

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM
AMERICAN ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR
WORKSHOP

Arlington, Virginia
Saturday, February 15, 2003

Transcripts provided by BETA Reporting

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 FRANK SCIOLI
National Science Foundation

3
4 NORMAN BRADBURN
National Science Foundation

5 RICHARD LEMPERT
National Science Foundation

6
7 JIM GRANATO
National Science Foundation

8 NANCY BURNS
American National Election Studies
9 University of Michigan

10 DONALD KINDER
American National Election Studies
11 University of Michigan

12 MARK HANSEN
American National Election Studies
13 University of Chicago

14 RICHARD SINNOTT
University College, Dublin

15
16 CHRIS ACHEN
University of Michigan

17 JOHN THOMPSON
NORC

18
19 HENRY BRADY
University of California, Berkeley

20 DIANA MUTZ
Ohio State University

21
22 IAN McALLISTER
Australian National University

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 HAROLD CLARKE
University of Texas, Dallas

3 ANDRE BLAIS
4 University of Montreal

5 ROGER TOURANGEAU
6 University of Maryland

7 CHUCK PIERRET
Bureau of Labor Statistics

8 ROBERT SANTOS
9 NuStats

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

* * * * *

1 CONTENTS

2	WORKSHOP SCHEDULE:	
3	Future Design Recommendations	6
4	Future Issues in Sampling	106
5	Concluding Remarks	231

6
7
8 * * * * *

9
10
11
12

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 (8:40 a.m.)

3 DR. GRANATO: First, I want to --
4 yes, Roger?

5 MR. TORANGEAU: Could I put
6 something in the record real quick?

7 I was awfully disparaging about
8 websites last night, and this was pointed
9 out to me.

10 I do want to say that, you know,
11 within any mode of data collection, there
12 are worse firms, and, certainly, Knowledge
13 Networks has made an effort to put together
14 a decent sample, you know, at least as many
15 telephone samples in terms of its coverages.

16 You know, there are problems, the
17 many stages of recruitment and non-response
18 and so on.

19 But I did want to, you know, say
20 that I was painting with a broad brush, and
21 if I inadvertently tired some fine firms,
22 then I apologize.

1 DR. KINDER: I've known Roger for

2 years and that's as good as it gets.

3 DR. GRANATO: Frank will be here
4 directly. He's having some trouble with the
5 Metro.

6 Last night, we had a very nice
7 dinner. We now know that the name, "no,"
8 has many meanings and that cats have more
9 than one life.

10 We'll start with Henry and Rob. I
11 believe Rob is going to go first. Is that
12 correct?

13 FUTURE DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

14 MR. SANTOS: I thank everybody.

15 We're supposed to talk about design effects,
16 and as you saw from the essay that I
17 prepared, it's a bit premature, at least for
18 me, to write an essay about design
19 recommendations if you don't really quite
20 have nailed down what the research
21 objectives are.
22 So to put some context to that,

7

1 what I did is I consulted the mission of the
2 NES, and there was actually some useful
3 information there.

4 What I got out of it, though, was
5 that NES, as a national resource, is
6 basically the building of some
7 infrastructure and the continuation of the
8 time series of election studies.

9 The infrastructure is, it's nice,
10 to think, actually, when I was at SRC, the
11 going theme was that NES was not a research
12 project in the sense of an individual, or
13 even a group of individuals, deciding and
14 running a project, but it was a national
15 resource that required stewardship.

16 So there was a heavy process for
17 bringing together research scholars and
18 putting on the table the issues that would
19 need to be addressed in a given NES study,
20 and then carrying on that process over time,
21 with the retention of this core that we now
22 know to be more core in terms of constructs

1 rather than specific questions.

2 So, in thinking through that
3 context, it occurred to me, and listening to
4 our discussions yesterday, it was clear to
5 me that, regardless of what decisions or
6 recommendations are made at this table,
7 there is general consensus that the national
8 election surveys, as a time series, need to
9 be preserved; that that, in essence, whether
10 it ends up being a cross-sectional survey or
11 some type of mix or cross-sectional design,
12 the preservation of that time series is
13 essential.

14 So, that was a given in terms of
15 where I started.

16 The second is that, in terms of
17 design recommendations, I really wanted to
18 push the envelope a little and sort of
19 challenge the group here to think more
20 broadly, sort of outside the box of election
21 studies, per se, and get at the substance of
22 the type of things that can be studied.

1 So I looked for sort of value
2 added recommendations, and where I started
3 were the research objectives because those
4 actually feed into specific design
5 recommendations.

6 I mentioned it yesterday, but I'll
7 mention it again, this whole notion of sort
8 of the paradigm shift from looking at
9 election studies, per se, to looking at the
10 formation of political opinion because I
11 believe that actually has --

12 Let me take a step back. I'm sure
13 that that's already part -- that type of
14 research question is already part of the NES
15 and has been for a long time.

16 But if one looks at the formation

17 of political opinion, two things might
18 happen in terms of thinking more broadly
19 about design recommendations and how to
20 orchestrate this type of research program,
21 the first of which is that the population --
22 the survey population could possibly change.

10

1
2 Currently, if I recall correctly,
3 the NES survey population is of citizens of
4 the U.S. or is it of any resident?
5 My recollection was citizen. So,
6 in this context, if one looked at
7 political -- the formation of political
8 attitudes and how that manifests itself in
9 terms of behavior, then, election studies
10 and election behavior is a subset of that,
11 and a very important subset that could be
12 retained over time.
13 But, also, there could be
14 consideration of folks that don't normally
15 participate in the political process with
16 respect to elections.
17 In that context, their population
18 from time series to -- from NES to NES, wave
19 to wave, so to speak, or instance to
20 instance, is not stagnant.
21 At each point in time that a
22 survey is conducted, there are new entrants
to this population, folks who either were 16

11

1 or 17, are now voting age.
2 There are folks that exit, either
3 because they pass on to greater things or
4 they leave the country, or they declare
5 citizenship elsewhere.
6 So that's something to consider.
7 Let's see. What else. Oh, the second is
8 that if you take a look at sort of the
9 formation of political behavior in this
10 context, then that opens up the Nancy Burns

11 discussion of doing survey in quiet times,
12 because then, if this is a legitimate or
13 becomes part of the overall research
14 objectives, one wants to look at, or can
15 look at, not only things that happen during
16 surveys, but things that happen --
17 elections, but things that happen between
18 elections.

19 So, I really would be excited
20 about taking a look at those type of issues,
21 and hope that that's part of the
22 consideration in the development of the RFP.

12

1 Now, putting sort of that aside --
2 that's a big putting aside -- but putting
3 that aside, even if the NES were not to
4 change in terms of its survey population and
5 the fact that surveys are conducted during
6 election years, there should be -- and there
7 probably is, but I'm not aware of it -- a
8 consideration of the changing demographics
9 of the population.

10 According to the census, I
11 believe, one in seven of the U.S. population
12 now speaks a language other than English at
13 home.

14 At a minimum, the NES should be
15 conducted in Spanish, but there are other
16 languages that possibly might be relevant.

17 Secondly, there's the whole issue
18 of even if folks can conduct the survey in
19 English, but they speak a language other
20 than English at home, then there's the whole
21 issue of the sensitivity of their
22 understanding of the questions that are

1 being asked with regard to sort of
2 multi-cultural issues, linguistic issues and
3 such.

4 That, I think, would be an
5 important area of research, either in the
6 pilot studies or in other contexts.

7 Another item is I think that
8 there's -- oh, sort of setting up this next
9 recommendation is I really look for value
10 added at, hopefully, nominal costs in terms
11 of some of these recommendations.

12 I really thought that there was an
13 opportunity loss in this program of research
14 when it -- in the sense that I think
15 qualitative research, like focus group, in-
16 depth interviews with maybe a subset of the
17 respondents, those types of things could
18 actually add value to the NES.

19 Maybe that's been done in the
20 past, but, again, I wasn't aware of that, so
21 I thought I'd toss out the whole notion of
22 looking at in venting or making part of the

1 RFP a regular program of qualitative
2 research to complement the quantitative
3 research that goes on.

4 I think that would be invaluable
5 for being able to develop additional theory,
6 and then you could use the NES to test that
7 out, the quantitative data.

8 A couple of other items. I think
9 that it's important to preserve the NES
10 pilot studies. The methodological research
11 is just crucial.

12 If that's not possible with
13 respect to costs, I think that NSF should
14 use its influence to somehow get the GSS and
15 NES cooperating together so that they could
16 benefit from each other in terms of joint
17 integrated methodological research work.

18 I do think that the future calls
19 for looking seriously at new technologies.
20 We've discussed that and I want to go into
21 that much further.
22 I think that's about it. Oh, I'm

15

1 sorry. There's one other thing that's also
2 been mentioned, the whole notion of survey
3 of candidates, other concomitant research
4 studies that could occur that transcend the
5 looking at the population, the looking at
6 other aspects of elections and political
7 processes.
8 So, that's what I've had. Thank
9 you.
10 DR. GRANATO: Henry?
11 DR. BRADY: Hi. Yeah. I'm not
12 going to recite what I wrote.
13 I would like to just do something
14 quickly, which is talk about some of the
15 contributions of the ANES, because I think
16 we've not really sort of focus enough on
17 them.
18 I'm going to make a long list
19 here, and it's going to go ridiculously
20 fast. But, just at the micro level, here's
21 the kinds of things I have.
22 Party identification, as a

16

1 fundamental concept in political science,
2 the importance of issues, ways of measuring
3 issues. The ANES has contributed to that.
4 The importance of economic
5 conditions in voting. The sociotropic

6 notion that people don't just look at their
7 own personal situation, but look at what's
8 happening nationally.

9 The traits, in terms of voting for
10 candidates, the traits of the candidates,
11 whether they're competent or decent or good
12 leaders or of high character, that those
13 things matter.

14 To the degree to which character
15 versus competence matters, we know a lot
16 about that now.

17 Emotions. We don't actually know
18 a lot about the causal story there, but we
19 certainly know that emotions seem to show up
20 and be important in certain circumstances.

21 For example, a lot of people,
22 in 2000, were mad at Bill Clinton. I can't

17

1 imagine why, but it turns out that was just
2 a remarkable feature of the emotions as you
3 look across for him, that there was just a
4 lot of people angry at him.

5 That didn't necessarily translate
6 into them not being so in favor of him in
7 other regards. It's just they were mad at
8 him and you can imagine why, I guess.

9 Strategic concerns that in voting,
10 it matters, especially in primaries, what
11 the chances are that the candidate will win
12 the election, not just win maybe the
13 primary, but also, the electability in the
14 ultimate Presidential contest.

15 We know a lot more about that.
16 It's a concept we just didn't even have
17 really in political science very much before
18 the eighties, I think.

19 We know an enormous amount about
20 knowledge and information, about what the
21 general electorate knows about politics, and
22 how solid that knowledge is.

1 In Congressional elections, we
2 know a lot about the power of incumbency,
3 the importance of constituency services,
4 about name recognition in Congressional
5 contests.

6 That's the micro stuff. With
7 the macro stuff, we know a lot about the
8 dynamics about party identification by using
9 the time series over time. We understand
10 how it changes and the degree to which it
11 changes.

12 There's still a lively debate in
13 political science about that, but I think we
14 know a lot more than we knew 20, 30 years
15 ago.

16 We certainly know a lot about the
17 dynamics and stability of issue positions,
18 some classic work that's been done there.

19 The dynamics of primaries. We
20 understand a lot more about how momentum
21 operates, the mechanisms by which it
22 operates, and how that can lead sometimes to

1 people doing well.

2 For a while, like Gary Hart,
3 in 1984, even though there wasn't really a
4 lot of solidity there, but he just did well,
5 early on, and that pushed him forward for a
6 while. He almost knocked off Walter
7 Mondale, which probably wouldn't have made a
8 difference in '84 in terms of he became
9 President, but would have made a difference
10 for the Democrats.

11 We know about changes in attitudes
12 over long periods of time, and, here, I just
13 mean sort of almost marginal changes, you
14 know, what's happened on racial attitudes.
15 What's happened on government-guaranteed

16 jobs. What's happened on environmental
17 issues. We know that from the ANES.
18 We know about third parties. The
19 ANES has in it, and its predecessor studies,
20 has Wallace, the Wallace phenomenon, and
21 several incarnations.
22 John Anderson, Ross Perot and

20

1 Ralph Nader now.
2 We know a lot more about the role
3 of religion. There was a lot of work that
4 was done in that in the eighties, I guess it
5 was, to try to get better questions to
6 better understand fundamentalism.
7 There's some wonderful questions
8 now in the ANES, getting at some of the
9 fundamental questions about religiosity,
10 religious attendance, exactly what kind of
11 religion one practices.
12 That turns out to be a fundamental
13 piece of understanding in American politics,
14 especially with its increasing, I would
15 argue, emphasis upon social issues or moral
16 issues or the abortion, prayer in the
17 schools, homosexuality kinds of issues.
18 We know a lot about the dynamics
19 of public opinion through the work of people
20 like John Zower, which uses NES data, and
21 others.
22 We really understand a lot better

21

1 who changes opinions and when, and under

2 what conditions, and how elites have an
3 opinion on that, how your susceptibility
4 matters, and how the problem is for some
5 people, just getting through to them because
6 they're not really exposed to much political
7 information.

8 In the Congressional field, we
9 know a lot about different kinds of
10 Congressional elections, that there are
11 different kinds.

12 There are some where incumbents
13 are just very strong. There are others
14 which are contested, and they have a
15 different kind of dynamic than ones that
16 aren't contested.

17 Then there's the ones without
18 incumbents, and on and on.

19 We know more about Senate
20 elections because of Senate studies that
21 were done by the ANES.

22 At a very natural level, we know a

22

1 lot about the coalition structure of
2 American politics over time because of the
3 sort of in- depth nature of American
4 national election studies data.

5 We know something about the
6 unraveling of the New Deal Coalition because
7 of the in-depth studies. I wish that they
8 went back to the 1930's. They don't. That
9 would be lovely, but at least we pick it up
10 in the fifties, and then we see what
11 happened post that period.

12 We see interesting things like
13 what happened to blacks in the sixties as
14 they moved, finally, completely away from
15 Republicans to the Democrats, and as Richard
16 Nixon, in the late sixties, started very
17 hard to try to have realignment in the
18 south, and was ultimately successful.

19 So we see that realignment in the
20 south, with the south going from being
21 Democratic to being Republican. It's all
22 captured in the data.

1 As a sort of macro-historical
2 thing, that's just fantastic to have those
3 data.

4 Then we have information on
5 political participation over time, which can
6 be useful, too, to see how that's changed.

7 So these are just some of the
8 things. I haven't even mentioned
9 everything, but that's just some of the
10 stuff in American national elections studies
11 data.

12 That's an incredible set of
13 accomplishments for one study, and
14 certainly, no other enterprise in American
15 political science has been so successful.

16 So, with that said, let me just
17 say something about what I think ANES needs
18 to be, and has been.

19 Then I'd like to sort of engage in
20 an exercise with everybody where we sort of
21 think about where we should be going, and
22 start, I think, to some extent, plan for the

1 last hour today, but I think we should start

2 this morning with sort of figuring out what
3 kind of design do we want in the future, and
4 I think we could maybe make some preliminary
5 decisions.

6 But let me just talk about what
7 NES or an NES-like enterprise needs to be.

8 I think NES has been characterized
9 by high-data quality, by R&D, research and
10 development of a high quality, as well,
11 dissemination and access to data, quick
12 dissemination.

13 It's remarkable, when I wrote my
14 thing in 2000, that I could just go get the
15 data off the web, and it was well enough
16 documented, given, frankly, the complexity
17 of some of the methodological experiments,
18 which drove some of us a little crazy.

19 But I understand why they were
20 done and they were a good thing to have
21 done. It was complex, but the documentation

22 made it possible for you to figure what the

1 heck was going on.

2 So dissemination and access has
3 been a very, very important thing.

4 Code books and archives. There's
5 a whole archive of technical memos, code
6 books, information so you can figure out
7 what these data are about. They're
8 incredibly accessible.

9 Then, finally, community
10 involvement through the different work
11 groups, planning groups, and so forth that

12 the NES has had over the years.
13 I think all of these things are
14 essential for any enterprise that would be a
15 national elections study or studies or
16 whatever, and we have to think about how we
17 can make sure that the institutional
18 framework is there to make sure those things
19 continue.

20 I mean, for example, if this were
21 ended, which I don't think by any means
22 should happen, what's going to happen to

26

1 some of this stuff, like the archives of the
2 technical memos and all that kind of stuff?
3 We'd have to think about that.

4 If it's transferred to some other
5 person or group, how are we going to deal
6 with those kinds of problems?

7 Also, we should probably be
8 thinking about how to increase community
9 involvement, and maybe there's even better
10 mechanisms that ANES has used in the past.

11 Okay. So that's sort of the
12 enterprise as an organizational,
13 institutional thing, and I think we need to
14 give some thought to that, because I think
15 that's a really important thing we haven't
16 talked much about in this meeting.

17 Okay. Where should we be going?
18 I'd like to say that -- Rob said this and I
19 think other people have said it. Could we
20 have a discussion where we start by saying
21 what's sort of the minimal, fundamental
22 thing we need to have an American National

27

1 Election Study, to continue with what we've
2 been doing?

3 I would put on the table the
4 notion that there needs to be a core, and

5 that, minimally, it needs to be a
6 Presidential year core, and that, once you
7 make the decision you want to keep a core,
8 that implies that, at least for the moment,
9 you have in-person interviews, given the
10 discussion yesterday.

11 Because, if we don't stay with in-
12 person interviews, that's tantamount to
13 saying that we're having discontinuity in
14 the core, and then it becomes less clear why
15 you want a core. You might still want it,
16 but it's going to have a big interruption in
17 it, and it's not clear that it's as useful
18 as it has been in the past.

19 So, I would argue that maybe we
20 should start by saying do we want to have,
21 at least minimally, a Presidential year core
22 that would be in person?

28

1 Maybe you could even start by
2 saying, suppose we did want to have a
3 Presidential year core, would it have to be
4 in person, because maybe we could come to
5 that decision pretty quickly, given
6 yesterday's discussion.

7 DR. SCIOLI: What do you think the
8 reaction would be at a meeting six times
9 this size, at the APSA, if you were to say,
10 "This is how we're proceeding; that this is,
11 you know, the baseline, that we must have a
12 core"?

13 What percent of the group there do
14 you think would be supportive, and what
15 percent do you think would say, "Well, maybe
16 we should look at American electoral studies
17 differently and not have the same core"?

18 DR. BRADY: I think that there
19 would be people who would say we need
20 innovation and new ways to think about the
21 studies, but I think they would also say
22 they want to maintain the core because of

1 its importance for historical analysis, and
 2 because a lot of it is darned good. I mean
 3 it's just darned good instrumentation.
 4 I don't think anybody really
 5 thinks we should get rid of trades
 6 questions, issue questions, thermometers, on
 7 and on.
 8 DR. SCIOLI: Trust questions.
 9 DR. BRADY: Yeah.
 10 DR. SCIOLI: Okay. I'm --
 11 DR. BRADY: There are people who
 12 argue for the trust question, believe me,
 13 the size of a constituency.
 14 DR. SCIOLI: Henry, and since
 15 you're not -- yeah, you --
 16 DR. GRANATO: You're not the
 17 devil.
 18 DR. SCIOLI: Yeah. You're not the
 19 devil. You can answer this less
 20 passionately than others might.
 21 What about the notion that I hear,
 22 "Well, you know, there's this core thing.

1 It's this kind of an interesting concept of
 2 the core," but it's a moving target.
 3 There's not a set of questions
 4 from '56 to 2003. There's not 90 percent of
 5 the instrument, which, quote, constitutes
 6 core.
 7 So, here I am from -- where was
 8 it -- Razor Blade Tech?
 9 I say, "I have a core."
 10 DR. ACHEN: West Razor Blade.
 11 DR. SCIOLI: "I have a core," and
 12 guess what, Henry? I think trust is
 13 important.
 14 But I also think that confidence
 15 in governmental institutions -- I mean we
 16 get that a lot that people say, "Oh, you
 17 know, they're snowing you if anybody tells
 18 you -- if a scholar calls up and says, 'I

19 use the core for everything I do,' push them
20 on that and say, 'What do you mean you use
21 the core?'"
22 "You use two Presidential

31

1 elections."
2 Now, I'm not asking you to defend
3 the American national elections. I'm just
4 trying to get a handle on the notion of
5 what's the best way to proceed for the study
6 of American electoral studies?
7 Is it to continue, as you started,
8 core and then build on that, or is it
9 anything's up for grabs and we should just
10 let everything -- let a thousand --
11 DR. BRADY: Well, I mean that's
12 what I just put on the table. I've given
13 you my answer. I actually think we should
14 start with a core.
15 I would also try to maybe cut down
16 the core and be really definitive about what
17 we mean by that.
18 I know that's a hard thing and
19 it's a hard task to give anybody, but I
20 think we really have to get pretty hard
21 nosed about it.
22 I loved Harold's image. You

32

1 backed up the truck to --
2 DR. CLARKE: Science truck.
3 DR. BRADY: The science truck to
4 the British instrument, and then started

5 throwing things out into the truck.
6 Some of that may have to happen,
7 but I guess I'm arguing strongly that I
8 think there's maybe even a consensus here
9 that we need to have something of a core.
10 I'm trying to get what the minimal
11 approach would be. Notice, I didn't say,
12 "mid-term elections."
13 I said a President election with a
14 sort of minimal core, and I don't quite know
15 what that means, but a core, and then build
16 out from that.
17 MR. SANTOS: Would your
18 replication -- would your definition of a
19 "core" necessitate replication of that
20 material from survey to survey, from
21 Presidential survey to Presidential survey?
22 DR. BRADY: Yes.

33

1 MR. SANTOS: So that you do, then,
2 have this time series of constants?
3 DR. BRADY: Yes.
4 MR. SANTOS: Okay.
5 DR. HANSEN: Or it might be as it
6 is currently, which is that there are some
7 core items that are -- core concepts, shall
8 we say, that are represented on every
9 survey, and that rotate so that, you know,
10 we have them there periodically, but they
11 aren't there all the time.
12 So there is a way of mixing and
13 matching this, as well.
14 DR. BRADBURN: Well, there is also
15 the issue, we talked about it yesterday, the
16 difference between a core defined as a set
17 inviolate question and a core defined as a
18 set of topics, the operation of which might
19 change with time.
20 I say that the GSS is the, you
21 know, extreme the other way, sticking with
22 absolutely as much as possible and constant

1 wording.

