 information that would be tremendously  
2 valuable and interesting --

3 DR. BRADY: Well, I think emotions  
4 and cognition in voting. Diana talked about  
5 that in her memo. It's a very important  
6 topic. I think, you know, the NES here  
7 actually deserves a lot of credit because I  
8 think early on, mostly through Don's work  
9 there are some questions there.

10 Now there are some real problems  
11 with those questions because of endogeneity  
12 and we're never sure what's causing what.  
13 But at least they are there and they have  
14 been a way to at least identify that yeah,  
15 those things do correlate with vote choice  
16 big time.

17 Now the question is, well, what's  
18 driving what? What comes first the  
19 emotions, the trait sort of feelings, or the  
20 cognition? So on and so forth. That's I  
21 think a really important question in terms  
22 of understanding politics. It may be that

---

1 emotions are a lot of what drives politics  
2 and therefore we better understand those  
3 better.

4 DR. CLARKE: ---- it's a natural.  
5 It's appeared in the ANES. We have tried to  
6 do it in the British study. We've been  
7 doing these monthly surveys and so forth.  
8 They are not just the best vehicles for some  
9 of these things as you mentioned Henry, but  
10 I still think that's an area, that's an  
11 exciting area for the future.

12 DR. BLAIS: But it also seems to  
13 me that there are some questions that ask  
14 basically political questions that don't  
15 have clear the theoretical connection which  
16 any election study has to address. For  
17 instance for the next American Election  
18 Study, I hope that there will be some  
19 assessment of the impact of the war,  
20 assuming the U.S. goes to war, on the  
21 election.

22 I mean, I don't know exactly what

---

1 the theoretical framework will be but  
2 that's, you know, a very basic question.  
3 I'm sure that in Canada, the meaning of the  
4 election, so to speak, the basic impact of  
5 issues, you know, how health played in the  
6 election, has to be addressed. You know,  
7 it's very basic. It's not clear exactly  
8 which theoretical framework but the impact  
9 of issues on the election has to be part of  
10 the election study.

11 DR. MUTZ: To formulate this in  
12 very general questions, we don't know the  
13 answer to why the person who wins the  
14 election wins. Is it just something he said  
15 he said during the campaign? Is it because  
16 of economic conditions in the country at  
17 large and it has nothing to do with what the  
18 candidate said or didn't say?

19 I mean all those kind of very  
20 large questions are there. Then the ones  
21 beyond that that we've been especially  
22 hampered, I think in understanding because

---

1 we don't follow people much after elections  
2 and between elections.

3           The question of how the public  
4 perceives election outcomes, why do they  
5 think a given candidate wins or loses? Of  
6 course usually they say it's because of the  
7 media or a person had, you know, better  
8 campaign consultants or whatever. That  
9 obviously, that answer is a more cynical one  
10 and suggests that the legitimacy isn't  
11 interpreted in the way that ideally we might  
12 want.

13           But I think those kind of  
14 questions that occur, especially after the  
15 last Presidential election long after people  
16 have cast their vote are things that could  
17 be incorporated into it. Because the  
18 function of elections is not just to elect a  
19 given individual in a given year but rather  
20 to legitimate the system on an ongoing  
21 basis. We've got to do better than trust  
22 measures for getting at that.

---

1           DR. ACHEN: I think you can  
2 imagine a situation in which we as a  
3 profession might be able to come in with a  
4 fairly glittery and pretty much agreed on  
5 set of proposals. Too many no doubt to do  
6 all at once, but a set of things we are all  
7 interested in doing. These endogeneity  
8 questions Henry just referred to that come  
9 up with the role of emotion in political  
10 choice for example would get some help if we  
11 could see people over time. That's true in  
12 a lot of other frameworks as well.

13           So, if there were a sense that  
14 from a variety of theoretical perspectives  
15 there were angles at looking at a different  
16 kind of data so we could come in with a list  
17 of substantively and theoretically  
18 consequential topics that we could answer if  
19 we had rather more money than we have now,  
20 it seems to me then we might have done part  
21 of our job which is give sex and violence to  
22 this proposal.

---

1           Then as you say, Rick, when the  
2 data actually appear people will say, boy,  
3 these sure were a dumb set of reasons they  
4 gave for building this data set. I've got  
5 something much more interesting I can do

6 with this that nobody had thought of and off  
7 it will go in the usual sorts of ways that  
8 we're familiar with.

9 But, it does seem to me that if we  
10 are going to propose to you and I'm hearing  
11 this around the room, that this is a very  
12 worthwhile enterprise, that has  
13 possibilities for extension to it, it's  
14 going to cost some more money. Part of the  
15 job is going to be for us to supply some  
16 reasons why it might be sensible to give it  
17 to us beyond simply, it will be great to  
18 have more data and we'll figure something  
19 out.

20 DR. SINNOTT: A comment on the  
21 word, theory. Of course it's interesting to  
22 comment in a way. But, one of the things

---

1 again, I brought to work on on the plane,  
2 having done the initial note was Karl  
3 Popper's book on objective knowledge.  
4 Because something clicked in mind when I was  
5 wondering about the status of what I was  
6 attempting to do.

7 Popper has a wonderful appendix in  
8 the back of his book on objective knowledge  
9 where he distinguishes between the bucket  
10 theory of the mind and the searchlight  
11 theory of the mind. It's obvious which one  
12 he prefers. But in a sense, the bucket  
13 theory is the one that we end up often  
14 working with and that strikes me as being  
15 perhaps particularly the case in regard to  
16 voter turnout.

17 We have this bucket with a hundred  
18 observations in it but we have no way of  
19 sorting it, or prioritizing it, or  
20 understanding the links between the bits and  
21 different parts of the bucket, or whatever.

22 The other point that Popper makes

---

1 that I think is very relevant is when he  
2 says theory, it's not something enormously  
3 elaborate. Theory starts, theory can start  
4 at a very low level because it is simply the  
5 set of assumptions and unresolved questions  
6 in relation to something like turnout that  
7 you have and you inch that forward and  
8 that's what guides the next step in your

9 research.

10 Because I think sometimes when we  
11 say, research must be theory driven it's in  
12 a sense a bit dismaying because you say, oh  
13 my god, I've got to have a good theory.  
14 But, in fact, you know we have our theories  
15 to start with. It's a question of then  
16 gradually reworking them, defining them,  
17 testing them.

18 DR. CLARKE: At the same time,  
19 though, I think it's fair, like we are sort  
20 of the choir here. I do think it's fair for  
21 our colleagues within political science and  
22 elsewhere to say, okay, what you learned?

---

1 What really have you learned?

2 To ask like in the British case  
3 that study has been going for four decades.  
4 Here we've been going for five. Canada is  
5 almost four. I think it's a very fair  
6 question. So I, you know, I think we really  
7 do want to be able to come up with some good  
8 answers to that. They don't have to be the  
9 same answers but they've got to be really  
10 good sound scientific answers.

11 If we can't do that, then I think  
12 the enterprise is going to run into  
13 considerable difficulty and so I don't think  
14 we want to lose track of that. I think  
15 that's really, really important.

16 DR. SCIOLI: Chris, what would you  
17 say to that? What do you tell your  
18 undergraduates? In your paper you started  
19 to say then you came off the same kind of  
20 approach that Diana did, that we don't know  
21 why we vote for this person. I mean is it  
22 that bleak? Is my neck on the line here

---

1 now?

2 DR. BRADY: Don't ask Chris this  
3 question. He's the wrong person to ask.  
4 He's such a pessimist.

5 (Laughter)

6 DR. ACHEN: Henry has known me too  
7 long obviously. No, we've learned a lot.  
8 But, I think it's fair to say that there is  
9 a good deal left to do and our conceptual  
10 frameworks now I think it would be widely  
11 agreed, are not strong enough to fill in

12 historically important elections. Abraham  
13 Lincoln, FDR, Huey Long, Adolph Hitler.  
14 They are not strong to fill those  
15 in in a way that reasonable middle of the  
16 road people could say, yes, given what we  
17 know, given the data we have, it's almost  
18 surely the case that thus and such happened.  
19 We don't have that.  
20 That presumably -- presumably  
21 that's not just around the corner but I  
22 think we ought not to lose track that that

---

1 is our goal and we ought to be able to talk  
2 to that point and how we intend to make  
3 progress toward it if we're going to ask the  
4 Foundation, as I hope we will, for  
5 considerably more money.  
6 DR. BRADBURN: Let me just follow  
7 up on -- well both of these arguments and  
8 particularly Harold's.  
9 I think one of the things which is  
10 important in -- both externally and  
11 internally -- in being able to make the case  
12 for more resources is being able to look  
13 cumulatively in the sense that we've learned  
14 some things and being able to enumerate at  
15 least enough of those to be convincing.  
16 But, there are all these things that we  
17 don't know and what it is we don't know.  
18 Secondly, where -- what is the  
19 relationship between what we're going to do  
20 now and answering those questions? Is what  
21 we're going to do next going to move us  
22 towards answering the remaining -- and you

---

1 know, I think everybody in all the sciences  
2 knows that it's a dynamic. In the process  
3 of solving one set of things you open up a  
4 whole set of new questions which you  
5 couldn't have even imagined before you got  
6 through those. Then you find that the  
7 matter -- 90 percent of the matter is  
8 missing or whatever.  
9 But, it took them a long time to  
10 get to the point that they even realized  
11 that it was missing, you know, what it was  
12 that was missing, sort of things like that.  
13 We're nowhere near that kind of precision.  
14 But it does have to have some sense of  
15 building rather than each time it's like



16 we're starting over again, as if we did.  
17 I think in a way it's analogous to  
18 Popper's point about theory in a way. I  
19 mean, every study's design has some at least  
20 implicit theory even if it's not explicit.  
21 I think we've been pushing more towards -- I  
22 mean, not just NSF but I think progress in

---

1 social sciences has been pushing more to  
2 making those more explicit and saying more  
3 what this study is going to add to either  
4 resolving some issues, or elaborating the  
5 theory, or building on it, whichever it is.  
6 I think that's I would think a  
7 sense of what people feel is missing in a  
8 lot of social science research in some kind  
9 of ways.

10 DR. SCIOLI: I'm in the enviable  
11 position. I remember when I used to call up  
12 Warren Miller and say, Warren, and this is a  
13 term that remains in our lexicon, nuggets.  
14 Nuggets, I need some nuggets, I need some  
15 nuggets. Particularly when I took this to  
16 the ANES, to the National Science Board  
17 twice, and explaining to a group of  
18 physicists, and chemists, biologists,  
19 engineers, what is this about?  
20 Predecessors to Don and Nancy but  
21 certainly they have also given me stacks of  
22 nuggets and they're being very modest.

---

1 You know, I mean we're talking as  
2 if we've learned nothing about American  
3 electoral behavior and if you guys don't  
4 bale me out, this will be part of the  
5 written record. Yeah, we don't know a darn  
6 thing about why people vote.

7 DR. KINDER: I remember --  
8 DR. SCIOLI: It's been a lot of  
9 fun.

10 DR. KINDER: I remember. I was  
11 Warren's writer when you called.

12 DR. SCIOLI: You used to send  
13 me 25 nuggets.

14 DR. KINDER: I have lots of  
15 nuggets. Yes, and I -- I have great respect  
16 for my colleague across the table here but  
17 we really think pretty differently I think  
18 about how far we've come. Not about -- I

19 think we're agreed about the absence of  
20 crowning theoretical achievement. But, we  
21 seem to differ about the power of what I've  
22 said are systematic empirical

---

1 generalizations that I think that we have  
2 been producing that are theoretically  
3 informed but don't emerge in a strict  
4 objective way out of a set of theoretical  
5 premises.  
6 There's nothing like that around,  
7 I think, for the most part in political  
8 science. I'm not sure we'll have it soon.  
9 There is a kind of impatience I see in  
10 Chris. He's waiting impatiently for Newton  
11 and he hasn't arrived yet. I think -- isn't  
12 this true that you're about 30 days older  
13 than I am and this accounts for why he's so  
14 cranky and I'm so sunny?

15 (Laughter)

16 DR. KINDER: I'm been thinking  
17 here and I want to do some more of this,  
18 that the test you put on the table is a very  
19 interesting one which is, so, you know, put  
20 up or shut up. What are your conjectures  
21 about who voted for Hitler? I really like  
22 that as a question.

---

1 It's not as if I have formulated  
2 an answer to that. But, I can't believe  
3 that you don't think that we have sensible  
4 things to say about that now based on what  
5 we've been doing, all of us together in the  
6 community, over the last 30 years. That  
7 we're smarter now in our conjectures than we  
8 would have been, you know, before the four  
9 horsemen sat down to write The American  
10 Voter.

11 DR. ACHEN: Yeah, just I don't  
12 want to leave the impression that I don't  
13 think that. As I said earlier, I teach  
14 history of political science, so I read what  
15 people thought about voting behavior in  
16 the 1930s and they really were in the dark  
17 almost entirely. So, I don't want to leave  
18 the impression here that I don't think there  
19 has been any progress. That doesn't  
20 represent my views.

21 DR. BRADY: Well, just to take one

1 about -- was it 1984? We were trying to get  
2 viability questions on I think the  
3 continuous monitoring project. Warren  
4 Miller said, well are we sure that people  
5 really estimate people's viabilities in  
6 terms of primaries and try to estimate who  
7 is ahead and therefore vote for those  
8 people?

