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INTRODUCTIONS AND PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

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

DR. BRADY: I love you too, Frank.

DR. SCIOLI: I get that all the time. Before I forget, let me note that we have a transcriber from Services who will be doing a verbatim transcription of what we say here. If there is anything you would like not to become part of the public record, do not say it.
Thank you for your willingness to provide commentaries on relatively short notice -- incisive, thoughtful, provocative -- and we hope this will be very useful to us as we plan for the next decade of studies in the area of American electoral behavior.

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

Our objective is to produce a report and to produce an announcement which will guide a competition for the next round of American electoral behavior studies. As many of you know, we have supported the American National Election Studies. In a minute everyone will introduce themselves, Nancy, Don, and John Mark Hansen from ANES are here.

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

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

Let me introduce first Norman Bradburn, our Assistant Director. For Jim and me it has been a singular pleasure to work with him over the past 3 years. He has 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
supporting mentor for us. Most recently Rick Lempert, our
Division Director, joined the division in August, 2002. He
too is first and foremost a scholar and a
leader and has been extremely supportive in
what we're doing in political science and
our efforts to launch this workshop.
In order to do a workshop in NSF
you must have support of the leadership or
it simply can't come off. The fact that
they are willing to be here today and to
listen and to participate fully, naturally,
is also testimony to their interest in the
study of electoral behavior and in their
support of the political science program.

So, please just a brief hello from
everyone at the table beginning with Norman
and then we will turn it over to Norman for
some broader remarks.

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

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

DR. SINNOTT: Richard Sinnott from
University College, Dublin. Basically,
thank you for the invitation. I had some
involvement in much less elaborate, I
suspect, central discussions that took place
in the British ESOC that led to some
reorganization of the British election
study.

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

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

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

DR. BRADY: Henry Brady at the

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

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

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

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

DR. MUTZ: Diana Mutz, Ohio State
University.

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

that runs the Australian Election Survey.

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

DR. BRADY: The real national
election studies.

DR. BLAIS: Andre Blais,
Department of Political Science at
University of Montreal.

MR. TOURANGEAU: I'm Roger Tourangeau. I'm the director of the Joint Program in Survey and Methodology at the University of Michigan and I'm a senior research scientist at the University of Michigan.

DR. SCIOLI: Please introduce yourself.

MR. PIERRET: I'm Chuck Pierret. I'm from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the principal -- the director of the National Longitudinal Survey.

DR. SCIOLI: Also a member of the ANES board and our colleague --

MS. WHITE: Pat White, NSF program director, sociology.

DR. SCIOLI: Pat is the overseer program director for the General Social Survey which as you probably know is in the sociology program. Norman?

DR. BRADBURN: Okay. Well I thought I'd start off by trying to give you a sort of -- well, cut the context for this workshop in terms of kind of the larger picture of what's going on at NSF.

I actually haven't seen the paper this morning but if -- we had testimony on our '04 budget yesterday and Representative Boehlert who is chairman of the Science Committee said that they were going to pass the Omnibus Budget bill later in the day. Did they do it? I don't know. Okay.

That will provide NSF with a rather larger increase than the President had recommended in '03 and I think the preliminary figures that I had seen for our budget would be an increase in '03 because we're half way through '03 or slightly over 13 percent. As you also probably know last year the Congress passed an NSF reauthorization bill which called for doubling the NSF budget in the next 5 years which means, in case you don't your arithmetic, a 15 percent a year increase in order to accomplish that.
Now, of course we're starting --
there is also the question of what year
you're taking as the base. In the proposed
budget in '04 where the President's
budget -- which is what we were talking
about yesterday -- there is a proposal for
a 9 percent increase over the '03.

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

He didn't say, no, we're not going
to do that but he didn't say, yes, we are
going to do that either. So, I don't
know -- we're sort of optimistic that in
fact there will be some kind of adjustment
to the President's '04 submission which
would be an increase.

But the general trend, as I'm sure
you read around in the various news and

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

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

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

as it looks. But, still it's positive
rather than negative which is what a number
of agencies around town are facing.

But in any case, if you just --

without thinking what the actual numbers
might turn out to be -- we are in a position
where we need to be thinking about what --
if we do get these increased resources how
we would best allocate them. What I see
this particular workshop as being is a kind
of intersection of two sort of general
planning efforts that we have going.

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

probably the single biggest investment that
we make.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The best -- I did a little quick calculation of what SPE now spends on infrastructure, broadly defined and it's around -- it's in the low '20s, somewhere around about 22 percent, if I remember. So, in light of the Board's, if the Board has a policy and that sort of thing, we'll probably want to increase that as proportion of the total. So -- and of course as the total goes up.

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

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

But, in looking over what we funded under those two things plus some other things that we have been funding, it seems to me that there are kind of four categories of infrastructure that we support.

The one, of course, which you are most familiar with and interested in presumably is our new data collections or data platforms of various sorts of which ANES is one, the GSS is one, the PSID is
one, the International Social Science
Program which is a kind of add on the GSS
which gets money out of the International
Division in our directorate are sort of
eamples and I think perhaps all there are.
I didn't -- but certainly they are all the
big ones and they have been going for many,
many years.

As you probably well know, I
certainly knew before I got here, NSF as an
organization kind of waxes and wanes on the
question of continuity of things. There are
sort of swings in which there is suddenly
give up the old things, and then there are
swings which say, oh, continuity is a great
thing.

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

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

The second category are shared
facilities of various sorts, what are coming
to be called collaboratories of various
sorts, one of which is -- I don't know
exactly how you'd describe it, but in my
notes it's called the Experimental Survey
Lab.

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

DR. MUTZ: Timeshared experiments.
DR. BRADBURN: Timeshared
experiments. Okay. There is another one
that we've financed at, I think it's
Virginia, University of Virginia, which is
sort of a game theory that is, again, a
shared facility across investigators. Not
only -- and they're developing kind of
wireless game theory kinds of things so you
could take -- do balloting experiments and
things like that in the field. They are
interested particularly in getting
anthropologists to take these other cultures
and do some of the replication of things

that have been done in this country in other
cultures.

Probably the biggest and easiest
one to think about as infrastructure are
data archives which are the research data
centers which we do at the Census Bureau and
a number of our universities and consortia
of universities, is one example.

But, what's interesting that I
hadn't realized until I got here was that
there are also -- aside from data in the
sense that you and I traditionally think
about, there are other kinds of things which
now to some extent go by the name of digital
libraries. For example, archives of FMRI
images of the brain or a genetic database
which we are financing at a consortia of
universities. So there are other -- but the
notion of large databases, of different
kinds of databases -- for instance they did
one on languages, of disappearing languages
for instance, this is another big kind of

Finally there is a sort of like,
traditionally, sort of other which I think
about as special facilities to promote the
development of some sort -- something new in
social sciences. We're forming a center for
spatial social sciences at Santa Barbara
which is doing development of techniques for
doing spatial analysis for program
statistics and so forth, a lot of mapping
and bringing GIS technology together with
the social data.

Another type is the National
Consortia of Violence Research which is
housed at Carnegie-Mellon but it's a consortia of universities that is now primarily developing capacity in the field of violence research. So they're doing a lot of training, a lot of archive development and other things as well as some research. But it's seen more as a kind of facility to develop capacity to do things in the future.

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

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

We spent -- as you probably know NSF's sort of strategic areas are divided into people, ideas, and tools. While infrastructure is primarily what gets done in the tools category, there are other kinds of things which are simply technology kinds of things -- things that are made possible because of information technology developments or perhaps somewhere in the future nanotechnology developments and so forth.

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

I'm very pleased that Chuck is here from BLS because one of the great
resources in the world is the data that BLS has not only in the surveys that they sponsor through the Census Bureau but the NOSY in its various forms over the years.

So, and then on the other side are the old problems that have actually been solved or if not solved at least sort of hit a dead end or where not much new is going on and maybe we should be moving investments out of that into some other.

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

So we've got to think about, you know, how we allocate our resources in the way that, you know, spreads across all the different fields, supports the most exciting fields, doesn't do justice to the traditional fields but it is always -- the bias here would be towards, I would say, the cutting edge of things and not so much routine science. Okay. I'll stop there.

DR. SCIOLI: Rick Lempert?

DR. LEMPERT: Well, I want to add my wishes for a Happy Valentine's Day to Frank's. I don't know whether it was love of the ANES or surveys or the Foundation that has brought you to the heart of Code Orange country today. Good thing I don't have an apple in my hand.

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

I also want to thank Jim and Frank for doing just a marvelous job organizing the workshop. When you come here, you know, this is transparent. Things seemed to be
going well and it wasn't too hard getting here. When you're behind the scenes and you

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

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

I went to Frank last night and said, what would you like me to say. He said, well, say that one of the purposes of this is to develop this announcement for the recompetition. I know that's the first thing Frank told you is the purpose of what this is about which, of course, reminded me of what I was supposed to say. That's very good.

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

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

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

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

One manifestation of this is that for the first time in the history of the Foundation we have what's called a Foundation wide priority area in the planning, and indeed the budget was passed yesterday, actually with some money. That is -- although it's Foundation wide the heart of it is in the social sciences. It's designed to promote social science approaches to scientific learning. It's called the Human and Social Dynamics or for short, HSD Priority Area.

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

The virtue of having a Foundation wide priority area is, at least in theory, the Foundation -- and in practice -- the Foundation gives you money beyond what you would have in your budget, not just by allocating it to your directorate but also other directorates contribute to fund joint work at the intersection of different disciplines in the priority areas. So, we have contributions to our priority area from the people in information sciences, biological sciences, physical math sciences, et cetera.
Strictly speaking, this gathering is unconnected to the priority area. It was planned before the dimensions of the priority area were clear. It doesn't depend for funding on the level of allotments to the HSD priority. But, instead, it is as you all know, a project which our Political Science Program has seen worthy of investing in for a substantial number of years and is in the process of considering issues relating to future funding when the current ANES grant expires.

As Frank told you one of the reasons they set up the workshop is to develop a creative invitation for the next round of the NAC competition. But anyways the workshop and the ANES itself relates to our new priority area.

First the priority area is motivated by a sense that the time is ripe for significant breakthroughs in understanding human activity through the social and behavioral sciences. We have new technologies. We have new methods, new talent, I think. All of which are leading to a stronger social science, allowing us to better understand what people are now recognizing is truly the hard science which is the science of how humans act and react. I think there are few social activities more important to understand than the workings of our democracy, and in particular, the signature feature which is the combination of free elections and the subsequent peaceful transfer of power that they seem around the world to legitimize. Many of the papers prepared for this workshop describe and discuss the kinds of new methods or approaches to social understanding that our priority area is designed to foster across the social and behavioral sciences.

The second way, in which as I read these and thought about this conference or this workshop that what's going on is connected to the priority area is that our
priority area contains six areas of emphasis. One of them as Norman has just told you at some length is building social science infrastructure. The data we collect through large scale surveys like the ANES, the PSID, the GSS, and others have really been for many years now essential infrastructure in our field. It's not just political science but across the social sciences.

We see this, for example, in the report that Don and Nancy -- and maybe it was Nancy prepared on the ANES that concludes with a list of studies that build on ANES data. You can do the same with the PSID, or the GSS, ranging from graduate student theses or even master's or bachelors, honors degrees up through, you know, very important prize winning books. So much of the best works in our field builds on these infrastructures.

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

My own perspective, to be candid since I came here, is that it is about time. Surveys are one of my primary concerns and were when I arrived although you know this much better than I do because you're specialists. I'm not. It's certainly my sense that a large infusion of money is needed, not just to take advantage of new technologies and new ways of collecting data, but to maintain the quality of our existing longitudinal and repeated cross-section surveys.

Survey costs as you find out when you're researching, you approach it at my university, ISR, and say what would it cost me per interview to do this survey? They give you this number, which, you know you thought was the cost of the study and it's like a per survey number or something.
They have risen -- they have increased dramatically over the past few decades and I think they have increased faster than the funds available to pay for them, at least in the case of surveys which like the ANES strive to attain the very highest social science qualities. They are very much a public good. There is no private return to the investment.

We see things like surveys going from year to year to every other year, sample sizes diminishing, modalities of questioning changing to ways that may be less expensive but bring with them special problems. So, it's at least my belief that we have to find a way to invest more in our survey data bases and bring in innovative technologies.

I mean, some of things we've done through things like multiple imputation like is to use technological fixes. But we can't keep that up forever. So, I feel very strongly about this and hope to be paying considerable attention over the next few years, or the next year -- I mean, I'm a year and 4 months now -- to the construction of survey data resources.

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

One of the things that we're doing is to think more deeply about surveys of all sorts. Indeed we have coming up, Roger Tourangeau is actually the organizing person, a workshop that's going to be held in the Foundation on March 28th and 29th that is sort of going to be carrying on in a sense work that we're going to be discussing here, but again conceived independently. Its central concern is over time surveys, both panel and repeated cross-section surveys, and the special issues that arise in trying to maximize values of both continuity and innovation as well as challenges posed to all surveys, but
perhaps in special ways with special
abilities to deal with them to your over
time surveys by such things as declining
response rates, increasing difficulty of
making telephone contacts, and the like.

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

I want to conclude on a note of
substance, at least substance that stood out
for me as I read the papers prepared for
this workshop. There were two issues in my
reading that struck me as particularly
interesting and important which I look
forward to hearing discussed.

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

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

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

which would, of course, include the survey
but would include complimentary coordinated
studies that can give us a better handle in
understanding the American voter and
American politics.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To begin, it is important to
acknowledge the contributions of the
American National Election Studies, the
ANES. It has been a central vehicle for
studying American electoral behavior. No one can question the obvious benefits that the ANES has provided for most of the past 50 years. Yet recognition of this fact should not beget forgetfulness of what constitutes the central mission of the NSF Political Science Program.

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

1 is uniquely situated to assert, even reassert scientific leadership within the scholarly community. This is based in large part on the extensive consultation with our community of scholars, such as yourselves. Your thoughtful essays have raised a number of questions, each of which deserves discussion during this workshop and after. From this interaction, the future study of American electoral behavior will come to rely on a platform, a data source, that not only can lead to new theoretical breakthroughs but which is also flexible enough to incorporate theoretical breakthroughs that, as yet, have not been extensively tested.

What should be remembered is that scholars in the future will be able to ask and answer questions of great importance depending on the breakthroughs in data acquisition today. Failure to innovate and improve data quality means future scholars will be forced to rely on crude proxies such as dummy variables or abandon a specific research inquiry altogether. This cannot be allowed to happen.

The excellent essays presented here and a good deal of research shows the task ahead is filled with uncertainty regarding the factors that contribute to validity and replication. This uncertainty, while not insurmountable, does present an appreciable head wind. In the face of this uncertainty and in carrying out the upcoming tasks, the Political Science Program will be governed by the principle of calculated risk. This
should be understood to mean the avoidance
of developing future design attributes that
are difficult to implement unless there is
good prospect, as a result of such usage, in
an overall design that enhances theoretical
and empirical breakthroughs at a cost
the Political Science Program can bear.

DR. SCIOLI: We're going to break
for lunch at the time designated on the
schedule and you're going to leave and go
over to our food court and bring it back and
mix informally. Henry, says, how many times
we're going to have to have that sushi, for
goodness sake. We have dinner reservations
at Tutto Bene, Valentine's Day, up the
street and it's within walking distance. If
you're not able to make it let either Jim or
me know and we'll cancel one of the seats or
however many are necessary.

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

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

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

MR. SANTOS: Rob Santos.
DR. GRANATO: Rob Santos joined
us.

MR. SANTOS: Coming late,
naturally.

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

MR. SANTOS: Oh, sure. Robert
Santos. I'm at NuStats in Austin, Texas.
For a number of years, more than I would
probably like to admit, I was at the Survey
Research Center as director of survey operations and had an opportunity to work with many of the people here on the National Election Surveys. I do want to clarify, the person downstairs asked to return the badge. So, we do not return the badge?

DR. GRANATO: Tomorrow.
MR. SANTOS: Okay. Thank you.
DR. GRANATO: I assume they're fearful that you'll misplace it and then they, you know, have to --
MR. SANTOS: Do another one.
DR. GRANATO: Yeah, do another one and get approval et cetera. Well, thank you for joining us. Other housekeeping questions? Okay. We want to kickoff then with a collaborative statement from Nancy, Don and Mark Hansen. They have a half hour and then will lead the discussion, questions and answers. So the first topic is the current and future state of national election studies and Nancy and Don are the co-PIs on ANES at the University of Michigan and we're delighted that you're going to lead off.

THE CURRENT AND FUTURE STATE OF NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

DR. KINDER: We drew straws and I lost so I'll lead off. It occurred to me that I should cede my 10 minutes to Rick Lempert. That was a delicious and inviting introduction I think to the topic for us. For starters, I'd like to thank the Political Science Program, Jim and Frank the higherups for sponsoring this workshop and bringing us all together, this interesting and distinguished group, and for paying for our transportation. It was pretty dicey yesterday some of you may know. I think Jim and maybe Norman and others spent time yesterday trying to make my social security number run through a sensor.

DR. SCIOLI: Colin Powell got it straightened out.
DR. KINDER: I thought it was Cheney. I heard Cheney. Anyway, thank you
for that. I'm sorry that you had to do
that. Anyway we're delighted to be here and
to participate in this conversation.

My assignment leading off is, in
very broad terms, justification. Why should
the National Science Foundation support a
National Election Study? So, the big
question here is just that. Why NSF should
support a National Election Study. The
first section of our paper is organized
around a series of questions and I will
follow that device here in my remarks.
The hope is that -- we have
something useful to say -- but that it will
provoke a discussion among all of us.
The first question is, why study
elections? The answer is, not to put too
fine a point on it, elections are important
in much the same way Rick was saying
earlier, that elections, as Robert Dahl once
wrote, are critical techniques. Elections
provide incentives for governments to
respond to the interests and aspirations of
common citizens and the mechanism of change,
peaceful change, when governments fail to
respond.

In the democratic system elections
are a primary point of contact between
citizens and their government. How does the
link function and how well does it function?
Those questions have been at the center of
what NES has been up to over the years and
you could say, we say it, NES has made
possible an intensive empirical
investigation of democratic politics that is
unparalleled in place and time.
NES over the years has taken up a
series of topics, we name some of them, that
are all familiar to us, I suppose. The
primacy of partisanship, the role of
interests and ethics in opinion choice and
behavior, why it is that some Americans take
part in politics and many do not, a story of
resources, skills, and mobilizing moments,
and much more.
We say that over the past half
century national election studies carried
out in the United States, especially, but
other places as well, increasingly have
provided the scientific foundation for
deepening our understanding of the
democratic experience. So, we say. We say
that our understanding has deepened, that we
have an understanding that is richer and
more sophisticated, that our questions are
finer grained and more subtle than they used
to be, and that synergistic connections have
been made.
We say that and we can defend it
but we don't have time to defend it at the
moment. You know, it is sort of abstract
and even platitudinous but we have examples
we could present. It's a bit of preaching
to the choir. Maybe we don't have to do
that in this room. But, the argument needs
to be made eventually and we'd be prepared
to talk about how to make the argument in
the question and answer that follows.
So, partly and primarily NES's

contribution has been you could say to
science but also, and simultaneously, and in
some ways inevitably to society. That there
is kind of applied contribution to NES that
comes from the results of basic science
informing ongoing debates about democratic
practice. So, they affect how we think
about the value of political parties, the
effects of campaign finance reform, the
conduct of the mass media, the possibilities
for more deliberative politics, and more.
NES takes up, we say, central
questions for science and for society and
that's why the appetite for national
election study data is large and growing.
We document this in the appendix we attach
at the end of our memorandum. There is
lots, and lots, and lots of work that relies
on NES data: Books, seminal books,
conference papers, articles, articles in the
very best journals, and dissertations, all
show the same upward trajectory.

Beyond this, this concentration of
research attention, theoretical application, which comes primarily from political science, we suggest in our memorandum that there is a way to think about elections in a different way that broadens their appeal across the social sciences.

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

If you think about elections in that way, which we invite you to, then elections can become a site or a locus for research on processes that are of more generic importance. Elections can become a laboratory for the investigation of processes of perception, comprehension, choice, strategy, collective action. Now, those are prominent concerns for political science, of course. But, they reach across the social sciences, to psychology, sociology, and economics.

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

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

We'll say more about that, Mark and Nancy will, a little later on this morning. A second question is, why study elections with sample surveys? We claim in
our memo that there is a near perfect fit
between the character of elections on the
one hand and the method of the sample survey
on the other, that in the study of
elections, the sample survey is the right
tool.

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

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

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

commercial and political polls are really no
substitute for a national election study.
We can talk about that later on. I choose
not to rehearse those arguments right here.
Instead I'd like to draw attention and
emphasize another answer or a set of answers
really to the question of why the National
Science Foundation should support a National
Election Study.

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

What that meant is that scores of

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

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

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

If you talk to people who have
been involved on the NES Board or on NES
planning committees, they will report this
very faithfully. It's true for me. I
realized in a document that we prepared for
today that I've been involved in one way or
another in the National Election Study
since 1979, a horrifying thought, to me at
least, and maybe to the rest of you too.
You know, I've been in fancy universities and fancy places like this. I participated in lots of high octane faculty seminars. But, the one that has meant the most to me, and this is true of lots and lots of people, scores of people, is the seminar that runs in the planning and design of a National Election Study. Over the years, NES has produced human capital of a high sort, training for social science in a general sort of way.

Okay, finally, for me at least, in one form or another NES has been in business

for 50 years or so. If my arithmetic is right the 2002 study which was funded entirely from private sources, is the 25th in a series. So, the pointed question here is, with so many election studies already in hand, why do more? The answers there are actually -- the required answers there are elaborate and detailed. I only have time this morning to be snappy and cryptic.

But, in three ways. We have three snappy and cryptic answers to the question about why do more. The first is that sustaining NES and sustaining the NES time series makes basic research on political and social change possible. Posing comparable instrumentation to comparable samples at regular intervals means that we can undertake analysis of the life history of issues or investigate the partisan realignment of the American South or analyze the disintegration of the New Deal party system. None of that is possible without NES or something like NES marching out in the future.

Our second reason goes to the dynamism of the social sciences and the generation of new ideas. NES was born before Downs wrote what he wrote about issue voting, or before Key wrote what he wrote about partisan realignment, before Verba and Nie wrote what they wrote on participation, before Kramer wrote what he did on economic voting.
There are new ideas being generated now, even as we speak. They need to be tested and refined in general and NES has proven to be a powerful venue for that kind of test.

Finally, thirdly, NES on into the future provides a powerful platform for the assessment of what you could call natural experiments. We've been in the United States visited by two conspicuous natural experiments recently. One, the unprecedented and completely unanticipatable near Constitutional crisis that followed the 2000 election and, of course, the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Those were galvanizing, mesmerizing, interrupting events, coordinated events in a way that stopped life as we knew it and drew the attention of the nation to this one aspect of our shared community life.

Now, to provide a sober and sophisticated understanding of the enduring political consequences that emerge from events like that you need something that looks very much like the National Election Study. You need comparable measurement to comparable samples, before such events intrude and then afterwards. So, those are some of the reasons that we wanted to put on the table for why something like the National Election Studies needs to go forward into the future. Mark now is going to talk about what is required to make that real.

DR. HANSEN: Thank you again for the invitation. I think all of us on the National Election Study Board see this conference as being something of a watershed event. The National Science Foundation took over responsibility for the funding of the project some 25 years ago now and this really is kind of an opportunity to take a look at 25 years of the National Election Study and ask, well what kinds of adjustments do we want to make and what do we want to do going forward from here?
So, I think it's very much a watershed event, not only for National Science Foundation and for the National Election Study but also for political science and the social sciences more generally.

I thought I would begin in talking about what these requirements might look like to put some concerns that the -- or sort of questions that occurred to the Board out of a conversation with Jim Granato at a Board meeting last summer, the kind of -- sort of kind of issues that I think are involved in thinking about changing, making changes in the National Election Study, and then moving forward in the National Election Study.

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

The first is, should we think of the American National Election Studies as a program or a process? That is, at one extreme we might think of the election study as a program which is designed and specified by the principal investigators in advance where the Board's role is simply to assist in the implementation of that program.

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

I'd say right now that the American National Election studies is something of a hybrid, that they look more like a project on matters of study design and they look more like a process model on matters of content. So one question is, what is the right balance point between a conception of a project versus the conception of a process? Does the American
National Election Study currently set the right balance or should it be moved in one direction or the other? Another way of putting the question is to what extent can and should the study anticipate the direction of science and the political circumstances that would provide opportunities for the investigation of important substantive questions and what are the implications of the balance that is struck both for the Board, the principal investigators for the research communities, and for the Foundation itself? A second question that we found vexing over time and we continue to think is quite important is the balance between continuity and innovation in the National Election Study. This is a constant point of contention around the American National Election Studies. It really strikes at the heart of the mission of the National Election Studies as a national resource. As a Board we believe that we have a responsibility to maintain continuity but it's also a responsibility -- it's been frustrating, especially in an era where budgets have been tight and where we haven't been able to do as much as we would like. We certainly have members of our research community who would like to see more continuity. We get that in the reviews on the project. We also have members of our community who would like to see more innovation. We get those reviews as well. So we think it would be very helpful to discuss this issue explicitly and decide in a self-conscious way what balance would be most of use to the social scientific research community. Finally, another kind of issue of the way the study is run, is what are the American National Election Study's research communities? At the very beginning of the study and certainly leading up to the point where the National Science Foundation took over responsibility for the study, the
American National Election Study was primarily in service of a research community that was concerned chiefly with electoral behavior. Through the years, and not without controversy, both within the research community and more broadly, the American National Election Study has expanded its focus to meet the needs of scholars who study public opinion. Now, of course, there are many of us, including many of us on the Board, who believe that the National Election Study should undertake to serve research communities that study institutions, state politics decision-making, information processing, and so on. So one chief question, I think, for this group is what are the benefits to the study and to the social sciences in reaching out to each of these communities? What are the prospects for success? What are the tradeoffs in service? Finally, are there interesting design packages that might be used to serve multiple communities more readily than we've been able to serve those multiple communities in the past with the kinds of designs we have? So, those are some questions that I think would be very helpful, I think both to the current group that is responsible for the American National Election Studies but also I think in thinking about the project as it moves forward. Being a national resource, a study that is a national resource, we think, has responsibilities that come with it. So, I'd like to also repackage some of what we said in the memo to talk a little bit about what we see as the responsibilities of a national resource, a study that is a national resource. The way I'd like to organize it is to say, well, what are the central requirements if the study is to have great scientific value? That's really asking two questions. The first is what do we want in
the outputs? Okay, what should the product look like?