2 When you change it, you know, very
3 elaborate sort of splicing, kinds of things
4 like that.

5 My impression is that the ANES
6 just got from yesterday's discussion was
7 tends to keep the same concepts, but maybe
8 operational has them differently and
9 different --

10 DR. BURNS: We try to -- I mean we
11 want to make sure that you can compare, you
12 know, whatever year to whatever year.

13 So if when we do change, and the
14 changes usually happen because the world has
15 changed some way or there has been some
16 important methodological development to say
17 you could actually, you know, tighten --

18 DR. BRADBURN: Right.

19 DR. BURNS: You know, pull out a
20 lot of the measurement area on this one if
21 you fine-tuned it a bit. The splicing is
22 crucial.

1 DR. BRADBURN: Right.

2 DR. BURNS: Because no one could
3 do the comparison on that.

4 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

5 DR. BURNS: That's part of the
6 reason for the core in the first place.

7 DR. BRADY: But I mean the truth
8 is, if the core isn't deemed essential of
9 the sort we've talked about, then the whole
10 argument for in-person interviews and so
11 forth, we're really in a totally different
12 ballgame.

13 This is the place we've got to
14 start, it seems to me, and it's in the

15 Presidential year because the core is longer
16 run in the Presidential years than it is in
17 the Congressional years where a lot of the
18 Congressional content goes back to only '78.
19 It's even arguable that some of
20 that is even a bit dated, and so that it
21 wouldn't be bad to redo it.
22 DR. SCIOLI: But Norman just

36

1 posited that perhaps the core is the set of
2 interesting theoretical concepts which are
3 then operationalized in a way that's
4 different from the scales, etc.
5 I guess, ultimately, our challenge
6 is to serve the community that thinks the
7 best possible science is articulated by
8 whatever study is undertaken.
9 You know, somebody made the
10 comment yesterday that -- and I was sharing
11 with Rick, you know, we had an Assistant
12 Director, David Kingsbury, years ago, who
13 came into a panel meeting and said, "Well,
14 you know, what's the deal on this core? How
15 long should this go on?"
16 There was the classic, "Ad
17 infinitum."
18 He went, "You know, I'm getting
19 out of here." As a biologist there, I can
20 appreciate that.
21 So you're saying "a core"?
22 DR. BRADY: Uh-huh.

37

1 DR. SCIOLI: Okay.
2 DR. BRADY: Well, and I think it's

3 a lot of the same questions. I mean, but,
4 yeah. A part of the virtue is that I can
5 look at some questions for 20 or 30 year
6 time frames and see what's happened to the
7 American public on those questions, and I
8 think that is an important thing.

9 DR. LEMPert: In a certain sense,
10 you can. In another sense, you can't
11 because the odds are the questions mean
12 something different today than the exact
13 same wording meant 30 years ago.

14 Can we tease it out? I mean one
15 of the things -- I've listened to this. You
16 know, all the hard questions we face deal
17 with conflicts.

18 I was teasing Frank and Jim
19 yesterday by saying, "Okay. Your jobs are
20 very easy. Just put all the political
21 science money into the ANES. We've heard a
22 really good case for spending that. You

38

1 could have one project you'll supervise and
2 there are very difficult problems.

3 Obviously, you know, we're not
4 going to get rid of international political
5 science to fund -- to put all that into
6 ANES. Those are difficult problems.

7 Another range of difficult
8 problems are the kinds of problems I think
9 you're putting on the table for us that's
10 really important to get guidance on which is
11 within whatever resource you're devoted to
12 ANES where we emphasize and where don't we.

13 With respect to the core, I, at
14 least, am hearing somewhat mixed messages.

15 First of all, one of the conflicts
16 I'm really interested in is a conflict
17 understanding historical change,
18 understanding current behavior.

19 To the extent we emphasize -- I
20 mean we all value history, and a lot of

21 things that Henry and others have said about
22 the value of the ANES is precisely this

39

1 historical light it gives us.
2 On the other hand, the more we
3 maintain parts of the study to give us
4 historical continuity, the less space we
5 have to understand the nuances of what's
6 going on.
7 I forget. One of you, and, Andre,
8 I think it was you, really emphasized the
9 importance of issues.
10 Within each election, there will
11 be issues that we have to understand if
12 we're going to understand that election. So
13 there's a trade-off here.
14 My confusion, in a sense, falls on
15 what Norman said, and it's a confusion to
16 really grasp this notion of core.
17 Originally, I thought it was we're
18 asking the same questions year after year
19 after year. Then I heard we're going after
20 the same kinds of concepts year after year
21 after year.
22 Now, they both could be defended,

40

1 and I'm not suggesting any choice between
2 them, but I think they're very different in
3 the sense that the second point you made,
4 Henry, was, you know, if we want to maintain
5 the core, we have to maintain in-person
6 interviews because, as we heard yesterday,
7 once you change modalities, you're changing
8 meaning, even of the same items.
9 But, my intuition is that if, in

10 fact, we're not asking the same items, we're
11 just trying to get at the same concepts in
12 different ways, that those changes might
13 make the mode issue pale by comparison in
14 terms of changing meaning over time.

15 So without a better sense that I
16 already have of these two aspects of core,
17 item and concept, as well as the splicing
18 kinds of things that have been done to
19 maintain equivalence and how that's working
20 out, I find it very difficult to understand
21 what we are doing. In fact, if we are

22 maintaining a strong investment in the core.

41

1 DR. KINDER: I'll try to clarify
2 the distinction between the two models of
3 core, one about construct stability; the
4 other about indicator stability.

5 I think it is true that we've done
6 both, but as a practice operational matter,
7 what core means predominantly is stable
8 indicators; that we change indicators only
9 when coerced to do so, where the coercion
10 comes either from some spectacular change in
11 the meaning of questions that -- driven by
12 politics.

13 So the meaning of school
14 desegregation, a standard question from a
15 golden past changed when busing became the
16 only practical way of making racial
17 desegregation of schools possible. So you
18 needed to take that into account.

19 Or the other form of coercion
20 comes from powerful demonstrations that show
21 the way you've been doing this is terrible,
22 and here's a better way. We've got

1 experimental and powerful demonstrations to
2 that effect.

3 Then we, you know, we deliberate
4 about that, and if we're persuaded, the
5 Board is, then we make such a change, along
6 with, as Nancy said, careful attention to
7 observations where the old and the new are
8 contained in the same survey for probably
9 more -- I don't know if we always do this --
10 but, usually, for more than a single
11 observation so you can do the transition
12 from the old to the new. You can do the
13 splice effectively.

14 So it is the case that, I think,
15 although we do follow the commitment to
16 constructs as a kind of matter of principle,
17 as a practical operational matter, mostly
18 what we do is we ask the same questions
19 again and again.

20 DR. BRADBURN: But just also to
21 clarify what I would say, as I understood
22 Nancy's response to discussions yesterday

1 about mode effects, that where they've
2 attempted to do changes in such a way to
3 preserve the construct in a different mode,
4 that it's been a disaster so far.

5 Which isn't to say that somehow we
6 can't, you know, understand what it is that
7 makes those difference, but at the moment,
8 in any case, any not even simple, but fairly
9 complex attempts to guberationalize the same
10 construct in different modes has not yielded
11 anything as useful yet.

12 DR. KINDER: That's right. The
13 practical consequence of shifting in mode is
14 much more dramatic than the year to year
15 shift in trying to pay attention to what's
16 topical in politics.

17 DR. BRADBURN: So it's a mix.

18 DR. HANSEN: It's also worth
19 saying, as well, that the core is not all
20 there is on the survey. It doesn't take up
21 the entire instrument. In fact, there's
22 quite a lot of additional content that's

44

1 possible.
2 The creative part through the
3 years of the study has been to ask, "Well,
4 you know, what are the opportunities that
5 are being presented to us by this particular
6 election to investigate questions of
7 substantial interest," and, "What kinds of
8 new content might we have that would be
9 nicely complemented by the core?"
10 Because the core, in a lot of
11 ways, the core concepts are there and the
12 core content is there so that the
13 instrumentation is available to do the kind
14 of in-depth analysis in the here and now,
15 never mind the historical, which is of
16 considerable value, as well, but let's do
17 the kind of analysis in the here and now to
18 really understand the phenomenon that we're
19 getting at with the newer content.
20 DR. BRADY: Now, I don't think the
21 trade-off is either you do the core or you
22 do innovation. I think the trade-off really

45

1 here is that if you decide to do core, you
2 have to stay within in-person at least for
3 the near future, because that, otherwise, we
4 won't have a continuity in the core.
5 So that's just really, it seems to
6 me, the very, very pressing question.
7 It seems to me, if you decide you
8 want to stick with the core, then you've got
9 the in-person. Then, you've got to decide
10 whether you want to just do it for

11 Presidential or also for mid-terms, and then
12 you've got to decide what else you could
13 possibly do given a budget.
14 My sense is, minimally, let's
15 start with the Presidential year core.
16 DR. SCIOLI: Andre?
17 DR. BLAIS: Yes. I guess I'm not
18 quite convinced that I would agree that you
19 have to keep things as they are.
20 Ideally, I think we should keep
21 things as they are. I mean it would be
22 lovely to keep them, but I would like to

46

1 know exactly what the implications are.
2 My understanding is that this is
3 extremely expensive and that, if we go that
4 way, we won't save that much money because,
5 you know, even reducing the questionnaire
6 won't help that much in terms of cost.
7 The real possibility for
8 innovation gets extremely limited, given the
9 costs.
10 I mean we haven't talked much
11 about the real cost of this operation, and
12 I'd like to have a better understanding of,
13 you know, what room --
14 My impression is that if we keep
15 the core in in-person interview, it would be
16 very little room for real innovation.
17 DR. SCIOLI: Well, you know,
18 Andre, let me just say that, at some point,
19 the political science program officers with
20 the Division Director will have to make some
21 hard decisions based on advice from the
22 scholarly community, not based on what's

1 said here today and not based on our own
2 feelings, but based on having a review panel
3 come in and look at competing proposals,
4 etc.

5 So, by no means do we want this to
6 turn into, you know, "What's Michigan doing,
7 Don and Nancy," and have them defend the
8 American National Election Study because
9 they're not -- you know, they're not here to
10 do that, and, certainly, we didn't invite
11 them to do it.

12 So, I think to get into that level
13 of detail, I think the advice we're hearing
14 is extremely useful, and, you know, as Rick
15 has articulated, it's something we have to
16 give very serious thought to, this notion of
17 what is a core, because the razor blade tech
18 principal investigator might come in with an
19 argument that there's a core that is
20 interesting, exciting, less expensive, and,
21 theoretically, more promising than the stat

22 core.

1 Then, a group of people around the
2 table, like yourselves, will say, "Yeah.
3 That makes a lot of sense." So that's why I
4 kind of, you know, gave Henry the --

5 If there are 200 people in the
6 room, you know, who's going to vote for --
7 because, ultimately, that's what it comes
8 down to, scientific judgment and whether or
9 not.

10 You know, perhaps you would even
11 be -- you might come up with, not to
12 conflict you on submitting a proposal, but
13 you might come up with a core that's a
14 little bit different than something that's
15 already existing.

16 DR. KINDER: I welcome such a
17 competition, but I wanted to -- did you want
18 to get back to it?

19 DR. BRADBURN: No. No. I just
20 wanted to say to Frank that what constitutes
21 the core is different than a principle there

22 ought to be a core, and that we shouldn't

49

1 confuse those two issues; that is, you can
2 start --

3 Let me just frame the range of
4 things here for a second to make sure
5 that -- I mean by silence, perhaps, people
6 were saying.

7 But, it seems to me that at least
8 a major decision confronting NSF is do we
9 have, as a major part of the electoral
10 college system, a large platform, data
11 platform, which is, at the moment -- and
12 I'll raise this, at the moment, is defined
13 as something that occurs in Presidential
14 election years. This is just the minimum,
15 and is a national sample and, you know, face
16 to face, probably, because of -- but let's
17 leave the mode of this to the side.

18 Has a core. That's something,
19 over the next ten years, we want to
20 preserve. At least that's the certain
21 minimum content.

22 Now, the alternative, of course,

50

1 is not having any single platform that's, as
2 Rob said, you know, is a infrastructure
3 thing for the whole field; that is, you
4 know, we do, in some sense, more like -- it
5 seems to be what Britain does is say, "Okay.
6 Elections are coming up. We want to have
7 elections. You know, let's see what people
8 want to do at this time."

9 DR. BRADY: No. No. But
10 remember, there was, according to Harold, a
11 requirement that you keep the post-election
12 in-person interview, right?
13 DR. CLARKE: That is correct.
14 DR. BRADY: So I guess I'm pushing
15 NSF. I really think maybe you need to have
16 that in RFP.
17 I don't think you understand that
18 most PI's out there who might put in a
19 proposal, might be deterred from putting in
20 a proposal if they thought that there wasn't
21 sort of a requirement to have the core so
22 they could just say, "Okay. I got to do

51

1 that. I'll do that, and then I can talk
2 about the other things I want to do."
3 I mean I know I was deterred last
4 time because I said, "I'm not going to write
5 a proposal, given the amount of money that's
6 there, because either I focus it all on the
7 core, which isn't really what I want to do,
8 or I say, 'To hell with the core,' and go in
9 another direction."
10 I don't want to be the guy who is
11 responsible for killing the core. I think
12 that you'll find that most of your
13 innovative people out there don't want to be
14 responsible for killing the core.
15 So I think NSF may have to write
16 an RFP which is a little more directive, and
17 say, "Protect the core minimally this way."
18 I think, then, you will actually
19 get more submissions and better submissions.
20 DR. CLARKE: I was just going to
21 add a note of clarification.
22 Yeah. It did, indeed, specify in

1 the competition that to be in the ballgame,
 2 you had to do the traditional,
 3 post-election, large, cross-sectional,
 4 in-person interview to do that. Now --

5 DR. BRADBURN: Didn't specify the
 6 content.

7 DR. CLARKE: They did not
 8 specify -- that's why -- I'm coming to that
 9 next, Norman.

10 They did not specify the content
 11 in detail, although they did say that there
 12 would have to be -- I figure it's the word,
 13 "substantial," but like considerable
 14 continuity.

15 That was actually there, as well.
 16 That was open to interpretation, of course,
 17 what's considerable.

18 I talked yesterday about how we
 19 operationalized what should go and what
 20 should stay.

21 I think for any serious group
 22 doing a survey, that operationalization

1 will, in fact, end up with something that
 2 looks like the core, like most people would
 3 understand that.

4 In terms of modes, though, I must
 5 say that one of the things we've really been
 6 interested in because there's so many
 7 advantages to some of the alternative modes
 8 in terms of pursuing interest about campaign
 9 effects and costs, all the different reasons
 10 we've talked about, that our research, so
 11 far, suggests in terms of drawing inferences
 12 about important, you know, competition
 13 between important theoretical alternative,
 14 theoretical perspectives, that our work with
 15 the telephone would not have misled us,
 16 either in the more recent British studies or
 17 in the Canadian studies, which I was
 18 involved in.

19 We have some overlap between some
 20 of these modes. So that idea is something
 21 to think about carefully.

1 yesterday about marginals versus
2 co-variances and things like that. There's
3 some serious, you know, serious questions
4 there about that.
5 So I just wanted to add that.
6 It's like what we found in the Canadian and
7 British case, but it was true that the
8 British ESRC did exactly what Henry was
9 suggesting in terms of how they specified
10 what would this study do.
11 Now, they gave us enough money,
12 though, that we could do some of the other
13 things, so that we ended up with sort of a
14 Canadian study, sort of Michigan or not the
15 old kind of study.
16 So, one of the neat things is,
17 now, we can do a lot of comparisons, as
18 well. But, just to clarify things so we
19 know exactly what that was.
20 DR. MUTZ: Henry, I'm curious. Do
21 you think that in order to receive the
22 number of proposals that would be ideal, you

1 need to couple the core with innovation, or
2 could those be separate projects?
3 DR. BRADY: Separate proposals,
4 even.
5 DR. MUTZ: I think that's another
6 way that you could handle it. You could
7 decide that you just want to say, "Well,
8 there's going to be a competition for a core
9 kind of thing and then there's going to be a

10 competition for innovation." That's another
11 way to go.
12 There might be some problems there
13 figuring out exactly how you split up the
14 funds, and how much is going to be there for
15 core.
16 I sort of like the idea that what
17 you might say is, "Look, we want to protect
18 the core in exactly the way that Harold just
19 described, which I think is really good
20 language because it would sort of be
21 directive to people.
22 You got to think about this. You

56

1 got to address it and be serious about it.
2 At the same time, though, we want
3 innovation, and that's maybe just exactly
4 the right kind of pressure.
5 So, for example, proposal that
6 said, "Well, we're going to protect the
7 core. We're going to cut it back, but we're
8 going to do Presidential only in person, but
9 then we're going to innovate."
10 DR. BRADY: You know, if I were
11 king, we could probably proceed that way,
12 and if Norman were king forever, we could
13 proceed that way.
14 But, you know, what started this
15 all with recompetition is the notion that
16 the gentleman who introduced himself says,
17 "You know, how long should the National
18 Science Foundation support this same thing?"
19 I mean why would we be issuing a
20 competition, maintain the core that's been
21 going on for 50 years?
22 I mean we're not a -- you know,

1 we're supposed to be promoting the best
2 science and having things compete on those
3 terms, not, you know, implementing a program
4 to support year after year or Presidential
5 election after Presidential election after
6 Presidential election.

7 So, I mean, quite honestly, Norman
8 understands the issues, but if a
9 psychologist is sitting in his chair --

10 MR. TORANGEAU: Hey, watch it.

11 DR. SCIOLI: -- in eight years,
12 it's a totally different situation.

13 DR. BRADY: Is that true that you
14 don't support telescopes on a long-term
15 basis?

16 DR. SCIOLI: Well, the policy of
17 the National Science Foundation now is that,
18 after ten years, there should be a sunset,
19 unless there's a compelling argument, to
20 continue. That's where the review community
21 and the community comes in. They'll argue
22 that the charge is so compelling that the

1 world would not be the same if this did not
2 exist in exactly the same form.

3 DR. BRADY: But I bet there's a
4 lot of telescopes that have been supported
5 for 30 or 40 years?

6 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Usually,
7 they come in and completely rebuild them.

8 DR. SCIOLI: Well, but that's what
9 we're talking about. We're trying to pretty
10 much completely rebuild it --

11 DR. BRADY: Right. Well, then
12 that's --

13 DR. SCIOLI: Let's preserve a
14 core. We're not -- we're keeping a
15 location --

16 DR. BRADY: Right. Yeah.

17 DR. SCIOLI: Some of the basic
18 notions of why it was built there, but we're
19 building a lot of the rest of it.
20 DR. BRADBURN: That's the -- I
21 mean, you know, some combination.
22 But I just -- let me add one other

59

1 thing about, I guess, something that's
2 related to core and innovation, but beating
3 up on Andrew's point about the importance of
4 different issues and different elections,
5 and what Rick was saying, you know, are we
6 doing things for history or for kind of
7 understanding.

8 But just note that, you know, the
9 next election will be, you know, the history
10 in another four years. So as the elections
11 go on, there is understanding, this
12 particular one, but then the next one,
13 that's moved back into the history.

14 I would think that what's
15 peculiar, at least what we hope in some of
16 the issues that Chris was raising, that one
17 of the values of having things not simply
18 understanding the historical sort of
19 changes, but looking at some more general
20 phenomena that can be -- theories that can
21 be tested out with different instances.

22 So, in some sense, you could look

60

1 at each of the elections as, you know, an
2 instance of a phenomena that, at one level,
3 is the same, because each instance is
4 different, and you want to find something.

5 At some level, what is the dynamic
6 that's across all of them?

7 DR. HANSEN: I think that's a

8 point that's well worth making is that there
9 are two kind of innovation that can be
10 supported by a long-term study like this.

11 There is innovation looking
12 forward, which is talking about new content,
13 investigating new questions, perhaps
14 paralleling it with other studies to enrich
15 the understanding of the phenomenon.

16 But there's also innovation
17 looking back and having a set of data there
18 in the archive that scholars can go back to
19 investigate questions, and the way Chris
20 talked about the way he was making use of
21 the abortion questions.

22 That wasn't the reason those

61

1 questions was designed. It was the happy

2 happenstance that they were part of the
3 core, part of the issues core, and they were
4 there consistently through time, asking the
5 same way and so on.

6 So the part of, I think, the
7 question that's wrapped up in the core and
8 wrapped up in the whole issue of continuity
9 is not just what do we need for analysis in
10 the future.

11 You know, core is something, I
12 think, that's very important to analysis.

13 There are a lot of things, even if
14 you say, "We don't have to carry core,"
15 there are a lot of things that would stay
16 there because they're simply essential to
17 the kind of analysis one would want to do.

18 But there's also the question of
19 what the responsibility of the project is to
20 the next generation of scholars who will
21 make use and reuse of the data, looking
22 back.

15 these things?
16 How much is core because you
17 wanted to tap a certain type of attitude,
18 like maybe some measures of conservatism,
19 and it is your judgment that you're better
20 off using these same measures over an
21 extended period of time, unless, as Don
22 says, you're kind of forced to drop them by

64

1 changed circumstances?
2 Because, it seems to me that one
3 thing, it doesn't take any rethinking,
4 nothing that would pose real issues for us.
5 But the other is we're -- I mean
6 Henry said the core should be cut slightly
7 perhaps to add more innovative work, and
8 that would be where it would happen.
9 I just -- if you can just give me
10 a feel for that balance.
11 DR. KINDER: It would be a really
12 intuitive calculation, but something like
13 half of --
14 DR. LEMPert: Okay. So we're
15 talking 30 minutes of what I call "core
16 core"?
17 DR. KINDER: Another 30 minutes of
18 what you might call, "carryover core,"
19 getting it good concepts and being very wary
20 of changing because we might lose some of
21 the time series value by changing those, and
22 we're talking about another 60 minutes or

1 so.

2 DR. LEMPert: Which is all a lot
3 of time in all categories.

4 DR. HANSEN: Well, Don, what is
5 the proportion between the core concepts
6 that we carry all the time versus those that
7 we rotate? About a third, we rotate?