9 We had done, Jay Merrill Shanks  
10 and I had done some experiments,  
11 convinced them to put it on. Now I think  
12 it's fairly well agreed that yes, that's an  
13 important aspect. Strategic thinking is  
14 part of what goes on in primaries. Hardly  
15 anybody doubts that anymore.

16 So that's just one example. Party  
17 identification. You wouldn't start thinking  
18 about voting without thinking of party  
19 identification. We know the mass electorate  
20 doesn't know that much about politics. We  
21 know that emotions matter. We know that  
22 traits matter. We could go on and on.

---

1 There's just a lot of things we now know  
2 that we would have to consider and think  
3 were important.

4 Now exactly how traits matter, and  
5 emotions matter, and issues matter, I can't  
6 quite write it all down and so forth. There  
7 is a lot of endogeneity there but I know  
8 they all matter.

9 DR. MUTZ: Yeah, I concur with  
10 both Henry and Don in that I think we've  
11 learned a tremendous amount from the NES  
12 studies and I think empirically careful  
13 generalizations is a good way to sort of  
14 summarize it. They are theoretically  
15 important for the most part.

16 But, I think the argument I would  
17 make in moving this forward and saying, you  
18 know, here's what we've done so far but we  
19 can't do more unless we have some more tools  
20 is that the biggest weakness I see in  
21 studies that I receive as an editor of  
22 Political Behavior, a small journal, is

---

1 causality.  
2                   You know because we use so much  
3 cross-sectional data we really don't have a  
4 good handle on what causes what. We can  
5 tell you what's related to what very  
6 reliably. But causality is just a big  
7 problem discipline-wide I think. So to the  
8 extent that we justify the need for these  
9 new tools by virtue of saying, these tools,  
10 whether it be, you know, a rolling  
11 cross-section design, or a panel, or  
12 whatever, are going to allow us to get  
13 beyond the empirical generalizations that we  
14 know and actually know what causes what.  
15                   I think that's a big and very  
16 convincing argument.  
17                   DR. SCIOLI: Is it better in  
18 psychology because of experimentation?  
19                   DR. MUTZ: Oh, yeah, with  
20 experiments.  
21                   MR. TOURANGEAU: All the  
22 theoretical questions in psychology have

---

1 been resolved.  
2                   (Laughter)  
3                   DR. BRADY: Thank you, Roger.  
4                   DR. CLARKE: That's right.  
5                   DR. MUTZ: They're resolved for  
6 purposes of sophomores. Yes, thank you.  
7                   MR. TOURANGEAU: Terrific theories  
8 of college sophomores. Another point I was  
9 going to raise, inspired in part by Chris's,  
10 you know, talking about Lincoln's election  
11 and Hitler's election, one of the great  
12 purposes of a survey like this is purely  
13 descriptive.  
14                   People a hundred years from now  
15 won't be in the same boat when they're  
16 trying to explain, how the hell did Reagan  
17 ever get elected? I mean, they'll be in a  
18 radically different situation.  
19                   I mean, the GSS from my point of  
20 view is an even less theoretical survey, and  
21 yet, it has a unique position in sort of  
22 American social history because you have a

---

1 good indicator of what people were thinking,  
2 a cross-section of the American people were

3 thinking for a given series of years.

4 This is a great resource and it's  
5 going to be grist for somebody's theoretical  
6 mill down the road. So I sort of -- it's  
7 unusual for me to be in this position of  
8 sort of, you know, singing the praises of  
9 descriptive information. I think people who  
10 know me will testify that I don't often do  
11 this.

12 But, I do think that this is a  
13 remarkable resource from that perspective  
14 that historians will be in a radically  
15 different position in understanding the  
16 American electorate a hundred years from now  
17 because of the existence of this resource.

18 Similarly sociologists a hundred  
19 years from now will have a much profounder  
20 understanding of American society because of  
21 the existence of the General Social Survey.  
22 Those virtues are not to be underestimated I

---

1 don't think.

2 DR. SCIOLI: Yeah, but Roger, then  
3 how should I answer the question if we're  
4 buying descriptive information, why not go  
5 to Roper or Gallup and they'll give me at a  
6 much less costly expenditure -- I mean,  
7 what's the difference between Roper, Gallup,  
8 and ANES, or anything in GSS?

9 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, I think,  
10 you know, I'll talk a little bit about some  
11 of the criteria for evaluating the quality  
12 of surveys. But I think on any front in  
13 terms of the amount of content, the quality  
14 of the data, you know, these are inferior  
15 instruments in many ways.

16 DR. BRADY: It's not just that  
17 though, Roger. In this article that I did  
18 for this unfinished election book, I did a  
19 very simple thing. I have religious  
20 attendance by income, okay? Then I take for  
21 various groups where they locate themselves  
22 on there and whether they're part of the

---

1 Democratic or Republican coalition.  
2 You can't do that simple diagram  
3 which turns out to be very powerful for  
4 explaining something about the American  
5 political parties. For example, Christian

6 fundamentalists are low in income but high  
7 on religious attendance and they are  
8 Republicans. Right? Union members are high  
9 on income but low on religious attendance.  
10 Then there are some other things probably  
11 going on there too.

12 But, I mean, just simple stuff  
13 like that you cannot do with standard  
14 surveys. You can with the ANES.

15 Then you've got all this other  
16 stuff like feeling thermometers, how they  
17 feel about different groups. So, for  
18 example that the union members don't like  
19 the managers and don't like capitalists. I  
20 can't remember the exact question you can  
21 use, but there is one, a feeling thermometer  
22 about rich people or something like that.

---

1 You say, oh, I begin to understand why those  
2 folks are still part of the Democratic  
3 coalition.

4 So, it's simple stuff like that.  
5 There's no big theory there. But boy, it  
6 tells you I think something about American  
7 politics to know the facts that I just  
8 recited.

9 DR. SCIOLI: But, that's the  
10 importance of the continuity argument.

11 DR. BRADY: Yeah, absolutely.

12 DR. SCIOLI: That's what you don't  
13 get typically from -- there a few things  
14 that Gallup actually -- there are some  
15 religious questions that they have time  
16 series on but on the whole they don't. None  
17 of the commercial polls because of their --  
18 unless they're run by somebody that has a  
19 particular interest like Gallup does in  
20 religion. But otherwise you don't get that  
21 kind of continuity.

22 MR. TOURANGEAU: Or it's the depth

---

1 of inquiry. Don't get me wrong. Gallup is  
2 one of my two or three favorite former  
3 employers.

4 DR. HANSEN: But, it's also a  
5 matter of the ANES and the general social  
6 survey being run by people who are  
7 interested in knowing what the relationship  
8 is between one thing and another which has

9 really not been much of a source of interest  
10 in the commercial polls.

11 DR. CLARKE: I think always when  
12 you write like election study proposals we  
13 always make the argument for the historical  
14 record. We've got boilerplate on that. We  
15 go and we know we can just pick it up in  
16 paragraph.

17 But I really don't think in terms  
18 of building the future in a competitive --  
19 in an intellectually and financially  
20 competitive environment like the NSF is that  
21 we can let it rest there.

22 I think everything we've said,

---

1 yeah, it's really good to have this stuff  
2 and it will be really good for future  
3 generations and so forth. But I don't think  
4 we can lose sight of the larger theoretical  
5 enterprise and -- you know, I was thinking,  
6 we go back, some of us go back to maybe  
7 reading about the funnel of causality.

8 Some of these things, like if you  
9 take the American voter, and take it  
10 seriously you can see this thing really in  
11 terms of providing what seems to be a really  
12 interesting and convincing explanation of  
13 individual level voting behavior, I'm going  
14 to read it and say, this is really exciting.  
15 This stuff is good. Then when I learned how  
16 to run these things on a computer, I said,  
17 gosh, I could really explain a lot of  
18 variance. This looks really good.

19 So I mean, it's work like that  
20 though that I think has energized a lot of  
21 us to be in this field and that it will be  
22 the best in the future, our best arguments

---

1 for perpetuating and enhancing this kind of  
2 inquiry.

3 DR. LEMPert: Let me, if I may,  
4 make an observation about this issue of what  
5 do we know and maybe some of the stuff you  
6 were saying.

7 One of the things that I think is  
8 most interesting about this whole area and  
9 one of the strongest cases for kind of, you  
10 know, continuation is that things are  
11 temporally embedded. So, it may be that one

12 can say we know from classic research about  
13 certain issues of party identification but  
14 if we acted on that basis today we might be  
15 dead wrong.

16 We have to continue to renew what  
17 we know or get a higher level of theory so  
18 that we can explain transitions -- that's  
19 another dimension. You asked about the  
20 Gallup thing or other things which I think  
21 is a constant challenge, it's to build on,  
22 in a sense what we know, while realizing it

---

1 may not be the way it is today, and kind of  
2 checking.

3 That's another argument for the  
4 core -- it's the continual checking of what  
5 we think we know. Hopefully over time we'll  
6 learn what it is that transforms patterns of  
7 behavior. Another -- perhaps that's an  
8 argument for panels as well, at least as a  
9 complement to repeated cross-sections.

10 DR. CLARKE: Oh, I think indeed --  
11 just to follow-up on this point I mean -- A  
12 lot of The American Voter was exciting, and  
13 theoretical, and it's innovations. I think  
14 in a lot of ways it was dead wrong. But  
15 nevertheless it's the kind of thing we  
16 should do and it's only by doing it again  
17 that you're able to, like, do what you say.

18 I worry though a lot that like the  
19 level of temporal aggregation is really not  
20 right in terms of answering a lot of the  
21 things like dynamics. Because a lot of the  
22 stuff that Chris writes about in terms of

---

1 Bayesian models and so forth, it just seems  
2 to me just on its face that it's highly  
3 implausible that I'm going to catch this  
4 right with a study done every 2 or 4 years.

5 If I get it wrong I may have  
6 buried my inferences maybe really.

7 I think we can -- this is not hard  
8 to show with some simulations and so forth.  
9 I've done some of this stuff with my  
10 students. You reach really different kinds  
11 of conclusions if you are aggregating this  
12 way as opposed to having a much more finely  
13 grained kind of thing, which I think suits  
14 our intuitions about information flow and



15 processing and so on.  
16 So, I mean it's one thing to do  
17 panels. But if you're going to do panels  
18 then you've got to really start thinking  
19 about when to do them, how to do them, and  
20 you could imagine different kinds of  
21 designs. You can say, okay, well I've only  
22 got like 5 variables or 10 whatever, but

---

1 these are things that I think really  
2 matter. So I do this study like very month  
3 or whatever, whatever I think is reasonable.  
4 I'm going to learn a lot more than doing a  
5 traditional study every 4 years.

6 One way around this, I mean this  
7 whole constraint, this sort of optimization,  
8 you know, this constraint that we're doing  
9 may well be to make successful our arguments  
10 to funding agencies like the NSF to broaden  
11 our, like, frame of what we're doing in  
12 terms of political decision making, if there  
13 were a broader sort of frame.

14 I think if we could ever do that  
15 that we'd solve a lot of these sort of  
16 conundrums. We sort of think oh, it's got  
17 to be this or it's not this. But,  
18 fundamentally it would be nice if we could  
19 really broaden out and do more. I mean  
20 that's just apple pie but I mean, it's  
21 really true.

22 You can't -- you just can't say,

---

1 okay we got to maintain the regular ANES  
2 every 4 years. We got to do it exactly the  
3 same way we did it when Warren Miller  
4 started back at Michigan in the 50s and then  
5 expect to do all these other sorts of things  
6 that are flowing out of theoretical work  
7 that's been coming online. I just can't see  
8 how we can do this.

9 DR. SCIOLI: I raised the Gallup  
10 Roper thing I hope you realize tongue in  
11 cheek. Because at a National Science Board  
12 hearing in a room like this on 1800 G Street  
13 I was asked, first why not have an 800 line  
14 and call people -- by a National Science  
15 Board member. How much would that be? You  
16 know at the time maybe it was \$3,000 a month  
17 or a year to use an 800 number. What does

18 the ANES do beyond that?  
19 Then I was asked about the New  
20 York Times, which is of course the font of  
21 all knowledge for politics. Why be curious  
22 about why people voted for Hitler when you

---

1 could look at the archives of the New York  
2 Times, and you can see what he was saying,  
3 and you know, it was very appealing, and so  
4 on and so forth? Why would you have to ask  
5 people, if it were in the Times, people read  
6 it and they --  
7 DR. CLARKE: What did you say?  
8 (Laughter)  
9 DR. SCIOLI: Well, as I said  
10 earlier, and as I said then, I had a really  
11 rich body of generalizations theoretically  
12 driven provided by Warren and Merle and  
13 subsequently Gina and Don and Nancy and  
14 others that gave considerable hope for the  
15 progress that has been made in unraveling  
16 some of the conundrums, but always pushing  
17 forward. That was Norman's point as was  
18 Rick's point also. Where do we go next?  
19 So, it's not like we're starting  
20 de novo. Oh, isn't it interesting people  
21 vote. Who cares? You know. Remember one  
22 of my questions was, who votes and who

---

1 cares?  
2 DR. BRADBURN: Now it's, who used  
3 to vote?  
4 DR. ACHEN: Who used to care.  
5 It's not how we decide elections anyway.  
6 DR. SCIOLI: Yeah and I've heard  
7 Harold elsewhere extol how much we've  
8 learned from studying electoral behavior in  
9 the United States and I don't, I don't want  
10 the record to not show that.  
11 DR. CLARKE: Oh, no. I think  
12 that's a part of the case, we have to be  
13 sort of -- in terms of really sort of making  
14 the case, it has to go both sides. We have  
15 really made contributions, really know a lot  
16 more than if this enterprise had not gone  
17 forward but at the same time we have an  
18 agenda which flows out of this that's worth  
19 pursuing.  
20 DR. SCIOLI: Norman and Rick in

21 particular are constantly pushed to answer  
22 the kind of questions that they raised

---

1 about, what are the exciting questions that  
2 we can ask now? What are the building  
3 blocks on which those questions have  
4 emerged? What are the methodologies that  
5 will get us there faster?