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

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

The second element of the data that are useable is data that is comparable in method through time. There are sort of two pieces to this. The first is that there be no surprises for the user community, the user community not suddenly discover that 5 point scales have been shifted to 7 point scales, and other sort of nasty surprises. So that there is a kind of a dependability to the study and the community has confidence that when changes have been made, they've been made in a very careful way and a way that's been also to investigate the way in which those changes might affect some of the data.

The second element of comparability and method through time is to have data that are comparable between one study and another to minimize discoveries in essence that are merely part of ---- Finally, I think a third requirement for data that are useable is data that are rich in accompanying content. There are many arguments out there for the value of core content that when one has core items that are carried consistently through time the performance of those items is known. There are particular research
communities that come to be dependent upon particular content on the study. As I've indicated before, there are demands of NSF reviewers and others in the community for continuity in the study.

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

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

So, there is quite a lot of sort of boring administration that goes along with producing a study that is going to have high quality out the back end. Secondly, the requirement that a study produce high quality data means that -- particularly in a survey context means that the data -- that the instrument be tested for validity and reliability. As we all know around this table, measurement error is endemic to social sciences and it's especially so in individual level data such as we get from surveys.

So, when survey time is a scare resource, it's essential that we know how
survey items perform, the extent to which they measure the construct for which they're intended, the extent of random error. So while we know performance -- we should know what the performance of the content is, and we should make available to community what we know about the performance of these items.

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

Finally, I think as a requirement of a national resource, we want data that reflect the best ideas and most vibrant research programs in the social sciences. So we need devices for the input from the research community so that the research community can participate in the study design and the research community can participate in the content of the study. There are several avenues that have been used before: The Board of Overseers, the planning committees, both in the production studies and in the pilot studies.

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

Secondly, to enable the best ideas to come forth, there must a conception in the study as being cooperation in the production of a public good where the data are available to all and available in the same timetable as they are available to the people who have been involved in the design of the study. So, there should not be privileged access to the data.

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

Broad community access is
essential if the data are to reflect new ideas in the field. But, access on its own is not enough. There will be little innovation if people with good ideas are left to their own devices in turning those ideas into the designs and implementation that work. In looking at the essays, it's striking how much of the outreach to new research communities is outreach to communities that have little experience and oftentimes little knowledge of survey research. So, innovation in the study is going to require expertise not only from the principal investigators and the Board but also from a skilled staff that knows about the craft of survey research.

DR. BURNS: So, I want to thank you all as well. I'm pretty excited to hear the conversation that is going to develop over the next bunch of hours. What I want to do is sketch a portfolio for coordinated studies that I think could make for an awfully interesting future for the National Election Study. The portfolio has three different goals. First off it's committed to continuity and coordination cross studies. I think that's one of the best ways to leverage the best of the past and the future of ANES data. So, that's the first thing. Second, is about process. Seeking to broaden the intellectual contributions to the study, to bring in new subfields, to bring in new disciplines. Then the third thing is kind of about substance. It wants to enhance the platform for contributions to science by building on the natural experiment of elections. So, these three things. I'm going to spend a little bit of time on each one of them. So, the first one continuity and coordination. So, repeating questions across time and space, bringing our comparable -- building comparable samples over time, linking studies across context. All of these things, I think, offer
scientific opportunities and offer new uses of both old and new data. The emphasis here is on leveraging the power of any particular data set. So, an isolated data set is fine and all but it's not nearly as good as one that's coordinated and can be leveraged. Without the coordination and continuity you miss replication. You miss chances to try out ideas in multiple contexts inside multiple coordinating events and on, and on, and on. You can keep building the list.

It seemed to me that there was widespread consensus among the essays on the value of continuity. That it would be kind of a waste of a valuable scientific opportunity to design a future NES without coordination and continuity.

The second sort of innovation is about a process for scientific advancement. So this is kind of building on what Don and Mark put on the table. The idea here is that scholars from a range of disciplines have found the data useful. They've even sometimes served as advisors to the study proposing instrumentation, shaping the study bias, service on the Board. But, the value of the coordinating event is just a lot greater than the advantage that neighboring disciplines have been able to take of the study.

So, I think the conversation should be broadened to extend more fully across the social sciences. So, putting economics, political science, sociology, psychology, and so on side by side -- and not on the idea that one should adjudicate among them, rather to make for a new creative potential, new ways to build scientific human capital. That exciting conversation where disciplines don't just, you know, borrow pieces from one another, but rather make new things out of their conversations which is something that Kathleen McGraw talked about in her essay, isn't something I think that
could just happen. It probably has to be
cultivated in some of the ways that Mark
talked about. People have to see that this
would be valuable and that this coordinating
event provides a unique opportunity for
social science and then they have to pick up
the methodological training to do this work

well.

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

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

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

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

Then some cool design innovations
to enhance the value of the laboratory, to
broaden the disciplinary reach of the study.
First off -- and again, these are
suggestions or ideas, beginning conversation
points, one might want to build leverage on
the coordinating event within the event itself. So, one might incorporate rolling cross-sections with large daily replicates all carried out within the campaign.

Henry and Andre outline a range of interesting questions that would enable. There are some really interesting things about this design. You'd be able to notice details of coordination, responses to campaign events, and the like. So, you'd get a kind of fine-grained look at the process of coordination.

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

A downside to this design is that it doesn't open up a huge amount of space for a new form of multi-disciplinary conversation. So while there would be new content, there would probably be a good sized chunk of old content because each data study probably needs to carry the same instrumentation.

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

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

So, the idea here is that a national representative sample is really wonderfully useful but there are some big things it doesn't do well because the cases come from -- the cases from a particular geographic location don't represent that particular geographic location. Instead
they join together to represent the nation as a whole.

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

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

An alternative and it's one we put forward in our memo for discussion would to be aim for state representing of our samples, either of all states or a good range of states.

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

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

This kind of state idea also seems like a natural site for scholars from across
disciplines to come together to build a new
and more synthetic understanding -- that
combines the study of institutions with the
study of individual thought and action.

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

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

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

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

These independent cross-sections,
especially if panels are embedded in them
would be great for capturing a kind of
comparative study of coordinating events,
comparative natural experiments.
The final part of this is that you
would probably have a small bit of content
to enable clean comparisons with the
Presidential year studies and clean
comparisons of different kinds of
coordinated events and different kinds of
quiet times. But, you'd also have space on these studies, I think, to carry brand new content and thus to provide opportunities for multi-disciplinary leveraging, again, of the kind that McGraw talked about. One part of the portfolio would focus on the coordinating event then and one would focus on other times so that the coordinating event itself could come much more crisply into focus, both within and across individuals.

Of course, there are lots of other incredibly valuable things to do and you've put lots and lots of those on the table. So, exploiting more of the experimental and video potential of CAPI along the lines for example that Hudson and Malitino (?) have developed, incorporating measures of response latencies.

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

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

All in all I think these meetings will be pretty exciting. They serve the goals that I talked about earlier. They leverage the best of past and future NES through continuity and coordination, broadening the intellectual contributions of the study to bring new subfields and new disciplines in to shape the study and enhance the platform for contributions to science by building leverage on the natural experiments of elections.

But these are beginning ideas and so it will be great to hear what you have to
DR. SCIOLI: Okay. Thanks. We'll let you guys entertain the commentaries. But, please, questions, comments. Go ahead Henry.

MR. SCIOLI: Could I -- Could I ask a question before Henry? You can reflect on this. I just wanted to pick up on Rick's statement about being admonished or trained to say, National Election Studies rather than National Election Survey. Would you reflect a bit on the difference? What's connoted by that difference? Because, I mean, we talk about the general social survey and we talk about the panel study and dynamics. But in your remarks, Nancy particularly, you sort -- I mean what came across was the centrality of a particular survey.

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

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

But, I think -- one of the things that I think a lot of us on the Board think would be quite exciting would be if in fact it were possible to make the Presidential pre-post say as part of a portfolio of projects many of them perhaps survey but also perhaps joined in a coordinated fashion to things that other scholars are doing. For instance, because the 2002 Midterm study was not funded, there were several of us on the Board who, as you know,
hurriedly put together a proposal which was unsuccessful for a kind of a stand alone or separate 2002 study where the idea is that this would be something where we would try to pull in as many of the Congressional scholars as possible and talk about it as a national representation survey.

That kind of model might be extended still further where it wouldn't just be a survey study but might be joined with other activities by that group of scholars. In occurred to me in the course of writing that, for instance, that this might be a step along the way to a sort of a 40 years later study that would look a lot like Bauer, Poole, and Dexter's study of the making of trade policy in the 1950's and the 1960's which was joined with elite interviews in Congress, following around lobbyists on Capitol Hill, and so on. So I think what's exciting about the future is that in fact we might be able to sort of join what has been a traditional survey study into sort of a variety of related activities as well.

DR. BRADY: I want to reiterate what was said about how important the ANES has been and how much I really appreciate the efforts these folks and other folks have put in over the decades on this project. It's a lot of work and they are really to be commended for what they have done. There's two things I want to mention which are sort of related. One is, I didn't hear a lot of talk about substantive areas that you thought the ANES should be focused on.

My memo actually spends a lot of time saying here's where I think ANES has done really well. Here's where I think they have contributed but maybe not as much. There are a variety of reasons for that, one of which is you can't do everything. So I wasn't by any means trying to say, well, gee, they should have done all these things, but. Then here's some areas where I think that not much has been done at all. Then I
even tried to identify some areas where I thought maybe more should be done and I thought it was sort of a natural outgrowth of things that had been done.

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

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

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

So, how can you do that? I think it's been done pretty well in the past. One idea might be that you should adopt something like the GSS model of modules or something like that that would really make an even bigger focus on an area and say, look, you're going to get not just a few questions but you're going to get a whole 10, 20 minutes or something like that on the survey. But you've obviously got to come up with a good design and a good approach. But, if you do, then we'll really devote a lot of time and effort to this.

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

So organizational issues I think do interact with substantive issues and I hope that we talk a lot about those issues here because I think they are very central.
to making the ANES even more successful than it has been.

DR. BURNS: So, I'd like to say just two sentences and then pass it off to the other two here. With respect to the substantive areas, we -- in our memo what we were trying to do was put on the table in a sense, "meta" substantive areas.

So, it seems one accounting of the development of some parts of political science and social science more broadly, you know, kind of focuses on behavior and then focuses on institutions, and then now, isn't it interesting that finally we have the opportunity to build theories of institutions and theories of behavior that actually seriously take into account the theoretical building blocks of institutional theory and the theoretical building blocks that need to -- or that inform thinking about thought in action. That seems actually to me at least -- but this is, you know, my argument, you know, not a general one. It seems to me that this is completely under exploited space in social science and this would a wonderful laboratory for enabling that sort of thing.

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

So, I wanted to say that and then I wanted to say just again, two sentences about the -- about modules. To the extent that the resource is -- it seems to be that the resource is especially valuable if those modules are integrated, if it's a
If there are separate modules and you buy a little piece that seems not --

just to my mind not quite as good as an integrated one where folks come to have conversations that they would have never had if they were to put an independent piece onto a study. I mean there are many incredibly good venues for that sort of thing. We've been doing more modules as the funding situation has changed and so NSF had supported a piece of the 2000 study and we ran around and collected funds for the rest of the 2000 study and that enabled more, you know, kind of developed modules to be added. You know, space for developed modules.

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

DR. BRADY: Well, tell us -- how has that worked? I mean, has that been successful? Do you think there are problems with it? Is it --

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

So what we've been trying to in the model for the 2002 study was we built one of the modules by building in collaboration with someone outside of the Board, with Larry Bartels, to go to Russell Sage to build a module. But again, we were fortunate that Sage and Carnegie both had us present ideas and in, you know, big settings where, you know, economists, and socialists, and social welfare folks were all working on ideas of inequality and gave us lots of
feedback.
But, that's pretty different from
people proposing instrumentation and, you
know, a long run discussion with the Board,
and so forth.

So, it's a -- we imagine good
things will come of it but it was an agenda
that was more centrally directed. So,
that's, you know, got some down sides.
Okay? Well, but I just talk too much, so
you all should --

DR. KINDER: You did just fine.

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

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

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

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

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

funding or staying basically level with, you
know, adjustments for inflation or what?
   I mean--you know, I mean I think
that's important to think about when you're
thinking about innovations in the study. Do
you see that there is going to be some
modest increase in funding to look at some
new innovations or do you have to find
innovations within basically sort of a flat
funding level? Or--
   DR. BRADY: I hope there is more
funding. I want to just jump in here. I
mean, I think that it's been underfunded the
last 6 years, I really do. Just to say
something that would sound controversial. I
think there's got to be more. I hope that's
one of the things that comes out of here.
Let's start deciding that we're going to
fund this at a level so we can get done the
things we want to get done.
   MR. TORENGEAU: I would second
what Henry said is, you know, given that

some of the ideas in several of the papers,
things like continuous monitoring or some
kind of longitudinal component--you know,
it seems like those are two of the most
promising additions--would require
substantial new investment unless the
existing time series were to be abandoned.
I don't think anybody wants that.
   It seems like the only way those
innovations would actually be innovated
would be to, you know, to increase, you
know, greatly increase the resources
available to the election studies.
   DR. SCIOLI: Rick?
   DR. LEMPERT: A similar but
different question. I want to preface it by
making clear that there is no implicit
suggestion. It's just to clarify thinking.
Clearly when one has a 50 year time series,
that has a great value of what one has and
everything that is planned is based on it.
   But, I am curious if it's possible
to do this thought experiment kind of on
your feet. Suppose there were no 50 year
time series. Suppose one were just today
having a meeting to plan a National Election
Studies and you did plan what you thought for the amount of money that was available the best kind of study. Then after you had done that you discovered this archive which had this 50 year time series.

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

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

DR. LEMPERT: I understand.

DR. HANSEN: So, I think one answer to it is that there would be a substantial overlap simply because the 50 years has been so important to getting us to where we are today.

DR. LEMPERT: Yeah, I am sure there would be anyway because the substantive questions of today relate to substantive questions we had yesterday.

But, I am trying to get a hold as one thinks about this balance between innovation and continuity, if we didn't have this dependent in a sense decision to make, what kinds of things would we nonetheless find, we would just reinvent, and what things that we may well want to continue, because we have the time series, we wouldn't want to continue if we -- both in methods and in content -- if we were just starting today?

MR. SANTOS: Actually, I wanted to jump in here because this, in a way, relates to some of the comments I made in my essay. I actually wonder, not that I'm a substantive expert in any of this, whether the questions or the focus would be on elections per se as opposed to the formation of political attitudes, their maturation, and then the end result behavior of elections.

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

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

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

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

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

You know I can't imagine that we
would not pay special attention to that even
in a continuous monitoring design. You
know, there might be panels built into that
in the way that we've been talking. They
might even have long term qualities to them.

But, there would be a feature that -- at

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

But, it would be very surprising
to me and disheartening to me, I suppose, if
we didn't think we were beginning a time
series. That is, there would be a
commitment to the analysis of political and
social change over the long haul and so that
would mean that we would be self-conscious
about -- whatever it is that we were
starting now, there would be the obligation
to continue that on into the future.

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

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

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

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

DR. CLARKE: Well, Henry a lot of

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

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

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

DR. BRADY: Right.

DR. CLARKE: Well the thought
experiment is really, really difficult. I mean, what question would we want to answer? If we're still focusing on the act of voting and on election outcomes which, of course, are not the same thing, then I would suspect that there would be a lot of design things would flow from that right away. Much harder would be the theoretical perspective because our theoretical perspectives have evolved out of

this interaction, this terrace game we've played for 50 years with the studies. So that part of the thought experiment to me Rob is really, really difficult. DR. BRADY: I didn't mean to imply that we were the first people to put some of those types of questions on the Canadian Election Study. I just meant to say that when we decided we'd do it anew, we found ourselves falling back again to those questions even though we did a quite radically new design. MR. TOURANGEAU: There are things you'd almost certainly do differently though because of technological drift. You know the world is a different place than it was 50 years ago. People weren't doing telephone studies 50 years ago. So, you might have given more attention to that. There is a preponderance, I think, because of statistical developments -- longitudinal designs are lot more popular than they were 50 years ago. So, there could be some things you'd do differently, not because the choices made, you know, were wrong 50 years ago but simply because we live in a different world. That isn't necessarily a compelling argument to change them. SPEAKER: Right. MR. TOURANGEAU: You know the benefits of the time series may outweigh the gains from these technological advances. DR. CLARKE: On the other hand I was just -- one of the things I've been reading is going back and looking at some of the recommendations that people were making
about the study of electoral behavior
nearly 50 years ago.
In this regard there is a very
interesting essay that some of at least the
older people here, I'm one of them of
course, by Peter Rossi called, Four
Landmarks in Voting Behavior Research, which
was published in a collection of essays in
American Voting Behavior in 1959.
One of the things that's striking,
you know, the actual technology aside in
terms of the details, to me was the emphasis
of things that we -- at least I see in
several of the essays here of the need to
study change, the need -- and then
technically in terms of developing panels.
Some of the other things Henry and
Dan and others work on -- context, bringing
parties -- he says, let's bring parties back
in. This is 1959. So, in a sense, you
know, some of the stuff has, you know, a
familiar quality and there is a sort of a
cyclical dimension to this that I found
really interesting. I went back, I said
this is -- I remember this essay from
graduate school, let's go back and see what
this guy was saying you know, in terms of if
he was here today, you know, what would he
be saying?

DR. ACHEN: I think one thing too
that's changed from the early days is that
it's just too hard to just put ourselves
back in the situation when NES started and
to remember just how little factual
information we had at that point.
I teach now a course with a
colleague on the history of political
science and if you read people writing in
the '30s, Merriam and others, they're
just desperate to know what the facts on the
ground are. Are there really people out
there who will say things like, well, I'm a
Republican but I'm going to vote Democratic
this year? Is that even a possibility? Or
is your party ID how you're voting this
year? So on and so forth.
What do people say when they're
asked questions about their opinions about the President? Do they have some? Do they line up with how they're going to vote? Do they not? In that kind of a world with this dearth of purely factual information, I think when these studies were designed it was relatively easy to have people sit around the table and say, yes, this is something we ought to do. They didn't care what their theoretical divisions were at that point. They just had to get the facts straight. That task has, you know, with the usual qualifications, largely been accomplished. We're now in a situation where we have genuine theoretical divisions, where there are schools of thought that think more of one, less of another, and so forth. Those are reflected in the essays as quite properly they should be. But, there is I think now, if we were designing now, there would be greater emphasis on, what are the bottlenecks within each of these schools of thought and how might the survey be directed to help with those?

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

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

DR. BURNS: So, I mean, one thing is it depends on whether you think other variables are handy to have around for any kind of innovative analysis that you'd be interested in doing. So, having two
else, whether that by itself would be okay
or whether in fact, I mean to say -- a point
that Mark made, whether in fact you need a
rich array of other, you know, I guess, well
variables, to think about, alternative
theoretical perspectives, that sort of
thing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

DR. BURNS: Yeah.
DR. BRADY: Pick a number.

DR. BURNS: No, in a different moment I would know the answer like instantly.

So, the 2002 study is 60 minutes. The 2000 study is 130 minutes. The 130 minute study? I'm going to venture a number and then I --

DR. KINDER: I have a number in my head.

DR. BURNS: Then you say it.

DR. KINDER: No, no. You say it and I'll tell you whether we're in the right neighborhood.

DR. BURNS: Okay. I'm thinking it's about half.

DR. KINDER: No, I think it's a little more than half but I think that's the right neighborhood.

DR. HANSEN: But there are -- it should be said, there are two kinds of core in the conception of the Board. There are the items that get carried in every study and then there are ones that get -- that sort of go in and out depending upon what seems to make sense at the time.

DR. BRADY: That core includes the socio-demographic and all that stuff obviously.

DR. HANSEN: Yes.

DR. BURNS: Absolutely.

DR. BRADY: So that's a lot of room.

DR. HANSEN: Yes.

DR. BURNS: Yeah.

DR. BRADY: I mean that's a whole other study by what I usually do with the telephone. I mean, it's like three studies if it's 135, 130 minutes or so. So, you've got a study and a half there left over.

DR. BURNS: Right. Right.

DR. HANSEN: Well and one of the difficulties I think in fleeing the core, because we're constantly confronted with this tradeoff, between, you know, if we ask more core, we ask less new
stuff. We're constantly confronted with this but you know while there are some political constraints on cutting the core because there are particular research interests that have built interest around certain items --

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

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

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

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

DR. SCIOILI: Um. Um. Um.

(Laughter)

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

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

NES?

DR. BURNS: Oh, core means something different than that. Core is -- I'm sorry. It means a theoretical space, a conceptual category.
MR. SANTOS: Okay.
DR. BURNS: It doesn't mean a question.
MR. SANTOS: Got it.
DR. BURNS: It's totally not a question. It's a conceptual space, a kind of category of intellectual investigation. So it's this category and what happens inside that category is -- well, whether the categories ought to stay the same categories is debated.

So the categories themselves are debated and then after that then we go through and just smash through the questions because at the end of the day the time on the instrument is too precious to carry something just because. But, you know, there are some things that, you know, facilitate -- I mean, you also don't want it to be -- core to be defined by the research interests of the folks on the Board, diverse as those research interests are. So, fortunately the folks on the Board read pretty broadly and so can imagine well, that's how they would use it, and oh, well that's how they would use this question.

Well if you have this question and that question you can enable -- excuse me -- advances in this, that, or the other. I don't know if that helps you to think about it.

MR. SANTOS: That's great.
DR. SCIOLI: Andre.
DR. BLAIS: Well, I'm not sure if

there is that much space left. Because you have the core but also there are questions that you have to ask because of particularities of the election. I mean, in Canada for instance, if there is all of a sudden a new leader with deep religious beliefs, you've got to ask new questions about religion. If there is a new issue
coming up and you want to, you know, make sense of the election, you've got to add these questions, whatever your theoretical point of view.

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

DR. BRADY: That's 65 minutes Andre. That's a lot of time unless I'm doing my arithmetic wrong. That's a lot of time.

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

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

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

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

Then -- excuse me -- we compose -- we start this discussion in February among the Board and then we continue the discussion right after that with a planning committee.
The planning committee is composed of some folks who are on the Board and then folks who are out and about who might have, you know, kind of cool new things to add, or different perspectives, or know about instrumentation, you know, in other places. Before Steven joined the Board, for example, he was on the planning committee just before that. Don Green. I mean a bunch of people were on that 2000 planning committee. So that's a large -- not a huge group of people, maybe 15 people.

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

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

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

DR. MUTZ: Yeah, I know. Part of the reason I asked is cause it strikes me we're talking about two very different kinds of innovation. From my involvement in the pilot studies, for example, it seemed our
task was innovation but geared to improving core measurement technique. That's different from innovation to innovate that doesn't have anything to do with the core necessarily. So, it seems to me we need to separate those functions in a way because they are different. I mean one is far more constrained by the time series and so forth than the other is. So those two have kind of been mashed together in my mind over time. But I think they may need to be differentiated.

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

So you know we try again pretty hard to make sure that the instrumentation is going to work if it goes on the study, that it will offer comparison, that sort of thing. So it's been just to say a little tricky to figure out where those spaces are going to be and you ---- is going to offer up a lot of, you know, full possibilities for that.

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

DR. HANSEN: Although it has accumulated through those innovations,
is and if I'm wrong about this question of, what is core?
Because what I was going to ask was when you think of core is it because in analysis of continuity you're interested in changes in marginals or interested in continuity about relationships. I assume it's the latter.
Because in the GSS, there's another core but there the core is meant very much to keep the questions the same, or if you change them, change them in ways that you can preserve a trend line and marginals because that's one of the big purposes of that.
So this, to me, gives me a wholly different view of the notion of what core is which on the surface at least would suggest that there's -- if core really means some concept, let's say, and there the continuity task I would think is keeping the equivalence of the concept measurement, not the wording or things like that. Which in a way, I think, would give you, I think, more room for innovation. Maybe that's what Diana was talking about, that kind of innovation.

DR. KINDER: I think it's the same logic as cross-national research.
DR. BRADBURN: Right.
DR. KINDER: Where the interest in exploration is to get equivalence on concept not on the details of it. There is -- I'm sorry. Just one more thing that I wanted to interject about core. It's more complicated than you think in that core also entails a kind of commitment not just to content or to categories of intellectual endeavor as Nancy was saying, properly so, but to data collection. It entails a commitment to a kind of sampling and a kind of mode, at
least in the absence of demonstrations
experimental or statistical fixups, that

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

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

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

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

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

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

DR. BRADBURN: Okay.