8 DR. KINDER: I would think it's
9 something like that, or maybe a little
10 smaller fraction.

11 MR. TORANGEAU: Let me jump in for
12 a second.

13 I mean I think that there's --
14 this imagine that I'm getting of this
15 horrible albatross, you know, the 45 minutes
16 of questions that can't be dispensed with,
17 but I don't think that's the issue.

18 I think even if we had zero
19 minutes of questions that we can't dispense
20 with, we'd still have a problem, and the
21 problem is do we want to mount a survey that
22 we know is likely to be susceptible to huge

1 biases?

2 I mean the problem is face-to-face
3 interviewing, and I think we're all very
4 uncomfortable with the idea that we're going
5 to mount a high-prestige, high-visible
6 scientific platform in a mode of data
7 collection like telephone that would yield
8 substantial savings at a cost of substantial
9 biases; non-response biases, reporting
10 biases, coverage biases.

11 You know, that's the issue. Even
12 if there were zero minutes core, you have

13 this problem.
14 If you're going to continue to do
15 it face to face, it's going to be expensive.
16 It's not that the core is some horrible
17 albatross?
18 I mean it seems to be inevitable.
19 If you're going to do a face-to-face
20 interview, you're going to go out there with
21 an hour, an hour and 15 minutes' worth of
22 questions.

67

1 It isn't -- you know, it just
2 doesn't make any sense to do it any less.
3 As soon as you get into an
4 instrument with 75 minutes of questions, the
5 idea of doing it over the phone, well, you
6 know, you're looking at, as I say, all kinds
7 of biases.
8 I don't know anybody who does that
9 kind of an instrument over the phone and
10 gets good data.
11 So, that's the issue. It isn't
12 that this core is some terrible albatross
13 that's driving up the cost of the survey
14 and, you know, eliminating innovation. It
15 doesn't seem to me.
16 The issue, the real driver here,
17 the problem is that it's so damned expensive
18 to do face-to-face interviews.
19 DR. SCIOLI: Excuse me one second.
20 I don't think the notion that is the core an
21 albatross. The notion is that if we have an
22 announcement asking for the best scientific

68

1 inquiry in the area of American electoral
2 behavior, Henry posited that we might have
3 two competitions.

4 DR. BRADY: Diana posited that,
5 and I wasn't convinced that was the best way
6 to go.
7 DR. SCIOLI: Okay.
8 DR. BRADY: I'm the Harold CLARKE,
9 British approach which says, "Let's have
10 something which says you've got to take
11 seriously the notion of a core," and grapple
12 with that.
13 Okay.
14 DR. SCIOLI: Okay.
15 DR. BRADBURN: I just want to make
16 sure I understand Roger's point.
17 I think Henry started by saying,
18 "We ought to have a national survey in
19 Presidential years and preserve a core, and,
20 therefore, for the foreseeable future, it
21 hasn't to be face-to-face."
22 What Roger is saying is it doesn't

69

1 matter whether you have a core or not. It
2 ought to be face-to-face because all the
3 other methods have got so many problems with
4 them that, for a major scientific sort of
5 thing, you shouldn't be doing that.
6 You may be using what Harold said
7 and so forth. You may be able to do, if
8 you've got that as your gold standard, so to
9 speak. You could do a lot of other things
10 by other methods and so forth.
11 MR. TORANGEAU: Let me, you know,
12 make my assumptions clear.
13 I mean I think the telephone is a
14 declining mode of data collection in this
15 country right now. It's more problematic
16 than it was ten years ago and it will be
17 more problematic ten years from now.
18 That's assumption number one so
19 that, you know, you can't go there.
20 As regards a mail survey in this
21 country, we just don't have a frame. You

22 know, and given those two constraints, I

70

1 mean maybe somebody cleverer than I could
2 figure out a way around these constraints.

3 But, given those constraints, a
4 major scientific study, you know, is going
5 to have to use face-to-face for the
6 foreseeable future, despite the fact that
7 it's, you know, these rising costs, it seems
8 to me.

9 You know, and you could argue. I
10 mean there are one or two federal surveys
11 have gone by the National Immunization Study
12 is the one I can think of. In the last 20
13 years, it started as a telephone study and
14 then make heroic efforts to get a response
15 rate, and I think they're in the sixties.

16 You know, and at some point, the
17 cost savings, you know, in order to get a
18 decent response by phone, the cost savings
19 start to be dissipated.

20 So I don't see any alternative.

21 DR. SCIOLI: Is there going to be
22 anybody at the meeting in the end of March,

71

1 the workshop at the end of March, who's
2 going to say, "Roger is dead wrong"?

3 MR. TORANGEAU: I mean we'll see.
4 Yeah. We'll find out.

5 DR. KINDER: All right. Roger,
6 right now, it's the first time in 25 years
7 we've differed about something which is that
8 I think it's actually a friendly
9 disagreement, but I think the insistence on,
10 given the current state of knowledge, the
11 insistence on face-to-face mode is right if
12 what we're talking about here is continuity

13 and maintaining the NES time series, some
14 commitment to some core.
15 If that's the issue, then I'm with
16 Roger all the way. But I think, and we
17 haven't gotten sort of off Henry's first
18 page yet.
19 But when we do and talk about
20 alternative designs that can be thought of
21 as complimentary to the main time series,
22 then I think we can put face-to-face not

72

1 entirely aside, but we should realize what
2 we're giving up if we decide to go, say,
3 with telephone.
4 But I think, although it may be
5 the case that we're in a kind of period of
6 turbulence about what the right technology
7 is to do interviewing, apart from
8 face-to-face interviewing into the future,
9 and telephone might not be the best choice,
10 we could live with that for the purpose of
11 these auxiliary studies. We could live with
12 that, I believe.
13 NES has lived with it and lots of
14 other folks have lived with it.
15 The biases he announces, I
16 subscribe to completely, but they have less
17 import for questions that would be
18 investigated in the kind of rolling cross
19 section designs that we talked about
20 yesterday.
21 It would be devastating, I think,
22 given what we know today to go to telephone

1 and pretend that we preserved core.

2 So, I'm with Roger there
3 completely, but that's only one of the
4 things that ought to be on the table if
5 we're talking about, and I hope we will. I
6 hope we let Henry finish his memo.

7 If we get to talk about
8 alternative designs, then I think telephone
9 is back on the table, and ought to be.

10 DR. MUTZ: Yeah. I should say
11 that's precisely the reason that I was
12 thinking that they might be better separated
13 because, you know, one of the ongoing
14 problems for the NES is always this tension
15 between pressure to maintain the core and
16 innovation that's always there when it's
17 just one pool.

18 If you separated those entities,
19 then we would be assured that the innovation
20 component would take place.

21 It is less important, I think,
22 that that be done face-to-face, the best

1 possible method, and so forth, because of
2 the kinds of things that are being looked
3 at.

4 But, once it's one organization
5 doing both, there has to be a tension
6 between the old and the new.

7 DR. LEMPert: Just out of
8 curiosity, one of the suggestions that's
9 emerged in some of the papers and discussion
10 yesterday was part of it being panel.

11 Would that, in the long run, offer
12 up for cost savings because the first round
13 might be face-to-face? It's easier to get a
14 follow up by telephone and every liability,
15 then --

16 DR. KINDER: Sure, and NES has
17 done a fair amount of that.

18 DR. LEMPert: Right.

19 DR. KINDER: Where the initial
20 interview is taken in person, and then,
21 subsequent reinterviews are over the phone.

22 DR. LEMPert: Okay.

1 DR. BRADY: Frank, how long do we
2 have for this session, by the way? We
3 started a bit late, so I would --

4 DR. GRANATO: It's supposed to end at
5 9:50, but let's keep going. There's a
6 rhythm here.

7 DR. BRADY: Okay.

8 DR. HANSEN: I just wanted to make
9 one point about the possibility of
10 separating sort of the core from other
11 content.

12 Part of what gives the other
13 content, the innovative content, if you
14 will, value, and part of what gives the core
15 value is they're related to each other so
16 that you can use them both.

17 I'd be concerned that if there
18 were a separation, that there be duplication
19 to begin with because there's a reason why
20 there's so much of it there, to begin with.

21 It's because it has proven so central to the
22 kinds of questions that get investigated

1 using the study.

2 DR. MUTZ: Right, before something
3 like the rolling cross-sectional design.

4 You know, that's going to be a different
5 animal altogether. You're going to have to
6 have some duplication because it's a
7 different purpose.

8 DR. HANSEN: Yeah. True.

9 DR. BRADY: It's also the case for
10 some of these other designs. You couldn't
11 really use in-person like rolling cross
12 section, like, I think, the Stoker- Bowers
13 kind of design.

14 It would be very, very hard to in-
15 person. It's possible, but it's pushing it,
16 it seems to me.

17 MR. TORANGEAU: I didn't mean to

18 imply that there is no rule for telephone
19 in --
20 DR. BRADY: Right.
21 MR. TORANGEAU: -- national
22 election studies. I just say that if it's

77

1 going to be --
2 It seems inconceivable to me that
3 you could switch over to that as the main
4 thrust of what you're doing, and, you know,
5 I just think it would be problematic.
6 Once you have that constraint,
7 this is going to be a big ticket item.
8 DR. CLARKE: You know, I think,
9 still, like, to me, the way I want to think
10 about this is in terms of scientific
11 questions I'm trying to answer, and a lot
12 flows, I think, from that.
13 Decisions, in some sense, become a
14 lot easier, what constitutes core, being an
15 example.
16 As long as you proceed from that
17 bay, I think that's a much more fruitful way
18 of doing this.
19 I think it's also very important,
20 if you want to defend national election
21 studies, as I said yesterday, it's not here.
22 We're the choir, essentially. We

78

1 may differ about who does it and how we do
2 it, but we're, basically, like, "Yeah. This
3 is good stuff. We want to do this."

4 But this is not the whole
5 political science community. It's not even
6 the community of all the people who do
7 political behavior, let alone all of the
8 National Science Foundation.

9 So I would like to -- you know,
10 the proposals that would be exciting to me,
11 if I'm a reviewer on this, would be the ones
12 that say, "Hey, we're really going to answer
13 some scientific questions now."

14 Really, this is really important
15 because of the science it will achieve. I
16 think it makes it much easier, then, to
17 defend, you know, high ticket and say,
18 "Well, you've got to have face-to-face, but
19 it's justified in terms of the science
20 that's going to be achieved.

21 That's the way I think that we
22 could really make headway in the future. I

79

1 mean that's sort of my general sort of
2 little pronouncement here.

3 DR. BRADY: Well, one way to go at
4 that is to maybe talk about some of these
5 new designs and new issues that could be
6 addressed to Cannon.

7 I have four designs, basically,
8 that I take out of the discussions that
9 people put forward.

10 DR. KINDER: Can I interrupt just
11 for a moment?

12 DR. BRADY: Sure.

13 DR. KINDER: Because I wanted to
14 respond to what Harold said.

15 I agree with it completely, and I
16 think it -- I guess I was taking it for
17 granted that whatever pitch is made by
18 whomever around the table next time around
19 has to be justified on scientific grounds,
20 and the value of the likely contribution to
21 advancement of scientific understanding

1 That said, this is the point.
2 You're looking for advice about the Core?
3 Fifteen pages isn't enough.
4 You know, this is a special kind
5 of project, yet there isn't just one idea
6 being forwarded, you know, and elaborated in
7 a series of experiments or something.
8 So, if we want to do what Harold
9 says we ought to do, which I believe he's
10 right, and if you want help from us, partly,
11 in convincing others about the importance of
12 the enterprise, then we need more space
13 than 15 pages.
14 DR. SCIOLI: No. You're exactly
15 right on that, and that's an issue that we
16 have to deal with.
17 It might be worth noting that
18 within this debate, well, when the project
19 was recompeted -- this is for all of our
20 visitors -- we had very little insight as to
21 how to proceed in any kind of a drastic way,
22 any kind of an upheaval way.

1 Our best judgment was that we were
2 going to buy, for the next four years, very
3 good science and, you know, make no mistake
4 about it, that's why we supported the
5 American national election studies, and I'd
6 be prepared to say that anywhere in this
7 building or any other building.

8 But, if there was a sense that we
9 have to think about the next decade and
10 where electoral behavior is going, and
11 whether or not we continued business as
12 usual or whether or not we make some kind of
13 a drastic innovation.

14 That's why all of you have been
15 invited in today, and that's why we're
16 listening very carefully, and we might have
17 to have another workshop with a different
18 group of people, as Harold said.

19 You know, maybe we have to get
20 some people who are not choir people.

21 No. I just wanted to be clear
22 that the last recompetition, these ideas

82

1 were kind of beginning to percolate, but we
2 didn't have any kind of systematic advice
3 where we wanted to say, "Okay. Let's stop
4 right now. Let's not do the Presidential
5 election study, and let's take stock."

6 We thought that would be tragic,
7 and we had a great proposal before us, so we
8 supported it.

9 DR. BRADY: I see Chris and Nancy.
10 Nancy, do you have something that's
11 immediately germane or --

12 DR. BURNS: It's germane to the
13 conversation we've been having, but it's a
14 sentence but --

15 DR. BRADY: Okay.

16 DR. ACHEN: I just, in following
17 up on what Frank just said, I'd like to
18 encourage us today to think about -- and
19 Roger was going in this direction, too, I
20 think -- what would it mean to do this in a
21 way that we would all be 100 percent
22 satisfied with the quality of the science

1 today, and not say, "Well, we could get it
2 down to \$1.75. No. We could get it down
3 to \$1.69."

4 Let's talk doing it right here,
5 and down the road, we may have to cut back,
6 and people may have to say, "No," and say,
7 "We can't do all that this time."

8 But, for today, let's put onto the
9 table what we could do on all fronts that
10 would be really exciting.

11 If it's a huge amount of money,
12 fine. That's the next meeting.

13 But let's put it out there the
14 best we can, the best set of ideas we have,
15 and not try to think of ways in advance to
16 hack it back. That's somebody else's job
17 down the road.

18 DR. BRADY: Nancy?

19 DR. BURNS: So I just had one
20 sentence, and that's just to -- maybe more
21 than one sentence, but to think about.

22 I was thinking about the number of

1 studies. I mean you mentioned a second ago.
2 I was thinking that are there times when
3 folks throw out the core and then build
4 their own thing?

5 So I was thinking of your example
6 of the Canadian study where building the old
7 thing, your own thing meant partly taking a
8 lot of essentially what's the core and
9 putting it in there.

10 I was thinking there's about a
11 percent overlap, 80, 85 percent overlap
12 between the NES questions and the National
13 Black Election Study, the Latino National
14 Politic Study, lots of election studies
15 around the world.

16 So, just as kind of a teeny

17 experiment, folks who didn't have to have a
18 commitment to any core, we could throw it
19 all out and build it again.
20 They built it again with the core
21 that looks like this core.
22 DR. BRADY: I'd like to go to

85

1 designs now, and as I was saying before --
2 this is page 2, by the way, to use my Paul
3 Harvey, if you remember, "Page 2, and that's
4 not all the story, and" -- however he did
5 it.
6 DR. HANSEN: "The rest of the
7 story."
8 DR. BRADY: "The rest of the
9 story." That's what it is. Thank you. I
10 love Paul Harvey.
11 Anyway, the Midwest. I have four
12 things: Panels, which Chris has alerted me
13 to that I ignored. He's absolutely right.
14 It's worth thinking about, although I don't
15 do windows and I don't do panels.
16 But, nevertheless, but I think
17 that there's a lot to be said for panels. I
18 really do, so --
19 Then, the rolling cross section,
20 during the campaign, would be a second one.
21 Then there's this midterm
22 geographic. It doesn't necessarily have to

86

1 be midterm, but the proposal that's sort of
2 before us is the Stoker-Bowers one, which is

3 a midterm one that would focus on geography.
4 Then, finally, a continuous
5 monitoring.
6 Just to go over each one quickly
7 what you gain, the idea of panels, I think,
8 especially the kind that Chris is talking
9 about, is that we don't know much about how
10 people, over time, really change and form
11 their opinions.
12 We don't know much between
13 election years what happens with people and
14 how events affect their opinions, and it
15 would be very good to have more
16 understanding of that process.
17 It's probably a real frontier that
18 we haven't really investigated very much
19 yet.
20 So that would be really, really
21 useful to understand that. It also would
22 maybe link us to governance, to try to

87

1 understand, in those interregnums before
2 elections where something seems to happen
3 that what does happen and learn more about
4 that.
5 Rolling cross section campaign is
6 really much more focused on campaign, their
7 media effects events again, candidate
8 strategies, the parties, to some extent, and
9 what they do.
10 You could think of that becoming
11 an element of that. That could be a very
12 interesting study.
13 I'm a little worried about that
14 because Annenberg is investing a lot on
15 that, and has an incredibly big study.
16 There's the Canadian studies.
17 There's the British study.
18 There's a fair amount of rolling
19 cross section work now, and I'm not
20 absolutely convinced the NES could mount

21 something that would be that novel at this
22 point, but that's a possibility.

88

1 Then there's this midterm more
2 geographic thing that I emphasized you could
3 maybe study parties and context a lot more,
4 which I find enormously exciting.
5 We don't know much about political
6 parties and how they're related to
7 elections, at least through the
8 instrumentality of the American national
9 election studies.
10 Maybe it's time to say, "The next
11 ten years, we're really going to find out
12 how parties operate during elections and
13 what role they play," and that will be our
14 big emphasis.
15 That might also involve on the
16 side some surveys of either candidates or
17 political parties, or as organizations,
18 maybe even interest groups.
19 You could think of an incredibly
20 interesting study along those lines.
21 Then, the continuous monitoring is
22 another way of getting some of the things

89

1 Chris is interested in with respect to
2 panels, because you could watch over time as
3 events and other things affect people's
4 attitudes and beliefs.
5 It has the virtue of continuous
6 monitoring, if it's continuous cross
7 sections, that you don't have so much of a
8 sensitization problem.
9 In fact, I think that's maybe one

10 of the major issues with the panels versus
11 continuous monitoring is how much you think
12 sensitization is an issue and how much you
13 think mortality is an issue, as well,
14 because panels have that particular problem
15 that leads you to eventually have fewer and
16 fewer people.

17 So those are the four designs I
18 think we might study. I think it's
19 important if people want to plump for one or
20 the other, and they say, why,
21 scientifically, using Harold's criteria,
22 you'd want to do it? So let's start the

90

1 discussion.

2 Anybody want to defend a pet
3 design?

4 DR. HANSEN: Well, I think there
5 is a lot of interest in the different
6 designs and a lot of different kind of
7 interests.

8 The designs are always very
9 closely related to the substance of what
10 wants to do, and so, a point of interest in
11 the media and attitude change, then that
12 argues for, say, panels or rolling cross
13 sections or something, where you can sort of
14 pick up those dynamics in a fairly
15 constrained time frame.

16 If your interest is in, say,
17 studying more of the relationship between
18 elections and governance, that argues,
19 perhaps, for a little longer term kind of
20 panel design, where you might begin with the
21 Presidential election and follow it in to
22 the next off year to investigate the way in

1 which what's actually happening on Capitol
 2 Hill and in the White House is affecting
 3 people's thoughts, followed in the
 4 Congressional election, and so on.

5 But I think that there has been a
 6 lot of interest expressed around the table
 7 in a greater incorporation of some dynamic
 8 element into the survey.

9 From the scientific standpoint of
 10 being able to make more secure causal
 11 inferences from these studies, but also, I
 12 think, from the substantive standpoint that
 13 the study has been very much focused on
 14 elections and very much on the kind of
 15 context that immediately surrounds the
 16 election, and where there's an awful lot
 17 more to be learned is in knowing more about
 18 the whole electoral period, or more about
 19 the relationship, as I said, between
 20 elections and governance.

21 DR. ACHEN: I think just to follow
 22 up on that, I think that this dynamics of

1 whatever kind -- and there's a lot to be
 2 said for all these various designs.

3 I doubt anybody around the table
 4 is opposed to any of these. They all were
 5 very much worth doing.

6 There is some, I think,
 7 interesting policy aspects of these, too.
 8 So take, for example, declining voter
 9 turnout, which is a serious problem, I
 10 think.

11 If you look at the rise of
 12 demagogues in democracy, one of the things
 13 they usually have going for them is that the
 14 voter turnout rate has declined, and they've
 15 got a pool of non-participant, slightly
 16 ignorant voters that they can exploit.

17 So, declining voter turnout, I
 18 think, is a problem that deserves some real
 19 attention.

20 But what is the problem, though,
 21 exactly? We have different ways of
 22 attacking it.

1 So, in the cross sections, we
2 treat every election as if the voter were
3 making a new decision, and that his or her
4 own past history wasn't very relevant
5 because we have no way of looking at the
6 past history.

7 So, one thing Nancy has done with
8 a colleague of ours named Mike Trogard, is
9 look at the Oregon data, where they've
10 actually given these two researchers access
11 to a series of voter turnout reports for the
12 same people over time.

13 This was of interest because of
14 arguments going to a mail ballot.

15 I haven't talked to Nancy about
16 this. I hope I get this story straight.
17 You can just hit me from across the room if
18 I don't.

19 But, one of the interesting things
20 that they did was impose quite a different
21 statistical model on this in which you get
22 into a kind of voter mode, where you get

1 used to it. You get incorporated, and if
2 you're not sick or something, you show up at
3 the polls.

4 It's like being married or
5 divorced. It's not that you can't get out
6 of those states. It's just that, once
7 you're in them, it's a little harder.

8 So there's a continuing presence
9 of people in these states.

10 When I first read this paper, as
11 always, when you encounter a good idea, you
12 think, "Gee, that's not the way we've done
13 it before."

14 The more I thought about it, the
15 more I liked it. Time will tell whether it,
16 you know, proves out in a variety of other

17 contexts.
18 My point is, simply, you can't
19 even touch that idea without dynamic data.
20 It has different policy
21 consequences. If it's a one off or one time
22 thing every election to get people to the

95

1 polls, that's a story about the candidates
2 are boring. We're not reaching them with
3 the media. They should remind us more
4 frequently, and so on.

5 If, on the other hand, it's that
6 people are now reaching the political system
7 in a state where it just seems dull and
8 irrelevant to them, and it's more systemic
9 so that nothing that happens in the campaign
10 is going to reach them because they're in a
11 different state, that's a different kind of
12 story, and, hence, different policy
13 consequences.