6 Typically they have to explain  
7 that to people in this building, as a matter  
8 of fact at the other end of the building,  
9 the north side, who are not social  
10 scientists or not behavioral scientists and  
11 then have to go up on the Hill and have to  
12 make the argument. You know what is going  
13 on in social and behavioral sciences that  
14 makes it interesting and exciting? We in  
15 the core disciplines want to argue that each  
16 of the disciplines has something to say  
17 about the priority areas, has something to  
18 say about the bigger questions.

19 Time for a coffee break. We have  
20 plenty of coffee now.

21 (Recess)

22 THE FUTURE OF INFORMATION COLLECTION

---

1 DR. SCIOLI: Now Roger, we don't  
2 have enough topics under your heading. We  
3 want you to put in Internet Voting. We want  
4 you to put in Knowledge Network Alternative.  
5 We want you to put in --

6 SPEAKER: This is the abridged  
7 version.

8 DR. SCIOLI: Please don't feel  
9 that you're limited to the nine topics  
10 before you. Because now we're getting into  
11 the exciting stuff since we've dealt with  
12 all the theoretical things.

13 MR. TOURANGEAU: I'll try to keep  
14 my remarks to under 40 minutes. One thing I  
15 want to do -- I want to make three basic  
16 points. But one thing I wanted to do is  
17 that in rereading what I wrote it seemed  
18 like I was a staunch defender of telephone  
19 surveys. I want to say for the record that  
20 I think that face-to-face surveys dominate  
21 telephone surveys except on the dimension of  
22 cost. I think they're superior in terms of

---

1 coverage. I think they're superior in terms  
2 of data quality. I think they're superior  
3 in terms of non-response.

4 In fact, I think one of the great  
5 achievements of Web surveys is that they've  
6 created a mode that telephone surveys can be  
7 better than. You know, and that's a  
8 remarkable achievement. I meant to say,  
9 Bill don't listen for next 30 seconds.

10 There are three points I wanted to  
11 talk about. The first point is -- well, let  
12 me lay them out. One is how much more  
13 difficult it's been to do good surveys, the  
14 combination of rising response --or rising  
15 cost and falling response rates. That's my  
16 first point.

17 My second one I wanted to talk  
18 about is that there are new forms of  
19 self-administration that I think have been  
20 overlooked in the design of all the  
21 infrastructure studies and I wanted to just  
22 put in a plug for those.

---

1 Then the third point I wanted to  
2 talk about was panel designs and some of the  
3 possibilities for NES to think about. So,  
4 those are my three big headings.

5 The first heading I wanted to talk  
6 about will come as no surprise to anyone who  
7 has tried to do surveys lately. It is that  
8 the characteristic move of a survey  
9 contractor now is to overrun his budget.  
10 That reflects not increasing incompetence on  
11 the part of the survey guys but just a more  
12 difficult environment that's out there.

13 In particular I think there are a  
14 couple of things going on. One is, I think  
15 that the increasing participation by women  
16 in the labor force has meant that the labor  
17 pool available to survey has gotten worse  
18 over the years. It used to be you could get  
19 highly motivated, very intelligent,  
20 overqualified women to do surveys. You  
21 can't do that anymore and so that's one  
22 element that has created this cost crisis.

---

1 The other element that I think  
2 contributed is the onslaught of  
3 telemarketing in its various forms and the

4 deliberate erection of barriers to access by  
5 larger and larger segments of the  
6 population.

7       So, if you do face-to-face  
8 surveys, you encounter doorman buildings,  
9 gated communities, and other barriers at a  
10 much higher rate than you would have 10  
11 or 20 years ago. The situation with respect  
12 to telephone surveys is even worse. There  
13 are many more ways you can filter out  
14 telephone calls than there were 20, 25 years  
15 ago. As a result it's just much, much more  
16 difficult to make contact.

17       In the case of telephone the  
18 situation is even worse than that because  
19 coverage is actually, I think declining.  
20 Nowadays you have a second phenomenon which  
21 is, in addition to people who don't have  
22 telephones at all, in this country there is

---

1 now a rising proportion of people who only  
2 have cellular telephones. Though in  
3 principle you could get them in a telephone  
4 survey, in practice it's extremely  
5 difficult. I don't think anybody has  
6 figured out a good way to include cell  
7 telephone owners in telephone surveys.

8       The response of the industry I'd  
9 say to this problem, this joint problem of  
10 rising costs, falling response rates has  
11 been, I think, three-fold. One is, that you  
12 seen -- some surveys moved to cheaper modes  
13 of data collection to cope with the cost  
14 side of the problem. So that would mean  
15 switching from face-to-face to telephone or  
16 from telephone to mail or trying to work  
17 some mixed modes, or from mail to Internet  
18 to reduce cost.

19       The trouble is that I think there  
20 is a falloff in quality as you go down that  
21 hierarchy of different modes.

22       The second response of the survey

---

1 industry to this rising cost, falling  
2 response rate problem has been a much wider  
3 use of incentives. OMB used to be the  
4 biggest obstacle to the use of incentives  
5 but even OMB is now approving federal  
6 surveys to use larger and larger incentives.

7 My household happened to fall into the  
8 National Survey on Family Growth sample and  
9 my children are still fighting about who is  
10 going to get the \$40.

11 The third thing that's happened  
12 within the industry is that people have  
13 begun to look at what are the actual bias  
14 consequences of increasing non- response  
15 rates. There have been three sort of  
16 well-publicized papers that have looked at  
17 what happens to non-response bias as a  
18 function of non-response rates.

19 There the disappointing finding is  
20 that more non-response -- higher rates of  
21 non-response don't necessarily portend  
22 higher non-response biases. So you'll see

---

1 comparisons between surveys that get, for  
2 example, a 60 percent response rate and a 38  
3 percent rate and otherwise are quite  
4 similar. This is the Pew study. None of  
5 the estimates differ despite the fact that  
6 there is a 22 percent difference in response  
7 rates.

8 So, that's sort of encouraging.  
9 Okay, so the response rates are crappy. It  
10 doesn't matter. You know. But, I think  
11 almost nobody believes that it really  
12 doesn't matter across the board.

13 Okay. So, that's my little bit  
14 about rising costs and falling response  
15 rates which is an industry-wide problem. It  
16 faces every survey contractor in the United  
17 States. It's a world-wide problem. It's  
18 very robust across, you know survey  
19 organization, mode, countries, and so on.

20 Okay, my second point I wanted to  
21 mention is that in part in response to this  
22 cost crisis people are trying to diminish

---

1 the role of the interviewer in survey data  
2 collection. As it happens, there is now a  
3 wide range of evidence that suggests that  
4 eliminating the interviewer is a good idea.  
5 Not just on cost grounds but in terms of --  
6 I mean, we don't have to kill them. Some of  
7 my best spouses are former interviewers, I  
8 don't want to go too far in that direction.

9 (Laughter)

10 MR. TOURANGEAU: But, if you look  
11 at comparisons between, for example,  
12 conventional telephone surveys this new  
13 technology -- it's known variously as TBE or  
14 IDR or telephone audio CASI where the  
15 computer reads the questions to the  
16 respondent over the telephone. It does look  
17 like there is an increment in the reporting  
18 of sensitive information when the questions  
19 are administered by a computer rather than  
20 by a person.

21 This exactly parallels a series of  
22 studies in face-to-face surveys where the

---

1 comparison is between what audio-CASI where  
2 the respondent interacts directly with the  
3 computer and questions are read to the  
4 respondent over the headset. It's for the  
5 illiterate. Right?

6 There's a number of studies  
7 including one that Tom Smith and I did that  
8 suggest there's a big gain in reporting  
9 accuracy.

10 So, insofar as there are sensitive  
11 questions in the election study, like  
12 whether or not you voted, it seems like some  
13 form of self-administration might be a good  
14 thing to look at.

15 One of the advantages of mail over  
16 other modes of data collection is that it  
17 eliminates the interviewer. So there is  
18 cost gains but also some reporting gains.

19 In fact some studies, in the olden  
20 days the big drug studies, it was then known  
21 as the National Household Survey of Drug  
22 Abuse, now it's gotten so big it's the

---

1 NHDUH. I'm not sure what that stand for,  
2 the NHDUH. Interesting acronym. But, drug  
3 abuse and health I think is the DUH. They  
4 used to have a method where they would do a  
5 face-to-face interview and then the  
6 interviewer would read the questions and the  
7 respondents would indicate their answers on  
8 an answer sheet. So, it was a blend of  
9 self-administration.

10 The National Survey of Family  
11 Growth is a mixed survey where part of it is  
12 interviewer administered and part of it is

13 audio CASI. Another strategy is to leave a  
14 self-administered questionnaire behind, the  
15 tactic the GSS has used.

16 So anyway, in part to reduce cost  
17 and in part to improve data quality, several  
18 new forms of self-administration have been  
19 invented. The Web promises to bring some of  
20 these gains. The trouble is, at least the  
21 definitive studies haven't been done yet I  
22 don't think, but it's not clear that people

---

1 trust the Web to be a confidential mode of  
2 data collection.

3 I mean the big advantage of these  
4 modes of self-administration is you don't  
5 have to tell a woman who looks suspiciously  
6 like your Aunt Hazel that you've used, say,  
7 cocaine in the last 2 months. Right? But  
8 there does seem to be some nervousness about  
9 the Web and it isn't clear that it's going  
10 to be a particularly suitable form of data  
11 collection for collecting sensitive  
12 information.

13 So, those are my first two points,  
14 driving costs and falling response rates,  
15 new forms of self-administration. The last  
16 point I wanted to talk about real briefly is  
17 panel designs. I wanted to talk a little  
18 bit about both panel designs and mixed mode  
19 designs.

20 In many panel studies, the data  
21 collection starts out expensive and then  
22 gets progressively cheaper. So once you've

---

1 socialized the respondent in a face-to-face  
2 interview you can switch in subsequent  
3 rounds to telephone interviews and then in  
4 later rounds, perhaps, if the panel is well  
5 centralized, you can switch to mail.

6 Usually in a single survey -- in  
7 many surveys in order to boost response  
8 rates, respondents are given a variety of  
9 methods of responding. Sometimes they're  
10 given those methods simultaneously. I worked  
11 on a survey once where there was mail  
12 questionnaire sent to faculty members. The  
13 population was university professors. They  
14 were told, oh, and you can also respond by  
15 calling this 800 number, or you can go to



16 the Web.  
17 But you'll see in a lot of  
18 designs, you might send a mail questionnaire  
19 to somebody. If you didn't get a sufficient  
20 response rate there would be telephone  
21 follow-up. If you still didn't get a  
22 sufficient response rate, there might be

---

1 face-to-face follow-up.  
2 So, that's the opposite strategy  
3 from what you do in a panel survey. Right?  
4 Where you start expensive and go cheap. In  
5 a cross-sectional survey you might start  
6 cheap and go expensive.  
7 So, one of the things that a panel  
8 design might enable you to do is to reduce  
9 data collection costs by using a variety of  
10 mixed modes. That was where I was headed  
11 with all that discussion.

12 The other thing is that in the  
13 papers but not so much in the discussion,  
14 today there are intermediate designs between  
15 classic panel designs and classic  
16 cross-sectional, repeated cross-sectional  
17 designs. The Current Population Survey uses  
18 a clever rotation scheme that might be  
19 suitable for election studies. You're in --  
20 a household is in for 4 consecutive months.  
21 It gets to retire briefly for 8 months and  
22 then it's back in for 4 months. So, they're

---

1 involved for a period of more than like a  
2 year and a half. But they do get some  
3 relief time.

4 In that survey I believe the first  
5 and the fifth round, the fifth round is when  
6 you come back from your vacation, your  
7 furlough, they do face- to-face but in the  
8 other rounds they try to do telephone data  
9 collection. They -- I don't know that there  
10 is a mode effect in any of the key variables  
11 on the Current Population Survey. But they  
12 live with it if there is.

13 It's known that there is a  
14 rotation group bias in that survey. So,  
15 some people -- I think Diana mentioned, I  
16 think you called it sensitization effects or  
17 conditioning effects. There's many terms  
18 for this. Time in sample effects -- some

19 survey people use that term.  
20 But it's known that there's a  
21 rotation group bias. It appears to be a  
22 time in sample effect. So, that's something

---

1 to worry about with these rotation group  
2 designs.  
3 I think the biasing effects are  
4 probably less in a rotation design than in a  
5 design where you think you're in for the  
6 duration. You know, I think the NLS people  
7 do they ever have any hopes? Do you have to  
8 die to get out of that sample?  
9 SPEAKER: Yeah, you die to get  
10 out.  
11 (Laughter)  
12 DR. SCIOLI: Then it's final.  
13 They still try to convert you I bet.  
14 SPEAKER: ---- next of kin every  
15 now and then.  
16 MR. TOURANGEAU: Pertinent to  
17 that --  
18 DR. SCIOLI: Let me just say on  
19 the PSID, your heirs are in it.  
20 MR. TOURANGEAU: Death won't even  
21 do it. That's tough. That's tough.  
22 SPEAKER: Take a cell phone with

---

1 you.  
2 MR. TOURANGEAU: All right. A  
3 related point, you can have people in and  
4 out and in. You can do the same things with  
5 items. I wanted to put in another plug for  
6 the design of the General Social Survey  
7 where any one respondent gets approximately  
8 two-thirds of the substantive items. Then  
9 all pairs of items show up an equal amount  
10 of time. That way you can look at all the  
11 co-variances.  
12 At the same time, through the  
13 miracle of modern imputation themes, it's  
14 not clear that you're going to lose that  
15 much. I mean there are some very, very  
16 sophisticated algorithms for filling in  
17 missing data. I know the National  
18 Assessment of Educational Progress also uses  
19 one of these balanced incomplete block  
20 designs. They actually --everyone ends up  
21 with a full data set. You know, some

1 everybody.