DR. LEMPERT: Nancy, I just want
to follow up a remark you made that you
don't have funds for pilot studies.

DR. BURNS: Uh-huh.

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

DR. KINDER: I think the problems
are invisible to us. My guess is that it's
been something of a disaster because pilots
are this space that NES creates to generate
ideas on the expectation that should those
ideas pan out they'll end up in the National
Election Study. That's a huge incentive for
people to think seriously both about
measurement, which you want to put in a
different category which is fine by me, but
also the innovation which has to do with
entirely new instrumentation or a new way of
thinking about something.
In the absence of panel studies --
or pilot studies, excuse me, that path has
really been cut off. I think it's a very
serious liability for the refreshment and
replenishment of NES as a kind of venue for
especially new ideas.

DR. LEMPERT: How much money are
we talking about? I mean suppose we said
that we really want to put back in the pilot
without losing anything. How much money are
we talking about?

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

DR. BURNS: The problem is in --
MR. SANTOS: Well, if it's not a
lot so you're still getting like percent of
the sample size then one could transfer the
funds over to --

DR. HANSEN: The difficulty though

is then the sample size has been trimmed,
and trimmed, and trimmed, and trimmed, and
MR. SANTOS: So, it's now at a minimum?

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

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

DR. BURNS: Yeah we did one -- I was thinking I mis-spoke a second ago. We had a version of a pilot study our first year. We got funding from Russell Sage to do a study of social capital and to rework, reconfigure measures of social capital and social trust.

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

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

DR. BRADY: Well, then good.

DR. BURNS: It's not okay at all. So that was -- it was a special topic. So we used -- it was less extensive because it was focused on, you know, one set of questions, empaneling the folks from before so you had a long battery of questions to add to.

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

That didn't work, huh?

DR. KINDER: No, I'm just wracking my brain thinking whether we ever had that conversation. We've talked about restoration of pilot studies in various
forms, and we've talked about modularizing NESs in the way that GSS has without settling anything on either front. But I don't think we've talked about the two things together.

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

So, I think sort of the larger point being, depending on what you want to do with the pilot, there may well be substantial economies you can achieve whereas in other cases in which you think you need representation, of course it becomes a very expensive enterprise.

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

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

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

MR. SANTOS: Maybe you could capture a little piece of the GSS, use that for the pilot.
DR. SCIOLI: Let me get back just for a second to this question that incorporates Rick and John Lennon. Imagine there is no core. I'm thinking that a lot of the arguments we hear at the program level that the core -- you know, from the modest, to it's critical to careers, and theoretical advancement will stop if the core is not present.

Having heard comments about the conceptual frameworks in which the core actually operates, technically then the community could evaluate whether one set of conceptual frameworks is better than another. So there is no conceptual framework that trumps any other and in some of the papers I had the feeling that there were items that, you know, if it's the scales or whatever, if they weren't present then we really kind of truncated any future progress or any legacy of intellectual development that we have.

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

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

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

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

So, I was looking a couple of years ago, for example, at this question
of -- it's so common in the formal literature on loss functions -- Are loss functions quadratic, or linear, or whatever? We don't know anything at all about this. I decided to see whether I could exploit something in the NES. I wound up using the abortion question because it's got four positions on the scale. The reason that works is that it's been asked the same way every year with the exception of this little shift in 1980. Even in that year I think

several of us wrote in and said, when you -- because they changed the wording slightly -- when you change it, be sure to overlap the old question and the new question. They did that. So, you can just run this thing right through the whole period. I had not the slightest interest in the abortion question per se. But a lot of people have done things like that. So, I think having a long running set of items that have been asked the same way over a long period of time is important in ways that you don't think of when you think that it's core and it's the same old people, studying the same old question, the same old way. That's not necessarily the case.

DR. BRADY: If you're studying the New Deal Coalition having the government guarantee jobs question repeated. I mean, in some ways it's a bizarre question. It has one end which is about we should have government guaranteed jobs for everybody and I don't know that anybody has proposed that ever in this country. But nevertheless, the question seems to work. It seems to get at a New Deal dimension. It's been great to have because you can look at over time what's happened to sort of New Deal sentiments.

DR. HANSEN: I think the key thing I see is core is the ability to go back to the data and to analyze new questions using the old data. That is, you know, in some sense innovation, in sort of talking about innovation we're very much sort of future
focused. What should be the new content?
What should be the new ideas that get
carried on the survey?

But another element of innovation
is innovative use of the data that already
exists. A lot of that has been made
possible because there has been consistency
through time in what's been carried on the

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

(Recess)

CROSS NATIONAL COMPARISONS

DR. SCIOLI: Okay, let's continue
and we're going to -- oh, okay.
Cross-National Comparisons. Andre can you
summarize your comments, please? Then we'll
go to Harold, and Ian, and Richard.

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

First of all I'd like to mention

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

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

DR. BLAIS: I mention here that
election studies have been done since 1968.
In fact, it's since 1965. I wasn't quite
sure whether the -- what's the council? --
the Research Council founded it or not. I
think it was probably founded by a Royal
Commission but I don't know. But basically,
there have been election studies since 1965. So, it's 10 elections out of 11. There have been election studies for each of the last 8 elections.

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

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

At least in the last four election studies, in each time there was an election study. But, of course there is no guarantee at all that there will be an election study because there is no special fund being set apart for election studies. So, we are competing with others.

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

There was a huge problem with the timetable. The last two elections in which I was the principal co-investigator I was really bad lucky. The 1997 study got funded in January 1997 and the election was called in April. In 2000, a snap election was called in October, it took place in November, and was funded in December. I will tell you exactly how we got the money at the end but there was an election study.
The MCRI program is very much geared to fund what are called excellent, new frontier, cutting edge, whatever. So, basically the focus is very much on innovation. So, if -- I guess the co-investigators who prepare proposals have this very much in mind. We've got to demonstrate that the new study will be the best ever, better than anywhere in the world, that it will of course build on what we already know, but that it will be extremely new knowledge being produced by the team.

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

The total budget that we had for the last 2000 election study gives you some perspective of the amount money involved. It's about $1 million (US) for a 5 year period. Basically there is also this problem of timing here which is, for instance there is a new team now applying for the next election study. If they get the money, they will start getting money next year and then there will be two election studies going on for a certain period of time, for a couple of years.

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

The design is basically since 1988, it's a campaign telephone voting
cross-section with about 3500 respondents. Then telephone re-interview after the elections and also a mail out questionnaire to all of those who still want to collaborate with the project. We also do content analysis of television news which are part of what, well, at least the teams have been proposing in the last -- since 1988.

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

Region is a huge concern in Canada. First the set of choices differs in Quebec and the rest of the country. We've got to perform different analysis of Quebec and the rest of the country because there is one party which does not have candidates other than Quebec, candidates only in Quebec. Which means that in all analysis, almost all analysis we do a separate analysis of Quebec and the rest of the Canada. Even outside Quebec we often perform separate analysis of vote choice in Ontario and the West because the regional cleavage is so strong.

We are very much concerned about sample size. We started at 2,500 but we basically ended up in the post-election with about 3,000. In the last proposal we proposed to double the size, the sample size, to 7,000 and we would have done so if the Prime Minister wouldn't have decided to call a snap election which prevented us from doing so because we wouldn't have had the grant to do it. This is I think a very
clear indication that we are concerned with large ends. In fact we want to increase the sample size and we find it very, very difficult, I guess to deal with the relatively small sample sizes that you have in the U.S.

We are also very interested generally in the impact of the media. So this is why we have devoted quite a bit of time in doing some analysis, content analysis, but also of respondents' reactions to the news. So we've tried some innovative work on that point. I should perhaps also mention that I think the new team that will be proposing the next election study is also now proposing to do provincial election studies on top of the federal election study so the same kind of interest I see here about different complexes of institutions is also present.

DR. BLAIS: In a few provinces.

DR. BRADY: Not PEI, for example.

DR. BLAIS: Not all of them. We also -- the panel component, we have a short term panel because we have pre and post. So, we have a panel but we don't have long term panels. I think this is probably one of the main shortcomings of Canadian election studies. I think it's pretty sad that we haven't had long term panels in the recent past. We haven't had candidate questionnaires which I think also -- which you have, for instance, in Australia. Which I think is also a short coming. We've been in touch with teams which were intending to do candidate questionnaires. We've been linking and there are some common questions but I think it would be much better if they had been coordinated and fully integrated and that's probably one thing that we should think about. Also I want to mention that in Canada we have two questionnaires. One
English, one French, which might seem
obvious. But we are working, always working
on the two questionnaires simultaneously.
So we when work on the question, we do both
French and English questions. I'm sure that
Henry will remember some of the very
interesting --

DR. BRADY: It gave us very decent
questionnaires.

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

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

DR. BRADY: But also Andre you
remember your other questions. Would you
drink a decent wine? He asked us.
(Laughter)

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

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

A major concern with measurement
issues and with experiments. Of course, the telephone helps on that front. We've been doing quite a bit of experiments all the way through, especially with questions of party identification.

Questions on strategic voting. That's a case, I think, where the inspiration came from probably the U.S. and also this was premised, I think on expectations. So we've been benefitting from these panel studies. We have used the old, I guess, questions about perceptions of various parties' chances of winning. I still have some doubts about these questions but I think these are the best in the world and thanks to the U.S. for this.

Finally the question for turnout. It's now a hot topic in Canada because turnout has declined very substantially. Turnout was 61% in the last election. Basically the Canadian Election Studies include very few questions on turnout. We find it very difficult to be able to integrate. The analysis of vote choice on one hand and the decision to vote or not to vote on the other hand seems to be two different kinds of questions.

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

In terms of governments and accountability perhaps I would just stress the last point which is that the funding agency, SHRCC strongly urges us to disseminate findings to the interested public. So, we know that if we want to get funded we've got to please them. To please them is to basically make sure, you know, the election study will be, you know, known to the interested public.

So, right after the election we write pieces for the newspapers. We launch our book in the press club. We have links with the journalists.
on our advisory board. Last year we organized one big workshop in Toronto at the time of the CPSA mostly for registrants to show them how to utilize the Canadian election study. That's a very important part of our program. We want to make sure that as many people as possible do utilize the election study. In Canada then the impetus is very much on innovation. In fact, continuity is a problem for us. We've got to be competing with other teams and the usual -- There are two criticisms. First, it's only political scientists. Why don't you integrate sociologists, historians, economists, and so on? Then, you know, why -- the second question is why another election study? These are the questions which we are asked and that's why it's making it more and more difficult to get funded because you've got to show every time that this is the best one, this is very important, and that it will discover very interesting new things. Either way, the teams that compete must come up with some innovations. So, this time, for instance, the new team is proposing a combination of federal election studies with provincial election studies, and on top of that comparison with Australia, Germany, I think that study is supposed to be linked to Australia, Germany, and another federation to look at specifically the impact of accountability on vote choice. So, it has to be a special theme, a special innovation, and there is very little emphasis on continuity. In fact, if we do too much continuity, we might be less likely to be funded.

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

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

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

DR. CLARKE: As I indicated earlier on the election studies that are done in countries like Great Britain, I
think Australia it's true it's well, and

certainly in Canada, owe a large intellectual to the American National Election Studies and in particular to principal investigators such as Converse in particular who -- and Don Stokes who were instrumental in founding the ANES research program.

I have over the years worked as

both a PI for the Canadian studies but more recently for the BES, British Election Study. Again the distinction between study and survey is one that's made. But, certainly the British election study has largely been a survey based project, much like the ANES.

Historically it began at Nuffield College with the famous collaboration between David Butler and Donald Stokes which produced a series of three national election studies in 1964, 1966, and 1970. They are a very well known book, Political Change in Britain.

Their research has really set the agenda for all subsequent work in terms of the nature of the surveys, the kinds of questions that have been asked, the various intellectual debates that have gone on. During the 1970s the study moved to the University of Essex under the direction or Ivor Crewe and Bruce Solvac with close collaboration by Jim Alt as well. Then in the 1980s it went back to Nuffield and then more recently back to Essex where I've been involved.

A few words on sort of nuts and bolts of funding because I think it's a very, very important consideration. The BES has been funded over the years by something called the ESRC, the Economics and Social Research Council which is the British equivalent of the National Science Foundation for social science research.

There is no guarantee from one election cycle to the next that there will be a British Election Study. Free competition is the norm as well. So, that
if in fact the ESRC puts out a notification for a competition, it will be indeed be exactly that. In 2001 that's exactly what happened and the team from Essex, of which I'm a part, was -- you know, was successful in that competition.

One of the things, again a practical point, but one which is I think of considerable moment for the planning and execution of a study is that the notification of award in the British context tends to come quite late in the life of a Parliament or in what, you know, the life of Parliament, of course we really don't know. But it tends to come in at least the third year or maybe even a little later and that causes, you know, understandable problems for the planning and execution of the project, in particular now, since as I found out to my chagrin that we have to have upwards of a 6 month period to comply with tendering rules of the European Union. So we had to go out and solicit bids and they have a way of doing this, making publicly -- you know, public notice that we will entertain bids from survey firms, and so forth. But, then we have to wait -- these things close for 6 months --

and react to them. That's a real problem. In terms of the amount of funding, and again, in very sharp contrast to the Australian study that we will soon hear about, our funding was approximately $1.2 million, the base funding, and then there was some top up after that, with approximately 85 percent of that amount, being quite different from the Canadian case, going to the field work.

All we had in terms of infrastructure really were a couple of small offices in the Government Department at Essex. Maybe you've been there, you know these are small offices. We hired two research -- really graduate students. You're supposed to call them research officers over there. But there were two senior graduate students to work on the
project as well as a part-time secretary to keep us out of jail, to keep the finances straight and so forth, and a little bit of travel money so that we could go back and forth to work on the project.

Design features generally and briefly. The British Election Studies from the beginning, the centerpiece has been the post-election in-person interview with a representative. National sample. The ESRC mandated in 2001 that any successful team would have to maintain that as a centerpiece of their design. So, even if you wanted you couldn't go off and do Internet study. You couldn't do a telephone study. As a centerpiece you had to maintain -- you could do other things within the funding limits, but you had to do this. Indeed, we did.

The second thing is historically, like Andre has mentioned in the Canadian case, the ends have been large in the British survey. For the last three surveys they've been all up above 3,500, a little less in ours -- we were 3219. But compared to the American ANES, these are very large ends indeed.

Another and I think extremely valuable component of this I have found as we have worked through our research is right from the very beginning with the intellectual agenda set by Butler and Stokes, there has been a real strong interest in individual level dynamics. So there are several very valuable multi-wave panels. Most of these have been inter-election but some have, you know, from one -- re-interviewing people across election cycles but there are inner election components as well.

In this regard, I think it's important to note that this effort has been significantly enhanced by work at the Centre for Research in Economic and Social Trends at Nuffield during the 1990s where they have done a series of very large and impressive inter-election panels even on a yearly basis.
I found these data to just be terrific additions to the BES. They really dovetailed the BES and significantly -- you heard the leverage earlier this morning from the Michigan team -- and they certainly do, these studies really leverage your ability to understand in the election surveys per se.

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

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

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

These are the questions that you get from outsiders. They say, well what have you guys, like what you have learned lately? Like, what's the value of this
study? Why is this study taking us anywhere further than the, you know, really excellent work that was done in The American Voter or Political Change in Britain. Do you guys really know anymore or, like, what's going on here?

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

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

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

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

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

So given what we knew was going on in the British context and elsewhere, we said, hey we're going to make this an important component. We're game. We're going to take rival theories, including the civic volunteerism model, Henry, and some others, several others. We're going to put researchers in a position where they can
horse race these models using, you know, appropriate kinds of techniques within the limits of survey methodology.

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

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

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

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

Then after the election was over and we had the data in hand, we, you know, very quickly put together a useable -- I spent an entire summer sitting at home basically doing this. Putting our data sets together and getting them up on the Web, having them available. The election was in June. The data sets were available in mid-September. They were useable versions, not the final archive versions. But they were useable versions of a lot of the stuff that we had gathered.

We also then went to something called the EPOP meeting, Elections Public Opinion and Parties which is the British -- it's the equivalent of the Voting &
Elections group for the APSA. They had their meeting in September and we handed out CDs to everybody and had a workshop on, you know, where we were with the study.

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

So, that's where we are on the British Election Study. There is no guarantee that there will be another one. I would emphasize here in terms of a planning sort of exercise in the ANES that this is one of the things, of course, that's very worrisome. We don't even know and now there hasn't even been an announcement of a bid. Will there be a -- like can you guys like -- we're going to try to do one again but we just go ahead and start putting things together hoping, and actually making some entreaties as people are here, of course. I think we should do this but there is no guarantee.

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

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

Well in comparison to the ANES, the BES, and most other election surveys, we are a relatively recent survey operation. We commenced our first survey in 1987. Since then we've conducted seven surveys, one covering a referendum. But, there were three earlier academic surveys of political opinion in 1967, '69, and '79.

Just getting on to Harold's point about the legacy of the ANES, one of the principal investigators in '67 was Donald
Stokes who took with him the ANES and then his experience with Political Change in Britain and so on. So, we have effectively been living within this framework right back from the 1960s.

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

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

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

The most recent survey in 2001 was on challenges to governance and we're just working on the current proposal which is on the, our theme is around the decline of political parties. Like the other surveys we make our data available on a public basis as soon as it's collected.

In terms of the methodology we use, we're perhaps the only National Election Survey which uses a post-election mail self-completion survey. We do that for a variety of reasons, mainly cost. But as
I'll explain later for other reasons as well. The main perceived disadvantage of a mail self-completion survey is a low response rate. Fortunately, we don't get a low response rate here and you'll see from the table on page 2, we get a response rate which varies in the mid-50s through to the low 60s. But it has been declining since we started and it's declining at the rate of about 1 percent at each federal election we conduct the survey in.

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

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

We send everybody an individually addressed and signed letter explaining the purposes of the study and the questionnaire, guarantee of confidentiality and so on. We do that to arrive with them on the Monday after polling which is on the preceding Saturday.

The second thing we do which is very important to the response rate is that we send all of the respondents a thank you reminder postcard one week after the original mailing. The purpose of that postcard is to remind people if they haven't returned the questionnaire to do so. What we find is, a lot of people simply put the questionnaire on the mantelpiece or they say they'll do it after they take the kids to school or something like that. Of course, they don't. But their general intention is they will respond to it.
We find that the thank you reminder postcard is worth about 15 percent on the response rate. After that, about 3 weeks after that postcard we send a second follow-up of all non-respondents, we send them a questionnaire, and so on. Then one of the surveys in 1987, we actually did a fourth follow-up which was simply a postcard. We find that that didn't really work very well. It was worth about 3 percent on the response rate and a major amount of aggravation because we got even more phone calls of people complaining about our thing. So, in fact, we've never actually done it ever since.

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

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

MR. McAllister: Yes, we have a good list.

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

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

I won't go into the candidate survey in a lot of detail. Again, what we've done in terms of the methodology is to sample all major candidates from major political parties. The crucial thing there is to get a letter from the party officers too say it's a bona fide survey. That
results in getting a response rate, mid-60s
up to about 70 percent.

You'll notice on page 3 in the

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

(Laughter)

MR. McAllister: We might get a letter from them next time.
We haven't had the resources to conduct a panel survey or a campaign survey as a lot of the other national election surveys have done.

What we did in 2001 was an on-line survey. I was in Britain at the time of the general election. I saw the BES on-line poll conducted by UGOV. I was quite impressed by the potential of this and we did a similar operation in Australia during the course of the election campaign which was also conducted by the British company, UGOV.

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

So, effectively on-line respondents were the same as off-line respondents who had Internet access. I think that's very important because it certainly may be 10 years away from using an on-line to do a regular national election survey. But, I think the real potential of on-line
polls are in doing rolling cross-sections during the course of the campaign. They are incredibly cheap to do. They’re very fast. You can get a large number of respondents and so on. I think the on-line poll is something we should be looking at instead of doing a rolling cross campaign section by the use of a telephone. We’ll be doing a major exercise in on-line polling the next Australian federal election.

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

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

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

Two disadvantages that are frequently mentioned are response bias, the fact that we have a very large number of immigrants in the population who are non-English speaking born means that there is some risk they will be under sampled. Our explorations into this would suggest not, or at least not to any significant degree.
There is also a risk that individuals other than the person who is nominated on the latter will respond to the questionnaire. Again, there has been research on this and it suggests that it's not a major problem. You get similar effects in high source surveys where you get two or three people in a room sitting with an interviewer.

The second perceived disadvantage is that we have a long fieldwork period. The survey is normally in the field right about 8 weeks, sometimes up to 10 weeks. It's possible that voters' recall weakens and other political events sometimes come to contaminate the voters' opinions. Again, we don't find that. We've compared the responses of people who have responded in the first week or two to people that have responded at the very end of the fieldwork and that doesn't seem to be a particular problem. Thanks.

Dr. Scioli: Thank you, Ian. Richard, you're competing with lunch. Don't let that inhibit you.

Dr. Sinnot: I take it that's confirmation that I have 10 minutes.

Dr. Scioli: Yes, sir.

Dr. Sinnot: I'm going to continue along the line I started when I prepared the note for this conference and that is I'm going to talk about turnout.

I could talk about the Irish Election Study. As I said, we did one in relation to the 2002 election but my feeling is that we were neophytes and learners in that regard and in fact we went to a lot of trouble beforehand to take account of lessons from the British Election Study, the American Election Study and the Dutch Election Study. There's no point now in my sort of now completing that circle and coming back and giving advice or describing our experiences.

I chose to focus on the turnout issue because I think it has fairly substantial implications for what I would
describe as a program of election research, as opposed to an election study or more particularly an election survey.

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

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

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

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

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

I mean if we were to be purely scientific we would -- you'd say you cannot study a topic like turnout without doing it comparatively because so many of the variables that affect it are systemic. Unless you've got systemic variation -- you can get some systemic variation as Nancy mentioned within -- by
doing state samples in the American context.
But the real systemic variation is the
cross-country variation. I'd like to
develop that point a little bit.
I mean there is a danger I think
----- I also think that the time is right for
research in this and other comparative ----
and certainly for a European- American
cooperation, and one would like to think
that an organization with the experience and
the strength of the National Science
Foundation would take a lead in that regard.
Because I think the lead would be
reciprocated, particularly in the context of

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

influenced by that.
We have a proliferation problem, a
proliferation of variables in regard to the
study of turnout. It was sort of thinking
about that that led me to think how would
you categorize, or what kind of typology
could you come up with that would reduce
some of this variety to manageable
proportions?
The starting place for the
typology that I've suggested in the short
note I've circulated, is actually a typology relating to the dependent variable. It
surprises me, the extent to which this typology has not -- or this distinction has
not figured in the literature. That's the distinction between circumstantial and voluntary abstention.
That really only comes out from an open-ended question about why did you not vote. Now, I know there are all sorts of difficulties and problems of rationalization

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

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

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

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

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

It's precisely the need to connect those two levels that drives you toward the view that the study of turnout has a problem -- and this probably can be extended to all aspects of electoral behavior. I think it applies particularly to the turnout problem, that the study of turnout simply must be cross-systemic, and that is hopefully underlined in that part of the
note that I circulated, and in the accompanying figures and tables. Or in particular, in the figures.

Coming over on the plane, one of the temptations that PowerPoint gives rise to is that you revise your paper as you're heading for the conference, particularly if you're stuck in an uncomfortable steerage class seat on a transatlantic flight, and you can just about fit, in the space between the seat in front of you and yourself, your laptop.

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

My conclusion, then, would be that the National Science Foundation, in looking at research on electoral behavior -- and what I detect is a very strong commitment to continue to look at electoral behavior as a major research area -- should actually be very ambitious. It shouldn't just be saying, how do we improve the existing National Election Study model. You know, agonizing about the dilemmas of maintaining continuity and the core versus innovation and all of that.

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

That my argument or my response to the discussion so far this morning, is that what the National Science Foundation should be doing is considering the whole range of possible fundamental problems in regard to
elections and electoral behavior, of which,
coming from my perspective, turnout is a
major one. But other ones have been
signaled this morning. It shouldn't be
trying to squeeze them all into a single

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

My argument, in conclusion, would
be that that research be comparative, that
researchers be very ambitious in what they
propose to the National Science Foundation;
that as I certainly detected this morning
from the remarks of Richard Lempert and
Norman Bradburn, that it seems to me that I
could detect a potentially positive response
to that kind of ambitious thinking.
Finally that obviously, if you
want to be comparative, you have to have
comparative partners. But my perception and
my experience of the funding situation in
Europe, particularly at the European level
as we say -- in other words, at the level of
the European Union -- is such that that kind
of an initiative might well draw a positive
response. Thank you.

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

(Whereupon, at 12:32 p.m., a
luncheon recess was taken.)
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 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 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
people questions in a face-to-face context?
Has there been evaluation that's arisen out
of this?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DR. MUTZ: Yes, that's right.
SPEAKER: They'll look up the
answer. But obviously, they're not.
MR. McAllister: You're assuming
great diligence on the part of the
respondents.

DR. ACHEN: You should have seen

the Australian respondents before they
looked up the answer.

DR. BURNS: This is just an
information question. I was trying to think
about how, you know, question order effects
and priming effects, and that sort of
thing -- they're pretty, you know, standard.
So the idea then would be to put into the
mail survey only things you'd be pretty darn
sure it wouldn't be subject to those kinds
of effects, because otherwise you'd be in
trouble, and you would never be able to sort
that out.

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

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

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

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

DR. BURNS: Right. Exactly.