14 So, this is just one example.
15 There will be a lot of these, but it's a for
16 instance.

17 Nancy's panel was -- you can
18 remind me, just a few years, I think. Not
19 terribly long.

20 DR. BURNS: Six years.

21 DR. ACHEN: Six years, so even --

22 DR. BURNS: Six elections.

96

1 DR. ACHEN: Six elections, so --
2 DR. BURNS: Longer.

3 DR. ACHEN: A little longer.
4 Yeah. So, it wasn't horribly long, but it's
5 an example, and one that's of some interest,
6 I think, on places like Capitol Hill.
7 So, it just seems to me that a lot
8 of real opportunities here, they would exist
9 in short panels or long panels, whatever,
10 but they are the kind of thing that we would
11 be able to -- we, of the community, would be
12 able to come in with in proposals if we had
13 a green light that a proposal of that kind
14 would be welcome.
15 DR. MUTZ: I really think it's
16 important, as Mark said, to match the design
17 to the questions. There are some things
18 that, you know, about campaigns which are
19 very short term, which the rolling cross
20 section approach is really, by far, the best
21 because you're catching things in a short
22 period of time.

97

1 But, if we had a panel, as well, I
2 think it would be completely different
3 research questions because a panel is not
4 going to be good for studying the campaign
5 process itself.
6 It's far better if we, you know,
7 have it over the longest period of time
8 possible, over an entire lifetime, if
9 possible, to track people's, you know, party
10 identification, feelings about government
11 and so forth.
12 So, you know, I can see both those
13 designs being used with no overlap because
14 it's real clear to me that some questions
15 are better answered before and then the
16 other, so --
17 DR. LEMPERS: In the spirit of
18 brainstorming, I've just been kind of
19 sitting here playing, you know, and
20 wondering what will happen if the

21 announcement came out, and the language
22 suggests to me was thinking about, but

98

1 saying, well, the American Voter was
2 written. That was the first, you know,
3 major work from this study.
4 So, the next series, you can study
5 everything but the voter. We want to
6 understand elections. We want to predict
7 them, but we can't talk to voters.
8 Where would the investments be
9 under those ground rules?
10 We've said things like media. I'm
11 just curious, that can expand the focus.
12 DR. BRADY: Parties.
13 DR. LEMPert: Parties?
14 DR. MUTZ: Interest groups.
15 DR. LEMPert: Interest groups.
16 DR. HANSEN: Or elected officials.
17 Yeah.
18 DR. LEMPert: Let me just follow
19 up because part of what I'm thinking about
20 all these things. I'm sure we could think
21 about some other even more interesting
22 things.

99

1 The economy, I mean, just for
2 example, and the way it articulates, and
3 who's affected by it, and so forth.
4 To what extent is the vehicle we
5 have, given that we're going to continue
6 studying voters and it's going to continue

7 to be the center of what we're doing, is
8 that a vehicle which is well articulated for
9 including as part of an announcement or part
10 of the program of research, these kinds of
11 other foci?

12 DR. HANSEN: Well, I think it
13 would make for a very interesting and
14 exciting possibilities to encourage sort of
15 interrelated studies, I guess.

16 One of the things I was thinking
17 about this morning, which gets back to my
18 kind of obsession with Bowerpool and Dexter,
19 is the notion that one might be able to
20 encourage research groups that are working
21 in parallel.

22 So, for instance, a group that is

100

1 doing elite interviewing on Capitol Hill, or
2 perhaps a legislative liaison office in
3 White House, or, you know, people who are
4 involved in real policy making.

5 If that group might work in
6 parallel with the election study, where the
7 kinds of things that are coming out of those
8 elite interviews then might inform the
9 content, fate for the fall pre-election
10 study.

11 The things that come out of the
12 fall study and the post-election study,
13 where we've been able to talk to voters,
14 might then inform the kind of things that
15 people are asking about when they go back up
16 onto Capitol Hill.

17 Whether one wants to encourage
18 that as sort of part of the election study,
19 or whether one wants to encourage that as
20 part of an overall program to kind of, you
21 know, make people aware that there are these
22 possibilities for coordination, and the

101

1 foundation might welcome those opportunities
2 for coordination.

3 That could be very, very exciting,
4 and it is, also, an opportunity to bring
5 these research communities, these new
6 research communities, into the study in a
7 way that has been difficult before.

8 A lot of the Congressional
9 researchers, what they do is they talk to
10 people on Capitol Hill. They don't do
11 surveys.

12 But the opportunity to sort of
13 have the work that they're doing, inform the
14 work in the election study, and then the
15 work in the election study being able to
16 inform the work on Capitol Hill, I think
17 would be really exciting and I think would
18 broaden their understanding because it
19 happens.

20 It's worth saying in this regard,
21 and, again, my obsession with Bowerpool and
22 Dexter, E. Shottsnyder's review of Bowerpool

102

1 and Dexter says, "The problem with this book
2 is that it doesn't talk about elections at
3 all. It's like, you know, Congress is
4 floating out in space and it has no
5 connection to voters."

6 Well, this would be an instrument
7 where you could, in fact, make that
8 connection in a very interesting way.

9 DR. SCIOLI: Let me answer the
10 question for Rick in the sense that our
11 outreach to the community tells us, and as
12 you read our jackets, you know we support
13 research on political parties.

14 We support research on studying
15 legislative institutions. We support
16 research on interest groups. We support
17 research on lobbying groups, public policy,

18 etc.
19 So the American politics portfolio
20 is, in fact, quite broad, and the ANES is
21 the main, if not the only opportunity we
22 have to look at the voter.

103

1 DR. LEMPert: The issue for me
2 that sort of motivated my question was,
3 following up with what Chris was saying, was
4 the scientific payoff.

5 Would it be better, for example,
6 if you took some of the money that's now
7 devoted to some of these other areas, and
8 there was an announcement that had a larger
9 pot of money for the ANES.

10 But, for example, to follow up
11 what Mark says, we expect that, you know,
12 three- quarters of this will go to voter
13 studies, and another quarter will be studies
14 that articulate with it.

15 Would that have a higher
16 scientific payoff than the practice that
17 we're now doing, which is competing, in
18 essence, a survey, and then having separate,
19 kind of very small, uncoordinate
20 competitions for lots of other things that
21 form an understanding of elections?

22 DR. BLAIS: Voters are choosing

104

1 them on parties, so I would agree with Henry
2 that, you know, the study of parties is
3 absolutely essential and that, for example,
4 a candidate survey that's done in Australia
5 seems to be, you know, the most logical

6 thing to do. It's just amazing it's not
7 done in those countries.
8 Especially if you want to tack
9 off, you know, points in the direction of
10 proximity debate, people in directional
11 theory are using now voters mean placement
12 as a proxy for their actual positions.
13 But why not use candidate
14 positions as in a survey, and a candidate
15 survey is a very, very cheap way of
16 proceeding, assuming that you can proceed by
17 mail for a candidate.
18 DR. BRADY: We could find out why
19 there's so many bad candidates, and Capitol
20 Hill, we know, loves that kind of thing.
21 DR. CLARKE: They love that stuff
22 on quality candidates.

105

1 DR. LEMPert: It's only the good
2 ones win. There's no downside.
3 DR. CLARKE: Well, there's one line
4 of research to gain a little bit of
5 comparative information.
6 One of the things that people in
7 Britain have been interested in is the whole
8 question of campaign effects with local
9 party organizations.
10 This is a line of research that
11 was pursued in the United States quite
12 vigorously by Sam Eldersval and other people
13 at the University of Michigan a long, long
14 time ago. But it's something that's been
15 reinvigorated in the British context in
16 the 1990's.
17 My colleague, Paul Whiteley, in
18 particular, has been very active in doing
19 this, and it's actually possible for us,
20 given the size of their party surveys, which
21 are mail surveys.
22 But they work quite well because

1 of the access they get through the
2 organizations for us to actually have
3 multiple level modeling where we can look at
4 the effect of another campaign as another
5 variable.

6 We've got, you know, work ongoing
7 in this area.

8 So that would be exciting. If you
9 want to bring parties back in, I think the
10 way to do it is probably along these lines,
11 using some of the ideas of Stoker and Bowers
12 and so forth, in terms of how you structure
13 a Congressional study.

14 DR. GRANATO: Let's take a ten-
15 minute break.

16 (Recess)

17 DR. SCIOLI: Okay. Page 3. Yes.
18 John Thompson. Okay. John?

19 FUTURE ISSUES IN SAMPLING

20 DR. THOMPSON: All right. Well,
21 most of what I had to say has already been
22 said, but let me jump up with something.

1 The first point that was sort of
2 made in the discussions is that we were
3 trying to set the goals for the next ten
4 years.

5 I've been trying to understand
6 what are the resources that might be
7 available for the next ten years or that's
8 something that's got to be addressed was
9 what is -- some kind of idea as to what kind
10 of resource is going to be there.

11 That's really hard to do. I mean

12 I'm not saying that it's an easy thing to do
13 because there are a lot of uncertainties in
14 the world with sources of funding and all
15 that.

16 Then, what would help that would
17 be to decide, like Diana said, what are the
18 questions that we want to answer for the
19 next ten years, over the next ten years,
20 because I think that would go a long ways
21 toward guiding some design issues.

22 Maybe we should spend a bit of the

108

1 time that I have today to talk more
2 specifically about what are the questions
3 that a survey should answer over the next
4 ten years, and I think that would lead into
5 some -- maybe some more discussions with
6 designs.

7 Just little footnote is I don't
8 understand the design that the state
9 compounded or why you do a state sample.

10 In the work I've done where I've
11 had these state samples, I've really been
12 burned with some inefficiencies on the
13 sample.

14 Most of my work was trying to
15 measure characteristics associated with
16 reapportionment and redistricting, but state
17 designs didn't work there, which is why I
18 think more about doing a Congressional type
19 design, I mean even a design to sub-
20 Congressional district, something that
21 stratifies across state boundaries and could
22 be used then as a predictive mechanism for

109

1 states.

2 But I'm not as familiar with the
3 kinds of data and the clustering of the data
4 that you're doing with, as you are. So you
5 know a lot more about that.

6 I think, just from what I've been

7 hearing about the concerns about getting
8 funding, that the survey is just going to be
9 pushed to do some kind of multi-mode of data
10 collection.

11 You just see that everywhere. The
12 organizations, government and private are
13 just going to more multi-mode.

14 You can do things with, you know,
15 RDD, and you can take RDD's and geocode them
16 to small areas, match them back to telephone
17 numbers, and you can get smaller estimates
18 from telephones.

19 There are some coverage issues
20 there that you have to worry about, but it
21 can be done.

22 The Census Bureau got a lot out of

110

1 some Knowledge Networks sampling in terms of
2 measuring the changing awareness, which
3 might relate to media as we approach the
4 census.

5 The data was just incredibly
6 timely, and when we analyzed it later, there
7 are some papers that a woman named Betsy
8 Martin at the Census Bureau wrote.

9 The results of the Knowledge
10 Networks actually compared very favorably
11 with some telephone studies that we also
12 did. So it was something that I think you
13 ought to look at in terms of more detail.

14 I don't understand what Roger is
15 saying about there not being a good mail
16 frame. That's something that I don't
17 understand.

18 I mean the American community
19 survey at the Census Bureau is going out
20 every month with a mailout that's a three
21 stage, multi-mode survey. They do a
22 mailout. Then they do telephone. Then they

1 do field, and they use different stages of
2 sampling for each --

3 MR. TORANGEAU: No one else has
4 access to the math, though, and that's what
5 they use, right?

6 DR. THOMPSON: Well, maybe if you
7 wanted to use mail, you might contract with
8 the Census Bureau to do a mailout for you.

9 I think that --

10 MR. TORANGEAU: That's the one
11 exception is that there is a master address
12 file compiled for the dissent and updated
13 for the SES. You're right.

14 They don't share. They don't
15 share with the other children, John.

16 DR. THOMPSON: Well, thank God I'm
17 not with that greedy organization.

18 MR. TORANGEAU: I believe they're
19 forbidden by law from sharing. They're
20 wonderful people.

21 DR. THOMPSON: Well, anyway, I'm
22 seriously thinking about doing some kind of

1 contract. If you're going to do a mailout
2 component, if you wanted to contract with
3 the Census Bureau, there would be some work
4 you'd have to do to get the data back.

5 But they could do a fairly
6 inexpensive -- mail is pretty inexpensive.
7 They could do a cheap mailout for you, and
8 then you could do the rest. That might be a
9 way to bring in the mail.

10 I don't know how the new -- I know
11 the National Science Foundation has some new
12 confidentiality provisions I saw in the

13 latest laws. That might also help in terms
14 of dealing with some of that data.
15 I don't know how that might work
16 out, but the confidentiality has been, I
17 think, strengthened a bit, so that's good.
18 Other than that I mean I think we
19 ought to just spend some time talking about
20 what the questions are that we want to try
21 to answer over the next ten years.
22 I mean that's -- we talked about

113

1 different modes of data collection, the
2 limitations of panel surveys, limitations
3 of, you know, the good things about a
4 rolling cross sectional survey.
5 So I think that's probably what we
6 ought to do, and I'm particularly a novice
7 here because I don't really have an idea as
8 to what kind of questions that you want to
9 answer over the next ten years.
10 DR. BRADY: Well, I'll just talk
11 for a minute about political parties.
12 I would love to know more about
13 how political parties actually operate in
14 the states and in the counties of America.
15 How they make decisions about
16 mobilizing voters, and then what impacts
17 those have on potential voters, which seems
18 to me that if you had a properly designed
19 study, you could actually maybe see some of
20 that.
21 You could see the ones that put
22 efforts in to get out the votes, things,

1 whether that led to mobilization of voters
2 or not.

3 You could see about how candidates
4 ran their campaigns in terms of mobilize
5 voters.

6 You could see what kind of issues
7 the parties decided they were going to focus
8 on, and then candidates focused on, and how
9 that affected what the voters learned about.

10 So all those kinds of things
11 struck me as really neat and interesting
12 things to know.

13 Also, things like political
14 participation, finding out which parties
15 tried to focus on money and which ones
16 focused on more time based activities, like
17 trying to get volunteers to work, and how
18 that affected people deciding whether
19 they're going to give money or time-based
20 stuff.

21 That's a really important question
22 in American politics right now, is

1 understanding money-based versus time-based
2 participation.

3 DR. BRADBURN: Let me just mention
4 at least a strategy for linking studies of
5 organizational institutions with national
6 surveys, and I'm not sure this would be
7 exactly applicable to parties, but it might
8 be. I mean I'll throw out one. It may be
9 ridiculous.

10 But, in the GSS, sometimes there
11 has been -- it didn't say and study
12 churches. So they find out what the parish
13 or the church that the individual in the GSS
14 belongs to, if they do, and then that
15 becomes the sampling frame for a study of
16 churches. So they go, then, to the church
17 of that person.

18 Similarly, a study of employers.
19 They find out who the employer of the person
20 is, and they use that to generate a study of
21 employers.
22 In principle, you could find out

116

1 what, you know -- well, you're not going to
2 find out, but code the precinct within which
3 the individuals live, and then go to see who
4 the precinct workers are and what the party
5 structure is for the segment that, a cluster
6 of houses.

7 Now, that -- you know, that might
8 affect -- going back to what John says, that
9 might affect, you know, what kind of cluster
10 size you want or something, if you want to
11 say something about -- or you jiggle your
12 clusters so that they're all in one precinct
13 or something like that.

14 But they are -- I mean these are
15 the kind of designs in which you sort of use
16 your individual sample to generate a path
17 into institutions.

18 DR. BRADY: Well, in churches and
19 workplaces, by the way -- churches are
20 something I'm especially interested in.
21 Diana has done a lot of work on workplaces.
22 It would be fascinating to know more about

117

1 because we know they are places where
2 politics get discussed and often movements
3 begin and things happen, so --

4 DR. BRADBURN: Well, this is, just
5 structurally --

6 DR. BRADY: I understand.

7 DR. BRADBURN: The study is
8 financed independently. I mean that's --

9 DR. BRADY: Right. Right.

10 DR. LEMPert: You know, in
11 response to John's question, there's two
12 issues that I'm particularly, you know,
13 intrigued by.

14 One is the marginal productivity
15 of different uses of money, and we have
16 gross statistics about, without spending
17 your means, but some money is spent wisely.
18 Some isn't.

19 I'd love to know where one gets
20 leverage in the system and how that is
21 contingent on other factors, including
22 issues and the like.

118

1 The other question, which I'm even
2 more fundamentally interested in, I think
3 that the ANES is well situated to get at,
4 has to do with the constellation of values
5 and concerns that voters have.

6 How it is that when the time comes
7 to make a binary decision, certain of these
8 seem to dominate others, even though if you
9 were to, perhaps, put people in a game
10 theoretical framework or something like
11 that, they might give you a different rating
12 of what is influencing them.

13 I'd love to really understand what
14 it is that, for some people, make a symbolic
15 issue, like abortion, the definitive issue
16 in the election, and how that mattering to
17 them might affect their actual understanding
18 of other issues in ways that may or may not
19 be incorrect.

20 I'd also like to see, and this
21 gets on very thin ice sometimes, perhaps,
22 but a kind of normative baseline to what

1 extent are voters correct in their beliefs,
2 and how does incorrect and correct beliefs.

3 I mean if you asked voters how
4 much does X matter to you, and what party is
5 supporting this, and so on and so forth,
6 these are questions that I think are -- I'm
7 curious about, just to be candid.

8 DR. KINDER: Those are great
9 questions, and I think we have at least some
10 partial answers to them already, and they go
11 something like this.

12 Part of what NES has helped to
13 produce is a reasonable understanding, I
14 think, a specification of the variables that
15 are important in a voters choice.

16 It's not a theory. It's a list, a
17 catalog of things that matter, on average.

18 But your question is, well, so
19 people differ in what they are passionate
20 about.

21 That's one source of variation,
22 and we have some capacity to look at that

1 already.

2 The other, in some respects, more
3 interesting source of variation is the
4 temporal or situational one that has to do
5 with the climate of the times and the
6 particular kind of campaign that's being
7 run.

8 On the idea that what really is
9 important for people depends a lot on what
10 is happening in politics and how issues are
11 being formulated by elites.

12 To investigate that, you need
13 variation of a spatial and temporal sort,
14 and we do that by continuing on out the
15 election study with a commitment to
16 comparable questions so you can basically
17 run a model at one point and run a model at
18 another point on the idea that the
19 coefficients are going to differ as a
20 consequence of circumstance.
21 You also get variation on it.
22 We've done it in the past and there's a

121

1 design on the table to it, and some way is a
2 more efficient way where the variation is
3 spatial.
4 People are in habitats, faced with
5 different kinds of choices and different
6 kinds of immediate circumstances. They live
7 in different states.
8 So the Senate election study and
9 the Congressional election study are a
10 state-based sample that was on the table,
11 that Laura Stoker and Jake Bowers have
12 articulated is another powerful device for
13 opening up to systematic analysis the kinds
14 of questions that you are just --
15 DR. LEMPert: Let me just throw
16 out two other things, not issues, but
17 methods that I talked very briefly about the
18 priority area and just mentioned what's most
19 relevant in it, which is this emphasis on
20 resources and infrastructure.
21 But, very, very closely related, I
22 think, really inseparable, another one of

1 the six foci in the priority area is on
2 modeling and model building.

3 There's two types of models I
4 would like to be able to work with. One is
5 what's going on with the agent-based
6 modeling.

7 I'd love to see work. I don't
8 know how it has to be done, but it would see
9 on what course, you know, limited core set
10 of principles one might generate the
11 patterns that we're seeing, and if we could
12 have a dialogue, if you will, between the
13 modelers and the work you're doing on that.

14 The other is the one I mentioned
15 yesterday. It's just sheer intuition.

16 But I can't believe that networks
17 are not crucial to what is going on. I
18 think there has to be some way for
19 combination modeling and researcher, maybe
20 substudies, to begin to tease out network
21 effects, both formal and informal, in ways
22 that go beyond what I think has been done to

1 date.

2 DR. HANSEN: Well, the kind of
3 approach that Norman was suggesting related
4 to churches and places of employment might
5 actually be quite helpful in helping to
6 bring more knowledge of those immediate
7 networks into the study.

8 MR. SANTOS: On the other hand, I
9 think it would be kind of interesting -- I
10 don't know if it's ever been done -- to do
11 some ethnographic research by planting folks
12 into specific campaigns in local areas and
13 following them, the action that happens.

14 Maybe you guys have already done
15 it in other countries, but I think that
16 could really get at issues of what's going
17 on and spark maybe survey questions that
18 could be added later on to the NES.

19 So it's been there, done that?

20 DR. BRADY: No.

21
22

DR. HANSEN: No.
DR. BLAIS: In 1997, in the Kenya

124

1 election study, we decided to do -- I think
2 it's 100 unstructured interviews, join a
3 campaign with a subset of our respondents.
4 We've never analyzed the data.
5 Just this is interesting. This is a gold
6 mine, but were, you know, billing out of
7 data, we never got to do it, so it's sitting
8 there.
9 DR. HANSEN: You know, I will
10 reiterate, although I'll try to do it
11 briefly, an interest in the relationship
12 between elections and governments as one of
13 the key questions that lies before us.
14 I think we have some knowledge
15 from the current studies about how
16 governance affects elections in that we do
17 ask people about their stands and their
18 perceptions on issues.
19 We ask them about their
20 evaluations of candidates on things like
21 performance. But what we haven't been able
22 to do is to carry that forward and to see

125

1 how the circumstances, the election then
2 shapes their perceptions of what's going on
3 in government, say, in an off year, and how
4 those perceptions of performance during off
5 years and the promises of the previous
6 election affect Congressional -- the next
7 midterm elections, and carrying it forward,
8 even, into the next Presidential cycle.
9 So I think that there are a very

10 rich set of questions out there that we
11 might investigate that have to do with sort
12 of relations between sort of mass sort of
13 voter behavior and the institutions of
14 government.

15 DR. MUTZ: I'd like to follow up
16 on the social network emphasis.

17 I think, again, while we have some
18 compelling evidence about how networks
19 matter to political attitudes and vote
20 choice and so forth, again, the biggest
21 problem is a methodological one because we
22 need people to change context, to change

126

1 networks or look at the impact that has and
2 know that it is not self-selection of people
3 and, you know, like Clavis and so forth.

4 So, again, it's something like a
5 long-term panel and that kind of thing,
6 would give us a lot more leverage to look at
7 how social networks matter over time.