2 A nice feature of that though  
3 is -- to put a plug in for one of my  
4 colleagues Trevereau Ragunathan does  
5 research on this. But a nice added benefit  
6 of this is since any percentage -- for any  
7 given respondent a certain amount of the  
8 data are made up, it gives you -- it confers  
9 a certain protection against disclosure  
10 risk.

11 He argues, Ragu argues that this  
12 is a good way to release public use data  
13 sets, to impute the entire data set  
14 basically is his argument. You know, after  
15 you get real data. Then you can create a  
16 parallel universe as it were, a parallel  
17 data set that has all the same statistical  
18 properties as the original data set, but  
19 it's completely imputed.

20 DR. BRADBURN: That's cloning,  
21 isn't it? That's what we're doing with the  
22 research data centers. We're using census

---

1 data.

2 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, anyway,  
3 there are some advantages to these kinds of  
4 matrix sampling schemes and these rotation  
5 designs where you get some extra leverage  
6 because you have the core relational  
7 structure between all the items. So, that  
8 was it for me. I kept it under 40 minutes  
9 as I promised.

10 DR. SCIOLI: Comments?

11 DR. BURNS: Could you talk some  
12 about the conditioning stuff? I've been  
13 ransacking the literature on conditioning  
14 and there don't seem to be you know, oodles  
15 and oodles of studies but there are studies.  
16 Where I can find results, the results  
17 suggest so -- things like turnout, things  
18 like campaign interest, and the National  
19 Survey of American Families, I think, the  
20 people enrolled are kids in more  
21 extracurricular activities. There's stuff  
22 that -- and so, I'm curious about your

---

1 perspective on conditioning and then also  
2 your perspective on kind of what are the  
3 smart ways to go to avoid conditioning  
4 through the kind of panel designs that we  
5 talked about in the last session.

6 Because there are kind of cool and  
7 interesting things that you can imagine  
8 doing, you know, new dependent variables  
9 that show up on the table. A lot of  
10 interesting things but not if the, you know,  
11 data in the end on, you know, people that,  
12 you know, you've created.

13 MR. TOURANGEAU: It's the opposite  
14 in the literature I'm aware of. It's that  
15 what you see over time -- there's two kinds  
16 of studies that I'm aware of.

17 One kind of study is a genuine  
18 panel study. what you typically see is less  
19 reporting in later waves. So people learn  
20 that if they are so foolish as to admit that  
21 say, they have a child, that they're likely  
22 to be hit with 240 questions asking details

---

1 about the child and so they stop admitting  
2 that they have children. Yes, I may have a  
3 children in a previous wave but somehow they  
4 seem to have disappeared quite tragically.

5 SPEAKER: Yeah, they all died.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. TOURANGEAU: So, that's one  
8 finding. Over time, you know, people get  
9 savvy about avoiding follow-up questions and  
10 they admit less. The classic study is  
11 Needer and Waksberg on that.

12 But, then there is also within  
13 diary studies actually at your shop, I think  
14 Adrianna Silverstein has done a number of  
15 these studies, that if you look at people  
16 keeping diaries of how much they have  
17 purchased, for example, on Day 1, they've  
18 purchased six times more than on Day 72 in  
19 the diary. That, again, you just see this  
20 dramatic falloff in reporting.

21 So, I'm not aware that you get  
22 people sort of reporting more sort of

---

1 stealth. Generally, the trend seems to be  
2 in the opposite direction that people report  
3 less and less. It just seems to be, you

4 know, one of many shortcuts that survey  
5 respondents take to get through interviews.

6 DR. MUTZ: It seems like this is a  
7 little different though because you're  
8 talking about socially desirable actions.

9 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah, well -- that  
10 is a actually a point I wanted to differ  
11 with Roger slightly from something he said  
12 about sensitive questions. Because the  
13 literature about sensitive questions  
14 about -- that are sensitive in the negative  
15 sense, that there would be under-reporting  
16 differ from those that are sensitive in the  
17 opposite direction where you get  
18 over-reporting.

19 So, some of the sort of effects  
20 that affect one, don't affect the other.  
21 Although that's not terribly worked out,  
22 there have been -- but I think you need --

---

1 this distinction is more behavior attitude  
2 than the other one. That when it's  
3 behavioral reporting, I think the data are  
4 pretty consistent that over time in a panel  
5 that you get less reporting because of  
6 these, some sense of fatigue or savvy, and  
7 so on.

8 That can be true even within one  
9 long questionnaire if it has lots of filters  
10 and after a little experience people realize  
11 that if they say they've done something,  
12 they're going to get 20 questions about the  
13 details of what they've done. There is a  
14 little falloff on that sort of thing. It's  
15 particularly true in nutrition surveys and  
16 things like that.

17 But I think the attitudinal one is  
18 the kind of problem. Then there are  
19 intermediate ones in which I guess I would  
20 put knowledge ones. I remember one study  
21 that I did on evaluating information from a  
22 television program. We went to elaborate

---

1 lengths to balance out and, you know,  
2 control for panel effects and so on.  
3 Nothing. I mean it was a total waste of  
4 resources because people didn't -- I mean,  
5 the dependent variables were how much  
6 knowledge you got out of informational  
7 programs. They -- you know, it didn't make

8 any difference how long you had been in it.  
9 So while I think there have been  
10 consistent effects on these attitudinal  
11 ones, it's not quite clear to me in the  
12 example that you gave and so forth whether  
13 those are examples of where people are  
14 actually changing their behavior or they are  
15 just picking up cues about what they think  
16 you want them to report because you're  
17 asking about it over and over.  
18 You keep asking over and over.  
19 You know, how many -- what are your kids  
20 doing and sort of things like that. They  
21 say, you know, well, if you keep asking,  
22 maybe you don't like my previous answers so

---

1 I'll do something better.  
2 I mean, either way it is a  
3 phenomena and there isn't -- I mean the only  
4 techniques I think we have handling those  
5 are trying to estimate the size of the  
6 effect by having a rotational panel and then  
7 adjusting for them or in some sense or other  
8 it just -- if you have a good rotation it  
9 just spreads the error out across the whole  
10 data set.  
11 DR. BURNS: I was just going to  
12 say for something like voting that's  
13 consistently over reported, I mean you'd  
14 also have something like the cross-section  
15 core that you could compare it to. But even  
16 though that's a behavior I would think it  
17 would still be subject to the kind of  
18 sensitization --  
19 DR. BRADBURN: Well, yeah because  
20 it's a socially desirable type of thing.  
21 DR. BURNS: Yeah.  
22 MR. TOURANGEAU: You know I was

---

1 just going to say there is actually a  
2 somewhat different design that involves a  
3 mixed panel rather than a rotating panel  
4 that's used in the Survey of Consumer  
5 Sentiment.  
6 That one is done monthly and at  
7 each point in time, there is cross- section  
8 plus a subset. You're going back to folks,  
9 a small sample of folks that was  
10 interviewed 6 months earlier. That's the

11 only time that they are used. So, every  
12 month there is a panel component from 6  
13 months earlier and a fresh cross-section.

14 One could imagine if one expects  
15 there to be a lot of this respondent  
16 learning and giving answers to questions, a  
17 design where at each NES you're only going  
18 back to a distinct subset at one point of  
19 time in the past and not carrying them on  
20 further. It might give you some gains in  
21 terms of measuring change over time but  
22 wouldn't instill that learning that you want

---

1 to stay away from.

2 DR. CLARKE: Yeah, there is a  
3 tradeoff in that if I could jump on that  
4 because -- in terms of the number of  
5 statistical techniques that we would like to  
6 use to address some of the important  
7 questions.

8 For example, on the stability of  
9 partisanship that you really need to have  
10 two things. You need -- unless you want to  
11 assume values for some of the parameters,  
12 you really need for the crucial parameters  
13 you need to have at least four waves.

14 Secondly, you need to have large  
15 ends. Absent those two conditions, then the  
16 exercise becomes pretty doubtful. So I've  
17 spent a lot of time over the last few years  
18 looking for four wave panels. You can find  
19 them, but often you end up with lost ---- as  
20 well.

21 So, it's a tradeoff. You get  
22 these conditioning things we're worrying

---

1 about on the one side. You say, well, gee  
2 we'll just keep them in once like you're  
3 saying. But on the other hand, in terms of  
4 really using the data to get the leverage on  
5 the dynamics you really need to have, you  
6 know, it appears a minimum of four. Four is  
7 really desirable. Three you might move back  
8 to after you have calibrated some of the  
9 parameters, but you know this gets to be a  
10 really expensive enterprise.

11 DR. BRADBURN: So, pick your  
12 poison, right?

13 DR. CLARKE: That's right, yeah.

14 DR. BRADBURN: I don't know that  
15 the effects are terribly large even when you  
16 find them, are they?

17 MR. TOURANGEAU: That's one of the  
18 great virtues of rotation groups. You can  
19 always see them. I mean you can always look  
20 for them. You know, I mean, it's like a built  
21 in experimental design so you can always test  
22 for that.

---

1 DR. ACHEN: What's been the  
2 experience of users with these more complex  
3 designs like PSID and others and the CPS.  
4 Are they manageable for people who aren't  
5 specialists in survey design to actually get  
6 some mileage out of?

7 MR. TOURANGEAU: I don't know if a  
8 lot of people use the CPS for analytical  
9 purposes. It's almost treated in my  
10 experience as though it were a repeated  
11 cross-section design. People -- except for  
12 the basic employment statistics which use a  
13 very sophisticated composite estimator that  
14 takes advantage of the rotation, except for  
15 that, I don't know anybody who uses it  
16 except as a cross-sectional design. I can't  
17 say about the PSID.

18 SPEAKER: Well, it's becoming more  
19 so with these research data centers where  
20 people can get into the micro-data of CPS or  
21 CIP or something like that. So you can do  
22 things and bring in even some other kinds of

---

1 data.

2 MR. TOURANGEAU: Yes.

3 SPEAKER: But, of course those  
4 users are all pretty sophisticated. I think  
5 it is a problem. It does require a more  
6 sophisticated data user. Now that shouldn't  
7 be insuperable in the sense that you can run  
8 training programs and so forth.

9 DR. CLARKE: Well, that's what  
10 they did with the British Household Panel  
11 Survey, as part of that initiative they  
12 actually have developed training programs  
13 for users and we run summer schools. The  
14 Essex Summer School is just like the  
15 Michigan Methods Summer School. They  
16 practically always will have BHPS module for



17 interested users.  
18 DR. ACHEN: I have a colleague who  
19 studies African politics and doesn't have  
20 much data from a lot of her countries and  
21 passed through Cambridge and got some advice  
22 and imputed the continent.

---

1 (Laughter)  
2 DR. ACHEN: Did some runs and so I  
3 was made a little nervous about what's going  
4 to happen when ordinary working stiff social  
5 scientists have to use these complex  
6 designs.  
7 MR. TOURANGEAU: If you did the,  
8 you know, the full imputation thing, then it  
9 looks like a panel data set. You know, and  
10 then you have filled in all the missing  
11 data. There are ways to do it so that it  
12 actually -- your parameter estimates and the  
13 standard errors on the parameter estimates  
14 are accurately estimated. I mean, usually  
15 you have to do a multiple imputation thing  
16 and so you replicate your analysis four  
17 times on four different versions of the data  
18 set or something.  
19 But, it can be done so that it  
20 doesn't -- I mean the software will be there  
21 in 5 years I think.  
22 DR. ACHEN: Yeah, I think that's

---

1 the point that the software will be there to  
2 match -- and that computing power and, you  
3 know, that's what we'll be teaching our  
4 students or our students will be teaching  
5 us.  
6 DR. THOMPSON: Although Norman I  
7 think you hit on a pretty important point  
8 there. I think with the growth in  
9 confidentiality concerns and data mining  
10 software, I think you're going to see  
11 more -- if you want to do any kind of  
12 serious analysis you're going to have to go  
13 into something like a research data center  
14 or get some file that's totally imputed to  
15 do the work on. I just think that's coming  
16 too.  
17 MR. SANTOS: You know, I was  
18 actually going to offer a different  
19 perspective of exactly the same thing, that

20 Chris was talking about.  
21 One view is that now we have this  
22 more complicated data set and in order to

---

1 take advantage of sort of the longitudinal  
2 aspect, it requires special training, et  
3 cetera. But, on the other hand, one can  
4 look at it from an added value perspective  
5 in that folks that normally used it for  
6 cross-sectional can still use it that way  
7 and then the value added is if you're  
8 willing to put in some training effort, you  
9 can also use it this other way.