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

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

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

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

enemy of something here sometimes.

Part of the problem here is this
tremendous constraint on time. It might be
that one way you can buy a little bit of
time is to say, okay, we're going to have a
mail back, and you will get this to people.
That might help you. I mean, put the damn trust question on the mail back. Okay?

SPEAKER: It always comes back to trust with you, Henry.

SPEAKER: We'll let you send that letter out.

DR. CLARKE: That's exactly the motivation for the mail back. It's clear we couldn't, as they say, you know, get this poured into a pint pot. To accommodate similar things that we really want to have some information on, we go ahead and do the mail questionnaire. Exactly why. Henry it's exactly what you said. We made the judgment something was better than nothing.

DR. BLAIS: We haven't discussed. I mean, this is obvious in Canada we do this forever. I mean, it's cheap. It helps a lot. Why not do it?

SPEAKER: I'm curious how much mail Australians and Canadians get on an average day. We're getting 25 pieces now a lot of days. I'm just not clear about how well --

SPEAKER: Well again, you know, it's worth -- I'm just going for worth a try some times, given the cost.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, one tactic, though -- and I think that's what Henry actually had in mind. This has been used in the GSS, is that you leave a questionnaire behind. The conditional probability that they'll fill it out, given that they already did a lengthy interview, is quite high, often more than what you get in a straight mail survey, in part because people don't throw it in the trash.

You know, they see it, it's out in the open, and so on.

SPEAKER: Plus there's a large literature, too, in terms of how to boost the response rates. Everything from what color paper you use, to -- what color paper you use, to providing various kinds of financial incentives. In some ways ----

POQs for all this kind of stuff.
DR. THOMPSON: I think that in the United States, if you didn't do something like drop it off when you leave it, if you just did a cold mail survey with all the kinds of things you could do, you'd be lucky to get anything much more than somewhere in the mid-fifties. That would probably be pushing it.

Based on the experiences that I had at the Census Bureau, I think right now the American community survey is getting somewhere between 50 and 55 percent. They're allowed to use a mandatory message too, which helps. They're doing an experiment this year, I believe, where they're dropping the mandatory aspect. So that will be really interesting to see what happens when they drop that.

DR. SCIOLI: How long is the GSS questionnaire, Roger? Do you know?

MR. TOURANGEAU: The basic questionnaire, I guess, varies between an hour and an hour and a half. Norman might know, too.

DR. THOMPSON: It's a 90 minute.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Is it now --

DR. THOMPSON: The whole questionnaire is 90 minutes. I think half of it, 45 minutes, is what they consider core, and then half of it is --

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, that's the other idea, I think.

DR. SCIOLI: Then the mail back. How long would it take?

MR. TOURANGEAU: I think they've done, like, half-hour questionnaires. But the other -- again, if the issue is constraints on how you can cram more content, I mean, this is one good technique. Another trick that GSS uses -- I don't know if they still use it. But it's -- they use, like, a balanced, incomplete block design, for you experimental design mavens.

Basically, there are I think four modules, one of which is constant. Then everybody gets two of the three that are not
constant. So -- and all those pairs. You
know, there's three pairs of the two modules
appear equally often. So you could estimate
covariances between any pair of items.
You know, but the sample sizes are
reduced for those co-variants.
MR. SANTOS: Do they mix in the
mode as part of the allocation scheme, so
you might go to module, either in the
questionnaire or in the mailing?

MR. TOURANGEAU: No. The mail
back thing has always been an add-on, to the
best of my knowledge. You know, a client
will come in and say I want 15 minutes on
the GSS. They won't do that, but they will
do this.
But those are two -- both those
methods, certainly matrix sampling or module
sampling and, you know, leaving people
something, are good ways to cram in extra
content and help with response rates.
DR. SCIOLI: What would be your
reaction if somebody pushed you on the Board
to do 45 minutes face-to-face max, and 45
minutes mail back? I'm just curious.
DR. KINDER: Somebody on our
Board?
DR. SCIOLI: Yes. I mean, if it
were -- I mean, somebody coming and saying
hey, I heard, I was at a meeting, and this
is what they do, in Canada, and this is what
they do in Australia, this is what they do
in Ireland.
If the instrument is now 130
minutes, and you were to cut the instrument
to 45 minutes face- to-face, and make it
another 45-minute questionnaire --
DR. BRADY: But Frank, you don't
really save that much by reducing the length
of an interview. The problem is getting
there and getting the person. Once you've
got them, you want them to sit there all day
with you.
DR. BRADBURN: The marginal
minutes.
DR. BRADY: The marginal minute
cost is very low.
DR. BRADBURN: Nancy, what do you do? 135 minutes?

DR. BURNS: We do a before and after the election. So in a Presidential election --

DR. BRADBURN: Oh, not in one?

DR. KINDER: No, no, no.

_________________________________________________________________

DR. BRADY: So it's 65 in each city, but I think 65 is quite doable. Cutting back would be --

DR. BURNS: Right.

MR. SANTOS: How long are the mail questionnaires that you guys use?

DR. CLARKE: 12 pages in our case.

The most recent one.

MR. SANTOS: Yes, but, you know eight-point font?

DR. CLARK: No. Big font. Like big, like here's a crown. You can fill this out, you know.

MR. SANTOS: But how long does it take to answer them?

MR. McAllister: It takes about 30 minutes if they go right through it properly. We have to do it in multiples of fours, not to waste space. So 24 is the --

MR. SANTOS: I'm surprised that they would stay with it that long.

MR. McAllister: Well, there's colleagues of mine who have gone up to 60, 70 pages and have had a response rate run about 50 percent.

DR. BRADY: This is a very dull country.

(Laughter)

MR. McAllister: Perhaps the solution is to introduce compulsory voting everywhere, and then everybody becomes compliant if you comply with that requirement.

DR. LEMPERT: I mean it seems to me that role for mail, might be expanding the sample, as opposed to cutting back on the survey of the existing sample.

SPEAKER: Yes, that's exactly the point. That's clearly the motivation for
this kind of stuff.

DR. SCIOLI: Expanding the sample or expanding the content in the current sample? Or both?

SPEAKERS: Both.

DR. LEMPERT: In this country, it

would be very hard to expand the sample using mail. Because you don't have good -- you don't know who lives where and so the costs of having to register it--

DR. HANSEN: There you get into cross mode issues as well.

DR. BRADBURN: You know it's really capitalizing on the fact that you already cooperated and you'll do more.

MR. TOURANGEAU: The way you could use it to beef up the sample is you could take some retired sample, and then mail it to them, or something like that. Where you do have a set of addresses and like that.

It isn't a very good standalone methodology in the United States, because of the frame problem. There's no good list of addresses, basically.

DR. SCIOLI: You would have to have done it sufficiently recently that the addresses are still pretty good.

Could I ask a question of all of the international contingent. I thought I heard -- and at least certainly I know in the British case -- that the funding goes to a group of principal investigators, and then that group selects either through another competition, and so forth, the survey organization that actually carries out the survey.

In all these countries, is that distinct?

DR. BLAIS: In Canada that's the case.

MR. McAllister: More or less.

DR. CLARKE: I know it is in Britain.

DR. BRADY: Yes, definitely.

DR. SCIOLI: So actually, in Britain, then, the PI group, where it's located, moves around or had at least a
pendula if not --

DR. CLARKE: It's moved a couple of times. Yes.

___________________________________________________________________

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clearly now, we've made -- I don't know what it was like in the past. But it's clearly now in Britain that they separate these things out very distinctly, and they make you entertain bids. I mean, for obvious conflict of interest reasons, now, the way they did this before would not --
there's no way that if I had a survey firm,
you know, obviously, I could choose my own

firm. I couldn't even enter a bid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We also did an Internet poll, as
was mentioned, as well, just for free. It
wasn't funded. It just turned out they said
they'd do it for us, and we said hey, great.
So we have been studying those
kinds of differences, and we'll do more.
But the house effect thing is interesting.
We haven't seen anything so far that you
wouldn't attribute to sort of a secular
trend.

I mean, if we had had a constant
response rate of whatever, 70 percent or
whatever, and then all of a sudden we come
along with something in the mid-50s, we'd
say oh wow, this may be, you know, it's really a house effect. These guys just can't get interviews, there's something going on here, or the response distributions look really different.

We haven't see any of that.

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

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

So it's quite different from here.

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

DR. CLARKE: Yes, they did. Well, I mean, you haven't seen, have you been to Essex? I mean, you know. The contribution was valued, but was pretty marginal. A couple of small offices, really, for the research officers.

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

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

DR. BLAIS: I don't think there is no return as such. In fact, I think the university gets some percentage of all of the research funds that were given by SHRCC. Basically, all that money has been reimbursed into the Canadian election -- reinvested in the Canadian Election Study.

So the university has put -- does
put in some real money, in fact.

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

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

DR. BURNS: I have a question. I was thinking about your sense that you didn't have house effects, and so forth. I mean, we micro-manage survey implementation. So we're, you know, kind of -- our staff is in there on a daily basis.

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

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

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

NOP was much more hands off. They just want -- basically said, okay, you know, we'll send you the data some day. We kept pushing them, and very deliberately.

One of the things in particular I was worried about, was whether they could program the copy correctly. Because we have experiments, we've got all sorts of branching, and you know, the normal kinds of
things. I said they screw this up, this is like a big-time problem right away.

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

But clearly, I'd like to have a closer relationship with whoever the survey firm is. As I say, if we do another one of these or whoever does it, it looks like they're basically going to have to put out for bids. It's going to be very hard. If you've got a reputable firm, and they've got a good low bid, I mean, you're pretty well going to have to go with them. I mean, if you don't go with them, you'd have to write some elaborate justification, you know, and so forth.

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

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

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

DR. BLAIS: This is one of the reasons we've been basically going with York ISR because we have, you know, we have all kinds of accessibility. We can go there any time. We discuss with them every first day of the campaign, after they see how things are going, and so on. I mean we know if there is a problem, they will tell us.

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

DR. BRADY: Yeah, Andre, remember Gallup was actually cheaper though, I think for the '92, '93. I'm pretty sure we had to
explain why we didn't go with Gallup, why
instead we went with York. I'm pretty sure
that's true.

DR. BLAIS: You're right.

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

That is, that we have tried to

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

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

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

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

One of the nice things, of course,
is the level of temporal aggregation we've
got is so much tighter. So if something
happens, a 9/11 happens or now going to war with Iraq and that, we'll be, you know, studying these things month-to-month and can articulate that with what's going on in the election study.

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

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

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

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

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

I'm wondering if other election studies have had things like that other than what Harold said or just maybe we could even know more about what Harold was talking about. Was that just all there was to it, or was there more to it, Harold?

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

DR. CLARKE: We have a Board of Advisors that help us. You know you sort of pick people -- we picked them -- who were former principal investigators of national election studies or prominent survey research enterprises and brought them together at the University of Essex last --
you know, 2 years ago in the spring. But we
don't have a board of overseers
institutionally.

MR. McAllister: Our
accountability is through the grant we
receive as principal investigators of the
grant from the agency. We have informal
discussions with people but we don't have
any formal board, or advisory board, or
board of overseers.

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

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

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

But we were not mandated on that.

It might be a good thing, it might not be as

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

DR. BRADY: Well, I'm just trying
to think of ways you might help the National
Election Study Board to solve some problems
they may have had. Maybe I've identified a
problem that's not a problem in their mind.
I don't know. But we maybe need some candid
discussion about whether something like that
would be helpful to the Board to help them
finally say, look, we got to throw out a lot
of the stuff that's accumulated. Maybe
there's no thought that's a problem. I
happen to think there's got to be stuff in
there that we could throw overboard without
doing tremendous damage to American
political science.

DR. SCIOLI: We're willing to take

the hit on suggesting that the design only
has 40 minutes.

DR. KINDER: Is that what you
want, Henry?

DR. BRADY: I don't know what I
want. But, I think the Board should get
together and maybe make some of these hard
statements and sotto voce get it back to
NSF. Something has got to happen here to
make this work. That's one of the ways you
might make it work.

But to just hold out and say, no
we can't cut anything from the core, the
core is so critical -- that's just not going
to work.

DR. SCIOLI: We could ---- as a
start --

DR. MUTZ: Well, I was just going
to say that I agree that that kind of
approach might be helpful but I think part
of it depends on, you know, on how big the
pool is of funds we're talking about.

we talking about a zero sum game where we've
got to cut back in order to have more
innovation? Or, you know, what's the
tradeoff here? That's a little difficult to
know in the context we're in now.

DR. HANSEN: I think it does
depend too upon what the purposes of the
study are, tat one kind of study it makes
sense to put the core on a meat block and do
a lot of things that are different. Another
kind of study, the argument for continuity
would be very, very strong. So, I'm not
sure that you can really decide which of
those options is the best, aside from an
overall conception of where the study is
going.

DR. BRADBURN: Could I get --
well, this will probably will come out in
the course of the rest of it too.

But I noticed in reading the
papers that it seems like there is a kind of
continuum you might say, from what Richard was talking about, in which you sort of focus on one -- like a dependent variable, like turnout, I mean, maybe a complex one like turnout -- though some -- it seemed to me at different times -- had topics. They may have had lots of things but they had a focus that was at least for some portion of it compared to something which is an omnibus -- well, it's not quite an omnibus but it has sort of core plus, whatever the relevant people at that time think is the best sort of thing. But, there was no pre-specified type theme of this round.

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

So, one of the things I hope over the rest of the time and at the end we get some sense as to -- something from running to we just study, you know, whatever -- some essential problem related to elections that sort of anchors one end. The other end, I guess is a kind of omnibus which tries to meet lots of -- you know, the broadest possible kind of constituency and may run -- well, I say, that might run the risk of falling between stools for some people. But that's my bias I guess.

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

DR. HANSEN: Or if the resources are there to have kind of -- as we were speaking this morning, of having a package
of options so that some could be quite
highly focused and some could really
emphasize the continuity in the study.

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

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

   But the question is whether there
would be synergies by having the group with
this really terrific advisory committee and
others to develop a program which one does
to get when you get individual researchers
who are relatively unconnected coming in or
don't know this.

Maybe there aren't. Maybe we're
much better off letting hundred flowers
bloom with one big cactus in the middle or
something.

DR. MUTZ: But it would be neat if
they could speak to each other. That is,
they go on now but they don't talk to each
other in important ways. So, if you took
results from experimental studies and fed
them directly into survey types of things,
then, you know, that would create that kind
of synergy, I think.

DR. SCIOLI: There is an
intermediate model I suppose between having
one kind of centralized, I mean, sort of

master group that tries to coordinate things
and letting a hundred flowers bloom.

Many NSF programs that -- where
there is kind of an overarching sort of
theme. Now, then -- and you have sort of
identified a certain number of grants or PIs
under that theme. Then sort of have yearly
meetings or some sort of mandated meetings
of the PIs so that they keep -- first of all
they know each other and they communicate
with each other.

While you don't say, absolutely
you've got to coordinate everything you do.
At least, you sort of help facilitate a
process of that going on. I mean, I think
generally it goes on if people are
encouraged to do it, and you know, there are
no barriers to doing it.

DR. CLARKE: In Britain they have
done this not with regard to election
studies but with regard to other kinds of
things. It would be of interest to people

in this room.

For example, by colleague Paul
Whiteley has a program, what they call a
program with the ESRC, the Participation in
Democracy Program, which has 21 projects
funded underneath that umbrella. They get
together -- we've gotten together now 4 years in a row and discussed our projects and talked about, you know, possibilities for coordination and so forth. There are several programs running in the British ESRC on things with regard to institutional design, and the British Constitution, you know, a variety of different things along this line, Norman, this sort of halfway kind of model.

DR. KINDER: There is the problem of getting the model or mechanism for coordination down right. It may seem like an interesting example to look at, and what you just said, Norman, is appealing to me. All that would need to be worked out.

But I also wanted to associate myself very strongly with the idea of coordinated experiments with ongoing surveys. I think that that's a really splendid idea. Henry in his paper chastises us, though gently, for not doing enough experiments and I think that that's right. We probably don't do enough experiments. Although doing experiments embedded in the survey is difficult because it means that you're mangling part of the survey that somebody feels is precious, even though from another point of view it looks like you're doing something interesting and illuminating.

So, we haven't been able to do or we haven't felt as though we could do as much experimentation of the substantive and theoretical sort that Henry wants us to do as we would like. But, being able to coordinate with experiments off-site, so to speak, that are in someway coordinated with the ongoing content of the survey is a very exciting possibility, partly for the reasons that Diana suggested which is about inferences of causality. You know, the kind of standard advantage that experiments have in that respect.

But, there's another which is -- which has to do with developments in experimental technology. That has to do
partly with the ability to represent iconic as well as verbal complex material for people as the nature of the campaign can be represented. You can turn CAPI around as they like to say.

Moreover, finally, developments in cognitive psychology about measurement of attitudes implicit or automatic, unconscious attitudes, it goes under various rubrics, is a very exciting development, I think, and one with portentous implications for how we understand public opinion, and the way public opinion -- what public opinion means.

So, this would be an opportunity to make a link in addition to the causality one. One about more subtle and indirect measurement that I think inevitably surveys have to confront. This would be a way to do it without going, you know, in too risky a direction too quickly.

DR. BRADBURN: It's too bad Pat White isn't here but I would allege some history or invent it if it's not true. But I need her to make sure it's true. But, my memory of the development of the General Social Survey over the last 30 years is that in the beginning -- or I know in the beginning because I was part of the methodological -- there was a methodological advisory group. I know that was there because I was a part of it.

We were trying to add on -- or do experiments with it and do methodological studies and so forth. Then we met a lot of resistance from the Board exactly for the reason that Don mentioned. It mucks up the -- you know all these methodological things muck up what we want to get done. So they really sort of stopped doing it.

Then -- and then NSF came in, in I think the mid-80's -- I don't know, Roger you may know -- and sort of mandated that there had to be a methodological -- every time it went there had to be methodological experiments incorporated into the thing. There was a separate grant coincident with that that renewed that cycle and a lot of
split ballot experiments got in there.  
Then after that I think there was  
no separate methodological money. But it's  
interesting, I was talking to Tom Smith  
actually earlier this week because I was  
looking for an experiment -- a specific  
experiment.  
He said, but they just stayed,  
they continued. It sort of turned the norm  
around so even though they don't have --

they're not under this injunction anymore  
they do each year continue to do  
methodological, I mean, at least split  
ballet experiments and some other kinds.  
But, it sort of changed the normative  
structure of the way it was being run so it  
can happen, I guess.  
MR. TOURANGEAU: One of the great  
unimplemented ideas in survey research is to  
set aside some percentage of a survey sample  
for methodological experimentation. I guess  
the CIP has a methods panel. I know that  
there was an effort to try and create one  
for the NOSY.  
DR. BRADBURN: The old -- the old  
NOSY had one.  
MR. TOURANGEAU: But, it's --  
people love the idea but it seems to be very  
rarely implemented. But, this could be  
another opportunity to try.  
DR. BRADY: But this is not just  
methodological, this is substantive. We  

have to begin to think of these experiments  
and as like just a question. It's the  
probes we use and it's the way we actually  
figure out what's going on inside people's  
heads so they're all of a piece.  
DR. MUTZ: Yeah, I want to second  
what Henry is saying in that when I said  
experiments, I wasn't talking about split  
ballet, you know, compared question wording  
types of things. I was talking about things  
that simulate laboratory experiments or  
actual laboratory experiments that have to  
do with things we care about in election  
research. In this case, it's not going to  
become part of the core survey. It's
something completely different. Especially
with, you know, technologies like Knowledge
Networks and so on and so forth, you can
experiments that involve stimuli, and so on
and so forth, that are very similar to what
you do in a laboratory.
So, I guess I think our use of the

_term is different by virtue of whose
speaking here. So, I would encourage it not
to be methodological in fact because I think
it's -- that would be appropriate in the
context of improving the core questions and
improving instrumentation of, you know,
measuring various concepts.
But this has to be different or
else it's going to end up being just more of
that. This has to be explicitly for
innovative purposes.

DR. KINDER: Well it's experiments
of the sort that you're talking about that
you were -- that set off the discussion.

DR. LEMPERT: Right, exactly.
Things that will increase the understanding
of what has been going on in the campaign.

DR. KINDER: You don't have to
choose between these by the way --

DR. MUTZ: Right.

DR. KINDER: If the experiments
have compelling virtues of a methodological

or a substantive theoretical sense.

DR. LEMPERT: Yeah there are
limitations and there is a complementarity
between the virtues of one and the
limitations in the survey, so they should go
together very nicely.

DR. SCIOLI: Okay. Sorry,
Richard --

DR. SINNOTT: Just a quick comment
on Norman Bradburn's question of a continuum
from a highly specialized, highly focused
research to an omnibus kind of an approach.
Just two comments.
The European Social Survey is a
major innovation at the moment in Europe.
It involves -- I think it's 27 participating
countries with, I think it's fair to say, a
much more rigorous approach to questionnaire
design and to sampling than has been seen in any comparative European research to date. Its design, very deliberately, is that it's 50 percent core and percent module. The idea is, if you have an hour long questionnaire, half of the 50 percent core is a consistently used set of attitude questions. The other half is the demographics. The idea is that this survey would be repeated every 2 years. The way they think of the modules then is those are open for tender. In other words, groups are invited to submit documents for a 15 minute module on this and the idea is that these modules might be repeated, say, on a 6 year cycle or they might not depending on their success and depending on what other ideas came up. Because there is a very clear distinction between a continuing core survey and the modules.

It does strike me though that the core is going to run into precisely the same problem that in 6 years time people will be saying, why are we asking these questions? We're asking them because they're in the core. People are saying, well, we don't want them, or whatever. It doesn't quite solve the problem. But that division between core and modular design is very explicit in that survey.

My other reaction to the discussion is that as I would see it anyway, the assumption about talking about additional studies like the proposal to have a focus on turnout or like the proposal to engage in experimental research related to campaigns and elections, it's very much based on the presupposition that this is an expanding program of research and is not just a reallocation of the resources devoted currently to the National Election Study. But, I suppose that goes without saying.

DR. SCIOLI: We have assiduously avoided Henry's 9:10 question about funding. Then it has come up a couple of more times. Let me comment that we were discussing the
that as the Political Science program has
gone slightly up in its funding, the ANES
funding has gone down considerably.

You heard Norman and Rick's
comments this morning about the context in
which we're considering this. Richard,
we're not sure where the tradeoff will come.
We may be asking -- we're going to ask
realistically within the resources that we
have at our disposal in the next year when
we formulate the announcement. At present
the waters are roiled and the budget climate
is not very sure. That doesn't mean that we
can't think about planning within the
context of political science, within the
context of social and economic science
division and certainly in the directorate.

I mean, we want to be prepared if
the federal budget structure changes
dramatically. As program officers we
would -- in Political Science
particularly -- we would use all the logical

arguments that we could to call for more
funding.

DR. BRADY: Frank, I just think
it's really important too to make sure that
when the RFP comes out there is enough money
to do things that sort of minimally people
think need to be done with the NES. I
thought last time there wasn't.
I think that's one reason why -- I
don't know how many proposals you got. I
think it was two. I might be wrong on that.
Maybe there was only one and maybe you can't
even say how many there were. But, the -- I
don't think there was a lot of competition.
I think that's a true statement. I think
it's because there simply weren't the
resources there that people felt like this
was a good opportunity to go off and put
together a proposal to try to do something.
So, either you have enough
resources or you say, you're going to sort
of somehow restrict it in a way that
somebody could feel like they could come in
without killing the time series. I mean, I
think that's the great fear that people had
last time, that if they put in a proposal
that was truly, truly innovative, it would
kill the time series and nobody wanted to be
known as the person who killed the time
series --

   DR. SCIOLI: Well, we'll revisit
that ---- tomorrow.

   DR. BRADY: These guys at least
tried to keep that intact which I give them
credit for.

   DR. SCIOLI: We'll revisit that
tomorrow. We can't comment on the number of
proposals but we know who the winner was.
Let's turn to future substantive concerns
and these things continue to recur.

Kathleen McGraw and Steven Durlauf
were unable for personal reasons to attend.
So, we have a little more time for
Christopher Achen and Diana Mutz to share
their thoughts and then for give and take.
So, Christopher you're listed first, if you
don't mind.

FUTURE SUBSTANTIVE CONCERNS

   DR. ACHEN: I've gotten used to
that with my last name over the years.
I'm in the position here in a lot
of ways of representing what I think is a
very large group of people which is the user
community, those of us who don't do surveys
ourselves or have only very peripheral parts
in them but who make very heavy use of the
data.

I guess what I'd like to do is not
repeat my statement but just talk a little
bit about, you know, how one might think
about that set of people. I think we're
very much in the position of the professors
that Franklin Roosevelt once called in to
give him some advice about one of his social
programs. He said, what would be the right
thing to do here? They said, well, taking

into account the budgetary and political
realities -- we think. Roosevelt said, stop
right there. Let me take into account the
budgetary and political realities. You tell me what would be best if none of that were an issue.

That's what I intend to do. I don't have to carry out one of these things. I don't have to fund it. So, I'm just going to run my mouth here about what I think would be exciting.

(Laughter)

DR. ACHEN: There were two things that I think tend to come up when people talk about what would be exciting and I think neither one of them is quite what I'd like to see. I was born in the middle of the Rocky Mountains and spent a fair amount of my early life there and we used to get dudes from the East coming out who would kind of stand there seeing the mountains the first time and their jaw would be hanging down and their tongue would be hanging out. They'd say, look at them mountains.

There is a tendency to slip into that sometimes with the election studies too. You think, boy, that was an interesting race or that's an interesting class of elections. You know, look at them elections. We ought to go study that.

