

ICPSR
Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research

Annual Report,
1963-1964

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research

ICPSR 4006

This document was previously available in paper and machine readable format only. It was converted to Portable Document Format (PDF), with minimal editing, on the date below as part of ICPSR's annual report conversion project. The document may not be completely searchable. No additional updating of this collection has been performed.

March 2004

**INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR
POLITICAL RESEARCH**

Annual Report

1963-1964

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

BOX 1248 • ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106 • PHONE: AREA CODE 313, 663-1511, EXT. 2255

June, 1964

To: The Council of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research

From: The Executive Director of the SRC Staff to the Consortium

Subject: Second Annual Report, 1963-64:

- I Summer Program
- II Data Repository Activity
- III Membership
- IV Related Research Activity
- V Staff Composition, 1964-65
- VI Budgets

I. Summer Program

- A. Level of participation
- B. Financial support for participants
- C. Two-week seminars
- D. Summary of enrollment, 1963
- E. Summary of expected enrollment, 1964

Addenda:

- 1. Proposal to the National Science Foundation for Advanced Science Seminars on Quantitative Political Research, Summer, 1965
- 2. Proposal to the National Science Foundation for Research Conference on the Application of Behavioral Research Techniques to the Analysis of Historical Political Data, Summer, 1965
- 3. Proposal to the National Science Foundation for Research Conference on Theoretical Models for the Analysis of Community Power Structures, Summer, 1965

I. Summer Program

A. Level of participation

The strengths and weaknesses of the 1963 advanced graduate training program are reflected, at least indirectly, in subsequent events. Despite a substantial increase in the number of schools participating as members of the Consortium, the anticipated increase in individual participation in the summer program in 1964 will be modest. Some 21 faculty members participated in 1963; to date only 22 have indicated their intention to participate in 1964. Graduate student enrollment is up from 41 to 47. These increases are almost directly proportional to the modest increase in subsidization from the Consortium operating budget; enrollment is up 13 percent and the subsidy increase from \$12,365 to \$13,560 is 10 percent.

On the other hand, the proportion of elections for graduate credit increased very sharply, from 23 percent of all elections in 1963 to 47 percent in 1964. This supports the casual impression of the staff that more schools are incorporating the Consortium offerings in their programs of graduate study. It is also true that a number of new Consortium members are only in the early stages of launching their own doctoral programs and have joined the Consortium expecting to make use of the training facilities in the years to come.

B. Financial support for participants

Despite good intentions and firm resolve, the level of subsidization for summer program participants did not increase appreciably in 1964. Requests for support did increase markedly. This clear, if unnecessary, testimony to the need for additional financing was anticipated by council and staff in overtures to various granting agencies. The problem has been discussed with appropriate personnel in the National Science Foundation and an informal outline of our needs has been presented to them. A formal proposal for support through the Advanced Science Seminar program will be submitted in the near future.

The availability of substantial support for 1965 is much to be desired, but would bring with it a new problem in terms of the number of participants. Keeping in mind the past demonstrations of need and the present indications of a large increase in potential participants from new members, financial resources to support the active demand would doubtless mean a doubling--or more--of summer enrollments. Council and staff will be challenged to locate the instructors needed to maintain program standards.

C. Two-week seminars

The two-week seminars of 1963 also left their mark on subsequent events. A manuscript from the Deutsch-Hyman lectures on cross-national and cross-cultural research is being reviewed by a prospective publisher. The Council and staff have decided to seek a flexible arrangement with a publisher whereby each manuscript submitted by the Consortium would be treated as an ad hoc candidate for publication. A succession of good manuscripts will result in a monographic series. Seminar leaders, in turn, may or may not choose to produce a manuscript suitable for publication.

There were some indications from the 1963 experience that the seminar format which is most likely to produce an excellent manuscript may not result in the most exciting direct experience for seminar participants.

The judicial behavior seminar stimulated a range of interests in data collection. As a consequence of proposals submitted to the Council by seminar members, funds have been acquired to secure the annual set of records of cases terminated in the U. S. Court system. Funds have also been obtained to sponsor one or more conferences concerned with the collection of additional data on judicial behavior to be added to the Consortium archives. Finally, a proposal has been submitted to the Survey Research Center suggesting a set of questions to be included in the 1964 election study.