10 So, there is a net gain at maybe a  
11 lower or nominal increase in cost.

12 DR. BRADBURN: I think the root  
13 problem which has obviously plagued  
14 discussions with the ANES and so forth --  
15 which may be going away simply because  
16 telephones are becoming a less and less  
17 attractive mode for doing things. But the  
18 mixed mode problem where at least one of the  
19 mixes in the mode is totally auditory so  
20 that you have the problems of, you know, how  
21 do you handle the hundred point scale? Or  
22 where are the show cards? Things like that.

---

1 So that may be a passing kind of  
2 problem because of the response problem.  
3 Although, you see if you go to a panel  
4 design of some sort then you do want to have  
5 that problem. In spite of knowing this and  
6 so forth, there is still a tendency for  
7 people to -- if they're going to start off  
8 face-to- face to take full advantage of what  
9 you can do face-to-face and then suffer when  
10 they try to follow up on the phone rather  
11 than designing it as a phone survey to begin  
12 with.

13 I just -- on the European Social  
14 Survey I am on the advisory committee for  
15 that and I begged them when they started off  
16 to design it so it could be done on the  
17 phone because I said, in a few years you're  
18 going to want to -- some of the countries  
19 are going to be wanting to do it on the  
20 phone. They said, no, no, we're going to do  
21 it face-to-face and so forth.  
22 So the first wave was done

---

1 face-to-face, even though already some of  
2 the countries, Sweden and those wanted to do  
3 it on the phone. Of course Finland you've  
4 got this problem of something like half the  
5 people only have cell phones already. So,  
6 you've got a big problem there.

7 Now, the second round, I was just  
8 in London a month ago, and, you know, it's  
9 come home to them and in some things --  
10 fortunately, they're only one year into the  
11 thing so whatever they do they will have  
12 only lost one year's continuity, but it was  
13 a terrible sort of mistake I think.

14 MR. TOURANGEAU: One other point  
15 I'd like to raise is that if -- you know,  
16 the temptation to go to some kind of mixed  
17 mode design, especially with a panel or a  
18 rotation group is going to be quite high.

19 The latest studies, the latest  
20 mode studies I'm aware of, sort of go in the  
21 face of the classic literature which says  
22 that, well the telephone, face-to-face

---

1 difference is not all that great. You know,  
2 the studies that Holbrook et al. did for you  
3 guys and then there was a similar study done  
4 based on the Eurobarometer that also  
5 indicates a difference.

6 So as we quadruple the budget of  
7 the election studies, we should build in a  
8 lot more mode research -- a little  
9 commercial for me. You know, because I do  
10 think there are some puzzling things going  
11 on and, you know, we need to worry about  
12 them.

13 DR. CLARKE: Does this have to do  
14 primarily with marginals, or with  
15 co-variances, or both?

16 SPEAKER: Both.

17 MR. TOURANGEAU: Oh, I think both  
18 in the case of NES studies. The  
19 Eurobarometer studies it was more marginals.

20 DR. HANSEN: It's probably worth  
21 mentioning that one of the particular  
22 problems for an election study, as in the

---

1 United States, with different mode  
2 comparisons is how important geography --  
3 sort of knowing where people are located  
4 physically, so we know who their elected  
5 officials are and so we know what kinds of  
6 races they're being exposed to -- is to us.

7 So that was a particular problem  
8 in this last implementation where we  
9 couldn't tell in advance, we couldn't have a  
10 pre-election study that was on the phone  
11 because -- well, in this 2002 election we  
12 had to go to a pre/post which we hadn't done  
13 in Congressional elections before. It was  
14 also that we could gather information about  
15 where they actually lived so that we could  
16 ask them then very specific questions about  
17 things that were geographically related in  
18 the second wave.

19 So, it's a special burden I think  
20 of a political survey like this one that it  
21 does matter a great deal to be able tell  
22 exactly where people are.

---

1 DR. CLARKE: That varies  
2 cross-nationally too. One of the things  
3 that was a pleasant surprise in Britain,  
4 with the rolling cross-section, we found out  
5 in our first meeting with Gallup that they  
6 actually know the constituencies as well.  
7 As a result of that, we had to code for all  
8 the data and we were able to immediately  
9 then merge in Pippa Norris's aggregate  
10 file and so we had this sort of basis for  
11 multi-level modeling almost immediately.

12 So we had no idea. We thought it  
13 was the same as, like, you know in the  
14 States or I guess Canada as well. You don't  
15 know this? But, it turns out that in some  
16 locales you do. Britain was one where they  
17 routinely will put that in for you which was  
18 very neat.

19 DR. BRADBURN: You could -- I  
20 mean, though the sampling frames of most  
21 organizations aren't drawn to represent  
22 Congressional Districts, you could do that.

---

1 I know John points out in his paper that you  
2 could draw them in ways that would use the

3 Congressional District or whatever you want  
4 as a cluster, as a stage in the draw and  
5 that might give you more power for those  
6 kinds of analyses.

7           It is a problem if you're doing  
8 the selection over the telephone. That's  
9 obviously a problem although -- well, it's  
10 going to be a worse problem but I think at  
11 the moment telephone exchanges are still  
12 geographically contiguous.

13           DR. HANSEN: Well although -- then  
14 there are cell phones.

15           DR. BRADBURN: Well, then cell  
16 phones.

17           DR. HANSEN: It's the matches  
18 between the exchanges and the Congressional  
19 Districts which are sort of divied up in  
20 weird ways and particularly to the extent  
21 that one wants to use panels to be able to  
22 trace causal processes over some substantial

---

1 period of time with mobility. It just may  
2 not work to begin with, the most expensive  
3 mode, personal contact and follow that  
4 through, given that a good proportion of the  
5 population moves in a given year.

6           So, by the time people are in the  
7 third wave or the fourth wave of the panel,  
8 they could be in an entirely different  
9 place.

10           DR. BRADBURN: Um-hum.

11           DR. ACHEN: Plus even if they sit  
12 still, as I have, I'm now in a different  
13 Congressional District than I was in 2 years  
14 ago because they moved the District.

15           DR. BRADBURN: But that only  
16 happens once every 10 years so you can have  
17 a good run before that.

18           SPEAKER: Who can blame them?  
19 They heard that you had moved in, you know,  
20 and they redrew that boundary --

21           MR. SANTOS: Actually it can  
22 happen twice in 3 years depending on when

---

1 the decennial is or when they redistrict.

2           DR. BRADBURN: Oh, that's right,  
3 depending on when that is.

4           MR. TOURANGEAU: One point I

5 wasn't clear on and I will throw a question  
6 out. It seemed like there is an assumption  
7 that it's almost incompatible to do a  
8 National Election Study and at the same time  
9 do Congressional Districts. But, I was  
10 thinking, at least when I was at NORC and we  
11 drew the national sample, the counties that  
12 comprise the PSUs that made up the NORC  
13 national sample had 40 percent of the  
14 population in them. I would guess that the  
15 SRC national sample is similarly. Would  
16 that imply or have you ever looked at what  
17 percentage of the Congressional Districts,  
18 the 435 Congressional Districts, how many of  
19 them are completely within the PSUs that SRC  
20 has?

21 DR. BURNS: See usually people go  
22 the other direction. I was thinking about

---

1 Laura and Jake's paper and they point out,  
2 you know, that if there are 20 competitive  
3 races what's the chance of it showing up on  
4 the sample? So it's that direction, that's  
5 at least one way that the worry gets put.

6 DR. LEMPert: Does it? I mean you  
7 talk about these 20 competitive races, and  
8 in terms of looking at winners and losers  
9 that's what shifts the balance of power.  
10 But, a particular non-competitive race may  
11 be 55 percent, you know, Republican one year  
12 and 65 percent another. That may mirror or  
13 is at least likely to mirror I would suspect  
14 the shift in the competitive districts.

15 So, if we understood what was  
16 happening in non-competitive districts to  
17 shift proportions we might still get a  
18 pretty good understanding of what are  
19 shifting proportions that have election  
20 ramifications. So, I'm not certain I'm  
21 right. But I'm not certain that one should  
22 say, oh there are only 20 competitive

---

1 districts, let's forget about anything at  
2 the district level.

3 DR. HANSEN: Well although one  
4 thing that I worried about after reading  
5 Laura's and Jake's paper is that one of the  
6 primary findings of the literature on  
7 Congressional elections is the power of

8 incumbency, the sort of dominant power of  
9 incumbency.

10 That paper made me wonder about  
11 the extent to which that's because we've  
12 only looked at instances where incumbency  
13 was enormously powerful because there wasn't  
14 a serious challenger.

15 The question really is, how  
16 powerful is incumbency when there is a  
17 really a challenge? So it does get wrapped  
18 up in the question of substantive.

19 DR. CLARKE: Well, we've got to  
20 question that, if there is a substantive  
21 theoretical question that motivates this.  
22 Right? That's the deal. I think that's why

---

1 that, you know, that discussion is so  
2 important because it really ties to the  
3 dominant theory in Congressional elections.

4 DR. ACHEN: Plus the experience of  
5 being in a competitive race in a district  
6 with a competitive race is so different from  
7 the experience of being in a race that's not  
8 competitive. The ad barrage is different  
9 and the level of information is different  
10 and so forth. So, you really do, I think  
11 need to have some of both.

12 DR. BRADY: Well, that's even true  
13 for the national election. I mean, we in  
14 California didn't know there was a 2000  
15 election. They weren't focusing on ads.

16 DR. CLARKE: Well, there wasn't.  
17 We wrote on that.

18 DR. ACHEN: In Michigan we reached  
19 the point where when the local used car  
20 dealer came on, there was a round of  
21 applause.

22 DR. SCIOLI: So, face-to-face is

---

1 best?

2 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, I think  
3 that's the consensus of survey researchers.  
4 You know, one point I would make is that  
5 these modes are actually packages of  
6 variables that are potentially separable.

7 So, the usual package is  
8 face-to-face. You know an area of  
9 probability sample. Right?

10 Then with a long field period, for

11 example, that's a common package. But it  
12 doesn't have to be that way. I mean you  
13 could have a list sample or some other kind  
14 of sample and do face-to-face. Or you could  
15 have an area prob sample and knock on  
16 people's doors and get their phone numbers.  
17 I mean, nobody does this. But, I mean, it's  
18 conceivable you could do that if you were  
19 really stupid, and you wanted to waste a lot  
20 of money -- you could do it that way.

21 (Laughter)

22 MR. TOURANGEAU: You know, a lot

---

1 of the difference between --

2 DR. ACHEN: The jury will  
3 disregard.

4 MR. TOURANGEAU: A lot of the  
5 difference it seems to me in the kinds of  
6 response rates you see in political polls as  
7 opposed to what's done in like the NES  
8 reflects the fact that political polls  
9 typically have a 5 day field period or  
10 something. You know it's not necessarily  
11 anything inherent in telephone that  
12 yields -- you know I do think it's very  
13 difficult. The very best telephone surveys,  
14 you know, have a very hard time getting  
15 above 60 percent. As John was claiming the  
16 very best mail surveys have a hard time  
17 getting above 55 percent.

18 You know, I think you could  
19 probably do a little bit better in a mail  
20 survey if you put a \$20 incentive in there.  
21 You know, you could break the 55 barrier.  
22 So, a lot of the differences between modes

---

1 have to do with the typical package in which  
2 the method of data collection is wrapped up  
3 and isn't necessarily -- like on some of the  
4 reporting differences in the Holbrook et al.  
5 Paper.

6 You know I bet -- you could make  
7 it go away if you sort of decoupled some  
8 standard features of telephone survey that  
9 aren't an essential part of that, you know,  
10 from the fact of the telephone.

11 But, in any case, you know, from  
12 the point of view of coverage, from the  
13 point of view of response rates, and from



14 the point of view of reporting error, I  
15 think it's pretty clear that face-to-face is  
16 superior on all three of those dimensions.  
17 Typically, as they are typically done.  
18 DR. SCIOLI: Has the per unit cost  
19 increased over the last -- where do you see  
20 that going?  
21 SPEAKER: Up.  
22 MR. TOURANGEAU: Yeah, and as I

---

1 say, I don't think anybody -- I mean unless  
2 somebody has done some analysis I'm unaware  
3 of but I don't think anybody has a handle on  
4 the economics of surveys. What I hear is  
5 that, you know, veteran professionals  
6 consistently underestimate the cost of face-  
7 to-face and telephone data collection.  
8 I mean, you know, at one point  
9 when we were having problems, Michigan was  
10 having problems with the National Survey of  
11 Family Growth, I know Bob Groves made some  
12 phone calls and all the big surveys at all  
13 the big survey organizations were having  
14 overrun problems similar to what we  
15 encountered. The cost is just rising in  
16 some, you know, hard to predict way for  
17 reasons that people don't fully fathom.  
18 I think I gave two of the most  
19 common explanations, change in the labor  
20 force and, you know, the increase in  
21 impediments to access.  
22 DR. BRADBURN: Well, I don't know

---

1 whether it's the same as the impediments to  
2 access but I think that one of the biggest  
3 causes is the difficulty of locating the  
4 respondent and that's partly due to labor  
5 effects too.  
6 The only place in some sense you  
7 could reduce substantially face-to-face, the  
8 cost of face-to-face, is having a better  
9 algorithm for figuring out when somebody is  
10 going to be at home because so much of the  
11 interviewer's time is wasted by going out to  
12 the segment and not finding anybody at home.  
13 You know people do all sorts of  
14 things, try and make appointments, and so on  
15 and so forth. But, it's still -- certainly  
16 the first time before you make a -- it's

17 like the first time getting through with the  
18 phone too. It's just, people aren't at home  
19 as much and when they are they're less, you  
20 know, their time at home is more limited and  
21 they don't want to spend it talking to an  
22 interviewer.