8 DR. GRANATO: On this topic of a
9 panel, we have Charles Pierret from the
10 Bureau of Labor Statistics, and he has a few
11 things to say.

12 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. I guess it's
13 not been clear exactly what I'd like.

14 I've been interested in this whole
15 discussion, but let me just say that we, at
16 the National Longitudinal Surveys, have been
17 interested in expanding kind of into some
18 areas that -- into some constituencies that
19 we haven't been traditionally associated
20 with.

21 Let me just tell you a little bit
22 about our survey and about what we're kind

1 of thinking about in terms of political
2 participation and that area.

3 We have a new survey, or
4 relatively new. Started in '97, in which we
5 started with a group of 12 to 16 year olds
6 and have been following them every year sine
7 that time, asking an hour long interview,
8 face-to- face interview in which we talk
9 mainly about -- well, we talk about a lot of
10 different subjects.

11 But the emphasis, of course, being
12 from the Bureau of Labor Statistics has
13 always been on schooling and on employment.

14 I think we're more interested in
15 kind of a general global question of
16 transition, of how do you get from schooling
17 to the world of work, from your parental
18 family into your family where you'll have
19 children, and things like that.

20 People have come to us and said,
21 "Well, one thing that you've never really
22 looked at is how do people develop into

1 either a social or a political
2 consciousness."

3 I think, you know, it's something
4 that we recognize that we've lacked, and
5 we're interested in going into this
6 direction, and our thought is to have
7 questions every two years, every four years,
8 about political consciousness, about --

9 You know, and, here, we're very
10 open to any thoughts that a panel like this
11 would have.

12 But where we would follow, you
13 know, to the extent of whether you've voted.
14 I mean the simplest part is just, "Are you
15 registered? Did you vote?" Questions that
16 are asked kind of in the CPS at this point.

17 Then going on to, "Who did you

18 vote for? What influenced you? What's your
19 political leanings? What political party do
20 you belong to? What have you been doing in
21 terms of a political nature?"
22 The advantages, I think there is a

129

1 lot of advantages to doing something like
2 this within an existing study.
3 One is -- I think Diana was
4 talking about this -- is that this would
5 only be probably five minutes out of a major
6 study, and so you're not muddying the waters
7 as much. You're not sensitizing these
8 people to that you're going to be talking
9 only about politics.
10 The other is just the context that
11 we have. I mean we started with a --
12 there's an interview of their parents,
13 actually, starting in the first round, and
14 so we know just everything about their
15 background. We know what they've done in
16 school, and we've known, you know, every
17 job. We try to follow every job that
18 they've ever had.
19 We know a lot about their
20 relationships with other people and their
21 fertility, marriage and things like that,
22 health, a lot of different areas.

130

1 So, what we want to do is think
2 about adding some questions.
3 One reason that we're, you know, a

4 little hesitant is that it's kind of out of
5 the basic mold of what the Bureau of Labor
6 Statistics has supported. That's kind of
7 why we're interested in getting some group
8 to say, "You know, this is a great idea."

9 DR. KINDER: It's a great idea.

10 MR. PIERRET: You know, and there's
11 probably a question of how far the bureau
12 wants to go.

13 I mean we look at ourselves as
14 very non-partisan, and there's this issue,
15 as well, of, you know, if results come out
16 that are not -- that rub somebody on Capitol
17 Hill the wrong way, you know, there is this
18 question of, you know, our funding that
19 we're a little sensitive about.

20 But, having someone such said, you
21 know, an outside group, as the NSF or
22 somebody else saying, you know, "This is a

131

1 good idea. It gives us kind of a cover for
2 doing something like that."

3 DR. KINDER: The tin cups come
4 forward.

5 DR. MUTZ: Mindy Olsen, who's --

6 DR. KINDER: Right.

7 DR. MUTZ: I know she was with
8 NLS, and I talked about this possibility a
9 few months ago.

10 You know, one of the things that
11 came up, and I don't know how difficult
12 these problems will ultimately be.

13 But when we're talking about
14 things like whether you voted, for whom you
15 voted, and so on and so forth, how much time
16 is going to have elapsed since those acts
17 took place before you all would be in the
18 field, because you're, for obvious reasons,
19 not organized around elections.

20 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. Actually, it
21 turns out very well for this group, just on

1 traditionally November 1st.

2 Okay. So if we wanted to wait
3 until after the election, you got three or
4 four days to wait and it's not a big deal.

5 Though the fielding does go over a
6 six or seven month period. However, 50
7 percent of the cases are done by the end of
8 December and another quarter is done in
9 January.

10 So, we're actually fielding it
11 right now. We just hit about 80 percent,
12 and this is the middle of February.

13 So, you know, it's close. I'm
14 sure everyone would like to do everything
15 the week after the election. You know, a
16 lot has changed, so I do wonder about that,
17 too.

18 Do things to these questions
19 change just, you know, a month afterwards,
20 depending on what happened in the world?

21 The other thing, of course, is we
22 do track the dates of when the interviews

1 are, so there is some time series going
2 along there that you can figure out do
3 answers to these things change.

4 I mean it could be that people
5 that are interviewed in November voted for
6 somebody different when they're asked in
7 January, but --

8 DR. BRADBURN: The initial survey

9 population is U.S. household residents,
10 regardless of citizenship?
11 MR. PIERRET: Yes. It is U.S.
12 Household residents.
13 DR. BRADBURN: So you could
14 actually get a different question?
15 MR. PIERRET: Right, and the sample
16 is about 8,000 and it is --
17 DR. BRADBURN: We can live with
18 that. Don't let him leave the room.
19 MR. PIERRET: As I said, there
20 are kids who -- also, the interesting thing
21 about finally getting something together
22 by 2004 is there is a fair number of these

134

1 kids who have never voted in a Presidential
2 election. A few have never voted in -- I
3 mean who never had the ability.
4 Obviously, lots of them have never
5 voted, but many of them have never had the
6 opportunity to vote in a Presidential
7 election. This would be their first.
8 About half the sample would be
9 that way.
10 DR. SINNOTT: What's the current
11 age range of your --
12 MR. PIERRET: So our members are
13 born in '80 to '84, so this year, they will
14 be turning 19 to 23. So, a year from now,
15 we'll --
16 DR. SINNOTT: On the question of
17 the sensitivity of organizations like yours
18 to asking these kind of questions, I mean I
19 think, obviously, you're thinking the inside
20 and you can anticipate what happened.
21 But we had the experience in
22 Ireland recently where we managed to

1 persuade the census office, the Central
2 Statistics Office, to attach a ten-minute
3 module on turnout to -- now, this is only
4 one off, but it's a one-off run of their
5 national household survey.

6 MR. PIERRET: Right.

7 DR. SINNOTT: Which is a sample of
8 about 39,000 households.

9 But it was a very -- I mean the
10 initial reaction, when I approached them,
11 was, "No. We're civil servants. That's
12 partisan. We couldn't touch it."

13 It took a lot of persuasion and
14 some political leverage to --

15 The British leverage was actually
16 quite simple. What it required was a letter
17 from the spokespersons from each of the six
18 main political parties to say that this was
19 an issue on which they were all agreed.

20 Once the statistics office had got
21 this kind of political fig leaf, then they
22 were willing to go ahead.

1 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. There is some
2 precedence, as I say. The current
3 population doesn't survey as a module at
4 the -- in November after elections.

5 DR. SINNOTT: But it would be used
6 with, "Look, they do it in America."

7 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. Right. Okay.

8 DR. BRADY: That's for or against?

9 MR. SANTOS: I was just going to
10 add that I think it would be a pretty easy
11 sell to Cathy Wolman at OMB, and that would
12 be a major endorsement, if you could get
13 that.

14 DR. BRADY: But, again, this is
15 whether you voted, not how.

16 MR. PIERRET: That's part of the
17 question is where do you go?
18 DR. BRADY: Right.
19 MR. PIERRET: Is it just whether you
20 voted and whether you participate, or is it
21 more details on your attitudes, like your
22 party identification and liberal

137

1 conservatism, and so on and so forth?
2 DR. BRADY: Well, I would
3 definitely like the latter.
4 MR. PIERRET: Right.
5 DR. BRADY: I mean to get further
6 into it, and that's the question of where we
7 can draw the line and where people -- what
8 we can get away with, I think is really --
9 MR. PIERRET: Because it seems to
10 me, I mean we, as I say, have been selling
11 this as transitions kind of how you become
12 an adult in some sense, and knowing how you
13 formulate your political identity, I think,
14 is -- would be, you know, just a great thing
15 to know for --
16 Especially when we have it in the
17 context of how you're doing all these other
18 things.
19 DR. BRADY: Merrill Shanks and I
20 recently did a thing which was about
21 participation and attitudes, where we had a
22 sample of 15 to 17 year olds, as well as a

138

1 general population 18 and older.
2 We became the darling of right-
3 wing talk shows because one of the things we
4 found out is that young people are actually
5 more conservative than some of the older

6 folks on abortion and some social issues.
7 They're actually much more liberal
8 on things like homosexual rights, but
9 they're much more conservative on abortion.
10 But this led to some interesting
11 experiences as we were on right-wing talk
12 shows.
13 DR. KINDER: This is a nice case,
14 for the obvious reason that we're all
15 excited about, but also to illustrate, I
16 think, one of the advantages that over the
17 years, the national election studies has
18 provided, which is a commitment to the
19 quality of measurement.
20 The things which are interesting
21 here are a tricky business to pull off, and
22 it's not as if we have immaculate

139

1 measurements exactly, but we have done, over
2 the years, a series of experiments of
3 question worrying about turnout and around
4 participation more broadly, about
5 partisanship and ideological identification.
6 Now, we have technical reports
7 we'd be delighted to send you, you know.
8 The advice, more generally, about
9 this that I think one of the signal
10 achievements of NES over the years has been
11 that it's provided a venue for serious worry
12 and work about measurement.
13 As it happens, you could be the
14 beneficiary.
15 MR. PIERRET: Thank you. The one
16 thing I should say, actually, at this point,
17 almost a third of the instrument is done on
18 audiocacy. I mean and it is a question of
19 whether, you know, where these things
20 belong, whether you want to do something or,
21 you know, the other possibilities to
22 experiment with it.

1 We've done things. I don't think
2 we've ever -- we've proposed doing things.
3 I don't think we've ever done anything where
4 we actually put half of the questions
5 outside.

6 We have, actually, in different
7 years, though we're something that was in
8 the audiocacy. We decided, well, that
9 really isn't that sensitive.

10 Part of the thing is an age thing,
11 I think. Some of it was like asking about
12 parents at one point.

13 More and more, we've gone to,
14 well, for one thing, they're not in the
15 parents' household anymore, and so it may
16 not be nearly as sensitive as it was, you
17 know, five years ago or whatever.

18 DR. BRADBURN: One of the things
19 that I think this is an unusual opportunity.

20 If, taking what Chris said and
21 Nancy and Mike, work in Oregon, if you do
22 think that what we -- the way to think about

1 voters is a sort of stage, you'd rather than
2 have it, then studying this period as to how
3 they get into the habit, or don't get into
4 the habit of voting, I mean that seems to be
5 a much more interesting question relative to
6 these data than too much about, you know,
7 who they actually vote for and things like
8 that. That's encouraging.

9 But how they become -- what I was
10 going to say was, until this came up, I was
11 waiting for this.

12 The absence of political
13 socialization as a topic kind of a round,
14 and, indeed, you need something, some panel
15 study like this, in order to be able to
16 study that kind of thing.
17 So that it seems to me this is a
18 kind of unique set of sample and sort of
19 things. You want to be certainly careful
20 about what the optimum questions to study in
21 this kind of context.
22 DR. SINNOTT: I definitely concur

142

1 with that and where the Central Statistics
2 Office in Ireland drew the line is they
3 would not ask, "How did you vote?"
4 They asked ultra voter questions.
5 They asked questions about perception of
6 political corruption, because partisanship
7 was the delicate one for them.
8 MR. PIERRET: Yeah.
9 DR. SINNOTT: I think a
10 concentration on how people become involved.
11 Now, in one sense, in leaving out
12 partisanship or partisan choice, you are
13 missing on part of the induction.
14 But I would say that if there was
15 any danger of kind of the study not going
16 because people were reluctant to ask
17 partisanship, then I'd skip the partisanship
18 and concentrate on participation.
19 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. We have had
20 discussions, you know, up the line a little
21 bit. We haven't and I mean the highest --
22 the Commissioner hasn't signed off on this,

1 but we do have the backing of our Associate
2 Commissioner.

3 So I think, actually, there's a
4 decent chance that we could get who you
5 voted for.

6 I guess the other thing I'm
7 thinking about on this is, you know, do
8 we -- at what level can you do this?

9 I mean do you ask for your
10 representative and Senators and all that?

11 That actually brings up a little
12 bit of a problem in terms of
13 confidentiality, which is, you know, to what
14 extent do you need to know who it is they
15 actually voted for, or just that they voted
16 for the Republican or Democrat, and, you
17 know, how to handle this.

18 You know, confidentiality issues,
19 I think it gets much bigger in the
20 longitudinal area because you have so much
21 data about them, and so it's
22 reidentification is just becomes easier.

1 I mean one way to handle that we
2 use is what we call a "geocode agreement,"
3 but the idea is it wouldn't have to be
4 geographic information.

5 But that we actually enter into a
6 bigger agreement in order to get access to
7 the data if -- the geographic data, but we
8 have a public lease, you know, which is
9 available on the internet, and just kind of
10 a standard release.

11 You know, who you vote for
12 President maybe wouldn't have to -- wouldn't
13 identify anybody, so that, we could put on.
14 But anything below that, you might have to
15 get special permission to use.

16 DR. ACHEN: I'm wondering here
17 whether there will be concerns down the road

18 about a government agency collecting this
19 kind of information about people.
20 The social science side of me is,
21 as I said earlier, salivating into the
22 microphone.

145

1 The citizen side of me is just a
2 little nervous about this.
3 MR. PIERRET: Yeah.
4 DR. ACHEN: I wonder whether,
5 let's say that NSF were interested in going
6 in with you on something that -- I wonder
7 whether the two agencies couldn't think of
8 creative ways in which you, as the BLS,
9 would never be able to get access to the
10 strictly political stuff or --
11 You know, I just think there's
12 some speculation here that could be engaged
13 in about ways to deal with the concern, I
14 think is likely to arise, and so it wouldn't
15 necessarily all have to be done in house,
16 I'm thinking, and maybe there'd be a way to
17 be creative about this and protect you, and
18 still give the user community the data.
19 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. I mean it's
20 hard because, you know, just what we've told
21 them about confidentiality and who owns the
22 actual sample.

146

1 I mean the truth is that BLS does
2 not have the names or addresses of anybody
3 who is in the sample. That's all housed at
4 our contractors.
5 So, I mean I wouldn't think that
6 the respondents themselves would understand

7 the nuance there, but, yeah. I mean
8 they're -- so that brings up the question of
9 whether, you know, this NSF versus BLS thing
10 would appeal to our respondents in any way.
11 But, yeah. I think that is
12 definitely an issue of whether they're going
13 to feel comfortable telling --
14 I mean it's funny what they do
15 feel comfortable telling about, so --
16 DR. MUTZ: Do you guys have
17 questions on sexual behavior --
18 MR. PIERRET: Yeah.
19 DR. BRADY: Drug use. Yeah.
20 MR. PIERRET: In some ways, this
21 doesn't seem --
22 DR. MUTZ: Nearly as --

147

1 MR. PIERRET: Yeah.
2 DR. BRADY: They're not illegal
3 behaviors, so --
4 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. Also, we
5 actually, two days ago, we have another --
6 we have different cohorts, but we were
7 talking about our women's cohort, which is
8 older women, and we had put some questions
9 on about Social Security.
10 It turns we thought they would be
11 hard and everything, but always they're kind
12 of opinion questions.
13 The women actually tended to
14 really like them. I mean if they felt like,
15 after all this time -- I mean most of the
16 data we collect is kind of behavioral, and,
17 you know, "What are your jobs?"
18 "What's your income sources?"
19 "How many assets," and all that kind of
20 thing. It was really pretty boring, when
21 you come down to it.
22 So I actually thought that maybe

1 talking about politics, talking about
2 elections and things that really matter
3 may -- they may actually like that.

4 DR. KINDER: Nobody has ever said
5 that to us.

6 MR. PIERRET: I mean it's kind of
7 funny because I think about the Social
8 Security questions because they think that,
9 you know, the government is asking me for my
10 opinion on something, and this is going to
11 change, you know, the way the world works.

12 Well, we all know that's probably
13 not true, that it was kind of something that
14 the Social Security Administration was
15 curious about.

16 But we're always looking for more
17 content that may of some interest to our
18 respondents to keep them interested.

19 DR. SCIOLI: So how would you like
20 to proceed, Chuck, other than this rousing
21 endorsement?

22 MR. PIERRET: Well, that's a good

1 start, at least.

2 DR. SCIOLI: I mean would you like
3 the individuals who are interested in
4 pursuing this to --

5 MR. PIERRET: Yeah, if we could,
6 because we --

7 DR. SCIOLI: -- contact you?

8 MR. PIERRET: -- will probably do --

9 I mean what we'll have to do is get together
10 a group of people, and this is always the
11 fun part, trying to write the questions

12 because, I mean when we started this survey,
13 we, you know, got all these different groups
14 of people together to write questions.
15 You know, the questions we had
16 probably would have taken six or seven hours
17 to do. So it's kind of a question of, you
18 know, where are your priorities in something
19 like this.
20 I, you know, I don't see this
21 as -- it's basically a completely different
22 animal than a election study in a lot of

150

1 ways.
2 I mean I think it's something that
3 what we're trying to get at is political
4 maturation or something. How you become a
5 political animal, in some sense.
6 So, yeah. If people are
7 interested and want to, you know, be
8 affected, talk to various people.
9 The timeline is fairly quick. I
10 mean if we're going to do this, we're
11 probably talking about the next six months,
12 getting it all in order.
13 You know, then there's questions
14 about what to do longer term. I mean we
15 definitely -- if we look at this, I would
16 say we're going to do this every four years,
17 at the least, and maybe every two years.
18 You know, for someone to help us
19 think through all the issues and fault would
20 be great.
21 DR. SCIOLI: Might I suggest,
22 then, Chuck, if you're game, is that if you

151

1 leave your e-mail address --
2 MR. PIERRET: Okay.
3 DR. SCIOLI: -- at the head of the
4 table, and those who are really interested
5 can surreptitiously walk by and scan it, and
6 I'm sure you'll have some contact.
7 MR. PIERRET: Okay. Thank you.
8 DR. SCIOLI: Vice versa. Those of
9 you who would like to --
10 MR. PIERRET: Yeah. If you could
11 write down, I will contact you.
12 DR. SCIOLI: Norman and I and Jim,
13 and I think Rick was out of town at the
14 time -- met with the folks from BLS, and I
15 think from a program point of view, we're
16 interested in political socialization.
17 Do you remember that area? So,
18 this would be a good point for us to get
19 involved, as well.
20 MR. PIERRET: Yeah.
21 DR. BRADBURN: It does also, I
22 mean as a general thing -- I mean this is a

152

1 wonderful immediate opportunity, but it does
2 raise the question of cooperation with other
3 ongoing panel studies, of which there are
4 several important ones, one of which is
5 right next door in the PSID.
6 As far as I know, there's never
7 been any political, in the broad sense of
8 the term, items or content to PSID, and, of
9 course, the aging study is another one.
10 It is true -- I mean there are
11 some longitudinal studies that educational
12 statistics from are general -- my experience
13 from that is that some agencies are more
14 open to this kind of cooperation than
15 others.
16 NIA, I think, the aging one seems
17 to be fairly open to things. BLS, of
18 course, is, and I'm sure his ideas certainly
19 has been branched out from its original, you
20 know, study of income. It's really all over
21 the place now in terms of socialization and,
22 you know, all sorts of things.

1 So I don't know. I mean it's
2 still primarily -- I mean it's financed out
3 of our -- primarily out of our Economics
4 Department, although I think about half of
5 it comes from the National Institutes of
6 Health.

7 I forgot which one. NICHD or
8 maybe it's a combination of NICHD and NIA.

9 But there are opportunities, I
10 think, which would be useful to pursue, and,
11 you know, if you can facilitate that, it
12 might be another way to expand the kind of
13 resources --

14 MR. SANTOS: It would be
15 interesting to see if NSF can cooperate with
16 itself.

17 DR. BRADBURN: It's probably
18 easier to do it with BLS. They're all under
19 my direction, so maybe I can --

20 So, maybe we should pursue back to
21 the kind of question that John and others
22 have raised about what the major questions

1 are, and the intertwining of that and
2 design.

3 DR. BURNS: So I would still put
4 on the table, and this actually builds on
5 Mark's points.

6 This is more a better question
7 than a particular empirical question, and
8 that's, you know, building a platform that
9 enables the development theory that
10 integrates institutional analysis with
11 individual analysis.

12 So, some of that may reach the
13 agent based, but maybe it's drawing on work
14 in sociology. Maybe it's drawing on work in
15 political science, sometimes psychology.

16 But building a more integrated
17 understanding of the relationship between
18 individuals and institutions, because lots
19 of times, our institutional theories may be
20 wonderful, but don't have, you know, kind of

21 psychological foundations, and that's, you
22 know, kind of an odd sort of person to be

155

1 creating.
2 Where maybe miss a sociological
3 foundation again, and that sort of person to
4 be creating or to be, you know, thinking
5 about.
6 But, by the same token, a lot of
7 times, our psychological or sociological
8 theories don't, you know, have as Rich
9 worked out, argument about what the
10 institutions are and how it is that they're
11 interacting with individuals.
12 So, again, my point is a more
13 theoretical point, as opposed to this, you
14 know, kind of empirical front will be moved
15 forward.
16 It's more enabling a kind of
17 theoretical advancement that I think would
18 be really smart. I mean it's got to be part
19 of the future of social science to have that
20 theoretical integration.
21 I mean in many of these designs
22 enable that sort of integration. I mean,

156

1 clearly, the whole class context one does,
2 that enables it the most clearly.
3 But also the, you know, the panel
4 designs enable that because they're feedback
5 between the political institutions and so
6 forth.
7 So things that lead in that
8 direction, you know, immediately engage my

9 attention, but --
10 DR. BRADY: Yeah. I think that
11 leads to the question of devising whereby a
12 group like NES, which will, by its very
13 nature, be focused on surveys of individuals
14 probably mostly could partner with maybe
15 another group that brings a tremendous
16 amount of knowledge about certain
17 institutions, like the media or churches or
18 the workplace or political parties, and how,
19 then, you could put together those two
20 enterprises.
21 Because I don't think we can
22 expect the American National Election

157

1 Studies, or whatever, to be doing all of
2 that other work. I mean I don't think the
3 money will be there, and I'm not sure it's
4 really the right vehicle to figure out
5 exactly how to do it.
6 But it certainly is a vehicle for
7 looking at the individuals and then linking
8 up with somebody who can do the
9 institutional analysis.
10 I don't quite know how to do that
11 right now. I don't think it fits easily in
12 the traditional NES pattern, which is more
13 based upon individuals getting involved in
14 planning groups, and then you get pilot
15 studies, and you get some questions on it.
16 It seems like a bigger thing than
17 that. It just seems bigger.
18 So maybe some thought has to go
19 into that, and maybe the Board needs to
20 think about exactly what that would look
21 like.
22 DR. CLARKE: You know, Henry, one

1 of the answers, historically, is that sort
2 of line of inquiry, or at least one sort of
3 departure points has, of course, been
4 comparative work because we want variations
5 on institutions, whether it be electoral
6 systems, party systems, whatever.