That I think was great in the early days when, as I said earlier descriptive information was largely missing. It's not, I think, where we ought to go now. The other idea that comes around a lot in these contexts is the -- is interdisciplinary studies of some kind. Bring in the unnamed people from the other disciplines and let's do some warm, wet, furry study that would incorporate these alternate perspectives. I think that's probably not quite where we want to go either. What bothers me so much about the current state of our

knowledge is how limited it is. So, I have a stack of books about who voted for Hitler that is literally that high off the ground and the great problem is there were no surveys at that point.

So, you know, what you'd like to
do on a desperately critically important
question of that kind is be able to say to
your undergraduates after you ask them how
did Hitler come to power, and they say, well
with guns, right? It was a coup, wasn't it?
Munich, wasn't it? You say, no, he was
elected fair and square. They say, gee, why
did people vote for him? You say, why did
people vote for him in one of the most
sophisticated countries in the world at that
time, is the real question. The answer is,
we just don't have any idea.
I meant what I said. To be
helpful on a situation like that when we
don't have a lot of data, or take, you know,
Huey Long who ran the state of Louisiana

using the, you know, National Guard and
state police as his private gestapo,
similarly, there are no data. You can extend
this on and on as far as you like. We just
don't have the theoretical machinery that
would help us fill in where the data are
missing.
I suspect that around this table,
for all we know and have learned, and there
is a lot of that, my guess is few if any of
you would dispute that. So, my prejudice
then is not cool new thoughts from adjacent
disciplines, as much fun as those sometimes
are, or amazing new technologies we haven't
tried, fun as those might be, but rather
what is the -- what are the current
bottlenecks in the theoretical agenda that
confront us?
There is more than one theoretical
agenda represented here. Many of the little
papers that we all wrote mentioned those and
I won't be invidious by mentioning

particular ones. We all have theoretical
points we want to make.
So, it seems to me it would be
helpful too, in the course of this day and
half, hard as it is because of the great
complexity of administering these things,
hard as it is to break off into this other
thing that is more difficult and maybe
pretty warm, and wet, and furry itself.
But, it seems to me pretty critical.

One of the things I hear from the
natural scientists I know is that it's hard
to spend money on the social sciences
because they just really in the end don't
know what they're doing. Now sometimes you
get this from people who aren't sure how
many houses of Congress there are --

DR. BRADY: Or physicists who have
lost 95 percent of the matter in the
universe.

(Laughter)

DR. ACHEN: Yes. So there is all

of that. There is all of that.

DR. CLARKE: Give or take an order
of magnitude.

DR. ACHEN: We all know those
jokes and the jokes about the economists and
so on. But they're not -- they're not
entirely without true content. I think we
do struggle. It is a hard science.

So somewhere in this day and a
half, I think that a little time spent
saying to ourselves, from within the various
theoretical traditions that are represented
around the table, what is an example of
something people are fighting over where the
theory kind of forks in the road there and
where the current data we have available to
us don't allow us to discipline our theories
enough to know what to do.

By my lights, when you do think
about that, and I can think about some
better than others obviously, and the rest
of you will have to fill in from your own

points of view, but it seems to me that
again and again you find that it's these
horribly short time periods in which we see
people. We're constantly taking these
snapshots and then trying to fill in, you
know, Gone With the Wind, in-between, at
these long intervals in-between.

So, you all read or saw at least,
stayed with it as long as you could on the
airplane before you fell asleep, my
arguments about this. But, I really -- I
really feel that dynamics is pretty crucial here.
The second part of that is that getting people to -- getting people in our discipline to move to that is a substantial political problem, getting it paid for is a substantial financial problem. But, like I said, that's not my problem. I'm just going to put out the abstract argument and try to encourage us to give those theoretical questions a little time while we're here if we can manage it.

DR. MUTZ: Okay. Some of the issues I had planned to bring up have already come up which I think is fortunate. But I want to start out by summarizing a little bit of what I'm hearing. I won't say it's a consensus because that would be a mistake. But there are some recurrent themes that seem to come up in various memos that were circulated that have to do with the substance.

I think probably this is the most difficult thing of all because to sit here now and plan what's going to be the substance of the NES 10 years from now does seem to me like a bit of an impossible task. We could do it but we'd be wrong anyway so I'm not sure it would be, you know, worth it to predict that. But what we can do is set up the right kinds of platforms so that whatever the substance is we do want to study by then we'll be able to do it and do it well.

What I read of the memos seems to be pretty much in agreement on the value of maintaining some kind of core. We may not know what the definition of core is per se, so we can differ on that. But the time series aspect on that has been very valuable to a lot of scholars.

But my own sense and I think the sense of many of the people in the room is that we do need to move toward a greater diversity of designs and approaches in order to move election research forward in some way.
Another thing that I think has come up in many people's comments is that we want to study a variety of things substantively. We may all have different ideas about what those are. But we want to study things for which some sort of long-term panel design or rolling cross-sectional design would be very helpful.

You know, I found it interesting -- actually I think it was Chris's characterization of the NES as having emphasized social psychology a great deal in the past, because Kathleen McGraw's comments indicate that she has never used NES data. I actually think I've used it once or twice at most. So, I haven't been a major user.

Part of the reason is very similar to what you were saying. That is the inability to distinguish between even various socio-psychological theories based on NES data. It's just not an ideal design for purposes of doing that and that's no fault of the NES. It's inherent in the method that we've using to collect those data.

So, for that reason I haven't done a lot of work with NES data. But, I found myself getting very excited about the idea of these alternative designs and what we might be able to do with them substantively if we had those kinds of data.

You know, in thinking about things like rolling cross-sectional designs, and panels, and so on and so forth, you know, I think it's easy to get carried away. We do have to think about a variety of issues that would come up. For example, my favorite being, as somebody who does individual level research for the most part, is to think about a panel where you could really get at change over time at the individual level and so forth.

But then again, I think about things like panel sensitization issues. If you have a panel followed for a long, long period of time and you're constantly asking
them questions about politics, they're going
to respond differently. They're going to
read the newspaper differently. They're
going to do a lot of things differently.

So, I don't think any one of these

particular things is cure all. But, I do
see a lot of potential in these alternative
types of methodological approaches. In
fact, one of the ideas I mentioned in my
memo was born over my concern over panel
sensitization and trying to embed political
questions in an already existing panel like
the NES surveys. Because you can essentially
bury the stuff in a lot of other questions
that would take the emphasis away from
politics.

So they wouldn't come away from
the experience of every interview saying,
you know, I'm going to be drummed to death
again 2 years from now about my political
knowledge, about my political attitudes, and
so on and so forth and in that way avoid
some of these methodological sensitization
issues and yet still get the kind of data
that would be ideally useful.

I guess in terms of talking about
substantive concerns, in a way I evaded the

question in my memo because I feel like in
the current political climate which I know
you don't want to address, but in the
current climate in the discipline trying
to -- having NES aligned with or promoting
any particular substantive area or
theoretical model is going to be really a
bad idea. Because the minute you do that
you become extremely controversial and I
think when you are first and foremost a
public good that's not the direction you
want to go.

So, you know, my own preference
would be not to align it with that but
rather to give people the vehicles that they
need, the platforms that they need to study
a wide variety of things and let that evolve
as time goes by and elections change and so
forth.

In terms of the main question that
I formulated for this particular section of our discussion, it actually is very much in line with what Rick was saying about how the National Election Studies might be made into something that doesn't use one tool to address all questions even if it's not the best tool for addressing those questions. That is, you know, how do we move election studies away from being synonymous with a large cross-sectional sample, from being synonymous with a survey essentially? So, that is the study of elections in a way that is more synergistic than it is currently.

One question I myself couldn't answer is the NES supposed to be serving all scholars in political science who are interested in studying elections? I don't know the answer to that question. The history of the project and the way it evolved probably means it has never explicitly been answered. But, given the diversity of methodological approaches that are out there that people use to study elections, you know, that aren't incorporated as part of this enterprise, I think that that integration could be done better.

A couple of the other of the issues that we were asked to address specifically I'll comment on. One was the study of networks and social interaction. This is something that I've done research on myself. I find it very interesting. I think it's, you know, too bad that the sort of sociological emphasis of some of the very earliest election studies has been lost. But in the context of the kind of instrument that the NES has worked with, I don't think you can do a good job measuring the social -- social networks in particular. It simply takes too large a battery of items and so forth to do a really good job with on any type of ongoing basis. But I do think that we could bring back in some of that sociological emphasis by increasing access to -- especially the
ease of access to the kind of contextual
data that you mentioned that you are
integrating. Because I think the one
study that I did that did involve NES data
and I wanted to match up contextual
information and so forth, it was just a
tremendous amount of work because you have to
go through the special access and all those
sorts of things.

Again, this intersects with human
subjects considerations. It happens for a
lot of good reasons. Nonetheless, it's very
discouraging for people who want to go off
and study things like social context because
it's so difficult, time consuming, to do it.

If one of my students comes to me
and wants to do that with the NES data,
well, unless they want to wait a year or
something they're kind of out of luck
because it takes a long time to do that and
they also have to do the work themselves.

So, if that were part of the release that

would be a big, I think, aid in encouraging
people to do more contextual research when
they're just linking it up with existing
data of other kinds. So, I think that would
be terrific to have in an easily accessible
form.

Then finally, I wanted to comment
on coming up with a better way to study
campaigns and media in particular during
campaigns. Because I think it's something
that because it's difficult to do through
self-reports and survey questionnaires we
don't really have a good systematic study of
that going on in the United States despite
the fact that everyone seems to think that
elections are entirely about media.

I think integrating that into the
NES makes a lot of sense. By that I don't
mean that I think the NES should go out and
code everything they can get their hands on
media-wise because I know what an impossible
task that would be.

But given the kind of technology
we have now I do think it would be possible
now to develop a sampling scheme and so on
and so forth and to distribute things like CDs of the content that individual investigators can then use for their own research purchases.

Because doing that on your own as an investigator is, you know, virtually impossible in a systematic way and if we had that content of the campaign as part of the study on a continuous basis over time I think that would be very advantageous to advances in that area of research.

I was actually thinking while we were talking a few minutes ago that one of my questions on my qualifying exam when I was in graduate school at Stanford was redesign the National Election Study, assume unlimited budget. Yes. It's been a long time ago. I don't remember the specifics of everything I wrote about it but I do remember that a central component was including the integration of information on candidates, information on the mass public, information on media and the communication environment, so that people could draw those things together.

We've really only had the public component on any kind of regular systematic basis and I think in the interests of sort of broadening what NES does, that would be a terrific thing to add on.

Again, I think -- I don't think we should do people's research for them. I don't think that we should step in and content analyze things for them and so forth. But I do think making the information available would go a long way toward encouraging research in that area and not every single scholar who wants to study something involved with media has to do their own separate study right now or their own separate collection of media content.

It's just not a very efficient way to learn more about these areas.

I'll stop there.

DR. BRADY: On just panels. Both of you have recommended panels. I just wrote down quickly, I can think of a series
of panels of months, years, and decades that
are out there. Months -- the People's Choice
I think was eight waves. There is
Patterson's six wave. There is C3PO
which was what, three of four waves but all
on an order of months between them. Okay?
Then there's years. There's the
CPS5660 which is three waves. Right? There
is the 72 to 76 which is three waves. Then
there's a British study out there which is
like 8 to 11 waves. Some woman, I can't
think of her name who has done something for
eight years.

DR. CLARKE: Himmelway (?).

DR. BRADY: Exactly. Yeah, so
that's over years. Then there's, of course,

the decades long political socialization
study. What are you talking about? Is it
months, years, decades? How many waves do
you need?

DR. MUTZ: I was talking years but
perhaps at, you know --

DR. BRADY: Every year?

DR. MUTZ: I hadn't gotten that
specific. Give me a budget, I'll --

DR. BRADY: No, but I mean if you
really have these -- Chris has some
particular intellectual things and you have
a model in mind I think. So, what's your
time frame to estimate your model?

DR. ACHEN: Well, I don't think
this is my model. One of the things I spent
a fair amount of time on in my memo which
you all saw was the necessity of this to be
appealing to people from different,
different theoretical perspectives.
But, I'm impressed by the PSID
setup which is a big continuously rolling

thing. They rotate people in and out.
They've got fresh cross-samples. Again, I
discussed briefly exactly the issues that
Diana just mentioned again and these have to
do with both attrition and panel
conditioning. Those are critical to doing
that. But again, there is this gigantic
body of experience and evidence with PSID
about how to do that and how you take --
DR. BRADY: So, that's years.
DR. ACHEN: It's years, yes.
DR. BRADY: It's what, 10 or 11 waves or something now? What is it?
DR. ACHEN: I would just let it --
yeah. I don't know exactly how long people should be in. It seems to me you might want different groups of people in for different periods. But, again, in an abstract world with no constraints, I would just start this thing off and let it run. People would rotate in and out on a continuing basis.

There would always be people in there who

had been in for several years and so on.

DR. LEMPERT: Let me -- three unrelated points, quickly though. One, just on this last thing. In thinking about it, you know, you're all thinking about is as political scientists. Step back more broadly, think about this, for example, from the perspective, for example, of aging researchers.

There you might want a lifetime panel to see how age itself is an independent variable. There is this sort of legend that people grow "more conservative" as they age. Do they or is it just changing life circumstances? One could carry this through to death really and maybe get some support from NIA in doing it.

SPEAKER: You could probably go beyond.

DR. BRADY: The socialization study has gotten support from NIA over the years.

DR. LEMPERT: Yeah. In any case I think that one might want -- in terms of interdisciplinary without necessarily -- one might want to think of the interests of new disciplines that would be asking different questions of similar data.

Second very quick point is, it just came across, I guess our e-mail about a week ago some people in South Carolina who have probably gotten a large private grant to put on a CD all of the media in the last South Carolina election and they are trying
to parlay this into kind of a national media center so maybe what you want is being done.

But the core point I want to raise, I was stimulated by your comments, Diana and what someone else who also used the word, network, said, was well, you know, we can't do that because it's so complex. My question is, suppose it is networks? I mean, we're trying to understand elections. There is an awful lot going on in the social sciences that says that network relations are crucial to understanding how information is disseminated, how it gets interpreted. If that is a large part of what is going on, should we be investing in NES if it's not looking at networks? I don't know if it is.

So, the challenge that I see is not to -- like the ---- at a light say, okay, we're going to look here, where we know there's nothing. It's first of all to determine what is going on and if something is going on in networks, it may mean we have to invest more money. It may mean that we might as well pull our investment out because we can't afford to look at it. Or, it may mean we need new modules. How do we discover how important networks are, how they might be incorporated, and the like? I don't think we can simply say, let's write that off because we don't have the funding to do it.

DR. MUTZ: Okay. Well, I was going to say, my research says they are important so I would obviously like to see more data like that.

But what is complex about it is that, you know, unless you're going to rely on self-reports of the main respondents of their network members preferences and et cetera, et cetera, you've got to interview not only the main respondents but you've got to interview the network members, and so on and so forth. There is a huge amount of attrition there and it's a big job. I mean, it would a huge amount devoted to that particular topic which would be fine with me.
But, what's going on for the most part is because those type of data are fairly few and far between, instead people use context measures to try to simulate social networks. Now, they're not the same thing because obviously we aren't able to get as close to people's networks as we'd like with these types of aggregated data. Yeah, no, it would be great to do if we could, but it would -- and it's one of those areas as I wrote in my memo that is very interdisciplinary right now. People from a wide array of disciplines are studying social networks toward very different ends.

DR. LEMPERT: Let me just sort of push something else which ties into another really nice initiative our Political Science Program has which is the EITM, the Empirical Implications of Theoretical Methods program. One of the -- again as method, network analysis has had some substantial advances in, you know, the past decade or two. One of the ideas behind the EITM is to sort of create a dialogue between modelers and researchers.

Is there a possibility of actually getting a lot more if we in fact quite consciously use a kind of EITM model over time so that we have relatively focused theoretical implications that we're looking for and then we expand the data base based on what we're finding? Could something like that be built into the election studies?

DR. MUTZ: I think it would be terrific. Whether it could be actually built into the election study depends on time available and you know --

DR. LEMPERT: Money and everything else.

DR. MUTZ: Yeah.

DR. LEMPERT: I'd love to be in a situation if you're committed, you could say, unlimited resources.

DR. CLARKE: I mean, to some extent good research always does that. If we're paying -- like we try to pay close
attention to alternative theoretical frameworks as I said earlier on and like, really close attention. In particular, some of the work Chris has done with regard to learning models and updated and what are the implications of this or classic social, you know, psychological kinds of discussions and what have you. So, I think that goes on. I think good research will be theoretically directed and, you know, I think that's always been the case. So you know, it will continue to be. You know things that get people excited on NSF panels are precisely the kinds of studies that do what you're suggesting. So, you know, I think that's going to happen. I think we can feel pretty optimistic about that. I mean, the EITM program is really neat because it put this right out and gets everybody like -- usually the younger generation in particular are going to have skills, a combination of skills that older people haven't. I think things will get much better in this regard. But, I think already they're pretty good. I mean the stuff that

I've ever seen, the NSF proposals that I've supported and so forth and that people get excited about on one of these panels are precisely these kinds of proposals.

DR. LEMPERT: Let me -- I don't want to hog it but let me ask one more question that has been floating around in my mind, partly stimulated by a lunch talk we had yesterday by someone and I wish Chris had been there. Because his whole schtick was, forget theory. Historically, no matter where we look we never resolve our theoretical disputes and in fact the best way to a good theory is a good method or a good study. From that perspective I am curious what are the questions, not that we want to answer from the study. Are there no new questions out there? I don't mean questions about deciding between theories. I mean questions about how voters are acting, the
good old let's just collect data we haven't had.

To what extent are the questions questions of we really know what's going on out there but we just have to go a little bit further to see whether this is being motivated by cognitive dissonance, or being motivated by conformity, or what have you?

Or, are there some real new questions that we want to know about the electorate, about voting patterns? I mean it seems to me the area of turnout, I'm not sure it's a theoretical, that we're at the stage, although there are obviously theories about allegiance and legitimacy and all of that. There may be lots of things we still don't know about turnout.

So, from that perspective, rather than being -- if innovation is -- and of course it's not either or by any means, I don't mean to suggest that. But, if innovations were motivated not by the search for resolving theoretical conflict but by information that would be tremendously valuable and interesting --

DR. BRADY: Well, I think emotions and cognition in voting. Diana talked about that in her memo. It's a very important topic. I think, you know, the NES here actually deserves a lot of credit because I think early on, mostly through Don's work there are some questions there.

Now there are some real problems with those questions because of endogeneity and we're never sure what's causing what. But at least they are there and they have been a way to at least identify that yeah, those things do correlate with vote choice big time.

Now the question is, well, what's driving what? What comes first the emotions, the trait sort of feelings, or the cognition? So on and so forth. That's I think a really important question in terms of understanding politics. It may be that
emotions are a lot of what drives politics
and therefore we better understand those
better.

DR. CLARKE: ---- it's a natural.
It's appeared in the ANES. We have tried to
do it in the British study. We've been
doing these monthly surveys and so forth.
They are not just the best vehicles for some
of these things as you mentioned Henry, but
I still think that's an area, that's an
exciting area for the future.

DR. BLAIS: But it also seems to
me that there are some questions that ask
basically political questions that don't
have clear the theoretical connection which
any election study has to address. For
instance for the next American Election
Study, I hope that there will be some
assessment of the impact of the war,
assuming the U.S. goes to war, on the
election.
I mean, I don't know exactly what
the theoretical framework will be but
that's, you know, a very basic question.
I'm sure that in Canada, the meaning of the
election, so to speak, the basic impact of
issues, you know, how health played in the
election, has to be addressed. You know,
it's very basic. It's not clear exactly
which theoretical framework but the impact
of issues on the election has to be part of
the election study.

DR. MUTZ: To formulate this in
very general questions, we don't know the
answer to why the person who wins the
election wins. Is it just something he said
he said during the campaign? Is it because
of economic conditions in the country at
large and it has nothing to do with what the
candidate said or didn't say?
I mean all those kind of very
large questions are there. Then the ones
beyond that that we've been especially
hampered, I think in understanding because
we don't follow people much after elections
and between elections.
The question of how the public perceives election outcomes, why do they think a given candidate wins or loses? Of course usually they say it's because of the media or a person had, you know, better campaign consultants or whatever. That obviously, that answer is a more cynical one and suggests that the legitimacy isn't interpreted in the way that ideally we might want.

But I think those kind of questions that occur, especially after the last Presidential election long after people have cast their vote are things that could be incorporated into it. Because the function of elections is not just to elect a given individual in a given year but rather to legitimate the system on an ongoing basis. We've got to do better than trust measures for getting at that.

DR. ACHEN: I think you can imagine a situation in which we as a profession might be able to come in with a fairly glittery and pretty much agreed on set of proposals. Too many no doubt to do all at once, but a set of things we are all interested in doing. These endogeneity questions Henry just referred to that come up with the role of emotion in political choice for example would get some help if we could see people over time. That's true in a lot of other frameworks as well.

So, if there were a sense that from a variety of theoretical perspectives there were angles at looking at a different kind of data so we could come in with a list of substantively and theoretically consequential topics that we could answer if we had rather more money than we have now, it seems to me then we might have done part of our job which is give sex and violence to this proposal.

Then as you say, Rick, when the data actually appear people will say, boy, these sure were a dumb set of reasons they gave for building this data set. I've got something much more interesting I can do
with this that nobody had thought of and off
it will go in the usual sorts of ways that
we're familiar with.

But, it does seem to me that if we
are going to propose to you and I'm hearing
this around the room, that this is a very
worthwhile enterprise, that has
possibilities for extension to it, it's
going to cost some more money. Part of the
job is going to be for us to supply some
reasons why it might be sensible to give it
to us beyond simply, it will be great to
have more data and we'll figure something
out.

DR. SINNOTT: A comment on the
word, theory. Of course it's interesting to
comment in a way. But, one of the things

again, I brought to work on on the plane,
having done the initial note was Karl
Popper's book on objective knowledge.
Because something clicked in mind when I was
wondering about the status of what I was
attempting to do.

Popper has a wonderful appendix in
the back of his book on objective knowledge
where he distinguishes between the bucket
theory of the mind and the searchlight
theory of the mind. It's obvious which one
he prefers. But in a sense, the bucket
theory is the one that we end up often
working with and that strikes me as being
perhaps particularly the case in regard to
voter turnout.

We have this bucket with a hundred
observations in it but we have no way of
sorting it, or prioritizing it, or
understanding the links between the bits and
different parts of the bucket, or whatever.

The other point that Popper makes

that I think is very relevant is when he
says theory, it's not something enormously
elaborate. Theory starts, theory can start
at a very low level because it is simply the
set of assumptions and unresolved questions
in relation to something like turnout that
you have and you inch that forward and
that's what guides the next step in your
Because I think sometimes when we say, research must be theory driven it's in a sense a bit dismaying because you say, oh my god, I've got to have a good theory. But, in fact, you know we have our theories to start with. It's a question of then gradually reworking them, defining them, testing them.

DR. CLARKE: At the same time, though, I think it's fair, like we are sort of the choir here. I do think it's fair for our colleagues within political science and elsewhere to say, okay, what you learned? What really have you learned?

To ask like in the British case that study has been going for four decades. Here we've been going for five. Canada is almost four. I think it's a very fair question. So I, you know, I think we really do want to be able to come up with some good answers to that. They don't have to be the same answers but they've got to be really good sound scientific answers.

If we can't do that, then I think the enterprise is going to run into considerable difficulty and so I don't think we want to lose track of that. I think that's really, really important.

DR. SCIOLI: Chris, what would you say to that? What do you tell your undergraduates? In your paper you started to say then you came off the same kind of approach that Diana did, that we don't know why we vote for this person. I mean is it now?

DR. BRADY: Don't ask Chris this question. He's the wrong person to ask. He's such a pessimist.

(Laughter)

DR. ACHEN: Henry has known me too long obviously. No, we've learned a lot. But, I think it's fair to say that there is a good deal left to do and our conceptual frameworks now I think it would be widely agreed, are not strong enough to fill in
historically important elections. Abraham Lincoln, FDR, Huey Long, Adolph Hitler. They are not strong to fill those in in a way that reasonable middle of the road people could say, yes, given what we know, given the data we have, it's almost surely the case that thus and such happened. We don't have that. That presumably -- presumably that's not just around the corner but I think we ought not to lose track that that is our goal and we ought to be able to talk to that point and how we intend to make progress toward it if we're going to ask the Foundation, as I hope we will, for considerably more money.

DR. BRADBURN: Let me just follow up on -- well both of these arguments and particularly Harold's. I think one of the things which is important in -- both externally and internally -- in being able to make the case for more resources is being able to look cumulatively in the sense that we've learned some things and being able to enumerate at least enough of those to be convincing. But, there are all these things that we don't know and what it is we don't know.

Secondly, where -- what is the relationship between what we're going to do now and answering those questions? Is what we're going to do next going to move us towards answering the remaining -- and you know, I think everybody in all the sciences knows that it's a dynamic. In the process of solving one set of things you open up a whole set of new questions which you couldn't have even imagined before you got through those. Then you find that the matter -- 90 percent of the matter is missing or whatever. But, it took them a long time to get to the point that they even realized that it was missing, you know, what it was that was missing, sort of things like that. We're nowhere near that kind of precision. But it does have to have some sense of building rather than each time it's like
we're starting over again, as if we did.

I think in a way it's analogous to

Popper's point about theory in a way. I

mean, every study's design has some at least

implicit theory even if it's not explicit.