---

1 DR. CLARKE: The answer though in  
2 part, Frank though, I was going to say,  
3 again, it depends on your research question.  
4 For the kinds of things that motivate the  
5 Canadian study that Andre and Henry have  
6 been doing face-to- face is a non-starter,  
7 even if you have the money.

8 DR. BLAIS: Yeah, because that's  
9 the point. In Canada, I think, nobody is  
10 really suggesting that we should come back  
11 to our old interviews for two reasons.

12 First, you know, campaign dynamics  
13 is a top priority and it would be very, very  
14 difficult to do rolling cross-sections with  
15 at home interviews. Also we need large  
16 N's. We are convinced that, you know, the  
17 dynamics are very different in different  
18 regions. So that we could not -- I think it  
19 would be a non-starter to go back to the at  
20 home interviews because of these two  
21 reasons.

22 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, you have a

---

1 big advantage in that -- it sounds like  
2 anyway -- that if you have a frame that has  
3 essentially complete coverage then going to  
4 telephone -- but you know, that's a  
5 difference here. It's that there are no  
6 good central lists. Or, I forget which  
7 country was it by mail.

8 DR. BRADBURN: Australia.

9 MR. TOURANGEAU: Yeah, Australia.  
10 Yeah, I mean, you know that -- you know,  
11 there's just -- it's a non-starter here  
12 because there's no list. There's just no  
13 list you could use to do a good election  
14 study. In the context of a panel design or a  
15 rotational design, where, you know, at round  
16 one you got the address and you know, and so  
17 on that changes the dynamic.

18 Likewise I think it becomes a  
19 reasonable option after you've had a

20 face-to-face survey and you've got your high  
21 initial response rate to do a telephone  
22 follow-up makes a lot of sense.

---

1 DR. SCIOLI: But the per unit  
2 costs are making it -- are driving sample  
3 size down. So, you know, the scientific  
4 integrity of the enterprise, I mean, you  
5 know, if we're having Ford Motor Company pay  
6 for these things.

7 DR. BRADBURN: They're less likely  
8 to pay much. The only -- I think it's safe  
9 to say the only really high quality, high  
10 surveys today are financed by public  
11 sources, mostly the federal government  
12 possibly some foundations that are -- or  
13 some combination of the two. Commercial  
14 surveys don't -- they're just not willing to  
15 put the money into it.

16 MR. McAllister: It seems to me  
17 you were a bit dismissive of Web based  
18 polls. Our experience is that if you're  
19 running something like a rolling  
20 cross-section during an election campaign, a  
21 Web based poll is actually a highly cost  
22 efficient way of doing it.

---

1 What survey researchers always  
2 remind me of in this regard is car  
3 mechanics. They learn how to service Honda  
4 Civics and then a Honda Accord comes  
5 through, they do it and they say nobody will  
6 buy it. It's finished. The way Web based  
7 surveys seem to be regarded today is what I  
8 saw with telephone polls maybe 20 years ago.

9 DR. BRADBURN: The major -- I  
10 don't know how it is in Australia but I  
11 think for us the major problem is the  
12 self-selection bias problem. I mean there  
13 are coverage problems but that will go away  
14 like telephones. But, the problem, the root  
15 problem except for knowledge networks is  
16 that there is no sampling frame for online  
17 polling. I've talked to -- given a couple  
18 of talks to computer experts and so on and I  
19 keep telling them that until there is  
20 something analogous to a phone number for  
21 access to the line there is no way in

1 MR. McAllister: Well, you can't  
2 do random sampling but you can do either  
3 active sampling or you can do passive  
4 sampling and then you whip the results you  
5 get to the known demographics of the  
6 population you are interested in.

7 DR. BRADBURN: What do you mean by  
8 active sampling?

9 MR. McAllister: You actually go out  
10 and get a sample.

11 You actually ask people to respond  
12 as the British company UGOV does, they  
13 register. So, you have a sampling frame of  
14 people with known demographics and then you  
15 actually go out there and sample them. The  
16 UGOV company does a regular, actually it's  
17 weekly based sample for one of the British  
18 newspapers.

19 DR. CLARKE: The Telegraph.

20 MR. McAllister: Yeah, the Daily  
21 Telegraph and I think The Independent does it  
22 as well and it's as reliable any of the other

---

1 surveys.

2 MR. TOURANGEAU: Yeah, Harris  
3 Interactive has done very well in this  
4 country. They have 7 million volunteers who  
5 have signed up and they will do sampling  
6 from that list of 7 million and people are  
7 invited to go to a Web site. They do pretty  
8 well. They don't just give weight to known  
9 demographics but they also do some  
10 calibration to a parallel telephone survey  
11 they do using political attitudes and other  
12 things, in addition. They've done fairly  
13 well here.

14 SPEAKER: A reminder that the  
15 Literary Digest did very well for years.

16 MR. TOURANGEAU: Exactly. A lot  
17 of survey researchers are just waiting for  
18 the other shoe to drop.

19 MR. McAllister: When we ran the  
20 Australian survey my colleagues believed it  
21 would produce a completely screwball result  
22 and they always referred to it as "The E

---

1 Literary Digest."

2 (Laughter)

3 MR. SANTOS: But, you know, there  
4 is a big difference in terms of statistical  
5 inferences that are drawn between the two.  
6 Because when you do a probability based  
7 sampling you're actually invoking known  
8 statistical theory. When you use these  
9 self-selected types of frames, you're  
10 basically putting faith in your weighting  
11 and that's a model based approach. Actually  
12 one could become a Bayesian and do it that  
13 way in which case you really don't need any  
14 type of scientific sampling, as long your  
15 model is right.

16 DR. ACHEN: Which would frighten  
17 even a Bayesian.

18 DR. BRADBURN: Well, I don't think  
19 anybody has looked at this data but  
20 certainly from my experience, there is a  
21 real fundamental difference between  
22 something that starts off with a probability

---

1 sample, even with a very low response rate,  
2 that's different from something that's  
3 self-selected. Even when you do the  
4 weighting, and so on and so forth. Of  
5 course a lot of times it will be okay.

6 But, as they say, you know, the  
7 Literary Digest was doing okay for 20 -- for  
8 about 20 to almost 15 years, and everybody  
9 said, isn't this wonderful? You know, they  
10 got 7 million or whatever the number of  
11 people and they produced very good results.

12 MR. SANTOS: You know the bias  
13 formula that Roger has in his paper for  
14 non-response actually holds for non-coverage  
15 because in a sense if you're not covered,  
16 it's a non-response. So if everybody  
17 responds to these, you know, voluntary  
18 things then one of the components goes to  
19 zero and you have no bias because everybody  
20 participated.

21 But that doesn't happen and so  
22 then you're really hoping that the folks

---

1 that responded are similar to those that

2 didn't. Now, you can try to correct that  
3 weighting but --

4 MR. TOURANGEAU: The only argument  
5 that you could make is that -- you know,  
6 electoral polls themselves have a 25 percent  
7 response rate or thereabouts. You know,  
8 they're embarrassing from the point of view  
9 of survey methodology. Yet they almost  
10 always are right. The argument you could  
11 make is that as with possibly Web surveys  
12 that the response propensity mechanism,  
13 whatever it is, the people who want to polls  
14 are like the people who want to vote.

15 In fact, I've seen people make  
16 arguments that the falloff in turnout is  
17 exactly the same phenomenon as the declining  
18 response rate. That it's the underlying  
19 variable of civic engagement or something  
20 and that it manifests itself equally in  
21 these two falling rates.

22 If you buy all that argument, then

---

1 it suggests that there won't be much bias.

2 DR. MUTZ: That's only if you're  
3 strictly interested in who wins and who  
4 loses.

5 DR. BRADBURN: But if you're  
6 interested in -- particularly in electoral  
7 studies you're interested in the people who  
8 don't participate.

9 DR. MUTZ: Right, right.

10 MR. SANTOS: But, this does remind  
11 me of the paper I saw somebody deliver once  
12 where they claimed that they had the answer  
13 to the removal of all biases in research by  
14 simply conducting mall interview surveys at  
15 the local mall and weighting them to the  
16 national sample.

17 SPEAKER: It just doesn't work.

18 DR. MUTZ: If I remember too,  
19 didn't John Krosnick's comparison of  
20 telephone and Harris show that although you  
21 could apply their various weights and  
22 produce some of their consumer items similar

---

1 to what a national population sample would  
2 do on all the political variables, these  
3 were far more extreme people and they didn't  
4 match well at all?

5 DR. CLARKE: Yeah, I mean that's  
6 the experience right now, exactly how it  
7 appears with the UGOV. We got a free  
8 comparison at the time of the 2001 British  
9 study. It turns out that one of our  
10 principal investigator's sons is one of the  
11 principals in UGOV and agreed -- just said,  
12 I'll do this for free, Dad. So we did. I  
13 mean, why not with the post-election  
14 instrument?

15 They got the vote shares  
16 remarkably good but the attitudinal stuff  
17 looks like it's really wild. I mean, if you  
18 take our traditional face-to-face interviews  
19 as some kind of gold standard, you have to  
20 start somewhere, these things really look  
21 like they're out in left field. So there  
22 are some puzzles there in terms of how you

---

1 get to vote shares but when you get to these  
2 other things they look totally strange.

3 I think Norman's point is  
4 fundamental about probability samples. But  
5 still this stuff is interesting and deserves  
6 careful scrutiny. So, we're right now doing  
7 additional surveys comparing telephone  
8 surveys in Britain with UGOV's stuff right  
9 now, looking at a variety of these political  
10 indicators. But, right now the story is,  
11 yeah, we can get -- two things, you get the  
12 vote share. It's looked really good.

13 Secondly, in terms of the  
14 co-variances interestingly enough for some  
15 of the models of the vote, we've got a paper  
16 that we gave at the APSA meeting last  
17 year that shows there are remarkably few  
18 differences in terms of sort of standard,  
19 substandard models of the vote.

20 But, it's still really scary when  
21 you look at the distributions on some of the  
22 standard political variables. You say, wow,

---

1 this is just a bunch of young Tories sitting  
2 around with their feet up in the cities, you  
3 know, answering UGOV surveys. That's the  
4 way it really looks until you look at the  
5 vote distributions. Then you say, oh, maybe  
6 there is something to this.

7 DR. SCIOLI: Last coffee. They're

8 taking the pot, sorry.

9 DR. BURNS: No, no. So, I was  
10 wondering. You were asking about -- you  
11 were asking Roger a lot about mode. So one  
12 of the things that we were kind of stewing  
13 over for awhile was could you maintain the  
14 time series and switch them out?

15 We had commissioned a great panel  
16 to work on this and then, you know, ran this  
17 study in 2000 to work on this and never --  
18 you know, I think the punch line or our kind  
19 of conclusion was that the splicing would be  
20 so complicated that you wouldn't have faith  
21 that you hadn't actually stopped the time  
22 series and started another one.

---

1 So I wondered if you all have a  
2 different impression. That there is some  
3 smoother, straightforward way to switch  
4 modes and maintain -- you know, be able to  
5 still compare, you know, the data back  
6 to '52. Because it would be sad if you  
7 couldn't I think -- if you couldn't compare  
8 the data back to '52.

9 MR. TOURANGEAU: When the CPS did  
10 a switch over in the Current Population  
11 Study -- and this is arguably the most  
12 important time series in social science, or  
13 in the American statistical system, anyway,  
14 I'd say. They did a switch over and they  
15 went from face-to-face with paper to  
16 face-to-face CAPI and they did an experiment  
17 and they thought there was going to be a  
18 discontinuity of about a half percent jump.

19 They also changed the  
20 questionnaire at the same time. So they  
21 were anticipating a half percent jump of the  
22 unemployment rate.

---

1 They switched over. They had a  
2 split ballot. I think there was overlap --  
3 or maybe you know John, for some period of  
4 time when they were doing it both ways. I  
5 think 18 months, actually they did it both  
6 ways. They had parallel studies.