The forthcoming 1964 seminar on legislative behavior is also located in a larger context than the limited two-week seminar period implies. It will be the third in a series of related meetings and will precede a major set of research activities. The first event was a conference on Congressional research. The conference was sponsored by the Consortium and financed by the Social Science Research Council in response to a proposal submitted to the Council by Professor Theodore Lowi of Cornell. Many of the 25 participants attended a subsequent conference on Congressional research called by Professor Ralph Huitt of Wisconsin. The Consortium seminar will be followed by a series of studies of Congress that will be carried out under Professor Huitt's leadership, financed by the Carnegie Corporation in response to a proposal sponsored by the American Political Science Association. Through fortunate circumstances of timing, the Consortium sponsored conference and seminar are contributing to a very major research effort relevant to the interests of many Consortium participants.

Tentative plans for 1965 include a seminar on analytic methods of historical analysis. This seminar would also be a part of a new thrust in political research. It would respond to the accelerated interest in the systematic analysis of historical data. It would exploit the current collection of election data being added to the repository; it might also suggest the potential for a major addition to the Consortium training program.

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

1963 Summer Program Attendance

	<u>687</u>	<u>787</u>	<u>781</u>	<u>782</u>	<u>524</u>	<u>583</u>	<u>584</u>	<u>684</u>	<u>687</u>
Credit	12	11	8	5	3			1	1
Visitor	6	4	6	5	8			3	7
Auditor	18	15	16	3	1	2	2		
Ph.D. Guest	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>
	46	36	43	24	14	4	2	4	8

ICPR	PS 687	Proseminar in Behavior Research Methods		
	PS 781	Seminar in Comparative Political Analysis (Deutsch/Hyman)		
	PS 787	Seminar in Quantitative Political Analysis)	second 4 weeks
	PS 782	Seminar in Research on Judicial Behavior (Murphy/Tanenhaus))	
SRC	Soc 524	Computer Applications in Survey Research		second 4 weeks
	Soc 583	Introduction to Survey Research I		
	Soc 584	Introduction to Survey Research II		second 4 weeks
	Soc 684	Case Studies in Survey Research	first &	second 4 weeks
	Soc 687	Methods of Survey Sampling		second 4 weeks

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

1964 Summer Program Attendance (as of June 1, 1964)

	<u>687</u>	<u>787</u>	<u>781</u>	<u>782</u>	<u>583</u>	<u>584</u>	<u>684</u>	<u>585</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>687</u>	<u>524</u>
Credit	20	19	15	11	11	7			2	4	3
Auditor	18	15	17	14	1	1		1	1		3
Ph.D. Guest	5	6	14	2							
Visitor (non-member)	1	2	1	2							
	<u>44</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>

-4-

ICPR	PS 687	Proseminar in Behavioral Research Methods	
	PS 781	Seminar in Legislative Behavior	
	PS 787	Seminar in Quantitative Political Analyses)
	PS 782	Seminar in Political Research in Developing Countries) second 4 weeks
SRC	Psych 583	Introduction to Survey Research I	
	Psych 584	Introduction to Survey Research II	second four weeks
	Psych 684	Case Studies in Survey Research	
	Psych 585	Analysis of Survey Data	second four weeks
	Psych 615	Case Studies of Surveys in Organizations	second four weeks
	Psych 687	Methods of Survey Sampling	second four weeks
	Psych 524	Computer Applications in Survey Research	second four weeks

On behalf of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, the Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan, requests support for two Advanced Science Seminars on Quantitative Methods in Political Research.

The seminars are intended to overcome a critical deficiency in the present professional training of political scientists, sociologists, historians and certain other social scientists. The objective of the seminars is to introduce the methodologies and techniques of behavioral science pertinent to research on political phenomena. The basic question of whether the behavioral approach is relevant to the study of politics and government has been recently answered, and largely in the affirmative. But the professional inclinations of those who would pursue rigorous, systematic, empirical research on political phenomena are now rarely buttressed with appropriate preparation in the workways of behavioral research. Only a handful of universities possess the teaching staff, facilities and formal curricula necessary for even elementary graduate training of this type. Indeed, one of the major incentives for institutional affiliation with the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research lies in the possibility of each of the forty member schools thereby acquiring advanced training opportunities for its graduate students and departmental staff members.

Despite grave difficulties in locating financial support for participants, approximately sixty graduate students and faculty members (from thirty or more different schools) have taken part in the seminars during each of the summers they have been offered, 1963 and 1964. With optimal

support, the seminars could be expected to serve well over one hundred advanced graduate students and college and university teachers in 1965.

The content of the seminars, and the ability of the Consortium to provide an exceptional instructional staff, make possible a professional training experience that is thus far unique within the United States. The seminars are offered at a sufficiently advanced level and for a sufficiently specialized clientele to restrict their ready development and introduction into the graduate curricula represented by the participants. At the same time, the objectives of the seminars are so well matched to professional needs and expressed demands as to command the interest reflected in the applications for participation in 1963 and 1964. As the active demand for this training grows, and as the cadre of trained professionals increases (in part because of the seminars), the larger institutions may be expected to inaugurate comparable work on their own campuses. But the immediate future will doubtless see the Consortium seminars continue to assume a significant role in the professional education of those engaged in research on political phenomena.