7 Of course, there's been repeated
8 attempts over the years, starting long ago,
9 again, to try to coordinate genuine cross
10 national inquiry.

11 The most recent of this, of
12 course, and there are some people in the
13 room who have been involved with this, has
14 been the study of electoral systems, the
15 comparative study of electoral systems.

16 But, when you talk about
17 institutions, and I immediately started
18 thinking about that. Where do we get the
19 variation.

20 The other thing I immediately
21 thought about, again, was sort of state
22 level stuff.

1 DR. HANSEN: Right. There was
2 quite a lot of interest when we put together
3 this quick proposal for separate funding for
4 the 2002 study. There was quite a lot of
5 study in that in state level politics
6 because there is substantial variation
7 institutionally among the states, both in
8 terms of the full institutions of the
9 government, but also in terms of things like
10 strength of partisanship or strength of
11 parties as organizations and the like.

12 We even had the unique success in
13 Nebraska with having a camera legislature,
14 so -- and, of course, I want to send people
15 to Nebraska.

16 DR. SCIOLI: This segues nicely to
17 an issue that we're interested in hearing

18 your views on, the governance structure for
19 such a major enterprise.
20 The Board of Overseers concept
21 began with ANES, is now part of the panel
22 study of income dynamics, and the general

160

1 social survey.
2 We were interested that such
3 mechanisms are not really part and parcel of
4 the other major studies.
5 Mark, what's your view of the
6 Board over the years? We've heard it's an
7 unruly mechanism, but that it's a good --
8 DR. HANSEN: The mechanism is
9 fine, but --
10 DR. KINDER: Well, yeah. You
11 remember Wolfinger and Stan Kelly and
12 Heintz.
13 DR. HANSEN: Is that a group or
14 sheep?
15 DR. SCIOLI: It's true.
16 DR. HANSEN: Well, I think
17 certainly the Board is involved in such a
18 way that it's a very cooperative
19 relationship, both among members of the
20 Board, and between the Board and the
21 principal investigators of this study.
22 I think the board has been a

161

1 useful mechanism for thinking through how
2 one might diversify sort of the content of
3 this study.
4 Certainly, one can look at the
5 Board membership now and compare it to the
6 Board membership from years ago, and see
7 that there now are a variety of people who
8 are represented on -- or a variety of
9 research needs that are represented on the
10 Board, where I think there has been some
11 useful injection of different viewpoints.
12 The Board has also been quite
13 useful, I think, in developing some of the
14 special aspects of the different studies.

15 So, most obviously, I suppose, is the case
16 of the development of the midterm studies
17 and the Congressional election studies,
18 where Richard Fenno was on the Board at the
19 time.

20 But, more recently, including the
21 Board members who were helpful in making
22 approaches to some of the foundations in

162

1 putting together the funding coalitions in
2 the last time around.

3 The other thing about the
4 governance structure that I would mention,
5 though, are the planning committees and the
6 planning conferences that the study has had
7 through its history because those are, I
8 think, even more focused ways of bringing
9 new people into the process and in getting
10 ideas about what's going on out there, and
11 setting agendas.

12 The planning conferences really
13 did. You know, they sort of started with an
14 idea among the PI's on the Board that, "Here
15 is a direction where we might want to move."

16 Then the planning conferences sort
17 of gave the opportunity to think about that
18 in a very coherent way, and to introduce
19 some new things into the study.

20 MR. SANTOS: Is it fair to say
21 that the Board establishes the innovation
22 agenda?

163

1 DR. HANSEN: I would say that
2 that's true in a kind of micro way because
3 in any study, there is more that everyone
4 wants to do than we could possibly do. So
5 it's really the Board that I think helps to
6 sort of trim things into what we could
7 actually afford to do.

8 MR. SANTOS: But the innovation
9 that actually occurs flows through the Board
10 decision-making process?

11 DR. HANSEN: Right. Right.

12 MR. SANTOS: Yeah.

13 DR. HANSEN: But also through the
14 proposal that is put together and sent in to
15 staff and evaluated.

16 MR. SANTOS: Okay, because the

17 only point I wanted to make, then, is that
18 the composition of the Board, then, is key
19 to -- if that's the case, then the
20 composition of the Board is really an
21 important element of establishing what
22 innovations occur.

164

1 Because of that, there might be --
2 I don't know if this would be of any
3 benefit, but there might be some
4 consideration for making, for ensuring some
5 type of composition of the Board that allows
6 for, you know, the full breadth of
7 innovative ideas to come forward and be part
8 of that process.

9 You know, that's just strictly
10 from the outside because I don't know
11 whether it's working that way or not.

12 DR. BRADY: Well, I think we've
13 actually tried to do that. It's something
14 I'm representing.

15 MR. SANTOS: That's true, too, and
16 self-conscious about expanding the
17 intellectual horizons of the Board.

18 I would say that, at least from my
19 perspective, that it's true the Board is
20 instrumental in adjudicating between
21 different claims and forwarding some parts
22 of an innovative agenda.

165

1 But, in part, that comes out of
2 their own heads, but I think, more often, it
3 comes from them being in touch or being a
4 representative of a research community.

5 So they -- I think of the Board as
6 a kind of search mechanism or an
7 identification mechanism to -- lines back

8 into research tradition so that the work
9 flows up through them.
10 It reinforces your point in
11 exactly the same way. It's equally
12 important, maybe more important, that the
13 Board have a composition that we, as a
14 consequence, have access to a broad range of
15 scholarly activity.

16 But it's not the Board and the
17 PI's who are cooking this up so much. It's
18 that we're members of communities that are
19 cooking things up, and we try to bring that
20 to the collaborative table, and then decide
21 what should go forward.

22 DR. BRADY: I think the Board has

166

1 been incredibly useful and very worthwhile
2 in a whole lot of ways.

3 There is a really fundamental
4 question about the role of the Board in a
5 recompetition. I think it's the following
6 question.

7 Is the Board a creature of the
8 PI's or of Michigan in some sense, or is the
9 Board a creature of the National Science
10 Foundation?

11 If it's the latter, it's not clear
12 that the Board should be working with the
13 PI's at Michigan to put together a proposal
14 for a recompetition.

15 I'm not trying to give a position
16 here because I don't know what the right
17 answer is. But it does seem to me that, in
18 a recompetition, there has to be some
19 absolute clarity about what the Board is,
20 and that, I think, has to come from NSF.

21 DR. SCIOLI: As a policy matter,
22 the Board are consultants to the principal

1 investigators, and serve without consent --

2 DR. BRADY: With our being NSF's
3 consent?

4 DR. SCIOLI: Yes. So if Nancy and
5 Don have an interesting person they'd like
6 to put on the Board, they tell us about it,
7 National Science Foundation, Political
8 Science Program Officers, and we say, "Yeah.
9 That makes sense, but what about this person
10 instead, and why not?"

11 That's worked very well.

12 DR. BRADY: But how does it work
13 for a recompetition?

14 So that means the Board is
15 essentially the creature of the PIs?

16 DR. SCIOLI: Absolutely.

17 DR. BRADY: So, if somebody else
18 wants to compete for the election study,
19 they just should ignore the Board. I mean
20 they're not worried, and presume that if
21 they win, they don't necessarily have to
22 take on that Board?

1 MR. SANTOS: Or do they have to
2 present a Board? Their own?

3 DR. BRADY: They have to present
4 their own Board?

5 DR. SCIOLI: Correct.

6 DR. BRADY: Could that Board be
7 some of the same people?

8 I mean, you know, I think there
9 are some delicate questions here.

10 DR. SCIOLI: There are, all of
11 which we are interested in only in the sense

12 that there is a governance structure which
13 makes sense to advise PI's.
14 Another wrinkle to this, though,
15 Henry, which is a more interesting question,
16 a little bit more abstract, and I have
17 heard, and not unfairly, that with bells and
18 whistles stripped from the study, where
19 you're saying, "Just do the core. Just the
20 core. Just the core," well, then, people
21 sitting on the Board say, "Well, what about
22 these interesting and innovative ideas and

169

1 methods that we want to build into the
2 study?"
3 Nancy and Don and others have
4 appropriately said, "No. We can't afford
5 that. What NSF has told us, this is the
6 framework in which we're operating."
7 So, in the salad days, the Board
8 did the planning conferences, assisted with
9 the pilot studies, met more frequently,
10 invited more people, and that's been
11 eviscerated or cut back.
12 DR. KINDER: The idea that if all
13 we had on the idea was core, there would be
14 nothing to do is wrong.
15 Every two or four years, or
16 however long we're in the field, however
17 regularly we're in the field, there is the
18 matter of core, and that requires summary
19 thinking each time.
20 What really is core? How should
21 we really measure core at this time? What
22 do we have to change in light of measurement

1 developments? There's that.

2 Then there is, well, here it
3 is 2004. These things have happened.
4 They're prominent in politics. They're in
5 the campaign. We have to develop
6 instrumentation for that.

7 There's the third thing which is
8 someone in behavioral economics has this
9 great idea. We're going to cook it up and
10 bring it in, you know. There's innovation.

11 So the Board has work to do. They
12 seem very busy to me.

13 DR. BRADY: It's that way.

14 DR. SCIOLI: Entertained?

15 DR. KINDER: No. No budget for
16 that, I'm afraid.

17 DR. BRADBURN: It's not as rich as
18 it was. It's not as much fun as it was.
19 That's for sure. But it's not the case that
20 if it's near core, only core.

21 Or another way to put it is that
22 sustaining NES in this modest way across

1 time means that there are a lot of puzzles
2 to solve all the time, and some of them are
3 major where we don't have the resources to
4 induce them. We don't have venues to test
5 them and vet them thoroughly, so we probably
6 get less of it than we otherwise would.

7 There's more -- there are less
8 toys to play with. That's for sure, but
9 there's real work to do.

10 It also sounds like the way it's
11 evolved that the Board is giving advice or
12 being proactive in studies that are not --
13 well, he said it's F funded, and you
14 referred several times to the '02 study.

15 But does that suggest that they
16 think of their mandate as a broader set of
17 electoral studies?

18 DR. HANSEN: Well, I think it
19 means that we -- that the Board feels, in
20 some sense, in a kind of trustee
21 relationship to the National Election Study,
22 and that it's the responsibility of the

172

1 Board, together with the PI's, to make sure
2 that the study can go forward at the high
3 scientific level that we expect.

4 So a lot of the sort of funding
5 coalition activity that the Board has been
6 doing is exactly out of that sense of
7 trusteeship; that that is what's really
8 necessary to bring the resources up to the
9 point where the study can move forward in a
10 positive way.

11 I should also say, though, that
12 the Board is very actively involved in
13 things that are directly related to the sort
14 of stewardship of the grant, if you will.

15 One responsibility of being on the
16 Board is that usually half or two-thirds of
17 the Board is on the Planning Committee.

18 When you're on the Planning
19 Committee, it means you not only participate
20 in the sort of discussions around content,
21 but then, when it comes time to make content
22 decisions, you're right up in there, having

173

1 to make decisions.

2 It oftentimes means writing
3 reports on sort of how things came out. So

4 many of the technical reports are written by
5 members of the Board who have been posted to
6 look into particular issues, most recently,
7 John Crosnick's analysis of the Motes study.

8 So there are real sort of
9 responsibilities of management, I would say,
10 that come along with membership on the
11 Board.

12 DR. BRADBURN: How does the Board
13 renew itself? I mean Frank just gave one
14 instance.

15 Is that the general mode, or --

16 DR. BURNS: Actually, it's a
17 discussion among the Board. A while before
18 somebody is about to retire from the Board,
19 folks bring in names, ideas about
20 communities that would, you know, would be
21 important to bring on, now, new developments
22 in, you know, the field more broadly.

174

1 New folks who would be, you know,
2 and the last person to join the Board is
3 Simon Jackman, so he's bringing in, you
4 know, raising kinds of approaches, and
5 that's going to be really, really, really
6 helpful.

7 Some folks started this
8 conversation several times before the actual
9 appointment would come to be. We have this
10 beginning discussion.

11 Then we've gotten in touch with
12 Frank and Jim to say, you know, these are
13 the, you know, set of names, you know, of
14 folks who might be -- who might, you know,
15 add, you know, a new perspective, and
16 would -- and we need somebody who, in
17 general, would not view this as something
18 they do an hour a year because that's not --
19 I mean that wouldn't be much of an
20 investment.

21 So we really would like the

1 DR. BRADBURN: Do you solicit
2 names from the larger community?

3 I mean is there an opportunity for
4 anybody in the political science community
5 to nominate people?

6 DR. HANSEN: Well, we have
7 recently asked for nominations from the --
8 it's the Elections Section of the American
9 Political Science Association. Then that
10 was the nomination that yielded John
11 Aldridge.

12 So we have been making moves in
13 that direction. It's more typically
14 happened that it's the context that the
15 current Board and the PI's have.

16 Back in the days when -- well,
17 even currently, I think a very common path
18 to the Board has been people who have been
19 active in previous Planning Committees, both
20 because of the expression of interest that
21 implies in the work of the study, but, also,
22 the sense that we're able to get from that

1 of the kind of energy and commitment they
2 would bring to the enterprise.

3 DR. BRADBURN: So, the Planning
4 Committee is a bigger -- that's another way
5 that people who are not with the Board or
6 with -- and so forth can be --

7 DR. HANSEN: Right, and,

8 oftentimes, membership of the Planning
9 Committee comes out of people making
10 proposals for the current study.
11 So there is a kind of voluntary
12 aspect to this, as well.
13 DR. LEMPERS: Do Board members
14 serve for a fixed term and then rotate off,
15 or replace it, or what happens?
16 DR. BURNS: They usually serve for
17 two four-year terms because the beginning
18 is, you know, getting your feet wet,
19 learning how it works, and so forth.
20 Then, only rarely do people -- and
21 it would be the person would have to
22 usually -- not usually, completely. The

177

1 person would have to opt not to take the
2 second term.
3 So I can think of instances where,
4 you know, personal tragedies and that sort
5 of thing --
6 DR. THOMPSON: But, it's two
7 terms?
8 DR. BURNS: It's two terms. Two
9 terms of four years.
10 DR. THOMPSON: Then you rotate
11 someone else in?
12 DR. BURNS: Then they're off.
13 Then the Board works with the PI's to think
14 of who would be the next Chair of the -- in
15 consultation, who would be the next Chair of
16 the Board.
17 So when Laura Stoker retired as
18 Chair of the Board, you know, a year ago or
19 two years ago, Mark stepped in, which is
20 great.
21 I don't know if that helps.

1 DR. SINNOTT: Is there any interest in trying
2 to get non Americans on
5 the Board?

6 MR. TORANGEAU: For example,
7 Canadians.

8 DR. BLAIS: Well, Americans who do
9 the actual study. I mean just -- just make
10 sure that, you know, there's a comparative
11 aspect goes on.

12 I'm concerned about the module of
13 the CSES, whether it would be maintained in
14 the next election study.

15 DR. HANSEN: In fact, in the same
16 way that there have been various seats on
17 the U.S. Supreme Court, there's something of
18 a CSES seat on the Election Study Board.

19 Phil Shidely, of course, has
20 filled that and Phil will be cycling off I
21 think very soon.

22 DR. BURNS: Yeah. This summer.

1 DR. HANSEN: So, we have earmarked
2 that as something that contained interest
3 and of benefit to us, not simply because
4 we're participating in CSES, but also
5 because of the subject of expertise that
6 people who are interested in the comparative
7 study elections can bring to the Board.

8 DR. BURNS: Russ Dolphin was the
9 second to the last person to come on the
10 Board. He came on just before Sam, and so
11 that part of the idea there was to make sure
12 we have a continuing comparative presence

13 that could grow, in fact, because we're
14 interested in comparative institutions.

15 DR. SCIOLI: Phil Shidely
16 participated in the infrastructure
17 competition that the division had and won an
18 award for the CSES.

19 DR. LEMPert: A somewhat different
20 question, Mark. I think you mentioned a
21 couple of times the 2002 and the scrambling
22 to get funds for it.

180

1 What is the potential over the
2 long term to complement whatever the NSF
3 contribution is to this study with sources
4 from private funds, other federal agencies
5 and the like?

6 DR. HANSEN: Well, in the last
7 several years, there has been success with
8 particular sort of well focused proposals at
9 like the Russell Sage Foundation.

10 I'm worried that it's just about
11 killed Don and Nancy, as principal
12 investigators, to be scrambling to put
13 together proposals. As you know, these
14 things take many rounds and they are quite
15 an intense investment of effort.

16 I think that there probably are
17 foundations out there that are interested in
18 particular, sort of particular focus things,
19 like the Russell Sage Foundation on Social
20 Trust, and more recently, on inequality.

21 Those are things where I think
22 there have been certainly some benefits in

1 approaching foundations.

2 It certainly expanded what the
3 election study is able to do. It has sort
4 of brought on some well focused thinking
5 around particular problems like social trust
6 and instrumentation for social trust.

7 At the same time, it's also meant
8 that there are more strings attached to the
9 funding. They're kind of obligations that
10 get created for the study in carrying
11 particular content which, in some sense, is
12 privileged and not sort of in the
13 competition of ideas around the normal
14 processes of solicitation of proposals for
15 content and planning committees and those
16 kind of things.

17 It's also meant that the direction
18 is set also by sort of the interest and the
19 expertise of members of the Board and PI's
20 and what kind of things they are sort of
21 deeply enough invested in to be able to put
22 together strong proposals to foundations.

1 So I think it's been a mixed
2 experience with the foundations.

3 DR. BURNS: I would add one
4 sentence which is -- or two sentences --
5 that experience in 2000 was an easier sell
6 for foundations because we had a base to
7 build on. So, going to the Russell Sage and
8 saying, "We would like to build on this."
9 So we had the Russell Sage money.

10 We went to NIA. We have a revise
11 and resubmit from NIA, and they were excited
12 because, again, it was a base.

13 In 2002, it was a harder thing
14 because there was no base to build on. It
15 was building the whole arrangement from
16 scratch.

17 So, we ended up building a base, a

18 kind of one-time thing out of the University
19 of Michigan funding from three sources
20 within the university, and that was a little
21 bit of a base that enabled other funding
22 partners to come along.

183

1 But every single one of the
2 foundation officers I spoke with and worked
3 with over the course of this said, "We're
4 not doing this again. This is a one-time
5 thing.
6 "We want to leverage what you got.
7 We want to leverage an ongoing thing, but
8 we're not building the scientific
9 infrastructure of the nation.
10 "We're going to add a special
11 module on in equality. We want to add a
12 special module on, you know, social trust,
13 that sort of thing."
14 I think that they're interested in
15 that because they liked the base. We were
16 able to persuade them, you know, "Just this
17 one time," that building the whole thing
18 would be a worthwhile investment, but the
19 scientific cost would be too great and the
20 loss to society would be too great.
21 So I don't know if that helps.
22 DR. ACHEN: Yeah. I'd like to add

184

1 a word here because I've served a year as
2 Associate Director of the center that NES is
3 housed in at Michigan, and a year as Acting

4 Director, and have had to deal with some of
5 the issues that come with getting people to
6 take the NES.

7 So I was involved in discussions
8 when we were trying to get Don and Nancy to
9 do this.

10 I think one thing that is very
11 important for the foundation to think about
12 in packaging this whole thing is what is an
13 RFP that would be attractive to first rate
14 people?

15 If, for example, we have -- the
16 thing is too cut up into little pieces, and
17 one of those little pieces is just doing
18 nothing but the core, and I haven't heard
19 anybody propose exactly that, but it's an
20 option that's always on the table.

21 To run the core isn't, you know,
22 isn't very exciting to anybody, and it won't

185

1 draw talent.

2 What we were a little slow -- we,
3 the University of Michigan, were a little
4 slow finding people the last time around,
5 and part of it was the need to put together
6 a package that was attractive to people.

7 The university has put quite a
8 good chunk of money into attracting the
9 level of talent that we've got across the
10 table here. We were excited when that all
11 fell into place.

12 But it didn't happen quickly or
13 easily, so one of the things we need to pay
14 attention to here is that, on the one hand,
15 this is a collective enterprise. The people
16 who run it don't get access to the data one
17 day sooner than anybody else does. They're
18 doing something for the profession.

19 But this is a long-term
20 commitment. When things fall apart, as they
21 did in '02 with the funding, your life gets
22 taken over as PI by this desperate scramble

1 for funds.

2 It's not anybody's idea of how to
3 spend some of the best research years of
4 their lives.

5 So I think that, again, operating
6 now in this mode of putting something on the
7 table that we would all be excited about, I
8 think part of what should go on the table
9 that people could be excited about is enough
10 support here for this, whatever it is that
11 the collectivity and the profession and the
12 foundation decide to do.

13 Enough support that first rate
14 people are going to want to come forward and
15 do it, because, otherwise, you get into a
16 downward spiral that will waste whatever
17 chintzy little second rate funding that
18 you're going to give it.

19 DR. SCIOLI: Andre and Harold and
20 Ian and Richard, what do you guys say about
21 principal investigators for this kind of a
22 project?