7 In fact when they implemented  
8 this, when they switched over completely to  
9 CAPI there wasn't any jump. They were  
10 expecting a discontinuity but they were



11 willing to take the hit because they had  
12 done the elaborate calibration study. Then  
13 the hit wasn't there as near as I can tell.  
14 SPEAKER: That's exactly right.  
15 DR. BURNS: Yeah, because we  
16 switched to CAPI already too and that wasn't  
17 a hit --  
18 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, maybe the  
19 difference between paper and CAPI is not so  
20 great as telephone.  
21 DR. BRADBURN: Well, on the NOSY  
22 when we did the experiment on CAPI we did

---

1 find a couple of -- by and large it wasn't  
2 too much. But it mostly had to do with  
3 things that in the end didn't make any  
4 difference when you aggregated things like  
5 whether you were looking for work or not.  
6 But they showed up in different  
7 places and that seemed to be because on the  
8 paper and pencil, you had two pages worth of  
9 questions and so people answer the questions  
10 in anticipation -- you know, because they  
11 see where you're going. So they answer the  
12 question that is three down in the filter.  
13 But, in CAPI you only get one  
14 question on a screen and the interviewer  
15 doesn't know where it's going and so they  
16 slog through the whole thing.  
17 So, things would show up in  
18 different places but in fact when you  
19 aggregate it back up to the rate there  
20 wasn't any difference.  
21 There were a couple of others like  
22 that but they all seemed to have to do with

---

1 peculiarities of the difference between the  
2 way a question appeared on the screen and  
3 the way it appeared in the thing and it  
4 wasn't substantively enough --  
5 MR. TOURANGEAU: You know it could  
6 be that the difference between telephone and  
7 face-to-face is larger than the difference  
8 between telephone and computer, but actually  
9 historically the studies suggest that that's  
10 not the case. But then, you know, your own  
11 studies suggest otherwise. So.  
12 DR. BRADBURN: Well, but I think  
13 the -- you're asking a different question

14 because -- that's why I was asking about the  
15 point about marginals. I mean, the GSS has  
16 never gone to the telephone because of that  
17 problem. But there very -- there preserving  
18 the marginals is extremely difficult -- I  
19 mean is an important issue too. I mean --  
20 they -- they were reluctant even to go to  
21 CAPI for a long time. But, I think  
22 they've -- I don't know, John, do you know

---

1 if they've gone to CAPI now for the GSS?  
2 DR. THOMPSON: Yeah, the last  
3 round we went to CAPI.  
4 DR. BRADBURN: I think probably  
5 everything has to be done CAPI because  
6 nobody knows how to do --  
7 MR. TOURANGEAU: They were a  
8 survey that held on to quota sampling a long  
9 time too.  
10 (Laughter)  
11 DR. BRADBURN: That's right.  
12 DR. BURNS: Yeah, because it  
13 hasn't seemed to us and maybe we're over  
14 reading the results but you know the  
15 Holbrook et al. study, the results are  
16 everywhere. The differences are everywhere  
17 and users have been getting in touch and  
18 saying, oh, my goodness if I run it in the  
19 face-to-face I get this result and if I run  
20 in the -- and these are very sophisticated  
21 you know, multi-arena (?) users who are  
22 sending in notes about this. You know,

---

1 footnotes that run, you know, kind of  
2 running strings of footnotes that use  
3 the 2000 study that want to pull cases from  
4 both face-to-face and telephone.  
5 This isn't -- this was all done  
6 within the same house. The idea was best  
7 practices because you wouldn't want to  
8 splice, you know best practices face-to-face  
9 with some imperfect set of practices. So,  
10 best practices face-to-face with best  
11 practices telephone and you know in the kind  
12 of modern era that's the -- that seemed the  
13 smartest way to go and there hadn't been  
14 much since Groves and Kahn and so forth.  
15 That's older data, a different era.  
16 Of course now when we were

17 designing this 2000 thing we were also able  
18 to draw on the developments in you know the  
19 psychology of survey response that have come  
20 since Groves and Kahn. So we were hoping to  
21 be able, you know, to you know capture that.  
22 So we can --

---

1 MR. TOURANGEAU: I like that  
2 phrase, the psychology of survey response.

3 DR. BURNS: Well, anyway. I mean,  
4 so, there are things that understanding the  
5 psychology of survey response, enables you  
6 to understand about how you build a splice  
7 but then there are just piles of surprises  
8 and that would make a splice -- I mean,  
9 would make it so you couldn't compare, you  
10 know, 2000 with --

11 MR. TOURANGEAU: I think you're on  
12 to something. All the machinery created is  
13 basically looking at shifts in means and  
14 proportions. The analyses that Holbrook et  
15 al. did are very different from the analyses  
16 that Groves and Kahn did. I mean, they're  
17 looking at shifts in marginals. You see a 1  
18 or 2 percent shift, so it's insignificant.  
19 Who cares?

20 You know. There's the rare  
21 analysis. You know, I mean, again, with the  
22 unemployment rate or something, a 1 percent

---

1 shift is big. But for most statistics, you  
2 know, one or a half percent is nothing.

3 But they did much more of a  
4 correlational analyses. Or you know,  
5 co-variances and patterns across items, and  
6 stuff. I don't think we're accustomed to  
7 that problem. Or the survey, the classical  
8 survey literature doesn't really address  
9 that problem. So you have a more  
10 complicated problem. I think somebody's  
11 going to have to invent a solution, as yet  
12 uninvented to sort of calibrate a switch  
13 over, where the key statistics are, you  
14 know, regression coefficients or logistic  
15 regression coefficients, or you know,  
16 co-variances or something rather than means  
17 or proportions.

18 DR. KINDER: The problem is worse  
19 than you just made out to be, I think.

20 Because we commissioned this experiment not  
21 in the expectation that there would be no  
22 differences across these two different

---

1 packages, one face-to-face and one  
2 telephone, but that the differences we would  
3 see would be regular, and coherent, and  
4 comprehensible.  
5 Then we would know how to fix  
6 them. You know, in some places we would  
7 find differences, in other places we  
8 wouldn't, and we would know how to fix them.  
9 It's not at all what it looks like. It's a  
10 mess.

11 So, maybe somebody will be able to  
12 fix it. But there isn't a kind of general  
13 remedy here. There doesn't appear to be.  
14 But, you know, it's one thing at a time.  
15 So, our reading at least of these initial  
16 but quite thorough analyses is that there's  
17 real trouble in trying to make the move.  
18 That if you were to shift over to telephone,  
19 it would be to say goodbye to 50 years, and  
20 start another.

21 MR. SANTOS: Were the results  
22 capricious for some variables? You know, it

---

1 went one way, direction one way, and others  
2 went the other?

3 DR. KINDER: Well, if you were  
4 more imaginative, they wouldn't seem  
5 capricious. But they sort of seemed  
6 capricious to me.

7 MR. SANTOS: Is it possible that  
8 all we're seeing is just sort of measurement  
9 error gone awry, and that on average, it's  
10 zero but it's --

11 DR. KINDER: No, I don't think so.

12 MR. SANTOS: Okay.

13 DR. KINDER: You know, there are  
14 sort of pockets of systematic relationships  
15 that don't add up in a way that you would  
16 have liked them to.

17 DR. BURNS: Just to elaborate one  
18 tiny thing. Another just a question. This  
19 is, you know, something again we've just  
20 been stewing over. You may have, you know,  
21 all sorts of clear ideas about this.

1 Now, is the telephone the same thing  
2 in 2012? Would you expect the same sorts of  
3 relationships between the telephone in 2012  
4 and the face-to-face survey in 2000, as you  
5 expect between the face-to-face survey  
6 in 2000 and the telephone in 2000? It  
7 seems, like, you know, I don't know, a  
8 different kind of social experience, or a  
9 different kind of conversation, all of that  
10 sort of thing about the telephone. So  
11 that's just another, you know, stewing  
12 point, to use my grandmother's approach to  
13 thinking about this.

14 MR. TOURANGEAU: I think you're  
15 really on to something. I mean, I think  
16 that the telephone is a dynamic medium right  
17 now. In part because of the onslaught of  
18 telemarketing. But also, because of broader  
19 changes, I think.

20 For instance, you know, I think  
21 that norms about, I don't know, tolerating  
22 silence, or something, may be changing.

---

1 That's an important feature of telephone  
2 surveys. I mean, I think one of the reasons  
3 why telephone does differ from face-to-face  
4 is the pace is probably a lot faster in the  
5 average telephone interview than it is in  
6 the average face-to-face interview, where  
7 it's fast and already.

8 So, I'm with you. I mean, I think  
9 the medium itself is changing, and so that  
10 you might have to do -- you know, I mean,  
11 there's going to be a one-time only thing,  
12 but then you could be really upsetting a  
13 long-term time series, because the telephone  
14 itself is going to evolve.

15 DR. BRADBURN: I mean, yes. I  
16 don't know about the 2012 study but  
17 ultimately, the two will come together so  
18 that you will have -- there will be  
19 widespread video communication of various  
20 sorts, so then you can get back to  
21 face-to-face interviewing, but  
22 electronically mediated face-to-face

---

1 interviewing. But that's, you know, at  
2 least a decade or more off.

3 DR. LEMPert: There are some  
4 fundamental problems here. I mean, plus the  
5 thing is that somehow face-to-face is not a  
6 dynamic. I think the meaning of inviting a  
7 stranger into your home has changed  
8 dramatically, and also changes in context.  
9 The time the sniper was active here or  
10 something, or with terrorists.

11 So, and I don't know how we get a  
12 handle on that. But it's at least plausible  
13 to suppose those effects are also temporally  
14 contingent.

15 DR. MUTZ: I think even when we  
16 think about it, you can especially see that  
17 being different with regard to sensitive  
18 questions, which there aren't many. But  
19 even something like voting. People were far  
20 more comfortable with public statements of  
21 their affiliations in the fifties than they  
22 would be now. So given that it is a social

---

1 interaction thing I think you can't get  
2 around that. Because even if you stick with  
3 exactly the same mode, you're going to be  
4 subject to that.

5 DR. CLARKE: I think that's an  
6 interesting point, because the sort of  
7 assumptions about the model -- I'm not quite  
8 sure how to say it, but those assumptions  
9 are changing. Maybe it's just the  
10 confidence people have in each other, in  
11 terms of, like, inviting someone into your  
12 home, or what have you. That's not a  
13 constant, obviously. We know it's not. It  
14 may well affect the nature of responses  
15 within mode really substantially, which  
16 would show up most often and obviously with  
17 non-response, and those things.

18 But it may well show up in more  
19 subtle ways as well, in terms of people  
20 offering sort of an obvious hypothesis, sort  
21 of guarded responses to things.

22 There are some other things, in

---

1 terms of lots of work, attitudes towards  
2 different ethnic groups or racial groups and

3 things like this. I think people's  
4 responses now probably are much more guarded  
5 with regard to these matters than they might  
6 have been when the studies began.

7 I think the whole sort of nature  
8 of the study -- the norms about responding  
9 to certain kinds of questions that are  
10 extremely interesting to us as social  
11 scientists have changed. So, within mode,  
12 comparisons might still be fraught with a  
13 number of serious problems.

14 SPEAKER: If we want time series.  
15 I mean, we really said well, look, you can't  
16 have time series in those things. Maybe  
17 there are some things we just can't do. So  
18 forget about it, it's not -- it's not ours.

19 MR. TOURANGEAU: I was going to  
20 say that just in my view, you know,  
21 face-to-face more or less dominates except  
22 for cost, telephone. I would say audio CASI

---

1 more or less dominates interviewer-  
2 mediated, face-to-face data collection.

3 DR. BRADY: For how long can the  
4 interview be with audio CASI?

5 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, it's not  
6 clear that it can be any less long. I mean,  
7 I know that we've done experiments where,  
8 you know, it's been an hour or more.

9 DR. BRADY: With audio CASI?

10 MR. TOURANGEAU: With audio CASI.  
11 The national survey -- well --

12 DR. BRADY: I'd hang up.

13 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, the  
14 interviewer is there.

15 DR. BRADBURN: What do you mean,  
16 hang up? This is face-to-face.

17 DR. BRADY: Face to face audio  
18 CASI?

19 MR. TOURANGEAU: Not telephone  
20 audio CASI, face-to-face audio CASI.

21 DR. BRADY: I thought you meant --  
22 okay, but how about the telephone -- this

---

1 other method you were -- I'm sorry.

2 MR. TOURANGEAU: IVR. Yes, I  
3 think the lore there -- and I think it's  
4 just lore -- is that it can't go very long.

5 DR. SCIOLI: What does it stand

6 for, IVR?  
7 MR. TOURANGEAU: Interactive Voice  
8 Response. Yeah. Which is a completely  
9 misleading name, but it's the most popular  
10 one. We've all dealt with these systems,  
11 right. Please, you know, press or say 1,  
12 right?  
13 DR. SCIOLI: Amtrak.  
14 MR. TOURANGEAU: Exactly. You  
15 know. How shall I put it? It's not a very  
16 engaging experience.  
17 DR. SCIOLI: Unless you're lonely.  
18 MR. TOURANGEAU: It's, like, the  
19 sidebar we were having, Henry. There's a  
20 lot of lore that says length is a huge  
21 determinant of response rate and cost. In  
22 fact, the empirical literature doesn't

---

1 support that. That there are, in fact --  
2 there's a relationship between length and  
3 response rates, but the regression  
4 coefficient is very small. You know,  
5 adding, you know, 50 questions loses you 2  
6 percent or something. It's very  
7 non-dramatic.

8 Likewise, the marginal cost once  
9 you've got somebody on the phone or once  
10 you've got somebody face-to-face, of  
11 adding 5 minutes worth of questions, is  
12 trivial.

13 I mean, you know, and I don't want  
14 to go overboard. But it's small.

15 DR. THOMPSON: Roger, I agree with  
16 that. We did a lot of work on the Census  
17 about the length of questionnaire response.  
18 What we found was the only time we got a  
19 real big effect was if it was very, very  
20 small. You know, like, six questions or so.  
21 But when you got up to any kind of  
22 reasonable amount of questions, there wasn't

---

1 much to see.

2 DR. BRADBURN: Well, there is a  
3 big difference between the short form and  
4 the long form.

5 MR. TOURANGEAU: But we looked at  
6 intermediate forms, too. The really, really  
7 short form and the short, short form.

8 DR. MUTZ: Is this a situation



9 where you're required to tell them up front  
10 how long it is?  
11 DR. THOMPSON: Well, any survey  
12 that OMB approves, you have to tell them  
13 what the length of the interview is.  
14 DR. MUTZ: Okay. So they are told  
15 up front it will be an hour, and that  
16 doesn't affect their likelihood of getting  
17 going.  
18 MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, this is  
19 true even in mail surveys, where the  
20 respondent can take a look and decide for  
21 himself or herself how long it is. You  
22 don't see a tremendously steep gradient

---

1 between the long and the short. As I say,  
2 that regression coefficient suggests that,  
3 you know, it's 25 items per point or  
4 something. It's not very dramatic.