I think we've been pushing more towards -- I

mean, not just NSF but I think progress in

social sciences has been pushing more to

making those more explicit and saying more

what this study is going to add to either

resolving some issues, or elaborating the

theory, or building on it, whichever it is.

I think that's I would think a

sense of what people feel is missing in a

lot of social science research in some kind

of ways.

DR. SCIOLI: I'm in the enviable

position. I remember when I used to call up

Warren Miller and say, Warren, and this is a

term that remains in our lexicon, nuggets.

Nuggets, I need some nuggets, I need some

nuggets. Particularly when I took this to

the ANES, to the National Science Board

twice, and explaining to a group of

physicists, and chemists, biologists,

engineers, what is this about?

Predecessors to Don and Nancy but

certainly they have also given me stacks of

nuggets and they're being very modest.

You know, I mean we're talking as

if we've learned nothing about American

electoral behavior and if you guys don't

bale me out, this will be part of the

written record. Yeah, we don't know a darn

thing about why people vote.

DR. KINDER: I remember --

DR. SCIOLI: It's been a lot of

fun.

DR. KINDER: I remember. I was

Warren's writer when you called.

DR. SCIOLI: You used to send

me 25 nuggets.

DR. KINDER: I have lots of

nuggets. Yes, and I -- I have great respect

for my colleague across the table here but

we really think pretty differently I think

about how far we've come. Not about -- I
think we're agreed about the absence of
crowning theoretical achievement. But, we
seem to differ about the power of what I've
said are systematic empirical
generalizations that I think that we have
been producing that are theoretically
informed but don't emerge in a strict
objective way out of a set of theoretical
premises.
There's nothing like that around,
I think, for the most part in political
science. I'm not sure we'll have it soon.
There is a kind of impatience I see in
Chris. He's waiting impatiently for Newton
and he hasn't arrived yet. I think -- isn't
this true that you're about 30 days older
than I am and this accounts for why he's so
cranky and I'm so sunny?
(Laughter)
DR. KINDER: I've been thinking
here and I want to do some more of this,
that the test you put on the table is a very
interesting one which is, so, you know, put
up or shut up. What are your conjectures
about who voted for Hitler? I really like
that as a question.
It's not as if I have formulated
an answer to that. But, I can't believe
that you don't think that we have sensible
things to say about that now based on what
we've been doing, all of us together in the
community, over the last 30 years. That
we're smarter now in our conjectures than we
would have been, you know, before the four
horsemen sat down to write The American
Voter.
DR. ACHEN: Yeah, just I don't
want to leave the impression that I don't
think that. As I said earlier, I teach
history of political science, so I read what
people thought about voting behavior in
the 1930s and they really were in the dark
almost entirely. So, I don't want to leave
the impression here that I don't think there
has been any progress. That doesn't
represent my views.
DR. BRADY: Well, just to take one
example, I remember when we were talking
about -- was it 1984? We were trying to get
viability questions on I think the
continuous monitoring project. Warren
Miller said, well are we sure that people
really estimate people's viabilities in
terms of primaries and try to estimate who
is ahead and therefore vote for those
people?
We had done, Jay Merrill Shanks
and I had done some experiments,
convinced them to put it on. Now I think
it's fairly well agreed that yes, that's an
important aspect. Strategic thinking is
part of what goes on in primaries. Hardly
anybody doubts that anymore.
So that's just one example. Party
identification. You wouldn't start thinking
about voting without thinking of party
identification. We know the mass electorate
doesn't know that much about politics. We
know that emotions matter. We know that
traits matter. We could go on and on.

There's just a lot of things we now know
that we would have to consider and think
were important.
Now exactly how traits matter, and
emotions matter, and issues matter, I can't
quite write it all down and so forth. There
is a lot of endogeneity there but I know
they all matter.

DR. MUTZ: Yeah, I concur with
both Henry and Don in that I think we've
learned a tremendous amount from the NES
studies and I think empirically careful
generalizations is a good way to sort of
summarize it. They are theoretically
important for the most part.

But, I think the argument I would
make in moving this forward and saying, you
know, here's what we've done so far but we
can't do more unless we have some more tools
is that the biggest weakness I see in
studies that I receive as an editor of
Political Behavior, a small journal, is
causality.

You know because we use so much cross-sectional data we really don't have a good handle on what causes what. We can tell you what's related to what very reliably. But causality is just a big problem discipline-wide I think. So to the extent that we justify the need for these new tools by virtue of saying, these tools, whether it be, you know, a rolling cross-section design, or a panel, or whatever, are going to allow us to get beyond the empirical generalizations that we know and actually know what causes what. I think that's a big and very convincing argument.

DR. SCIOLI: Is it better in psychology because of experimentation?

DR. MUTZ: Oh, yeah, with experiments.

MR. TOURANGEAU: All the theoretical questions in psychology have been resolved.

(Laughter)

DR. BRADY: Thank you, Roger.

DR. CLARKE: That's right.

DR. MUTZ: They're resolved for purposes of sophomores. Yes, thank you.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Terrific theories of college sophomores. Another point I was going to raise, inspired in part by Chris's, you know, talking about Lincoln's election and Hitler's election, one of the great purposes of a survey like this is purely descriptive.

People a hundred years from now won't be in the same boat when they're trying to explain, how the hell did Reagan ever get elected? I mean, they'll be in a radically different situation. I mean, the GSS from my point of view is an even less theoretical survey, and yet, it has a unique position in sort of American social history because you have a good indicator of what people were thinking, a cross-section of the American people were
thinking for a given series of years.

This is a great resource and it's going to be grist for somebody's theoretical mill down the road. So I sort of -- it's unusual for me to be in this position of sort of, you know, singing the praises of descriptive information. I think people who know me will testify that I don't often do this.

But, I do think that this is a remarkable resource from that perspective that historians will be in a radically different position in understanding the American electorate a hundred years from now because of the existence of this resource. Similarly sociologists a hundred years from now will have a much profounder understanding of American society because of the existence of the General Social Survey. Those virtues are not to be underestimated I don't think.

---

DR. SCIOLI: Yeah, but Roger, then how should I answer the question if we're buying descriptive information, why not go to Roper or Gallup and they'll give me at a much less costly expenditure -- I mean, what's the difference between Roper, Gallup, and ANES, or anything in GSS?

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, I think, you know, I'll talk a little bit about some of the criteria for evaluating the quality of surveys. But I think on any front in terms of the amount of content, the quality of the data, you know, these are inferior instruments in many ways.

DR. BRADY: It's not just that though, Roger. In this article that I did for this unfinished election book, I did a very simple thing. I have religious attendance by income, okay? Then I take for various groups where they locate themselves on there and whether they're part of the Democratic or Republican coalition.

You can't do that simple diagram which turns out to be very powerful for explaining something about the American political parties. For example, Christian
fundamentalists are low in income but high on religious attendance and they are Republicans. Right? Union members are high on income but low on religious attendance. Then there are some other things probably going on there too. But, I mean, just simple stuff like that you cannot do with standard surveys. You can with the ANES. Then you've got all this other stuff like feeling thermometers, how they feel about different groups. So, for example that the union members don't like the managers and don't like capitalists. I can't remember the exact question you can use, but there is one, a feeling thermometer about rich people or something like that.

You say, oh, I begin to understand why those folks are still part of the Democratic coalition. So, it's simple stuff like that. There's no big theory there. But boy, it tells you I think something about American politics to know the facts that I just recited.

DR. SCIOLI: But, that's the importance of the continuity argument.
DR. BRADY: Yeah, absolutely.
DR. SCIOLI: That's what you don't get typically from -- there a few things that Gallup actually -- there are some religious questions that they have time series on but on the whole they don't. None of the commercial polls because of their -- unless they're run by somebody that has a particular interest like Gallup does in religion. But otherwise you don't get that kind of continuity.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Or it's the depth of inquiry. Don't get me wrong. Gallup is one of my two or three favorite former employers.

DR. HANSEN: But, it's also a matter of the ANES and the general social survey being run by people who are interested in knowing what the relationship is between one thing and another which has
DR. CLARKE: I think always when
you write like election study proposals we
always make the argument for the historical
record. We've got boilerplate on that. We
go and we know we can just pick it up in
paragraph.

But I really don't think in terms
of building the future in a competitive --
in an intellectually and financially
competitive environment like the NSF is that
we can let it rest there.

I think everything we've said,

yeah, it's really good to have this stuff
and it will be really good for future
generations and so forth. But I don't think
we can lose sight of the larger theoretical
enterprise and -- you know, I was thinking,
we go back, some of us go back to maybe
reading about the funnel of causality.

Some of these things, like if you
take the American voter, and take it
seriously you can see this thing really in
terms of providing what seems to be a really
interesting and convincing explanation of
individual level voting behavior, I'm going
to read it and say, this is really exciting.
This stuff is good. Then when I learned how
to run these things on a computer, I said,
gosh, I could really explain a lot of
variance. This looks really good.

So I mean, it's work like that
though that I think has energized a lot of
us to be in this field and that it will be
the best in the future, our best arguments

for perpetuating and enhancing this kind of
inquiry.

DR. LEMPERT: Let me, if I may,
make an observation about this issue of what
do we know and maybe some of the stuff you
were saying.

One of the things that I think is
most interesting about this whole area and
one of the strongest cases for kind of, you
know, continuation is that things are
temporally embedded. So, it may be that one
can say we know from classic research about
certain issues of party identification but
if we acted on that basis today we might be
dead wrong.

We have to continue to renew what
we know or get a higher level of theory so
that we can explain transitions -- that's
another dimension. You asked about the
Gallup thing or other things which I think
is a constant challenge, it's to build on,
in a sense what we know, while realizing it

may not be the way it is today, and kind of
checking.

That's another argument for the
core -- it's the continual checking of what
we think we know. Hopefully over time we'll
learn what it is that transforms patterns of
behavior. Another -- perhaps that's an
argument for panels as well, at least as a
complement to repeated cross-sections.

DR. CLARKE: Oh, I think indeed --
just to follow-up on this point I mean -- A
lot of The American Voter was exciting, and
theoretical, and it's innovations. I think
in a lot of ways it was dead wrong. But
nevertheless it's the kind of thing we
should do and it's only by doing it again
that you're able to, like, do what you say.

I worry though a lot that like the
level of temporal aggregation is really not
right in terms of answering a lot of the
things like dynamics. Because a lot of the
stuff that Chris writes about in terms of

Bayesian models and so forth, it just seems
to me just on its face that it's highly
implausible that I'm going to catch this
right with a study done every 2 or 4 years.

If I get it wrong I may have
buried my inferences maybe really.

I think we can -- this is not hard
to show with some simulations and so forth.

I've done some of this stuff with my
students. You reach really different kinds
of conclusions if you are aggregating this
way as opposed to having a much more finely
grained kind of thing, which I think suits
our intuitions about information flow and
processing and so on.
So, I mean it's one thing to do panels. But if you're going to do panels then you've got to really start thinking about when to do them, how to do them, and you could imagine different kinds of designs. You can say, okay, well I've only got like 5 variables or 10 whatever, but these are things that I think really matter. So I do this study like very month or whatever, whatever I think is reasonable. I'm going to learn a lot more than doing a traditional study every 4 years.

One way around this, I mean this whole constraint, this sort of optimization, you know, this constraint that we're doing may well be to make successful our arguments to funding agencies like the NSF to broaden our, like, frame of what we're doing in terms of political decision making, if there were a broader sort of frame.
I think if we could ever do that that we'd solve a lot of these sort of conundrums. We sort of think oh, it's got to be this or it's not this. But, fundamentally it would be nice if we could really broaden out and do more. I mean that's just apple pie but I mean, it's really true.
You can't -- you just can't say,

okay we got to maintain the regular ANES every 4 years. We got to do it exactly the same way we did it when Warren Miller started back at Michigan in the 50s and then expect to do all these other sorts of things that are flowing out of theoretical work that's been coming online. I just can't see how we can do this.

DR. SCIOLI: I raised the Gallup Roper thing I hope you realize tongue in cheek. Because at a National Science Board hearing in a room like this on 1800 G Street I was asked, first why not have an 800 line and call people -- by a National Science Board member. How much would that be? You know at the time maybe it was $3,000 a month or a year to use an 800 number. What does
the ANES do beyond that?

Then I was asked about the New York Times, which is of course the font of all knowledge for politics. Why be curious about why people voted for Hitler when you could look at the archives of the New York Times, and you can see what he was saying, and you know, it was very appealing, and so on and so forth? Why would you have to ask people, if it were in the Times, people read it and they --

DR. CLARKE: What did you say?

(Laughter)

DR. SCIOLI: Well, as I said earlier, and as I said then, I had a really rich body of generalizations theoretically driven provided by Warren and Merle and subsequently Gina and Don and Nancy and others that gave considerable hope for the progress that has been made in unraveling some of the conundrums, but always pushing forward. That was Norman's point as was Rick's point also. Where do we go next?

So, it's not like we're starting de novo. Oh, isn't it interesting people vote. Who cares? You know. Remember one of my questions was, who cares and who cares?

DR. BRADBURN: Now it's, who used to vote?

DR. ACHEN: Who used to care.

It's not how we decide elections anyway.

DR. SCIOLI: Yeah and I've heard Harold elsewhere extol how much we've learned from studying electoral behavior in the United States and I don't, I don't want the record to not show that.

DR. CLARKE: Oh, no. I think that's a part of the case, we have to be sort of -- in terms of really sort of making the case, it has to go both sides. We have really made contributions, really know a lot more than if this enterprise had not gone forward but at the same time we have an agenda which flows out of this that's worth pursuing.

DR. SCIOLI: Norman and Rick in
particular are constantly pushed to answer
the kind of questions that they raised

about, what are the exciting questions that
we can ask now? What are the building
blocks on which those questions have
emerged? What are the methodologies that
will get us there faster?

Typically they have to explain
that to people in this building, as a matter
of fact at the other end of the building,
the north side, who are not social
scientists or not behavioral scientists and
then have to go up on the Hill and have to
make the argument. You know what is going
on in social and behavioral sciences that
makes it interesting and exciting? We in
the core disciplines want to argue that each
of the disciplines has something to say
about the priority areas, has something to
say about the bigger questions.

Time for a coffee break. We have
plenty of coffee now.

(RECESS)

THE FUTURE OF INFORMATION COLLECTION

DR. SCIOLI: Now Roger, we don't
have enough topics under your heading. We
want you to put in Internet Voting. We want
you to put in Knowledge Network Alternative.
We want you to put in --

SPEAKER: This is the abridged
version.

DR. SCIOLI: Please don't feel
that you're limited to the nine topics
before you. Because now we're getting into
the exciting stuff since we've dealt with
all the theoretical things.

MR. TOURANGEAU: I'll try to keep
my remarks to under 40 minutes. One thing I
want to do -- I want to make three basic
points. But one thing I wanted to do is
that in rereading what I wrote it seemed
like I was a staunch defender of telephone
surveys. I want to say for the record that
I think that face-to-face surveys dominate
telephone surveys except on the dimension of
cost. I think they're superior in terms of
coverage. I think they're superior in terms of data quality. I think they're superior in terms of non-response.

In fact, I think one of the great achievements of Web surveys is that they've created a mode that telephone surveys can be better than. You know, and that's a remarkable achievement. I meant to say, Bill don't listen for next 30 seconds.

There are three points I wanted to talk about. The first point is -- well, let me lay them out. One is how much more difficult it's been to do good surveys, the combination of rising response -- or rising cost and falling response rates. That's my first point.

My second one I wanted to talk about is that there are new forms of self-administration that I think have been overlooked in the design of all the infrastructure studies and I wanted to just put in a plug for those.

Then the third point I wanted to talk about was panel designs and some of the possibilities for NES to think about. So, those are my three big headings.

The first heading I wanted to talk about will come as no surprise to anyone who has tried to do surveys lately. It is that the characteristic move of a survey contractor now is to overrun his budget. That reflects not increasing incompetence on the part of the survey guys but just a more difficult environment that's out there.

In particular I think there are a couple of things going on. One is, I think that the increasing participation by women in the labor force has meant that the labor pool available to survey has gotten worse over the years. It used to be you could get highly motivated, very intelligent, overqualified women to do surveys. You can't do that anymore and so that's one element that has created this cost crisis.

The other element that I think contributed is the onslaught of telemarketing in its various forms and the
deliberate erection of barriers to access by
larger and larger segments of the
population.

So, if you do face-to-face
surveys, you encounter doorman buildings,
gated communities, and other barriers at a
much higher rate than you would have 10
or 20 years ago. The situation with respect
to telephone surveys is even worse. There
are many more ways you can filter out
telephone calls than there were 20, 25 years
ago. As a result it's just much, much more
difficult to make contact.

In the case of telephone the
situation is even worse than that because
coverage is actually, I think declining.
Nowadays you have a second phenomenon which
is, in addition to people who don't have
telephones at all, in this country there is

now a rising proportion of people who only
have cellular telephones. Though in
principle you could get them in a telephone
survey, in practice it's extremely
difficult. I don't think anybody has
figured out a good way to include cell
telephone owners in telephone surveys.

The response of the industry I'd
say to this problem, this joint problem of
rising costs, falling response rates has
been, I think, three-fold. One is, that you
seen -- some surveys moved to cheaper modes
of data collection to cope with the cost
side of the problem. So that would mean
switching from face-to-face to telephone or
from telephone to mail or trying to work
some mixed modes, or from mail to Internet
to reduce cost.

The trouble is that I think there
is a falloff in quality as you go down that
hierarchy of different modes.

The second response of the survey

industry to this rising cost, falling
response rate problem has been a much wider
use of incentives. OMB used to be the
biggest obstacle to the use of incentives
but even OMB is now approving federal
surveys to use larger and larger incentives.
My household happened to fall into the National Survey on Family Growth sample and my children are still fighting about who is going to get the $40.

The third thing that's happened within the industry is that people have begun to look at what are the actual bias consequences of increasing non-response rates. There have been three sort of well-publicized papers that have looked at what happens to non-response bias as a function of non-response rates. There the disappointing finding is that more non-response -- higher rates of non-response don't necessarily portend higher non-response biases. So you'll see

comparisons between surveys that get, for example, a 60 percent response rate and a 38 percent rate and otherwise are quite similar. This is the Pew study. None of the estimates differ despite the fact that there is a 22 percent difference in response rates.

So, that's sort of encouraging. Okay, so the response rates are crappy. It doesn't matter. You know. But, I think almost nobody believes that it really doesn't matter across the board.

Okay. So, that's my little bit about rising costs and falling response rates which is an industry-wide problem. It faces every survey contractor in the United States. It's a world-wide problem. It's very robust across, you know survey organization, mode, countries, and so on.

Okay, my second point I wanted to mention is that in part in response to this cost crisis people are trying to diminish the role of the interviewer in survey data collection. As it happens, there is now a wide range of evidence that suggests that eliminating the interviewer is a good idea. Not just on cost grounds but in terms of -- I mean, we don't have to kill them. Some of my best spouses are former interviewers, I don't want to go too far in that direction.

(Laughter)
MR. TOURANGEAU: But, if you look at comparisons between, for example, conventional telephone surveys this new technology -- it's known variously as TBE or IDR or telephone audio CASI where the computer reads the questions to the respondent over the telephone. It does look like there is an increment in the reporting of sensitive information when the questions are administered by a computer rather than by a person.

This exactly parallels a series of studies in face-to-face surveys where the comparison is between what audio-CASI where the respondent interacts directly with the computer and questions are read to the respondent over the headset. It's for the illiterate. Right?

There's a number of studies including one that Tom Smith and I did that suggest there's a big gain in reporting accuracy.

So, insofar as there are sensitive questions it the election study, like whether or not you voted, it seems like some form of self-administration might be a good thing to look at.

One of the advantages of mail over other modes of data collection is that it eliminates the interviewer. So there is cost gains but also some reporting gains.

In fact some studies, in the olden days the big drug studies, it was then known as the National Household Survey of Drug Abuse, now it's gotten so big it's the NHDUH. I'm not sure what that stand for, the NHDUH. Interesting acronym. But, drug abuse and health I think is the DUH. They used to have a method where they would do a face-to-face interview and then the interviewer would read the questions and the respondents would indicate their answers on an answer sheet. So, it was a blend of self-administration.

The National Survey of Family Growth is a mixed survey where part of it is interviewer administered and part of it is
audio CASI. Another strategy is to leave a
self-administered questionnaire behind, the
tactic the GSS has used.
So anyway, in part to reduce cost
and in part to improve data quality, several
new forms of self-administration have been
invented. The Web promises to bring some of
these gains. The trouble is, at least the
definitive studies haven't been done yet I
don't think, but it's not clear that people
don't trust the Web to be a confidential mode of
data collection.
I mean the big advantage of these
modes of self-administration is you don't
have to tell a woman who looks suspiciously
like your Aunt Hazel that you've used, say,
cocaine in the last 2 months. Right? But
there does seem to be some nervousness about
the Web and it isn't clear that it's going
to be a particularly suitable form of data
collection for collecting sensitive
information.
So, those are my first two points,
driving costs and falling response rates,
new forms of self-administration. The last
point I wanted to talk about real briefly is
panel designs. I wanted to talk a little
bit about both panel designs and mixed mode
designs.
In many panel studies, the data
collection starts out expensive and then
gets progressively cheaper. So once you've
socialized the respondent in a face-to-face
interview you can switch in subsequent
rounds to telephone interviews and then in
later rounds, perhaps, if the panel is well
centralized, you can switch to mail.
Usually in a single survey -- in
many surveys in order to boost response
rates, respondents are given a variety of
methods of responding. Sometimes they're
given those methods simultaneously. I worked
on a survey once where there was mail
questionnaire sent to faculty members. The
population was university professors. They
were told, oh, and you can also respond by
calling this 800 number, or you can go to
the Web.

But you'll see in a lot of
designs, you might send a mail questionnaire
to somebody. If you didn't get a sufficient
response rate there would be telephone
follow-up. If you still didn't get a
sufficient response rate, there might be

face-to-face follow-up.
So, that's the opposite strategy
from what you do in a panel survey. Right?
Where you start expensive and go cheap. In
a cross-sectional survey you might start
cheap and go expensive.
So, one of the things that a panel
design might enable you to do is to reduce
data collection costs by using a variety of
mixed modes. That was where I was headed
with all that discussion.
The other thing is that in the
papers but not so much in the discussion,
today there are intermediate designs between
classic panel designs and classic
cross-sectional, repeated cross-sectional
designs. The Current Population Survey uses
a clever rotation scheme that might be
suitable for election studies. You're in --
a household is in for 4 consecutive months.
It gets to retire briefly for 8 months and
then it's back in for 4 months. So, they're

involved for a period of more than like a
year and a half. But they do get some
relief time.
In that survey I believe the first
and the fifth round, the fifth round is when
you come back from your vacation, your
furlough, they do face-to-face but in the
other rounds they try to do telephone data
collection. They -- I don't know that there
is a mode effect in any of the key variables
live with it if there is.
It's known that there is a
rotation group bias in that survey. So,
some people -- I think Diana mentioned, I
think you called it sensitization effects or
conditioning effects. There's many terms
for this. Time in sample effects -- some
survey people use that term. 

But it's known that there's a rotation group bias. It appears to be a time in sample effect. So, that's something to worry about with these rotation group designs.

I think the biasing effects are probably less in a rotation design than in a design where you think you're in for the duration. You know, I think the NLS people do they ever have any hopes? Do you have to die to get out of that sample?

SPEAKER: Yeah, you die to get out. 

(Laughter)

DR. SCIOLI: Then it's final.

They still try to convert you I bet.

SPEAKER: ---- next of kin every now and then.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Pertinent to that --

DR. SCIOLI: Let me just say on the PSID, your heirs are in it.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Death won't even do it. That's tough. That's tough.

SPEAKER: Take a cell phone with you.

MR. TOURANGEAU: All right. A related point, you can have people in and out and in. You can do the same things with items. I wanted to put in another plug for the design of the General Social Survey where any one respondent gets approximately two-thirds of the substantive items. Then all pairs of items show up an equal amount of time. That way you can look at all the co-variances.

At the same time, through the miracle of modern imputation themes, it's not clear that you're going to lose that much. I mean there are some very, very sophisticated algorithms for filling in missing data. I know the National Assessment of Educational Progress also uses one of these balanced incomplete block designs. They actually --everyone ends up with a full data set. You know, some
A nice feature of that though is -- to put a plug in for one of my colleagues Trevereau Ragunathan does research on this. But a nice added benefit of this is since any percentage -- for any given respondent a certain amount of the data are made up, it gives you -- it confers a certain protection against disclosure risk.

He argues, Ragu argues that this is a good way to release public use data sets, to impute the entire data set basically is his argument. You know, after you get real data. Then you can create a parallel universe as it were, a parallel data set that has all the same statistical properties as the original data set, but it's completely imputed.

DR. BRADBURN: That's cloning, isn't it? That's what we're doing with the research data centers. We're using census data.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, anyway, there are some advantages to these kinds of matrix sampling schemes and these rotation designs where you get some extra leverage because you have the core relational structure between all the items. So, that was it for me. I kept it under 40 minutes as I promised.

DR. SCIOLI: Comments?

DR. BURNS: Could you talk some about the conditioning stuff? I've been ransacking the literature on conditioning and there don't seem to be you know, oodles and oodles of studies but there are studies. Where I can find results, the results suggest so -- things like turnout, things like campaign interest, and the National Survey of American Families, I think, the people enrolled are kids in more extracurricular activities. There's stuff that -- and so, I'm curious about your
perspective on conditioning and then also
your perspective on kind of what are the
smart ways to go to avoid conditioning
through the kind of panel designs that we
talked about in the last session.