1 Harold, I know, is also a
2 professor, and all those other
3 responsibilities.

4 Are you guys only PI's for the
5 election study?

6 DR. CLARKE: I know he brought
7 his -- grading papers.

8 DR. BRADY: He's not only a
9 professor, he's a dedicated professor.

10 DR. SCIOLI: But it's a serious
11 question. Is it the same issue or I mean
12 are you indentured for life to be --

13 DR. BLAIS: Well, there's one big
14 difference in our case, which, you know, we
15 own the data for -- it's one year after the

16 election, so, basically, about six months.
17 So we own the data for one time. We have
18 the first go at --
19 Also, we have release time for the
20 study being paid by Shirk.
21 DR. BRADY: The Canadians do.
22 DR. BLAIS: The Canadians.

188

1 DR. BRADY: Through a part of this
2 team.
3 DR. BLAIS: The Canadians. At
4 that time, though, none of us had it. This
5 is only since '97.
6 So there is some time release, so
7 it's --
8 So, anyway, the incentives are
9 greater because, on the one hand, you have
10 some time release. On the other hand,
11 you're also on -- you own the data for a
12 short period.
13 MR. McALLISTER: Well, we don't
14 own the data for any period. As soon as the
15 data is available, we release it, just like
16 the NES.
17 We don't get any time release.
18 There is four or five of us run it.
19 On the other hand, it's not an
20 ongoing commitment in the sense that it may
21 be, at some future stage, the Australian
22 Research Council decides not to fund it. So

189

1 it's always on a one-off basis.
2 DR. MUTZ: But you have teaching
3 responsibilities.
4 MR. McALLISTER: No, we have a
5 research only faculty, so we don't play
6 favorites like Andre.

7 DR. BRADBURN: The issue of the
8 archive and the service, essentially
9 servicing of users, and talk about, "Who
10 does that," or is that?
11 MR. MCALLISTER: We run in the --
12 and we run the equivalent of the ICPSR --
13 DR. BRADBURN: Oh, okay.
14 MR. MCALLISTER: -- or the Essex
15 Archives, so they actually run the survey.
16 DR. BRADBURN: So the matter there
17 is the survey is basically turned over to a
18 professional archive --
19 MR. MCALLISTER: Absolutely
20 right.
21 DR. BRADBURN: Okay.
22 MR. MCALLISTER: Yeah, and they

190

1 do all the documentation, and that's not our
2 responsibility.
3 DR. CLARKE: In the British case,
4 the announcement of competition is, I think
5 I may have mentioned yesterday, mandates
6 archiving the data with the official
7 archive, which is the so-called "Essex
8 Archive."
9 But, in our case, we wanted to
10 release the data much more quickly than that
11 as I described yesterday.
12 So it's a combination of access,
13 and there is no privilege to access. The
14 very moment the data were ready, they were
15 out on the web. As I said, we were even
16 putting them out as they came in, and it's
17 sort of a data cam thing we were doing.
18 In terms of some of the other
19 issues, I mean the major incentive is to do
20 the science.
21 The opportunity to do a study like
22 that is really, in the British context, is

1 what attracts people.

2 The possibility for some of the
3 incentives that Andre was mentioning in
4 terms of courses released and things like
5 that, I think possibly would be there.

6 There is some flexibility in terms
7 of how you use your funds, at least there
8 was the last time around.

9 We chose, as I said, to put 85
10 percent of the money into the data
11 collection and just relatively small amounts
12 mainly into our research officers.

13 Perhaps that could be done
14 differently, and, certainly, I know it was
15 done differently with the Crest group at
16 Knottfield.

17 John Curtice, who some of you may
18 know, from CSES and so forth, had a -- he's
19 from the University of Strasswide, but he
20 hasn't been there for well over a decade.

21 I asked him, "How's your courses
22 going?"

1 He says, "Well, I haven't had one
2 since 1986."

3 So, I mean he has much more that
4 king -- he was the British election study in
5 terms of the operational arm of it, along
6 with Roger Jowl, for a long period.

7 So, there's some flexibility there
8 in terms of how that would work, from one
9 cycle to the next.

10 There is, also, I was just going
11 to say the final thing is we talked about

12 the Board, and my sort of -- a couple of
13 images of the Board, and people who are
14 familiar with it in this country might
15 correct me, but one of them, of course, is
16 that here is you got the science guys, and
17 you want to do this, and you've got some
18 real focus.

19 You're sort of like Gulliver and
20 you got all these Lilliputians, all these
21 people around sort of tying you down. So
22 you end up with the possibility of not

193

1 really sort of doing anything the way you
2 really want to, and, hence, being criticized
3 for the sort of same old, same old kinds of
4 things, and really not enough of anything to
5 really make a big breakthrough.

6 We didn't have that problem.
7 That's another thing like that. I think
8 this is true in Canada, and it's in
9 Australia, basically, too. I'm not sure
10 about Ireland, but it's basically your deal.

11 I mean, again, on the incentive
12 side, that's really -- it's your deal. It's
13 your election thing, so that's --

14 DR. BURNS: So I was fuzzy on one
15 thing. Is the Board the way? Is that what
16 you were saying?

17 I was just --

18 DR. CLARKE: I was just wondering
19 to what extent that is a disincentive for
20 PI's to have to --

21 DR. BURNS: Well, I think it's
22 quite an incentive.

1 DR. CLARKE: -- to deal with the
2 more -- it's an incentive or a disincentive?
3 Is it helpful --

4 DR. KINDER: It's unimaginable to
5 do this job without Mark and his co-workers.
6 Unimaginable.

7 DR. BURNS: Because they're
8 incredibly -- I'm sorry. They're amazing
9 intellects and they believe deeply in the
10 idea of a public good, and so, you're
11 surrounded by these amazingly smart people
12 who, you know, you're just privileged to be
13 in a room in an argument with, who want
14 science to be better.

15 Oh, my goodness. It's an amazing
16 group.

17 DR. CLARKE: Well, it wasn't that.
18 It's sort of like in terms of like what --
19 if you said that, you're in argument with
20 them. I was wondering if you said,
22 "Well, gee, we got to satisfy all these

1 constituencies," because I think I heard you
2 say they like research constituencies.

3 So you end up with a very
4 compromised instrument each time.

5 DR. BURNS: Oh, it doesn't work
6 that -- this is my own little bias, but it
7 totally doesn't work that way.

8 I mean I, alas, and unfortunately
9 for me, had no connection to the NES
10 until '99. So the Board was just a brand
11 new thing for me.

12 Oh, my goodness. What happens is,
13 in my opening remarks -- that was so long
14 ago -- I talked about --

15 DR. KINDER: It was just
16 yesterday.

17 DR. BURNS: So, the idea, you know,
18 instead of, I don't know, adjudicating
19 between ideas or anything, but, rather, you
20 know, building a new thing out of the
21 conversation that comes from a set of ideas,

that's, I don't know, how you would see it,

196

1 but that's certainly what I think happens in
2 a Board meeting.

3 I have to say it's one of my
4 favorite intellectual experiences ever -- I
5 mean that sounds like a strange thing to
6 say, but, you know, a Board meeting is
7 absolutely that.

8 I mean I'm completely exhausted
9 after, but it's intellectual exhaustion
10 because it's just been an amazing set of
11 intellectual debates for, you know, several
12 days.

13 DR. SCIOLI: Can you fire them, I
14 guess?

15 Harold, you know, if I'm reading
16 too much into it, ever been any on the
17 Board. They're such a pain in the neck that
18 you say, "Wow, this person is pushing only
19 for this set of items."

20 The public good is not part of the
21 picture. This, you know, person comes from
22 this section of the APSA, and we really have

197

1 to figure a way to deep six this person.

2 DR. HANSEN: I've never seen that
3 in my experience.

4 DR. BRADBURN: Could I just -- I
5 want to follow this because I need your
6 responses.

7 One of the differences, and I may

8 be wrong, but description I got from the
9 other countries, that the PI -- there seem
10 to be sort of strictly what I call "PI's," a
11 larger set and more diverse in the sense
12 that they're in different institutions, and,
13 obviously, even from different countries.
14 The way I think the Board -- at
15 least, again, I know the GSS Board much
16 better.
17 The Board effectively becomes co-
18 PI's with the nominal PI's.
19 Is that -- or is that overstating
20 the case?
21 DR. KINDER: I think, even in the
22 room, that's true. There is the
matter of

198

1 writing proposals and kind of taking care of
2 the study day to day.
3 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah.
4 DR. KINDER: That's much more our
5 business than it is the Board's, but --
6 DR. BRADBURN: But, although I
7 heard earlier that the Board did participate
8 in writing a proposal.
9 DR. KINDER: Some.
10 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah.
11 DR. SCIOLI: It's circulated
12 through the Board. The proposals that
13 arrive at your door, yes.
14 The ability to consult even within
15 the constricted confines of the Board was
16 very restricted when we were scrambling for
17 money, you know, when you are knocking on
18 doors.
19 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah. I know. But
20 in the ideal type that's -- I mean just your
21 description of it, it sounds like that it is
22 a much more -- nearer a co-PI model than

1 just a bunch of people who could meet and
 2 give you advice, and then you go off and do
 3 whatever you think is best from having taken
 4 their advice.

5 DR. CLARKE: That was our model.
 6 The latter was our model.

7 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Right.
 8 That's right.

9 DR. BRADY: Norm?
 10 DR. THOMPSON: How long has the
 11 GSS been getting a substantial amount of
 12 outside funding?

13 DR. BRADBURN: Outside funding?
 14 DR. THOMPSON: Yeah. I know the
 15 last couple of rounds. I'm familiar with
 16 Tom Smith was out there getting, you know,
 17 funding for --

18 DR. BRADBURN: I don't know
 19 exactly when, but I would say over the last
 20 ten years, maybe longer, we've gone from
 21 funding the whole thing to funding maybe 75
 22 percent of it.

1 DR. BURNS: So who's funding the
 2 other 25?

3 DR. BRADBURN: Different
 4 foundations and some other agencies or other
 5 people who get grants from NIH or something
 6 like that.

7 I mean, basically, there's the
 8 others, you know, they sell it or such thing
 9 to --

10 DR. LEMPERS: It's a modular
 11 structure.

12 DR. BRADBURN: The modular
 13 structure.

14 DR. BURNS: Some people are paying
 15 for items?

16 DR. BRADBURN: People can buy five
 17 minutes or something like that, and then
 18 they get the whole.

19 The two rules are, then they get
 20 access to all the data, but, also, everybody
 21 gets access to their data.

1 is put on there, they get -- that's into the
 2 pool, and that gets put into the archive.
 3 I mean, for example, the religious
 4 items are paid for by Andrew Greeley.
 5 DR. THOMPSON: The thing is though
 6 that they pay more than for just -- they do
 7 pay for some --
 8 DR. BRADBURN: Oh, they pay the
 9 average cost. They don't pay --
 10 DR. THOMPSON: The cost. They do
 11 pay for support --
 12 DR. BRADBURN: They pay average
 13 costs. That's right. So he gets paid for
 14 the Irish GSS, too.
 15 DR. CLARKE: I mean that's
 16 something that, I don't know. I mean I know
 17 you were saying that --
 18 DR. BRADBURN: Well, that's true.
 19 The PSID, NSF, I think, only supports about
 20 half of the PSID, and the rest comes --
 21 I don't think the total of the
 22 rest of it comes from NIH, but maybe 40

1 percent and then another ten percent comes
 2 from various other shifting sources.
 3 DR. THOMPSON: So that might be a
 4 model that might help --
 5 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah. I think
 6 the -- I think that certainly -- I think --
 7 well, obviously, the testing of the market.
 8 As you said, when there's a base

9 there, it's sort of --
10 DR. THOMPSON: Exactly right.
11 That's the important distinction.
12 DR. BRADBURN: People can do
13 things if you --
14 DR. THOMPSON: This model rests on
15 the continuing commitment to --
16 DR. BRADBURN: Right. I mean you
17 know that there is, you know, a solid bed of
18 it, and that's --
19 That, actually, I mean they've
20 become quite -- but my understanding is they
21 become -- they've built up a sort of -- some
22 of which are kind of -- because one

203

1 foundation, actually, is, you know, buys in
2 every time because they're into time series,
3 too, and on their particulars of issue.
4 So that there are some other
5 places who are really interested in exactly
6 the same thing, but with very specialized
7 interest, which NSF wouldn't support, but I
8 mean not regularly, but other foundations.
9 DR. SINNOTT: Just a quick remark,
10 but not so much on the structure of the
11 Irish, but he basically draw like the
12 Canadian one in terms of the role of the PI.
13 There was some provision for
14 personnel, but that was spent on post-
15 doctoral fellows involved in the study, who
16 would be co-authors of the study, and the
17 intent of it is to write a book called, "The
18 Irish Voter."
19 But on the governance structures
20 and the paper that I did a couple of years
21 ago for the ESRC in Britain with Warren
22 Miller, we asked that question about were

1 there any overseeing committees, or
2 whatever, in the studies we looked at.

3 The responses were interesting.
4 Three were -- half of the studies had no
5 really formal structure.

6 The Canadian had a committee of
7 advisors, but it was purely advisory on
8 questionnaire, on ideas.

9 In the Swedish case, Soren Homberg
10 wrote back and said, "You can't do research
11 by committee."

12 There was a committee in Sweden,
13 but, obviously, they didn't do very much.

14 DR. BRADY: He would say that.

15 DR. SINNOTT: The Dutch case was
16 classic, Dutch politics. It was the
17 politics of accommodation. All interests
18 were co- opted onto this committee, and the
19 PI role rotation between the main
20 institutions, and it was all everybody got
21 something.

22 Our description of the American

1 Board of Overseers was that it was
2 Democratic centralists which might have been
3 a contentious way of putting it.

4 But it seemed it wasn't
5 procedurally represented, obviously, and it
6 wasn't represented, you know, kind of neo
7 corporative sense, but from the reactions we
8 got -- and this, I think, was mainly from
9 Larry Bartels -- was that it was
10 sufficiently open and there was sufficient
11 movement in and out of it that it was
12 generally regarded as being democratic in a
13 sort of looser, broader sense, and that it
14 contributed substantially to the legitimacy
15 of the enterprise.

16 DR. BRADBURN: Could I ask

17 another -- it's different kind of question,
18 but if one were putting -- we were putting
19 out an RP, essentially, or RFA for the
20 electoral study, would it be better to have
21 it have both a call for applications that
22 had the basic platform, and let's say core

206

1 plus modules or innovations and so forth in
2 the core platform, but also -- the
3 possibility of other studies and with the
4 idea of multiple awards?
5 That sort of makes it bigger, but
6 they'd have to be coordinated.
7 Well, maybe we would take some --
8 we would probably put some guards on
9 coordinating them, but it wouldn't
10 necessarily mean that, well, that they had
11 to be coordinated in advance.
12 But that's a --
13 DR. BRADY: Well, you might say it
14 has to be a multiism whereby the people
15 apply would have a way of thinking about
16 what coordinating would look like.
17 DR. BRADBURN: Well, but they
18 wouldn't know who the other -- you know,
19 this would --
20 DR. BRADY: It strikes me as a big
21 deal if you're asking to do American
22 National Election Studies, plus you're going

207

1 to have a bunch of coordinating studies all
2 at the same time.
3 DR. BRADBURN: No. No. No, but I
4 was --
5 DR. BRADY: You wouldn't want to
6 be the PI --
7 DR. BRADBURN: I was just
8 saying -- no. That's why I was saying that
9 this is not -- would not be -- there would
10 not be a pre- packaged sort of thing which,

11 you know, the people who were interested in
12 the basic platform wouldn't necessarily need
13 to line up with the set of people who were
14 doing other sorts of things.
15 But the question would be, I mean
16 if we did it that way, that, I think, given
17 the way -- then we would have the mechanism
18 for saying, now, after they're awarded, then
19 all the PI's and all these things have got
20 to work together as they go forward.
21 I mean this is the way we do with
22 some special competitions of various sorts

208

1 where, because they all come in under one
2 competition, that gives us a kind of stick
3 to say, you know, we have a PI's meeting,
4 you know, twice a year or something, I
5 guess.
6 So we guarantee that the PI's talk
7 to each other about what they're doing and
8 presenting things that -- not that it puts a
9 continuous constraint on what they do, but
10 at least it assures that they're talking to
11 each other and they know what it was doing,
12 and so they can --
13 In all the other cases I know of
14 this, then, you know, they think that's a
15 good thing, and then they -- you know, they
16 just wouldn't do it on their own because
17 they're too busy doing other things.
18 But you need a kind of outside
19 somebody who says, "Look, you got to spend
20 time getting together and" --
21 DR. LEMPERS: Let me add one thing
22 to that and I think along these lines.

1 This is a question, I guess, for
2 Mark and Nancy and Don more.

3 I take Henry's point that I think
4 it would be, you know, asking for too much
5 and not be productive to say to the PI's
6 running the survey, "As part of your
7 proposal, we'd like to have seven satellite
8 studies, using different modalities that
9 will let us deal with parties, let us deal
10 with this, let us deal with that."

11 I mean maybe you could do that and
12 they wouldn't mind, but as a requirement, I
13 know it gets terribly effective in terms of
14 discouraging proposals.

15 But the other side, of course, is
16 much more doable if they're coordinating
17 mechanisms.

18 By that I mean if they were sort
19 of -- NES, it would fit in with other things
20 they are doing, so they could think
21 discreetly about what they're doing.

22 But to do this right, I need five

1 minutes of the survey. Is the survey itself
2 in a form that that would be a possibility,
3 that one could expand what you're doing by,
4 say, 20 minutes of it, four separate
5 independent studies could integrate much
6 more closely with the ANES than they now are
7 able to do, because, now, they just have to
8 take the questions that are there.

9 DR. HANSEN: I guess my reaction
10 is, yeah, that's something that could be
11 very easily accommodated. There would be
12 lots of details to work out, but the -- I
13 think the main challenge for the PI's and
14 the Board of Election Study, in those
15 circumstances, would be to make sure that
16 that added content meets the scientific
17 standards of the study.

18 But that would be a challenge, I
19 think, mostly in working with the associated
20 PI's and really using the expertise that NES
21 has developed through the years, and in
22 taking the ideas that they have and turning

1 them into an effective content.

2 DR. KINDER: In fact, at one time,
3 the election study had five separate modules
4 appended. The one that jumps in my mind is
5 the Senate study, which was part of the
6 complete packet submitted.

7 When NSF cut the study to the core
8 only, we entertained the modules as separate
9 units, and the Senate study eventually was
10 funded, but not under the ANES proposal or
11 under the Board, but from Board members.

12 DR. HANSEN: The recent precedent
13 is CSES --

14 DR. SCIOLI: Yes. Exactly.

15 DR. HANSEN: -- which is
16 distinctively a module within the election
17 study, and where there has been very close
18 cooperation between the PI's.

19 DR. SCIOLI: Which is more
20 tractable. I mean I think we disassembled
21 the NES to say the core and the modules come
22 in independently from Board members, in

1 fact, or ANES, you know, which makes more
2 sense.

3 I mean you say the details are
4 with the devil.

5 DR. CLARKE: Well, right. I was
6 going to say, too, it depends on a game like
7 what research questions you're answering.

8 If you say, "Well, yeah, there are
9 some things we could add on modules fairly
10 easily to the traditional post-election
11 survey," and you could entertain those and
12 say, "Okay. Here are some that fit and
13 would work."

14 But, then, again, there are other
15 things. You have somebody like Andre come
16 along and want to do a rolling cross
17 section, but that's a much bigger enterprise

18 and totally -- and sort of --
19 So one recommendation that I'd
20 have right away, which is the foundation,
21 you wouldn't want to shut off the latter
22 kind of proposals. They may be very

213

1 exciting scientific proposals.
2 Again, say, "Yeah. You can sort
3 of participate in this, but you all got to
4 sort of fit into this particular modality of
5 doing questions," which, you know, you say
6 there's a lot of value in this, and, yeah,
7 we want to do this.
8 But then, these other things might
9 get shut out if we went down that road
10 exclusively.
11 DR. HANSEN: Well, and one of the
12 issues, I think, for the foundation in
13 designing the RFP is how is a directive to
14 be, whether -- because you could imagine
15 kind of different designs of the survey
16 study, coupling with particular kinds of
17 research questions, but not with others.
18 I think that's one of Harold's
19 points.
20 The question will be, "Well, you
21 know, how directed do you need to be in
22 terms of making sure that there's a level

214

1 playing field for all of the people who are
2 proposing that there's enough specificity in
3 what one is supposed to propose, that
4 there's a way of evaluating it?"
5 But, also, sort of making it
6 possible to sort of see what the ideas out
7 there are and to decide which would be the
8 best science.

9 DR. BURNS: So one thing just to
10 add is so I think it would be a scientific
11 loss if the modules were -- if the modular
12 proposals or whatever were so self-contained
13 that they didn't have this kind of
14 conversational aspect across.

15 So, I like the scientific fat
16 freezing bowl. I like the scientific value
17 added that comes from putting an idea in the
18 context of a bunch of other ideas as opposed
19 to building a little wall around an idea and
20 running it in a laboratory that isn't about
21 having that idea. Have a conversation with
22 other ideas.

215

1 So, if part of the, you know,
2 notion of these separate -- so, partly, I
3 would feel it a scientific loss if, for
4 example, the NES sold, you know, some chunks
5 of itself off to different researchers who
6 weren't actually in conversation with one
7 another.

8 That seems to me not as good as
9 the science that could come from a
10 conversation.

11 DR. BRADBURN: Supposing we were
12 thinking of putting an RP, which is being a
13 little bit like the British one, where you
14 say, "Okay. The minimum is maintaining a
15 national face-to-face survey with a core of
16 roughly half an hour or something like
17 that." I didn't exactly specify it, but
18 something sort of like that.

19 Then, but with proposals for
20 innovations of various sorts. Again, I'm
21 not sure how to pronounce that.

22 Now, the question, there are two

1 ways you could do that. You could say, "You
2 got to have a proposal that covers both
3 parts, or you could have a proposal which
4 only does one or the other of the parts."

5 Is that feasible, do you think?

6 DR. HANSEN: I think it would be
7 very hard to do it where you divided the
8 parts.

9 DR. BRADY: Well, the division
10 works better in one direction than the
11 other.

12 DR. HANSEN: Yeah. That's right.
13 That's right.

14 DR. BRADY: The problem is that I
15 think it's a good idea to say you might have
16 proposals that were just the innovative
17 part --

18 DR. HANSEN: Right.

19 DR. BRADY: -- if you protected
20 the core, but I think -- I can't see many
21 people coming in and say, "I'm just going to
22 put in a proposal on the core."