5 DR. BLAIS: But on some topics,  
6 that must make a difference.

7 MR. TOURANGEAU: I think topic  
8 swamps length, actually. If you have a  
9 topic that people want to talk about,  
10 they're willing to talk about it at length.  
11 If you have a topic that they don't want to  
12 talk about it, it doesn't matter that it's a  
13 short questionnaire. You know. I think  
14 that's -- well, that's what the empirical  
15 literature seems to suggest, I think.

16 DR. SCIOLI: I think in terms of  
17 the 2012 example, I'm fascinated with the  
18 socialization experience of younger people,  
19 where the cell phone is probably the  
20 preeminent medium for communicating, and  
21 where it's on all the time, and they're  
22 talking all the time. I mean, they're

---

1 not --

2 MR. TOURANGEAU: Particularly  
3 while they're doing web surveys.

4 (Laughter)

5 MR. McCREADY: Where that's going  
6 is they're not talking all the time now in  
7 the Asian countries, and so on. It's all  
8 instant messaging. They don't use the oral  
9 piece of it at all. We're seeing everybody  
10 doing it, CSMS. That's going to happen  
11 here, too, if it ----

12 DR. SCIOLI: At Princeton, they've  
13 become adept at it, haven't they?  
14 DR. CLARK: There's another sort  
15 of -- just a small point on this, though.  
16 It's not just like losing a respondent. But  
17 anybody who's ever done any work with  
18 telephone surveys, and even listening to  
19 them, is that there's a real strong  
20 intuition that the quality of response is  
21 going down beyond a certain point. Yes,  
22 they may be polite enough and stick with

---

1 you. But the measurement error is really  
2 increasing substantially. I mean, that's my  
3 intuition, having done a lot of that stuff.

4 So you say, hey, yes, I can keep  
5 them for another 10 minutes. That's right.  
6 But it's really not worth it. The quality  
7 of data has really gone down. So, that's --  
8 I mean, I don't have a study to cite on  
9 that. But that's, you know, based on a lot  
10 of experience of doing these things.

11 That's certainly something to  
12 think about as well. Yes, I can keep him  
13 for an hour, an hour and a half maybe. But  
14 that would be wild. But I can keep him for  
15 another 10 minutes. But I'm highly  
16 suspicious of what I get myself after  
17 about 20 minutes. I say hey that's about it  
18 for this call.

19 DR. SINNOTT: There isn't just the  
20 time factor. But in regard to telephone  
21 interviewing, I'd presume anyway there is a  
22 major consideration in regard to the

---

1 sophistication of the question or the scale.

2 I had one experience of being  
3 interviewed. It was actually by the Flash  
4 Eurobarometer. The Flash Eurobarometer is a  
5 telephone. It was the early 1990s, and it  
6 was a complex question on the European  
7 Monetary Union. There were two ends to the  
8 scale.

9 The interviewer went -- you know,  
10 I was just about able for it. But, you  
11 know, I said to her, I had a conversation  
12 with her. It was a very short interview,  
13 and I had a conversation with the

14 interviewer afterwards. She said yeah, you  
15 know, this one was really causing  
16 difficulties. She did say that her  
17 solution -- she was working from the  
18 telephone directory, well, that she could  
19 recognize the addresses where she'd get a  
20 good response.

21 (Laughter)

22 SPEAKER: Good.

---

1 DR. SINNOTT: That's what we all  
2 face.

3 DR. ACHEN: I think it's worth  
4 remembering here, too, that just as the  
5 military has found that technology is one  
6 thing, and then getting well-trained people  
7 to operate the technology is another  
8 thing -- this goes back to a point Roger was  
9 making earlier.

10 There isn't something called  
11 telephone, or face-to-face. There's  
12 telephone with high-quality people, and  
13 telephone with low-quality people, and so  
14 forth. I've certainly been on the phone.  
15 One case, a survey that was half about my  
16 fondness for General Motors vehicles, and  
17 the other half was about deodorant usage.

18 This went on for 50 minutes. The  
19 woman who was on the other end of the line  
20 kept me entertained. Fifty minutes flew by.  
21 She was an enormously skillful interviewer.  
22 Other people, I'm busy after about 4 or 5

---

1 minutes, and can't finish.

2 So, I think we have to think of  
3 this. Again, this relates to this whole  
4 question of the NES. As Henry was saying  
5 earlier, I'm not famous for my optimism  
6 about how well things have been done. But I  
7 trust NES data. The reason is I know how  
8 they do it. There are just a lot of issues  
9 here about the depth of training and the  
10 care with which things are done that needs  
11 to be a part of the conversation, too.

12 DR. LEMPERT: What does all this  
13 conversation mean for the ANS? Does it mean  
14 we have to look forward to the same  
15 modality, increasing costs of face-to-face?  
16 Or are there --

17 MR. TOURANGEAU: Plus a lot of  
18 mode research.  
19 DR. LEMPert: Yes.  
20 DR. SINNOTT: It means you have to  
21 be a Rolls-Royce.  
22 DR. LEMPert: But what is that

---

1 going to be?  
2 DR. BRADBURN: Actually, let me  
3 mention another thing. John and I were  
4 talking about this earlier in the week. A  
5 strategy which is another way of coping with  
6 things, if you're willing to believe a bit  
7 in model. It makes it a more complicated  
8 data set.  
9 But that's for a fixed set of  
10 money, stopping at a lower response rate,  
11 and using the rest of the money to learn  
12 about the non-respondents, and then use that  
13 data to do either a more sophisticated  
14 imputation or waiting of things like that,  
15 rather than trying to go flat out and get a  
16 traditionally high response rate. That's a  
17 way of coping with -- I mean, I think that's  
18 statistically a better way of doing it.  
19 Now, it does produce a somewhat  
20 more -- I mean, a data set that  
21 traditionalists don't like, because it's got  
22 more imputed data and so on and so forth.

---

1 But it's -- you know the -- in principle if  
2 you do it right you know a lot about the  
3 properties of the non-respondents. You're  
4 better off, I think, with a lower, you know,  
5 direct observations and putting in a good  
6 chunk of your money.  
7 Because, you know. I mean, it's  
8 the same thing that we were talking about.  
9 Interviewers used to tell me that they said  
10 when we would push them to get high response  
11 rates, they'd say are you sure you really  
12 want that last ----.  
13 They said, you know, people are  
14 just doing this because it's easier to give  
15 us an interview and get rid of this because  
16 we keep pestering them, and so forth. You  
17 know, they're not giving thoughtful answers,  
18 and various things.

19 In fact, the guy in Michigan who  
20 did economic -- not Jim Morgan, but the guy  
21 who did a lot of stuff on savings.  
22 SPEAKER: Chester?

---

1 DR. BRADBURN: No. Earlier. Go  
2 back. You're all too young.  
3 (Laughter)  
4 DR. BRADBURN: Anyway, I was at a  
5 conference with him once. He said, you  
6 know, I would much rather have, you know,  
7 a 20 percent response rate in which I was  
8 sure that the people had -- he was getting  
9 asset data, and so on -- are really giving  
10 me good data than a much higher response  
11 rate.  
12 SPEAKER: George Toner.  
13 DR. BRADBURN: No. I forgot.  
14 Anyway. That's the right generation.  
15 DR. BURNS: We've been following  
16 this. I mean, there are these studies that  
17 Roger talked about. I guess Groves has got  
18 this new experiment in the field.  
19 DR. BRADBURN: Well, Bob has  
20 written about this.  
21 DR. BURNS: Yes, I know exactly on  
22 the non- response stuff.

---

1 DR. BRADBURN: Suggested this kind  
2 of as a method.  
3 DR. BURNS: So it is awfully  
4 interesting. I mean, at least as far as I  
5 can tell in the studies, they get -- the one  
6 difference they find, at least in the Grove  
7 study, I believe -- the one difference they  
8 find is folks who are racially conservative  
9 drop out more. So there's that, and so  
10 you'd end up with that.  
11 But they do seem -- the studies  
12 seem awfully interesting. They're, you  
13 know, kind of usually within house studies.  
14 So it's not, you know, getting a cheaper --  
15 or excuse me, getting a lower response rate  
16 by carting yourself off to some house that  
17 is going to get a lower response rate.  
18 DR. BRADBURN: But if you -- I  
19 mean, I would take a lot of things. Suppose  
20 you could easily get a 40 percent response  
21 rate, and take the rest of the money, and

---

1 gotten, and really drill in and try to get  
2 them.

3 DR. BRADY: Do we know that in  
4 person, is it the case that the marginal  
5 cost of the last people we get is the really  
6 expensive part? That's true?

7 DR. BRADBURN: Yes. It goes  
8 from -- it goes up astronomically. I mean,  
9 exponentially.

10 DR. BRADY: Okay. So that would  
11 really reduce the cost of the in person  
12 interview.

13 DR. BURNS: That would reduce it.  
14 I mean, the other thing is, right now, we  
15 are at a small -- you know. So a the 2004  
16 study is slated to be 1200 cases. 1200  
17 cases spread across the U.S. that you don't  
18 want interviewers to have to travel, because  
19 then you'd end up not -- you wouldn't be  
20 able to analyze the data, because there  
21 would be a correlation between date of the  
22 interview and place of the interview.

---

1 So right now, at 1200, the fixed  
2 costs are 100 percent of an interview.  
3 Right? So there's no, you know, fixed -- so  
4 the average costs and marginal costs are the  
5 same number, and that's not where you want  
6 to be. You want to be, you know, down off  
7 that curb some. So that's just another  
8 thing to think about.

9 DR. BRADBURN: Yes. The later  
10 interviews may be five times as expensive as  
11 the earlier ones.

12 DR. KINDER: That's a very  
13 interesting idea. We've already begun to  
14 think about it, because we are going with  
15 these studies.

16 DR. BRADBURN: Yes. I mean, there  
17 are just a whole lot of progress, if you can  
18 put it that way, in modeling error. I mean,  
19 if you look at -- Bob has got a book on  
20 total error, you know, he says there are two  
21 approaches. You know, you can try to  
22 improve the basic observations, and then you

---

1 know people -- and some people, like me,  
2 have always pushed in that sort of  
3 direction.

4           Then there's the other fellow who  
5 says well, we don't worry too much about  
6 that. We model the rest.

7           I think we're just at a point,  
8 because of the, you know, escalating costs  
9 of the direct observations that we'd have to  
10 learn to do with less of the direct  
11 observations and do more modeling of the  
12 non-response.

13           That's uncomfortable for a lot of  
14 people, but I think they're -- I mean, just  
15 an example. For example, on this modeling  
16 of the non-response. The economists used to  
17 absolutely reject that notion, and so forth.  
18 Now they're coming around to it as something  
19 that is -- I guess now they understand it  
20 more. So but now that, you know, they'll do  
21 it more.

22           DR. KINDER: Another thing worth

---

1 saying to Rick's question was to remind  
2 everyone of where we began this morning,  
3 especially in Nancy's presentation, was to  
4 suggest, in the future, a portfolio of  
5 coordinated studies, one of which would be  
6 this maintenance of a time series.

7           This is where this immediate  
8 conversation was about the high quality or  
9 the high cost of face-to-face ---- sampling  
10 data. Maybe this kind of solution that  
11 Norman has suggested is one to take  
12 seriously.

13           But in addition to that, we talked  
14 about -- and everybody else has, too now  
15 over the course of the day, alternative  
16 designs. Rolling cross-sections here and  
17 there, panels marching out into time. It  
18 has been the case in the past, and I think  
19 we presumed into the future, that we'd be  
20 contemplating alternative designs with  
21 cheaper -- sorry, less expensive approaches  
22 in mind.

---

1                   So, even though it's true that if  
2       we had our way, and if we had all the money  
3       in the world, we'd be doing face-to-face  
4       ---- sampling interviewing, for some  
5       purposes, say, for example, this rolling  
6       cross-section design, we put a couple on the  
7       table, other people have put some more on  
8       the table. As long as the non-response bias  
9       is constant across time, then, you know,  
10      it's not such a big worry.  
11                   You know, we're not patching it up  
12      against a previous time series that we want  
13      to maintain.  
14                   We're just -- you know, what we  
15      want to do is be able to make comparisons  
16      across time. We can do that, and we have  
17      done that in the past. We exploited the  
18      less expensive telephone mode for perfectly,  
19      I think, reasonable purposes, and to good  
20      effect.  
21                   DR. BRADBURN: If you're starting  
22      on the phone, then you don't have this

---

1       retractable problem of what do you do  
2       with 100-point scale on the phone.  
3                   DR. SCIOLI: That raises a lot of  
4       interesting questions. I'm thinking back to  
5       the question I guess it was Henry raised  
6       this morning about the core, and telling the  
7       community that we want a well-designed,  
8       rigorously scientific study. Then the kinds  
9       of constraints that of necessity, we  
10      imposed.  
11                   Henry's observation that boy, then  
12      you tell -- then the community's all  
13      confused. Like who else could do that but  
14      ISR or SRC? It's really a very interesting  
15      question.  
16                   Final comments? Rick and Norman  
17      will be with us tomorrow. We'll begin  
18      at 8:30. Will be. Yes.  
19                   (Whereupon, at 4:42 p.m., the  
20      PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)  
21                   \* \* \* \* \*