Because there are kind of cool and
interesting things that you can imagine
doing, you know, new dependent variables
that show up on the table. A lot of
interesting things but not if the, you know,
data in the end on, you know, people that,
you know, you've created.

MR. TOURANGEAU: It's the opposite
in the literature I'm aware of. It's that
what you see over time -- there's two kinds
of studies that I'm aware of.

One kind of study is a genuine
panel study, what you typically see is less
reporting in later waves. So people learn
that if they are so foolish as to admit that
say, they have a child, that they're likely
to be hit with 240 questions asking details
about the child and so they stop admitting
that they have children. Yes, I may have a
children in a previous wave but somehow they
seem to have disappeared quite tragically.

SPEAKER: Yeah, they all died.

(Laughter)

MR. TOURANGEAU: So, that's one
finding. Over time, you know, people get
savvy about avoiding follow-up questions and
they admit less. The classic study is
Needer and Waksberg on that.

But, then there is also within
diary studies actually at your shop, I think
Adrianna Silverstein has done a number of
these studies, that if you look at people
keeping diaries of how much they have
purchased, for example, on Day 1, they've
purchased six times more than on Day 72 in
the diary. That, again, you just see this
dramatic falloff in reporting.

So, I'm not aware that you get
people sort of reporting more sort of
stealth. Generally, the trend seems to be
in the opposite direction that people report
less and less. It just seems to be, you
know, one of many shortcuts that survey respondents take to get through interviews.

DR. MUTZ: It seems like this is a little different though because you're talking about socially desirable actions.

DR. BRADBURN: Yeah, well -- that is a actually a point I wanted to differ with Roger slightly from something he said about sensitive questions. Because the literature about sensitive questions about -- that are sensitive in the negative sense, that there would be under-reporting differ from those that are sensitive in the opposite direction where you get over-reporting.

So, some of the sort of effects that affect one, don't affect the other. Although that's not terribly worked out, there have been -- but I think you need --

this distinction is more behavior attitude than the other one. That when it's behavioral reporting, I think the data are pretty consistent that over time in a panel that you get less reporting because of these, some sense of fatigue or savvy, and so on.

That can be true even within one long questionnaire if it has lots of filters and after a little experience people realize that if they say they've done something, they're going to get 20 questions about the details of what they've done. There is a little falloff on that sort of thing. It's particularly true in nutrition surveys and things like that.

But I think the attitudinal one is the kind of problem. Then there are intermediate ones in which I guess I would put knowledge ones. I remember one study that I did on evaluating information from a television program. We went to elaborate lengths to balance out and, you know, control for panel effects and so on.

Nothing. I mean it was a total waste of resources because people didn't -- I mean, the dependent variables were how much knowledge you got out of informational programs. They -- you know, it didn't make
any difference how long you had been in it.

So while I think there have been consistent effects on these attitudinal ones, it's not quite clear to me in the example that you gave and so forth whether those are examples of where people are actually changing their behavior or they are just picking up cues about what they think you want them to report because you're asking about it over and over.

You keep asking over and over.

You know, how many -- what are your kids doing and sort of things like that. They say, you know, well, if you keep asking, maybe you don't like my previous answers so

I'll do something better.

I mean, either way it is a phenomena and there isn't -- I mean the only techniques I think we have handling those are trying to estimate the size of the effect by having a rotational panel and then adjusting for them or in some sense or other it just -- if you have a good rotation it just spreads the error out across the whole data set.

DR. BURNS: I was just going to say for something like voting that's consistently over reported, I mean you'd also have something like the cross-section core that you could compare it to. But even though that's a behavior I would think it would still be subject to the kind of sensitization --

DR. BRADBURN: Well, yeah because it's a socially desirable type of thing.

DR. BURNS: Yeah.

MR. TOURANGEAU: You know I was just going to say there is actually a somewhat different design that involves a mixed panel rather than a rotating panel that's used in the Survey of Consumer Sentiment.

That one is done monthly and at each point in time, there is cross-section plus a subset. You're going back to folks, a small sample of folks that was interviewed 6 months earlier. That's the
only time that they are used. So, every
month there is a panel component from 6
months earlier and a fresh cross-section.
One could imagine if one expects
there to be a lot of this respondent
learning and giving answers to questions, a
design where at each NES you're only going
back to a distinct subset at one point of
time in the past and not carrying them on
further. It might give you some gains in
terms of measuring change over time but
wouldn't instill that learning that you want
to stay away from.

DR. CLARKE: Yeah, there is a
tradeoff in that if I could jump on that
because -- in terms of the number of
statistical techniques that we would like to
use to address some of the important
questions.
For example, on the stability of
crash that you really need to have
two things. You need -- unless you want to
assume values for some of the parameters,
you really need for the crucial parameters
you need to have at least four waves.
Secondly, you need to have large
ends. Absent those two conditions, then the
exercise becomes pretty doubtful. So I've
spent a lot of time over the last few years
looking for four wave panels. You can find
them, but often you end up with lost ---- as
well.
So, it's a tradeoff. You get
these conditioning things we're worrying
about on the one side. You say, well, gee
we'll just keep them in once like you're
saying. But on the other hand, in terms of
really using the data to get the leverage on
the dynamics you really need to have, you
know, it appears a minimum of four. Four is
really desirable. Three you might move back
to after you have calibrated some of the
parameters, but you know this gets to be a
really expensive enterprise.

DR. BRADBURN: So, pick your
poison, right?

DR. CLARKE: That's right, yeah.
DR. BRADBURN: I don't know that the effects are terribly large even when you find them, are they?

MR. TOURANGEAU: That's one of the great virtues of rotation groups. You can always see them. I mean you can always look for them. You know, I mean, it's like a built in experimental design so you can always test for that.

DR. ACHEN: What's been the experience of users with these more complex designs like PSID and others and the CPS. Are they manageable for people who aren't specialists in survey design to actually get some mileage out of?

MR. TOURANGEAU: I don't know if a lot of people use the CPS for analytical purposes. It's almost treated in my experience as though it were a repeated cross-section design. People -- except for the basic employment statistics which use a very sophisticated composite estimator that takes advantage of the rotation, except for that, I don't know anybody who uses it except as a cross-sectional design. I can't say about the PSID.

SPEAKER: Well, it's becoming more so with these research data centers where people can get into the micro-data of CPS or CIP or something like that. So you can do things and bring in even some other kinds of data.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Yes.

SPEAKER: But, of course those users are all pretty sophisticated. I think it is a problem. It does require a more sophisticated data user. Now that shouldn't be insuperable in the sense that you can run training programs and so forth.

DR. CLARKE: Well, that's what they did with the British Household Panel Survey, as part of that initiative they actually have developed training programs for users and we run summer schools. The Essex Summer School is just like the Michigan Methods Summer School. They practically always will have BHPS module for
interested users.

DR. ACHEN: I have a colleague who studies African politics and doesn't have much data from a lot of her countries and passed through Cambridge and got some advice and imputed the continent.

(Laughter)

DR. ACHEN: Did some runs and so I was made a little nervous about what's going to happen when ordinary working stiff social scientists have to use these complex designs.

MR. TOURANGEAU: If you did the, you know, the full imputation thing, then it looks like a panel data set. You know, and then you have filled in all the missing data. There are ways to do it so that it actually -- your parameter estimates and the standard errors on the parameter estimates are accurately estimated. I mean, usually you have to do a multiple imputation thing and so you replicate your analysis four times on four different versions of the data set or something.

But, it can be done so that it doesn't -- I mean the software will be there in 5 years I think.

DR. ACHEN: Yeah, I think that's the point that the software will be there to match -- and that computing power and, you know, that's what we'll be teaching our students or our students will be teaching us.

DR. THOMPSON: Although Norman I think you hit on a pretty important point there. I think with the growth in confidentiality concerns and data mining software, I think you're going to see more -- if you want to do any kind of serious analysis you're going to have to go into something like a research data center or get some file that's totally imputed to do the work on. I just think that's coming too.

MR. SANTOS: You know, I was actually going to offer a different perspective of exactly the same thing, that
Chris was talking about.

One view is that now we have this more complicated data set and in order to
take advantage of sort of the longitudinal aspect, it requires special training, et cetera. But, on the other hand, one can look at it from an added value perspective in that folks that normally used it for cross-sectional can still use it that way and then the value added is if you're willing to put in some training effort, you can also use it this other way.

So, there is a net gain at maybe a lower or nominal increase in cost.

DR. BRADBURN: I think the root problem which has obviously plagued discussions with the ANES and so forth -- which may be going away simply because telephones are becoming a less and less attractive mode for doing things. But the mixed mode problem where at least one of the mixes in the mode is totally auditory so that you have the problems of, you know, how do you handle the hundred point scale? Or where are the show cards? Things like that.

So that may be a passing kind of problem because of the response problem. Although, you see if you go to a panel design of some sort then you do want to have that problem. In spite of knowing this and so forth, there is still a tendency for people to -- if they're going to start off face-to-face to take full advantage of what you can do face-to-face and then suffer when they try to follow up on the phone rather than designing it as a phone survey to begin with.

I just -- on the European Social Survey I am on the advisory committee for that and I begged them when they started off to design it so it could be done on the phone because I said, in a few years you're going to want to -- some of the countries are going to be wanting to do it on the phone. They said, no, no, we're going to do it face-to-face and so forth.

So the first wave was done
face-to-face, even though already some of
the countries, Sweden and those wanted to do
it on the phone. Of course Finland you've
got this problem of something like half the
people only have cell phones already. So,
you've got a big problem there.

Now, the second round, I was just
in London a month ago, and, you know, it's
come home to them and in some things --
fortunately, they're only one year into the
thing so whatever they do they will have
only lost one year's continuity, but it was
a terrible sort of mistake I think.

MR. TOURANGEAU: One other point
I'd like to raise is that if -- you know,
the temptation to go to some kind of mixed
mode design, especially with a panel or a
rotation group is going to be quite high.

The latest studies, the latest
mode studies I'm aware of, sort of go in the
face of the classic literature which says
that, well the telephone, face-to-face
difference is not all that great. You know,
the studies that Holbrook et al. did for you
guys and then there was a similar study done
based on the Eurobarometer that also
indicates a difference.

So as we quadruple the budget of
the election studies, we should build in a
lot more mode research -- a little
commercial for me. You know, because I do
think there are some puzzling things going
on and, you know, we need to worry about
them.

DR. CLARKE: Does this have to do
primarily with marginals, or with
covariances, or both?
SPEAKER: Both.
MR. TOURANGEAU: Oh, I think both
in the case of NES studies. The
Eurobarometer studies it was more marginals.
DR. HANSEN: It's probably worth
mentioning that one of the particular
problems for an election study, as in the
United States, with different mode comparisons is how important geography -- sort of knowing where people are located physically, so we know who their elected officials are and so we know what kinds of races they're being exposed to -- is to us.

So that was a particular problem in this last implementation where we couldn't tell in advance, we couldn't have a pre-election study that was on the phone because -- well, in this 2002 election we had to go to a pre/post which we hadn't done in Congressional elections before. It was also that we could gather information about where they actually lived so that we could ask them then very specific questions about things that were geographically related in the second wave.

So, it's a special burden I think of a political survey like this one that it does matter a great deal to be able tell exactly where people are.

DR. CLARKE: That varies cross-nationally too. One of the things that was a pleasant surprise in Britain, with the rolling cross-section, we found out in our first meeting with Gallup that they actually know the constituencies as well. As a result of that, we had to code for all the data and we were able to immediately then merge in Pippa Norris's aggregate file and so we had this sort of basis for multi-level modeling almost immediately. So we had no idea. We thought it was the same as, like, you know in the States or I guess Canada as well. You don't know this? But, it turns out that in some locales you do. Britain was one where they routinely will put that in for you which was very neat.

DR. BRADBURN: You could -- I mean, though the sampling frames of most organizations aren't drawn to represent Congressional Districts, you could do that.

I know John points out in his paper that you could draw them in ways that would use the
Congressional District or whatever you want
as a cluster, as a stage in the draw and
that might give you more power for those
kinds of analyses.

It is a problem if you're doing
the selection over the telephone. That's
obviously a problem although -- well, it's
going to be a worse problem but I think at
the moment telephone exchanges are still
geographically contiguous.

DR. HANSEN: Well although -- then
there are cell phones.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, then cell
phones.

DR. HANSEN: It's the matches
between the exchanges and the Congressional
Districts which are sort of divied up in
weird ways and particularly to the extent
that one wants to use panels to be able to
trace causal processes over some substantial

period of time with mobility. It just may
not work to begin with, the most expensive
mode, personal contact and follow that
through, given that a good proportion of the
population moves in a given year.

So, by the time people are in the
third wave or the fourth wave of the panel,
they could be in an entirely different
place.

DR. BRADBURN: Um-hum.

DR. ACHEN: Plus even if they sit
still, as I have, I'm now in a different
Congressional District than I was in 2 years
ago because they moved the District.

DR. BRADBURN: But that only
happens once every 10 years so you can have
a good run before that.

SPEAKER: Who can blame them?
They heard that you had moved in, you know,
and they redrew that boundary --
MR. SANTOS: Actually it can
happen twice in 3 years depending on when
the decennial is or when they redistrict.

DR. BRADBURN: Oh, that's right,
depending on when that is.

MR. TOURANGEAU: One point I
wasn't clear on and I will throw a question out. It seemed like there is an assumption that it's almost incompatible to do a National Election Study and at the same time do Congressional Districts. But, I was thinking, at least when I was at NORC and we drew the national sample, the counties that comprise the PSUs that made up the NORC national sample had 40 percent of the population in them. I would guess that the SRC national sample is similarly. Would that imply or have you ever looked at what percentage of the Congressional Districts, the 435 Congressional Districts, how many of them are completely within the PSUs that SRC has?

Dr. Burns: See usually people go the other direction. I was thinking about

Laura and Jake's paper and they point out, you know, that if there are 20 competitive races what's the chance of it showing up on the sample? So it's that direction, that's at least one way that the worry gets put.

Dr. Lempert: Does it? I mean you talk about these 20 competitive races, and in terms of looking at winners and losers that's what shifts the balance of power. But, a particular non-competitive race may be 55 percent, you know, Republican one year and 65 percent another. That may mirror or is at least likely to mirror I would suspect the shift in the competitive districts.

So, if we understood what was happening in non-competitive districts to shift proportions we might still get a pretty good understanding of what are shifting proportions that have election ramifications. So, I'm not certain I'm right. But I'm not certain that one should say, oh there are only 20 competitive

districts, let's forget about anything at the district level.

Dr. Hansen: Well although one thing that I worried about after reading Laura's and Jake's paper is that one of the primary findings of the literature on Congressional elections is the power of
incumbency, the sort of dominant power of
incumbency.

That paper made me wonder about
the extent to which that's because we've
only looked at instances where incumbency
was enormously powerful because there wasn't
a serious challenger.

The question really is, how
powerful is incumbency when there is a
really a challenge? So it does get wrapped
up in the question of substantive.

DR. CLARKE: Well, we've got to
question that, if there is a substantive
theoretical question that motivates this.
Right? That's the deal. I think that's why

that, you know, that discussion is so
important because it really ties to the
dominant theory in Congressional elections.

DR. ACHEN: Plus the experience of
being in a competitive race in a district
with a competitive race is so different from
the experience of being in a race that's not
competitive. The ad barrage is different
and the level of information is different
and so forth. So, you really do, I think
need to have some of both.

DR. BRADY: Well, that's even true
for the national election. I mean, we in
California didn't know there was a 2000
election. They weren't focusing on ads.

DR. CLARKE: Well, there wasn't.

We wrote on that.

DR. ACHEN: In Michigan we reached
the point where when the local used car
dealer came on, there was a round of
applause.

DR. SCIOLI: So, face-to-face is

best?

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, I think
that's the consensus of survey researchers.
You know, one point I would make is that
these modes are actually packages of
variables that are potentially separable.
So, the usual package is
face-to-face. You know an area of
probability sample. Right?
Then with a long field period, for
example, that's a common package. But it
doesn't have to be that way. I mean you
could have a list sample or some other kind
of sample and do face-to-face. Or you could
have an area prob sample and knock on
people's doors and get their phone numbers.
I mean, nobody does this. But, I mean, it's
conceivable you could do that if you were
really stupid, and you wanted to waste a lot
of money -- you could do it that way.
(Laughter)

MR. TOURANGEAU: You know, a lot

of the difference between --
DR. ACHEN: The jury will
disregard.
MR. TOURANGEAU: A lot of the
difference it seems to me in the kinds of
response rates you see in political polls as
opposed to what's done in like the NES
reflects the fact that political polls
typically have a 5 day field period or
something. You know it's not necessarily
anything inherent in telephone that
yields -- you know I do think it's very
difficult. The very best telephone surveys,
you know, have a very hard time getting
above 60 percent. As John was claiming the
very best mail surveys have a hard time
going above 55 percent.
You know, I think you could
probably do a little bit better in a mail
survey if you put a $20 incentive in there.
You know, you could break the 55 barrier.
So, a lot of the differences between modes

have to do with the typical package in which
the method of data collection is wrapped up
and isn't necessarily -- like on some of the
reporting differences in the Holbrook et al.
Paper.
You know I bet -- you could make
it go away if you sort of decoupled some
standard features of telephone survey that
aren't an essential part of that, you know,
from the fact of the telephone.
But, in any case, you know, from
the point of view of coverage, from the
point of view of response rates, and from
the point of view of reporting error, I think it's pretty clear that face-to-face is superior on all three of those dimensions. Typically, as they are typically done.

DR. SCIOLI: Has the per unit cost increased over the last -- where do you see that going?

SPEAKER: Up.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Yeah, and as I say, I don't think anybody -- I mean unless somebody has done some analysis I'm unaware of but I don't think anybody has a handle on the economics of surveys. What I hear is that, you know, veteran professionals consistently underestimate the cost of face-to-face and telephone data collection. I mean, you know, at one point when we were having problems, Michigan was having problems with the National Survey of Family Growth, I know Bob Groves made some phone calls and all the big surveys at all the big survey organizations were having overrun problems similar to what we encountered. The cost is just rising in some, you know, hard to predict way for reasons that people don't fully fathom. I think I gave two of the most common explanations, change in the labor force and, you know, the increase in impediments to access.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, I don't know whether it's the same as the impediments to access but I think that one of the biggest causes is the difficulty of locating the respondent and that's partly due to labor effects too.

The only place in some sense you could reduce substantially face-to-face, the cost of face-to-face, is having a better algorithm for figuring out when somebody is going to be at home because so much of the interviewer's time is wasted by going out to the segment and not finding anybody at home. You know people do all sorts of things, try and make appointments, and so on and so forth. But, it's still -- certainly the first time before you make a -- it's
like the first time getting through with the
phone too. It's just, people aren't at home
as much and when they are they're less, you
know, their time at home is more limited and
they don't want to spend it talking to an
interviewer.

DR. CLARKE: The answer though in
part, Frank though, I was going to say,
again, it depends on your research question.
For the kinds of things that motivate the
Canadian study that Andre and Henry have
been doing face-to-face is a non-starter,
even if you have the money.

DR. BLAIS: Yeah, because that's
the point. In Canada, I think, nobody is
really suggesting that we should come back
to our old interviews for two reasons.
First, you know, campaign dynamics
is a top priority and it would be very, very
difficult to do rolling cross-sections with
at home interviews. Also we need large
N's. We are convinced that, you know, the
dynamics are very different in different
regions. So that we could not -- I think it
would be a non-starter to go back to the at
home interviews because of these two
reasons.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, you have a
big advantage in that -- it sounds like
anyway -- that if you have a frame that has
essentially complete coverage then going to
telephone -- but you know, that's a
difference here. It's that there are no
good central lists. Or, I forget which
country was it by mail.

DR. BRADBURN: Australia.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Yeah, Australia.

Yeah, I mean, you know that -- you know,
there's just -- it's a non-starter here
because there's no list. There's just no
list you could use to do a good election
study. In the context of a panel design or a
rotational design, where, you know, at round
one you got the address and you know, and so
on that changes the dynamic.

Likewise I think it becomes a
reasonable option after you've had a
face-to-face survey and you've got your high initial response rate to do a telephone follow-up makes a lot of sense.

DR. SCIOLI: But the per unit costs are making it -- are driving sample size down. So, you know, the scientific integrity of the enterprise, I mean, you know, if we're having Ford Motor Company pay for these things.

DR. BRADBURN: They're less likely to pay much. The only -- I think it's safe to say the only really high quality, high surveys today are financed by public sources, mostly the federal government possibly some foundations that are -- or some combination of the two. Commercial surveys don't -- they're just not willing to put the money into it.

MR. McAllister: It seems to me you were a bit dismissive of Web based polls. Our experience is that if you're running something like a rolling cross-section during an election campaign, a Web based poll is actually a highly cost efficient way of doing it.

What survey researchers always remind me of in this regard is car mechanics. They learn how to service Honda Civics and then a Honda Accord comes through, they do it and they say nobody will buy it. It's finished. The way Web based surveys seem to be regarded today is what I saw with telephone polls maybe 20 years ago.

DR. BRADBURN: The major -- I don't know how it is in Australia but I think for us the major problem is the self-selection bias problem. I mean there are coverage problems but that will go away like telephones. But, the problem, the root problem except for knowledge networks is that there is no sampling frame for online polling. I've talked to -- given a couple of talks to computer experts and so on and I keep telling them that until there is something analogous to a phone number for access to the line there is no way in
principle we are going to be able to sample.

MR. McAllister: Well, you can't
do random sampling but you can do either
active sampling or you can do passive
sampling and then you whip the results you
get to the known demographics of the
population you are interested in.

DR. BRADBURN: What do you mean by
active sampling?

MR. McAllister: You actually go out
and get a sample.

You actually ask people to respond
as the British company UGOV does, they
register. So, you have a sampling frame of
people with known demographics and then you
actually go out there and sample them. The
UGOV company does a regular, actually it's
weekly based sample for one of the British
newspapers.

DR. CLARKE: The Telegraph.

MR. McAllister: Yeah, the Daily Telegraph and I think The Independent does it
as well and it's as reliable any of the other

surveys.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Yeah, Harris
Interactive has done very well in this
country. They have 7 million volunteers who
have signed up and they will do sampling
from that list of 7 million and people are
invited to go to a Web site. They do pretty
well. They don't just give weight to known
demographics but they also do some
calibration to a parallel telephone survey
they do using political attitudes and other
things, in addition. They've done fairly
well here.

SPEAKER: A reminder that the
Literary Digest did very well for years.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Exactly. A lot
of survey researchers are just waiting for
the other shoe to drop.

MR. McAllister: When we ran the
Australian survey my colleagues believed it
would produce a completely screwball result
and they always referred to it as "The E
MR. SANTOS: But, you know, there is a big difference in terms of statistical inferences that are drawn between the two. Because when you do a probability based sampling you're actually invoking known statistical theory. When you use these self-selected types of frames, you're basically putting faith in your weighting and that's a model based approach. Actually one could become a Bayesian and do it that way in which case you really don't need any type of scientific sampling, as long your model is right.

DR. ACHEN: Which would frighten even a Bayesian.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, I don't think anybody has looked at this data but certainly from my experience, there is a real fundamental difference between something that starts off with a probability sample, even with a very low response rate, that's different from something that's self-selected. Even when you do the weighting, and so on and so forth. Of course a lot of times it will be okay.

But, as they say, you know, the Literary Digest was doing okay for 20 -- for about 20 to almost 15 years, and everybody said, isn't this wonderful? You know, they got 7 million or whatever the number of people and they produced very good results.

MR. SANTOS: You know the bias formula that Roger has in his paper for non-response actually holds for non-coverage because in a sense if you're not covered, it's a non-response. So if everybody responds to these, you know, voluntary things then one of the components goes to zero and you have no bias because everybody participated.

But that doesn't happen and so then you're really hoping that the folks that responded are similar to those that
didn't. Now, you can try to correct that weighting but --

MR. TOURANGEAU: The only argument that you could make is that -- you know, electoral polls themselves have a 25 percent response rate or thereabouts. You know, they're embarrassing from the point of view of survey methodology. Yet they almost always are right. The argument you could make is that as with possibly Web surveys that the response propensity mechanism, whatever it is, the people who want to polls are like the people who want to vote.

In fact, I've seen people make arguments that the falloff in turnout is exactly the same phenomenon as the declining response rate. That it's the underlying variable of civic engagement or something and that it manifests itself equally in these two falling rates.

If you buy all that argument, then it suggests that there won't be much bias.

DR. MUTZ: That's only if you're strictly interested in who wins and who loses.

DR. BRADBURN: But if you're interested in -- particularly in electoral studies you're interested in the people who don't participate.

DR. MUTZ: Right, right.

MR. SANTOS: But, this does remind me of the paper I saw somebody deliver once where they claimed that they had the answer to the removal of all biases in research by simply conducting mall interview surveys at the local mall and weighting them to the national sample.

SPEAKER: It just doesn't work.

DR. MUTZ: If I remember too, didn't John Krosnick's comparison of telephone and Harris show that although you could apply their various weights and produce some of their consumer items similar to what a national population sample would do on all the political variables, these were far more extreme people and they didn't match well at all?
DR. CLARKE: Yeah, I mean that's the experience right now, exactly how it appears with the UGOV. We got a free comparison at the time of the 2001 British study. It turns out that one of our principal investigator's sons is one of the principals in UGOV and agreed -- just said, I'll do this for free, Dad. So we did. I mean, why not with the post-election instrument?