1 So, what you could end up with is
2 suppose you liked -- there was several
3 proposals with innovations, plus core, and
4 then some with just innovations.

5 You like the innovations very,
6 very well. Since these are the only people
7 who did the core as well as the innovations,
8 what do you do then?

9 Do you just say, "Well, we're
10 going to cut off your innovations. You just
11 get the core"?

12 I would think some PI's would say,
13 "No. I don't want it under those
14 circumstances. I don't want somebody else's
15 innovations married to my core."

16 So that is the problem.

17 DR. HANSEN: Right. The other

18 side of the problem which I was thinking
19 about is that if you say you've got to have
20 a proposal which covers both parts, that
21 limits severely the number of people who can
22 do it, at least because there aren't --

218

1 there are a small number of places that can
2 do the core part.
3 Well, you could team up. I mean
4 make a consortium of sorts. I suppose
5 that --
6 DR. BRADY: But it might be a way
7 of getting more innovative ideas and so
8 forth.
9 DR. HANSEN: See, what I --
10 DR. BRADY: You have to face the
11 problem of what are you going to do if
12 somebody comes in with the only core
13 proposal and with innovations?
14 You just say you don't like those
15 innovations?
16 DR. HANSEN: Right.
17 DR. BRADY: I don't think PI's are
18 going to say, "Oh, that's fine. I'll take
19 the other guy's innovations."
20 DR. HANSEN: Yeah.
21 DR. BRADY: "It's fine with me.
22 I'm just in here to do the core."

219

1 DR. HANSEN: Well, I just question
2 whether that would unduly restrict the range
3 of innovations that might --
4 DR. BRADY: Yeah. Well --
5 DR. HANSEN: I mean if you're in a
6 place where you've got a great idea about
7 how to do something, if you could just get
8 onto it.
9 DR. BRADBURN: But, now, you have
10 some -- I understand you have some mechanism

11 for doing that now; that is, you, the Board
12 calls for proposals or they, in effect, come
13 in.

14 So there are opportunities in the
15 present structure to have innovations coming
16 in from the larger community.

17 DR. BURNS: We've been trying to
18 ramp that up --

19 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

20 DR. BURNS: -- and having more and
21 more public meetings at the major national
22 conventions and so forth.

220

1 DR. BRADBURN: Right. Yeah.

2 DR. BURNS: So that people feel
3 even more comfortable.

4 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah. That seems
5 to work pretty well with USS, and I'm not
6 sure how it works in the PSID, but --

7 DR. BURNS: Can you tell us more
8 about what is the process for the GSS of
9 people adding modules and that sort of
10 thing?

11 DR. BRADBURN: Well, the Board, as
12 I -- I mean I've been a little out of it and
13 so forth.

14 The way it worked the last time I
15 looked, which was about four years ago or
16 so, and I think it's sort of stabilized this
17 way because it seems to be working is the
18 Board really functions as the PI's. I mean
19 the grant is -- Tom Smith and --

20 Well, actually, the Chairman of
21 the Board -- well, not any more, but he was
22 at the time the last grant came in. I think

1 Peter Margin is a PI.

2 So it's sort of -- the structure
3 of it makes the Board pretty much the real
4 PI's, substantive PI's, and they have formal
5 advertising requests for modules.

6 There's a core bit and it has a
7 rotation, and that's sort of laid for a ten
8 year period or something, what the rotation
9 is for the different core bits.

10 Then the rest is up for
11 competition, essentially, for modules, and
12 the Board entertains proposals of various
13 sorts.

14 Then, there are two, as I
15 understand it, and, then, again, this may
16 have changed slightly, but it's an
17 interesting model.

18 There's our own competition for
19 models, and then the reward the Board gets
20 for doing all this is the Board gets to
21 design a module.

22 So there's one module that's the

1 Board's module, and then there's the modules
2 that are supported by the NSF grant.

3 Then, there's modules that are
4 essentially sold outside in a way, and what
5 I don't know is the degree to which the
6 Board exercises, you might say, quality
7 control over those modules.

8 I mean they don't -- not the
9 questionnaire wording, I think, you know,
10 Tom Smith and Jim Davis would do that, but
11 whether it's appropriate or not.

12 I mean just to give you -- I know
13 years ago, when I was involved, one thing
14 that was decided to be inappropriate was --
15 and this was when things were really sort of
16 desperate. They even raised it, but as to
17 whether a commercial --

18 I remember talking to the market
19 research director for Sears Roebuck who
20 said, "We use the -- a great deal free. We
21 will be happy to pay a very large price if
22 we could add a question which says, 'Do you

223

1 shop at Sears,' and keep that proprietary."
2 We said, "No."
3 DR. BRADY: Oh, temptation.
4 DR. MUTZ: That sounds like a
5 different model than how NES is operating
6 because it isn't people proposing modules or
7 anything like that. It's general ideas that
8 the Board might consider and so forth.
9 DR. BRADBURN: Then these things,
10 as I mentioned, the getting like the church,
11 the thing, the employees. That was simply,
12 you know, getting the follow up, just
13 getting a list of data.
14 Then that data where you -- I mean
15 that was a whole separate proposal, then, to
16 go and do the funding, but it was enabled by
17 the extra question or two added in order to
18 get the basic data from which you could
19 build the sample to do the other studies.
20 DR. THOMPSON: Let me add one
21 little thing.
22 Tom Smith, you know, in the recent

224

1 times, has been really sort of representing
2 the Board in terms of finding grants. He
3 does a lot of work.
4 DR. BRADBURN: Oh, he does a lot
5 of salesmanship.
6 DR. THOMPSON: To line up, you
7 know, the grants and all that.
8 DR. BRADBURN: That's right.
9 Yeah.

10 DR. THOMPSON: So it is an effort
11 on his part.
12 DR. BRADBURN: Oh, he spends a lot
13 of time. He complains about how much time
14 he spends I mean to do that. But, yeah, I
15 think he told me he spent a quarter of his
16 time or something.
17 DR. THOMPSON: But I think that
18 might be why it works so good is he's sort
19 of the focal point --
20 DR. BRADBURN: Right. That's
21 right. Yeah.
22 DR. THOMPSON: -- to actively --

225

1 DR. HANSEN: He's a full-time
2 employee of the project.
3 DR. BRADBURN: He's a full-time
4 employee of the project. That's right.
5 That's right.
6 DR. SINNOTT: But, presumably, in
7 all of this, in, say, talking about the core
8 and other modules and how competition for
9 this ought to be managed, at least around
10 this table and for the present purposes, we
11 are presumably also envisaging that is only
12 one part of an expanded program of research
13 relation to elections, so that there would
14 also be invitations for some of the other
15 either substantive concerns, like turnout,
16 or other analytical concerns, like getting
17 at causation, and that they would be scope
18 for putting in proposals for appropriate
19 research designs to solve those problems in
20 an expanded program.
21 As Chris has said repeatedly, down
22 the line, it may come to be that this

1 program has to be pared back because the
2 budget just can't meet it. But at this
3 stage, presumably, it's the grand design
4 that's being considered.

5 DR. SCIOLI: Well, we are open
6 window with regard to all those other kinds
7 of ideas, Richard, and we don't issue other
8 than we're here and people know about us.

9 We have outreach, and we represent
10 all of the subfields of political science.
11 Then, within that, the best ideas win out.

12 The ANES for the political science
13 program, GSS for sociology and PSID are
14 really the only announcements that we make
15 for competing the proposals.

16 To the best of my knowledge, PSID
17 and GSS did not issue an announcement for a
18 recompetition, but I could be corrected on
19 that.

20 DR. BRADBURN: Well, they have to
21 come in every five years for -- I mean --

22 DR. SCIOLI: But I mean with

1 response to Henry's comment yesterday, when
2 we announced in a "Dear Colleague" letter --

3 DR. BRADY: Right.

4 DR. SCIOLI: -- I don't believe
5 the GSS or PSID did that.

6 DR. BRADBURN: No. I don't think
7 so.

8 DR. SCIOLI: I mean, of course,
9 you weren't here.

10 DR. BRADBURN: That's right.
11 Yeah.

12 DR. BRADY: But it did. It was
13 the last GSS one was -- or was it part of
14 the infrastructure?

15 DR. SCIOLI: A module was.

16 DR. BRADY: Oh, I see.

17 DR. SCIOLI: The integration
18 module.

19 DR. BRADBURN: But just relative
20 to this, what I was asking is to whether
21 what added value you would get by having not
22 so much included all of this, rather than

1 just having a thing which adjusted the NES
2 and the others just come into the program as
3 they do now?

4 Would there be added value by
5 trying to sort of have this as a larger in a
6 competition -- in a bundled sort of way?

7 DR. HANSEN: I think there would
8 be substantially added value, although it
9 might be something where if simply the
10 suggestion came out of NSF that there was
11 real interest in trying to develop synergies
12 between ANES and other projects that
13 investigators might be interested in, and
14 seeing what develops from that, whether the
15 media studies research community picks up on
16 that or the Congressional Studies Research
17 Team picks up on that.

18 So it might be as simple as NSF
19 simply raising the possibility that here are
20 some opportunities for research communities
21 that really haven't articulated with the NES
22 to do so.

1 DR. CLARKE: I think one of the
2 dangers with sort of the way things work,
3 Henry got some of this before. You're
4 talking about the last recompetition is I
5 think there's a very strong perception that
6 there's only going to sort of be one sort of
7 electoral project.

8 People said, "Well, it's going to
9 be Michigan."

10 So Henry said, "Then I won't put
11 in a proposal. Professor X won't put in a
12 proposal."

13 But, also, just more generally,
14 the NSF has like, you know, X dollars, and X
15 dollars would go to whoever wins this
16 competition and there won't be anything
17 else.

18 So that, I think, serves to dampen
19 down quite substantially other kinds of
20 proposals. There just isn't any -- you
21 know, the only way I'd ever get my questions
22 on, quote, unquote, is I must get on the

230

1 Board or I must work through the ANES.
2 So I think that has a real sort of
3 dampening down effect in terms of proposals,
4 coming to do electoral related research
5 along the lines we've been discussing.
6 So I don't know a signal, Norman.
7 You know, sort of a signal that somehow,
8 it's not just this. Whatever team gets it
9 or whatever, however that worked out.
10 But, certainly, a signal along the
11 lines of openness to electoral related
12 research, more generally, I think would be
13 very, very positive that could be -- because
14 I think people right now back away.
15 DR. BRADBURN: Yeah. That's
16 interesting. That's why I was thinking that
17 some of the bundling all would say maybe
18 multiple awards, you know. We're in this
19 whole sort of area.
20 This is one thing we know. We
21 want to get going, but, beyond that, we're
22 open to, you know, whatever creativity there

231

1 is in the field.
2 DR. SCIOLI: Other comments,
3 observations, summary conclusions?
4 DR. CLARKE: Advertisements?

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

6 DR. BRADY: I want to say thank
7 you to Frank and Jim for organizing this,
8 and to Norman and Rick sitting through all
9 of this. I really appreciate it.

10 I think it shows a tremendous
11 amount of commitment on the part of the
12 National Science Foundation to this
13 enterprise that such a distinguished group
14 of people sit here and listen to us for two
15 days, so -- day and a half. We appreciate
16 it.

17 DR. SCIOLI: It's unprecedented to
18 have the Division Director and the Assistant
19 Director stay in a room with a group like
20 this, and it's only with Norman's leadership
21 over the last three years that the Assistant
22 Director has become fundamentally involved

232

1 interest the intellectual part of the
2 directorate.

3 Rick is now doing far too many of
4 these sit-ins. I think it's the only thing
5 that makes the job interesting and exciting
6 is for him to be able to do it.

7 But, Rick, your comments, please,
8 as we go down the road?

9 DR. LEMPert: Okay. I want to
10 just begin by sort of, I guess, an echo, but
11 reversing it, and just thanking you all for
12 coming here.

13 I think I did begin my original
14 comments by talking about how grateful we
15 are for the service we get from you.

16 I hope that you respond as I do
17 and feel this meeting really has been its
18 own reward, so you are compensated, if not
19 in cash, certainly in something maybe even
20 rarer, which is really intellectual
21 stimulation.

22 In a sense, I hope I'm being part

1 of something which I think is important to
2 the advance of political science because
3 this has been a very useful session as far
4 as I'm concerned in thinking about the
5 recompetition, what the announcement should
6 contain and the like.

7 I expect it was clear from the
8 outset that this was not a meeting about is
9 it worth continuing with the NES. At least
10 I certainly came with a very high
11 probability that this was a valuable and
12 important research, and did not expect this
13 group to dissuade me of that, and you
14 haven't.

15 There are so many remarks that
16 stood out that were made, and I just want to
17 refer to one that I felt was very important
18 at this stage. This was Chris Achen's
19 comment about, "Let's really think about the
20 science value," which I think had a -- you
21 know, is very important, and is really what
22 I, at this stage, kind of am most interested

1 in, in part.

2 One of the nice things about
3 knowing very little about a particular area
4 is you have a very steep learning curve.
5 You've been exposed to a group of people who
6 know a lot. You learn a lot quickly, and
7 that's been tremendously valuable in
8 thinking about the science.

9 The hard questions, of course, are
10 ones that it's harder to deal with, and
11 these have to do with tradeoffs.

12 One set which you all are experts
13 in are the tradeoffs within the different
14 things one might do within the NES,
15 something in which I think we would probably
16 get a revolt if we said you were the ones
17 who decided the tradeoffs between ANES and
18 election studies and other kinds of research

19 that the political science program sponsors.
20 Of course, that is going to set
21 the limits, and this is something which all
22 of us here, the foundation side, perhaps

235

1 with consultation with community, but very
2 broadly speaking, have to think about, and
3 we are aware of -- I am aware of, you know,
4 how that is going to affect what is
5 possible. At this point, I have no
6 particular position on this.

7 I do think the issue that Norman
8 just brought up, which was one that I also
9 had on my list, is going to be really
10 interesting to think about, and this is what
11 everyone wants to become much more
12 programmatic about election studies, of
13 which an important part, but not exclusively
14 with the ANES.

15 If one does want to become more
16 programmatic is that take it from funds and
17 putting it in announcements, or is it, on
18 the other extreme, simply just saying to the
19 field, "Hey, we're interested in election
20 studies and we have a, you know, a
21 centerpiece, but we need a lot of things
22 around it."

236

1 That's why I asked my question
2 recently. I think it's sort of the docking
3 station model. So that's something I'm
4 interested in.

5 Then I think if I had a role here
6 it's been to ask pointed, and perhaps
7 sometimes the dumb question, and I want to
8 just sort of conclude with one which may
9 exceed that, but it was one I posed to John

10 Thompson during the break.
11 The question was do politicians
12 and political consultants use the ANES? His
13 answer was, "No. They're much more
14 interested in polling."
15 That's right, and, yet, you know,
16 if we really -- and I'm not sure that's the
17 complete answer.
18 But it does occur to me, if we're
19 really getting an understanding of
20 elections, it should be people who are using
21 this, apart from those of us who want to
22 refine our political theory, because an

237

1 awful lot of people would pay an awful lot

2 of money to know what the secrets are.
3 I'm just kind of curious as a last
4 question, but if you have e-mails or have
5 things you've written, what has grown out
6 of 50 years of election study which people
7 who want to win elections are using?
8 DR. SCIOLI: Did you want to make
9 a comment, Henry, or --
10 DR. BRADBURN: I actually was
11 going to ask that, but I'll make an answer,
12 too. But go ahead.
13 DR. BRADY: Well, I was just going
14 to say that I think there is a lot of people
15 out there who are consultants who use the
16 ANES.
17 They actually often are trained in
18 it. They went to school. They learned
19 about elections through their study of
20 textbooks which were based on the ANES.
21 They get into courses and get
22 interested in polling, especially because

1 they've been analyzing the ANES.

2 Then, when they go out and do
3 polling, all the concepts and ideas and
4 instrumentation from the ANES gets used in
5 their own work.

6 I think Dick Wirthlin, for example,
7 who was a pollster for Reagan, was a big
8 supporter of the ANES.

9 I think Mark Melman is another
10 one, and I'm sure we can come up with other
11 names. But those are just some I know.

12 It's really fundamental to that
13 field.

14 DR. BRADBURN: What I'm
15 interested, Henry, and maybe this is the
16 same answer. I mean I can understand the
17 data that's being collected.

18 I'm interested in the point that
19 was made about building theory.

20 Are there theories that are
21 growing out of this which are -- and, again,
22 as I said, I'm revealing my ignorance about

1 this. This is not my field, political
2 science -- which the people who really want
3 to win elections are using as theories that
4 guide them?

5 DR. BRADY: Actually, my
6 experience is a resounding, "yes," although
7 I wouldn't use the word, "theory." I would
8 use the word, "concepts," that are being
9 developed and interrogated and developed --
10 or elaborated in a national election study.

11 DR. BRADBURN: What I was going to
12 say when Henry, this morning, did off his
13 list is what struck me in knowledge and kind
14 of practices that most of those -- I would
15 say all of those things have been so taken
16 up and penetrated into political practice
17 now.

18 Now, the problem is nobody
19 realizes that that's where they came from,
20 and so when you -- I can imagine giving that
21 list to some practice and they said, "Oh,
22 you know, you finally discovered this?"

240

1 You know, they're like, "We've
2 been onto this all along," but, of course,
3 they haven't.

4 DR. BRADY: It's like the
5 Congressman who thought that he didn't need
6 the census because those data were available
7 in the private sector.

8 DR. BRADBURN: But a wonderful
9 paper somehow would be if we could somehow
10 trace the development of the findings and
11 things that come out, and then see how they
12 pop up in practice later.

13 DR. MUTZ: As I said, I think
14 there is a significant lag. I think many of
15 the consultants sort of pick up on the
16 conventional wisdoms that come out of this
17 literature and then start applying them.

18 But, often, they've moved on in
19 the interim and they are quite up to date.

20 There are some organizations like
21 the AAPOR, the American Association for
22 Public Opinion Research, where those types

1 mix, and they do, you know --
 2 DR. BRADY: I do want to be very
 3 clear unless I be misunderstood.
 4 I'm not suggesting there should be
 5 a purpose of the ANES.
 6 DR. BRADBURN: No. No. No, but
 7 it's a test of what --
 8 DR. BURNS: Well, and, for
 9 example, you know, the whole idea that
 10 parties are less important. You know, that
 11 certainly seeped into their conventional
 12 wisdom and led them to run campaigns
 13 differently than they had before.
 14 DR. HANSEN: Traits.
 15 DR. BURNS: Yeah.
 16 DR. BRADY: Traits.
 17 DR. ACHEN: In a sense, if I might
 18 reinterpret what you said, where you have
 19 some knowledge that really works in a sense.
 20 I mean if we really got stuff that here we
 21 are these enterprise that really sort of
 22 moves the world, and if that's the way the

1 natural science will say, "Yeah. We can do
 2 things."
 3 Engineers will take this and do
 4 this. Then I think it's a very appropriate,
 5 you know, important question. Is it
 6 really -- are we at a point where we really
 7 can, you know, there can be engineering
 8 applications?
 9 I was sitting there at 8:00 on
 10 election night in the year 2000. Every
 11 political scientist in the room said, "Don't
 12 call Florida on the basis of what you're
 13 seeing on the computer screen."
 14 DR. SCIOLI: Remember, as a
 15 personal anecdote, and they're always
 16 dangerous, but years ago, when my boys were
 17 political science majors at the University
 18 of Pennsylvania, they had a professor by the
 19 name of Frank Luntz.
 20 They came home one time because
 21 they were in this course together, senior
 22 and sophomore, and said, "Do you have

1 anything to do with the American National
 2 Election Study? Professor Luntz has given
 3 us an assignment where we have to use these
 4 data, and we have to come up with a module
 5 for running an election and advising a
 6 candidate on what factors."

7 I went, "Oh, my gosh. Well, yeah.
 8 National Science Foundation funds that."

9 DR. BRADY: Did you help them with
 10 their homework?

11 DR. SCIOLI: One is now a doctor.
 12 One's a lawyer, so they didn't pursue it
 13 beyond Frank Luntz.

14 DR. BRADY: Norman, would you like
 15 to --

16 DR. BRADBURN: Okay. Let me
 17 just -- I mean I'm really extremely
 18 appreciative of your comments and as I told
 19 one or two of you in the beginning, at the
 20 first break, I was a little worried that you
 21 all were going to agree and not disagree,
 22 and that we wouldn't -- but that you rose to

1 the occasion.

2 My interest in -- to my somewhat
 3 larger problem for NSF, and it's not just
 4 for SBE, but it's a problem for all of NSF,
 5 and that's really how to structure, compete
 6 and manage large projects.

7 We've never resolved that problem,
 8 and there's a lot of discussion within the
 9 foundation about it. A lot of pressure on
 10 us from Congress and from OMB about it. So
 11 that's one of the reasons we're particularly
 12 anxious -- at least I'm particularly anxious
 13 to get the kind of feedback from this.

14 Actually, from my point of view,
 15 this is not actually a particularly large
 16 project, although, within social sciences,

17 it's a pretty large project. Certainly by
18 the standards of the other directorates,
19 it's not a very large project.
20 But I think it is a test bed, in a
21 way, for us to think about how we do do
22 larger projects, and I hope if all the

245

1 budget things go well, we will have an
2 opportunity to do more and larger projects.
3 So, I think, you know, I'm going
4 to think a lot about what I've heard in the
5 last couple of days and try to figure out
6 how this can change the way we do things,
7 not only for this particular project, but
8 for the social sciences in general.
9 So thank you all.
10 DR. SCIOLI: I'd like Jim to have
11 the last word, if he would.
12 DR. GRANATO: About two years ago,
13 we had a similar meeting, and within that
14 meeting, we had a substantial discussion,
15 of what became known as EITM.
16 At the end of the discussion, the
17 prior Division Director said, "Well, let's
18 see if you're pushing on a string."
19 I left the meeting thinking,
20 biting my lip, saying I felt there was an
21 enormous amount of energy. I bet the
22 community was going to respond, but we

246

1 didn't know.
2 Well, the proposals came and some
3 of them were just stellar. I'm getting the
4 same feeling here, and I'm hopeful, if we
5 can come up with the money, that we're going
6 to have a set of proposals that are going to
7 really push the envelope for political
8 science.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

I want to thank you all for
coming. It's been a very, very valuable
experience for me, and I think it's really
going to help the program and NSF.
(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the
PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)
* * * * *