They got the vote shares remarkably good but the attitudinal stuff looks like it's really wild. I mean, if you take our traditional face-to-face interviews as some kind of gold standard, you have to start somewhere, these things really look like they're out in left field. So there are some puzzles there in terms of how you get to vote shares but when you get to these other things they look totally strange.

I think Norman's point is fundamental about probability samples. But still this stuff is interesting and deserves careful scrutiny. So, we're right now doing additional surveys comparing telephone surveys in Britain with UGOV's stuff right now, looking at a variety of these political indicators. But, right now the story is, yeah, we can get -- two things, you get the vote share. It's looked really good.

Secondly, in terms of the co-variances interestingly enough for some of the models of the vote, we've got a paper that we gave at the APSA meeting last year that shows there are remarkably few differences in terms of sort of standard, substandard models of the vote.

But, it's still really scary when you look at the distributions on some of the standard political variables. You say, wow, this is just a bunch of young Tories sitting around with their feet up in the cities, you know, answering UGOV surveys. That's the way it really looks until you look at the vote distributions. Then you say, oh, maybe there is something to this.

DR. SCIOLI: Last coffee. They're
taking the pot, sorry.

DR. BURNS: No, no. So, I was wondering. You were asking about -- you were asking Roger a lot about mode. So one of the things that we were kind of stewing over for awhile was could you maintain the time series and switch them out?

We had commissioned a great panel to work on this and then, you know, ran this study in 2000 to work on this and never -- you know, I think the punch line or our kind of conclusion was that the splicing would be so complicated that you wouldn't have faith that you hadn't actually stopped the time series and started another one.

So I wondered if you all have a different impression. That there is some smoother, straightforward way to switch modes and maintain -- you know, be able to still compare, you know, the data back to '52. Because it would be sad if you couldn't I think -- if you couldn't compare the data back to '52.

MR. TOURANGEAU: When the CPS did a switch over in the Current Population Study -- and this is arguably the most important time series in social science, or in the American statistical system, anyway, I'd say. They did a switch over and they went from face-to-face with paper to face-to-face CAPI and they did an experiment and they thought there was going to be a discontinuity of about a half percent jump.

They also changed the questionnaire at the same time. So they were anticipating a half percent jump of the unemployment rate.

They switched over. They had a split ballot. I think there was overlap -- or maybe you know John, for some period of time when they were doing it both ways. I think 18 months, actually they did it both ways. They had parallel studies.

In fact when they implemented this, when they switched over completely to CAPI there wasn't any jump. They were expecting a discontinuity but they were
willing to take the hit because they had
done the elaborate calibration study. Then
the hit wasn't there as near as I can tell.

SPEAKER: That's exactly right.

DR. BURNS: Yeah, because we
switched to CAPI already too and that wasn't
a hit --

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, maybe the
difference between paper and CAPI is not so
great as telephone.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, on the NOSY
when we did the experiment on CAPI we did

find a couple of -- by and large it wasn't
too much. But it mostly had to do with
things that in the end didn't make any
difference when you aggregated things like
whether you were looking for work or not.

But they showed up in different
places and that seemed to be because on the
paper and pencil, you had two pages worth of
questions and so people answer the questions
in anticipation -- you know, because they
see where you're going. So they answer the
question that is three down in the filter.

But, in CAPI you only get one
question on a screen and the interviewer
doesn't know where it's going and so they
slog through the whole thing.

So, things would show up in
different places but in fact when you
aggregate it back up to the rate there
wasn't any difference.

There were a couple of others like

peculiarities of the difference between the
way a question appeared on the screen and
the way it appeared in the thing and it
wasn't substantively enough --

MR. TOURANGEAU: You know it could
be that the difference between telephone and
face-to-face is larger than the difference
between telephone and computer, but actually
historically the studies suggest that that's
not the case. But then, you know, your own
studies suggest otherwise. So.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, but I think
the -- you're asking a different question
because -- that's why I was asking about the
point about marginals. I mean, the GSS has
never gone to the telephone because of that
problem. But there very -- there preserving
the marginals is extremely difficult -- I
mean is an important issue too. I mean --
they -- they were reluctant even to go to
CAPI for a long time. But, I think
they've -- I don't know, John, do you know

_____________________________________________________________

if they've gone to CAPI now for the GSS?
    DR. THOMPSON: Yeah, the last
round we went to CAPI.
    DR. BRADBURN: I think probably
everything has to be done CAPI because
nobody knows how to do --
    MR. TOURANGEAU: They were a
survey that held on to quota sampling a long
time too.
    (Laughter)
    DR. BRADBURN: That's right.
    DR. BURNS: Yeah, because it
hasn't seemed to us and maybe we're over
reading the results but you know the
Holbrook et al. study, the results are
everywhere. The differences are everywhere
and users have been getting in touch and
saying, oh, my goodness if I run it in the
face-to-face I get this result and if I run
in the -- and these are very sophisticated
you know, multi-arena (?) users who are
sending in notes about this. You know,

_____________________________________________________________

footnotes that run, you know, kind of
running strings of footnotes that use
the 2000 study that want to pull cases from
both face-to-face and telephone.
    This isn't -- this was all done
within the same house. The idea was best
practices because you wouldn't want to
splice, you know best practices face-to-face
with some imperfect set of practices. So,
best practices face-to-face with best
practices telephone and you know in the kind
of modern era that's the -- that seemed the
smartest way to go and there hadn't been
much since Groves and Kahn and so forth.
That's older data, a different era.
    Of course now when we were
designing this 2000 thing we were also able
to draw on the developments in you know the
psychology of survey response that have come
since Groves and Kahn. So we were hoping to
be able, you know, to you know capture that.
So we can --

MR. TOURANGEAU: I like that
phrase, the psychology of survey response.
DR. BURNS: Well, anyway. I mean,
so, there are things that understanding the
psychology of survey response, enables you
to understand about how you build a splice
but then there are just piles of surprises
and that would make a splice -- I mean,
would make it so you couldn't compare, you
know, 2000 with --

MR. TOURANGEAU: I think you're on
to something. All the machinery created is
basically looking at shifts in means and
proportions. The analyses that Holbrook et
al. did are very different from the analyses
that Groves and Kahn did. I mean, they're
looking at shifts in marginals. You see a 1
or 2 percent shift, so it's insignificant.
Who cares?

You know. There's the rare
analysis. You know, I mean, again, with the
unemployment rate or something, a 1 percent
shift is big. But for most statistics, you
know, one or a half percent is nothing.
But they did much more of a
correlational analyses. Or you know,
co-variances and patterns across items, and
stuff. I don't think we're accustomed to
that problem. Or the survey, the classical
survey literature doesn't really address
that problem. So you have a more
complicated problem. I think somebody's
going to have to invent a solution, as yet
uninvented to sort of calibrate a switch
over, where the key statistics are, you
know, regression coefficients or logistic
regression coefficients, or you know,
co-variances or something rather than means
or proportions.

DR. KINDER: The problem is worse
than you just made out to be, I think.
Because we commissioned this experiment not in the expectation that there would be no differences across these two different packages, one face-to-face and one telephone, but that the differences we would see would be regular, and coherent, and comprehensible. Then we would know how to fix them. You know, in some places we would find differences, in other places we wouldn't, and we would know how to fix them. It's not at all what it looks like. It's a mess. So, maybe somebody will be able to fix it. But there isn't a kind of general remedy here. There doesn't appear to be. But, you know, it's one thing at a time. So, our reading at least of these initial but quite thorough analyses is that there's real trouble in trying to make the move. That if you were to shift over to telephone, it would be to say goodbye to 50 years, and start another.

MR. SANTOS: Were the results capricious for some variables? You know, it went one way, direction one way, and others went the other? DR. KINDER: Well, if you were more imaginative, they wouldn't seem capricious. But they sort of seemed capricious to me. MR. SANTOS: Is it possible that all we're seeing is just sort of measurement error gone awry, and that on average, it's zero but it's --

DR. KINDER: No, I don't think so. MR. SANTOS: Okay. DR. KINDER: You know, there are sort of pockets of systematic relationships that don't add up in a way that you would have liked them to.

DR. BURNS: Just to elaborate one tiny thing. Another just a question. This is, you know, something again we've just been stewing over. You may have, you know, all sorts of clear ideas about this.
So, say you did a splice in 2000.

Now, is the telephone the same thing in 2012? Would you expect the same sorts of relationships between the telephone in 2012 and the face-to-face survey in 2000, as you expect between the face-to-face survey in 2000 and the telephone in 2000? It seems, like, you know, I don't know, a different kind of social experience, or a different kind of conversation, all of that sort of thing about the telephone. So that's just another, you know, stewing point, to use my grandmother's approach to thinking about this.

MR. TOURANGEAU: I think you're really on to something. I mean, I think that the telephone is a dynamic medium right now. In part because of the onslaught of telemarketing. But also, because of broader changes, I think.

For instance, you know, I think that norms about, I don't know, tolerating silence, or something, may be changing.

That's an important feature of telephone surveys. I mean, I think one of the reasons why telephone does differ from face-to-face is the pace is probably a lot faster in the average telephone interview than it is in the average face-to-face interview, where it's fast and already.

So, I'm with you. I mean, I think the medium itself is changing, and so that you might have to do -- you know, I mean, there's going to be a one-time only thing, but then you could be really upsetting a long-term time series, because the telephone itself is going to evolve.

DR. BRADBURN: I mean, yes. I don't know about the 2012 study but ultimately, the two will come together so that you will have -- there will be widespread video communication of various sorts, so then you can get back to face-to-face interviewing, but electronically mediated face-to-face
interVIEWING. BUT THAT'S, YOU KNOW, AT LEAST A DECADE OR MORE OFF.

DR. LEMPERT: THERE ARE SOME FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS HERE. I MEAN, PLUS THE THING IS THAT SOMEHOW FACE-TO-FACE IS NOT A DYNAMIC. I THINK THE MEANING OF INVITING A STRANGER INTO YOUR HOME HAS CHANGED DRAMATICALLY, AND ALSO CHANGES IN CONTEXT. THE TIME THE SNIPER WAS ACTIVE HERE OR SOMETHING, OR WITH TERRORISTS.

SO, AND I DON'T KNOW HOW WE GET A HANDLE ON THAT. BUT IT'S AT LEAST PLAUSIBLE TO SUPPOSE THOSE EFFECTS ARE ALSO TEMPORALLY CONTINGENT.

DR. MUTZ: I THINK EVEN WHEN WE THINK ABOUT IT, YOU CAN ESPECIALLY SEE THAT BEING DIFFERENT WITH REGARD TO SENSITIVE QUESTIONS, WHICH THERE AREN'T MANY. BUT EVEN SOMETHING LIKE VOTING. PEOPLE WERE FAR MORE COMFORTABLE WITH PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF THEIR AFFILIATIONS IN THE FIFTIES THAN THEY WOULD BE NOW. SO GIVEN THAT IT IS A SOCIAL INTERACTION THING I THINK YOU CAN'T GET AROUND THAT. BECAUSE EVEN IF YOU STICK WITH EXACTLY THE SAME MODE, YOU'RE GOING TO BE SUBJECT TO THAT.

DR. CLARKE: I THINK THAT'S AN INTERESTING POINT, BECAUSE THE SORT OF ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE MODEL -- I'M NOT QUITE SURE HOW TO SAY IT, BUT THOSE ASSUMPTIONS ARE CHANGING. MAYBE IT'S JUST THE CONFIDENCE PEOPLE HAVE IN EACH OTHER, IN TERMS OF, LIKE, INVITING SOMEONE INTO YOUR HOME, OR WHAT HAVE YOU. THAT'S NOT A CONSTANT, OBVIOUSLY. WE KNOW IT'S NOT. IT MAY WELL AFFECT THE NATURE OF RESPONSES WITHIN MODE REALLY SUBSTANTIALLY, WHICH WOULD SHOW UP MOST OFTEN AND OBVIOUSLY WITH NON-RESPONSE, AND THOSE THINGS.

BUT IT MAY WELL SHOW UP IN MORE SUBTLE WAYS AS WELL, IN TERMS OF PEOPLE OFFERING SORT OF AN OBVIOUS HYPOTHESIS, SORT OF GUARDED RESPONSES TO THINGS.

THERE ARE SOME OTHER THINGS, IN TERMS OF LOT'S OF WORK, ATTITUDES TOWARDS DIFFERENT ETHNIC GROUPS OR RACIAL GROUPS AND
things like this. I think people's
responses now probably are much more guarded
with regard to these matters than they might
have been when the studies began.

I think the whole sort of nature
of the study -- the norms about responding
to certain kinds of questions that are
extremely interesting to us as social
scientists have changed. So, within mode,
comparisons might still be fraught with a
number of serious problems.

SPEAKER: If we want time series.
I mean, we really said well, look, you can't
have time series in those things. Maybe
there are some things we just can't do. So
forget about it, it's not -- it's not ours.

MR. TOURANGEAU: I was going to
say that just in my view, you know,
face-to-face more or less dominates except
for cost, telephone. I would say audio CASI

more or less dominates interviewer-
mediated, face-to-face data collection.

DR. BRADY: For how long can the
interview be with audio CASI?
MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, it's not
clear that it can be any less long. I mean,
I know that we've done experiments where,
you know, it's been an hour or more.

DR. BRADY: With audio CASI?
MR. TOURANGEAU: With audio CASI.

The national survey -- well --
DR. BRADY: I'd hang up.
MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, the
interviewer is there.
DR. BRADBURN: What do you mean,
hang up? This is face-to-face.
DR. BRADY: Face to face audio
CASI?

MR. TOURANGEAU: Not telephone
audio CASI, face-to-face audio CASI.
DR. BRADY: I thought you meant --
okay, but how about the telephone -- this

other method you were -- I'm sorry.
MR. TOURANGEAU: IVR. Yes, I
think the lore there -- and I think it's
just lore -- is that it can't go very long.

DR. SCIOLI: What does it stand
for, IVR?

MR. TOURANGEAU: Interactive Voice Response. Yeah. Which is a completely misleading name, but it's the most popular one. We've all dealt with these systems, right. Please, you know, press or say 1, right?

DR. SCIOLI: Amtrak.


DR. SCIOLI: Unless you're lonely.

MR. TOURANGEAU: It's, like, the sidebar we were having, Henry. There's a lot of lore that says length is a huge determinant of response rate and cost. In fact, the empirical literature doesn't support that. That there are, in fact --

there's a relationship between length and response rates, but the regression coefficient is very small. You know, adding, you know, 50 questions loses you 2 percent or something. It's very non-dramatic.

Likewise, the marginal cost once you've got somebody on the phone or once you've got somebody face-to-face, of adding 5 minutes worth of questions, is trivial.

I mean, you know, and I don't want to go overboard. But it's small.

DR. THOMPSON: Roger, I agree with that. We did a lot of work on the Census about the length of questionnaire response. What we found was the only time we got a real big effect was if it was very, very small. You know, like, six questions or so. But when you got up to any kind of reasonable amount of questions, there wasn't much to see.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, there is a big difference between the short form and the long form.

MR. TOURANGEAU: But we looked at intermediate forms, too. The really, really short form and the short, short form.

DR. MUTZ: Is this a situation
where you're required to tell them up front how long it is?

DR. THOMPSON: Well, any survey that OMB approves, you have to tell them what the length of the interview is.

DR. MUTZ: Okay. So they are told up front it will be an hour, and that doesn't affect their likelihood of getting going.

MR. TOURANGEAU: Well, this is true even in mail surveys, where the respondent can take a look and decide for himself or herself how long it is. You don't see a tremendously steep gradient between the long and the short. As I say, that regression coefficient suggests that, you know, it's 25 items per point or something. It's not very dramatic.

DR. BLAIS: But on some topics, that must make a difference.

MR. TOURANGEAU: I think topic swamps length, actually. If you have a topic that people want to talk about, they're willing to talk about it at length. If you have a topic that they don't want to talk about, it doesn't matter that it's a short questionnaire. You know. I think that's -- well, that's what the empirical literature seems to suggest, I think.

DR. SCIOLI: I think in terms of the 2012 example, I'm fascinated with the socialization experience of younger people, where the cell phone is probably the preeminent medium for communicating, and where it's on all the time, and they're talking all the time. I mean, they're not --

MR. TOURANGEAU: Particularly while they're doing web surveys.

(Laughter)

MR. McCREADY: Where that's going is they're not talking all the time now in the Asian countries, and so on. It's all instant messaging. They don't use the oral piece of it at all. We're seeing everybody doing it, CSMS. That's going to happen here, too, if it ----
DR. SCIOLI: At Princeton, they've become adept at it, haven't they?

DR. CLARK: There's another sort of -- just a small point on this, though. It's not just like losing a respondent. But anybody who's ever done any work with telephone surveys, and even listening to them, is that there's a real strong intuition that the quality of response is going down beyond a certain point. Yes, they may be polite enough and stick with you. But the measurement error is really increasing substantially. I mean, that's my intuition, having done a lot of that stuff.

So you say, hey, yes, I can keep them for another 10 minutes. That's right. But it's really not worth it. The quality of data has really gone down. So, that's -- I mean, I don't have a study to cite on that. But that's, you know, based on a lot of experience of doing these things. That's certainly something to think about as well. Yes, I can keep him for an hour, an hour and a half maybe. But that would be wild. But I can keep him for another 10 minutes. But I'm highly suspicious of what I get myself after about 20 minutes. I say hey that's about it for this call.

DR. SINNOTT: There isn't just the time factor. But in regard to telephone interviewing, I'd presume anyway there is a major consideration in regard to the sophistication of the question or the scale.

I had one experience of being interviewed. It was actually by the Flash Eurobarometer. The Flash Eurobarometer is a telephone. It was the early 1990s, and it was a complex question on the European Monetary Union. There were two ends to the scale.

The interviewer went -- you know, I was just about able for it. But, you know, I said to her, I had a conversation with her. It was a very short interview, and I had a conversation with the
interviewer afterwards. She said yeah, you know, this one was really causing difficulties. She did say that her solution -- she was working from the telephone directory, well, that she could recognize the addresses where she'd get a good response.

(Laughter)

SPEAKER: Good.

DR. SINNOTT: That's what we all face.

DR. ACHEN: I think it's worth remembering here, too, that just as the military has found that technology is one thing, and then getting well-trained people to operate the technology is another thing -- this goes back to a point Roger was making earlier.

There isn't something called telephone, or face-to-face. There's telephone with high-quality people, and telephone with low-quality people, and so forth. I've certainly been on the phone. One case, a survey that was half about my fondness for General Motors vehicles, and the other half was about deodorant usage.

This went on for 50 minutes. The woman who was on the other end of the line kept me entertained. Fifty minutes flew by. She was an enormously skillful interviewer. Other people, I'm busy after about 4 or 5 minutes, and can't finish.

So, I think we have to think of this. Again, this relates to this whole question of the NES. As Henry was saying earlier, I'm not famous for my optimism about how well things have been done. But I trust NES data. The reason is I know how they do it. There are just a lot of issues here about the depth of training and the care with which things are done that needs to be a part of the conversation, too.

DR. LEMPERT: What does all this conversation mean for the ANS? Does it mean we have to look forward to the same modality, increasing costs of face-to-face? Or are there --
MR. TOURANGEAU: Plus a lot of mode research.

DR. LEMPERT: Yes.

DR. SINNOTT: It means you have to be a Rolls-Royce.

DR. LEMPERT: But what is that going to be?

DR. BRADBURN: Actually, let me mention another thing. John and I were talking about this earlier in the week. A strategy which is another way of coping with things, if you're willing to believe a bit in model. It makes it a more complicated data set.

But that's for a fixed set of money, stopping at a lower response rate, and using the rest of the money to learn about the non-respondents, and then use that data to do either a more sophisticated imputation or waiting of things like that, rather than trying to go flat out and get a traditionally high response rate. That's a way of coping with -- I mean, I think that's statistically a better way of doing it.

Now, it does produce a somewhat more -- I mean, a data set that traditionalists don't like, because it's got more imputed data and so on and so forth.

But it's -- you know the -- in principle if you do it right you know a lot about the properties of the non-respondents. You're better off, I think, with a lower, you know, direct observations and putting in a good chunk of your money.

Because, you know. I mean, it's the same thing that we were talking about. Interviewers used to tell me that they said when we would push them to get high response rates, they'd say are you sure you really want that last ----.

They said, you know, people are just doing this because it's easier to give us an interview and get rid of this because we keep pestering them, and so forth. You know, they're not giving thoughtful answers, and various things.
In fact, the guy in Michigan who did economic -- not Jim Morgan, but the guy who did a lot of stuff on savings.

SPEAKER: Chester?


(Laughter)

DR. BRADBURN: Anyway, I was at a conference with him once. He said, you know, I would much rather have, you know, a 20 percent response rate in which I was sure that the people had -- he was getting asset data, and so on -- are really giving me good data than a much higher response rate.

SPEAKER: George Toner.

DR. BRADBURN: No. I forgot. Anyway. That's the right generation.

DR. BURNS: We've been following this. I mean, there are these studies that Roger talked about. I guess Groves has got this new experiment in the field.

DR. BRADBURN: Well, Bob has written about this.

DR. BURNS: Yes, I know exactly on the non-response stuff.

DR. BRADBURN: Suggested this kind of as a method.

DR. BURNS: So it is awfully interesting. I mean, at least as far as I can tell in the studies, they get -- the one difference they find, at least in the Grove study, I believe -- the one difference they find is folks who are racially conservative drop out more. So there's that, and so you'd end up with that.

But they do seem -- the studies seem awfully interesting. They're, you know, kind of usually within house studies. So it's not, you know, getting a cheaper -- or excuse me, getting a lower response rate by carting yourself off to some house that is going to get a lower response rate.

DR. BRADBURN: But if you -- I mean, I would take a lot of things. Suppose you could easily get a 40 percent response rate, and take the rest of the money, and
take a sub-sample of the people you haven't
gotten, and really drill in and try to get
them.

DR. BRADY: Do we know that in
person, is it the case that the marginal
cost of the last people we get is the really
expensive part? That's true?

DR. BRADBURN: Yes. It goes
from -- it goes up astronomically. I mean,
exponentially.

DR. BRADY: Okay. So that would
really reduce the cost of the in person
interview.

DR. BURNS: That would reduce it.

I mean, the other thing is, right now, we
are at a small -- you know. So a the 2004
study is slated to be 1200 cases. 1200
cases spread across the U.S. that you don't
want interviewers to have to travel, because
then you'd end up not -- you wouldn't be
able to analyze the data, because there
would be a correlation between date of the
interview and place of the interview.

So right now, at 1200, the fixed
costs are 100 percent of an interview.
Right? So there's no, you know, fixed -- so
the average costs and marginal costs are the
same number, and that's not where you want
to be. You want to be, you know, down off
that curb some. So that's just another
thing to think about.

DR. BRADBURN: Yes. The later
interviews may be five times as expensive as
the earlier ones.

DR. KINDER: That's a very
interesting idea. We've already begun to
think about it, because we are going with
these studies.

DR. BRADBURN: Yes. I mean, there
are just a whole lot of progress, if you can
put it that way, in modeling error. I mean,
if you look at -- Bob has got a book on
total error, you know, he says there are two
approaches. You know, you can try to
improve the basic observations, and then you
know people -- and some people, like me,
have always pushed in that sort of
direction.

Then there's the other fellow who
says well, we don't worry too much about
that. We model the rest.

I think we're just at a point,
because of the, you know, escalating costs
of the direct observations that we'd have to
learn to do with less of the direct
observations and do more modeling of the
non-response.

That's uncomfortable for a lot of
people, but I think they're -- I mean, just
an example. For example, on this modeling
of the non-response. The economists used to
absolutely reject that notion, and so forth.
Now they're coming around to it as something
that is -- I guess now they understand it
more. So but now that, you know, they'll do
it more.

DR. KINDER: Another thing worth

saying to Rick's question was to remind
everyone of where we began this morning,
especially in Nancy's presentation, was to
suggest, in the future, a portfolio of
coordinated studies, one of which would be
this maintenance of a time series.

This is where this immediate
conversation was about the high quality or
the high cost of face-to-face ---- sampling
data. Maybe this kind of solution that
Norman has suggested is one to take
seriously.

But in addition to that, we talked
about -- and everybody else has, too now
over the course of the day, alternative
designs. Rolling cross-sections here and
there, panels marching out into time. It
has been the case in the past, and I think
we presumed into the future, that we'd be
contemplating alternative designs with
cheaper -- sorry, less expensive approaches
in mind.
So, even though it's true that if we had our way, and if we had all the money in the world, we'd be doing face-to-face sampling interviewing, for some purposes, say, for example, this rolling cross-section design, we put a couple on the table, other people have put some more on the table. As long as the non-response bias is constant across time, then, you know, it's not such a big worry.

You know, we're not patching it up against a previous time series that we want to maintain.

We're just -- you know, what we want to do is be able to make comparisons across time. We can do that, and we have done that in the past. We exploited the less expensive telephone mode for perfectly, I think, reasonable purposes, and to good effect.

DR. BRADBURN: If you're starting on the phone, then you don't have this retractable problem of what do you do with 100-point scale on the phone.

DR. SCIOLI: That raises a lot of interesting questions. I'm thinking back to the question I guess it was Henry raised this morning about the core, and telling the community that we want a well-designed, rigorously scientific study. Then the kinds of constraints that of necessity, we imposed.

Henry's observation that boy, then you tell -- then the community's all confused. Like who else could do that but ISR or SRC? It's really a very interesting question.

Final comments? Rick and Norman will be with us tomorrow. We'll begin at 8:30. Will be. Yes.

(Whereupon, at 4:42 p.m., the PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)