The seminars are conducted as combined lecture-discussion courses. Optimal financing would allow us to divide each seminar into smaller sections and thereby improve the lecture-discussion balance. Even without this, however, the staffing and other administrative provisions at present make possible extended informal contact among seminar members and staff outside the formal meeting hours. The specific content of each seminar is described in the attached memorandum, "ICPR Summer Program Curricular Plans" (Appendix B). The seminars for which we are

requesting support are offered through The University of Michigan Department of Political Science as fully accredited graduate courses, P.S. 687s and P.S. 787s. Content is chosen for its applicability to the research problems and data resources that presently guide actual research, as well as for the purposes of more generalized research training.

Through other facilities of the Consortium, members of the scholarly community at large as well as participants from Consortium schools now have a richly varied, and constantly growing, array of data available to them. This new facilitation of access to a wide range of data relevant to one or another scientific problem both creates a demand for the seminars and provides the resources necessary for subsequent utilization of the training acquired in the seminars.

Yet another part of the Consortium program in research training consists of specialized research conferences. The conferences are organized around substantive topics of special interest to scholars engaged in research and graduate instruction. The advanced seminars perform the incidental function of providing the foundation necessary for subsequent participation in the conferences relevant to one's teaching or research interests.

Both in 1963 and 1964, participation was limited by the funds available to support the instructional staff and to subsidize reliance of institutions such as Yale, Northwestern, UCLA, North Carolina, Georgetown and others on the unique opportunities that the seminars afford. The formal programs of many graduate students and the profes-

sional plans of faculty members are now being adjusted to permit participation. At the same time, the financial problems of potential participants are severe. It is uncommon to find institutionalized means of summer support for graduate students apart from that related to work on research projects. It is only slightly less difficult for junior faculty members to be able to pay for the long-range investment in the short-range luxury of a summer of advanced study and training that does not produce an article, a monograph or a completed book as evidence of time well spent. With the initial experience of the summer of 1963 to demonstrate the utility of the seminars, the Council and staff of the Consortium have been under great pressure to find the means to support wider participation.

The seminars have the potential for a strategic contribution to the revolutionary changes now taking place in political analysis and research. Their development in conjunction with other aspects of the Consortium program to facilitate research, including the establishment of the data repository and the stimulation of new research plans, permits subsequent utilization of the training they afford. The existence of the seminars, in turn, promises both the quantitative and qualitative growth of research as scholars are better equipped to exploit the data resources now being made available to them.

The advanced seminars, as well as the other aspects of the Consortium training program, are organized and administered under the general supervision of the Consortium Council and staff. They are directed by Dr. Warren E. Miller, Professor of Political Science and Program Director

of the Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan, Executive Director of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research. The staff members who will offer the seminars in 1965 are Drs. Philip E. Converse and Donald E. Stokes. Both men are Associate Professors of Political Science and Senior Study Directors at the Survey Research Center, and both serve as Associate Directors on the staff of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research.

Participants in the seminars are scholars committed to the approach of behavioral science in the study of political phenomena. They are predominantly advanced graduate students and junior faculty, primarily from political science but with increasing representation from history, sociology and social psychology. Applicants are admitted to the seminars if properly prepared through formal or informal acquisition of the minimal knowledge and skills described on pages 3-5 of the memorandum on "ICPR Summer Program Curricular Plans." The level of the instruction offered is such as to limit participants to those equipped to benefit; other work is available for the less advanced.

Although the program is organized by the Consortium and shaped to meet the needs of Consortium participants, the seminars are open to all interested and qualified scholars. Both in 1963 and in 1964, some half dozen faculty members from as many nonmember institutions participated in the program. If financial support were available to sustain and expand the program, the seminars for 1965 would be publicized well beyond the Consortium membership through announcements in the American Political Science Review, the Public Opinion Quarterly, the American Behavioral Scientist and other appropriate professional journals.

Application to the National Science Foundation
for Funds for the Support of a Research Conference

On behalf of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, the Survey Research Center of The University of Michigan requests support for a research conference on the application of behavioral research techniques to the analysis of historical political data.

The conference would be held during the summer of 1965. It would be located on The University of Michigan campus in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and would be held in conjunction with the Consortium-sponsored program of research training through advanced science seminars.

The conference will be jointly sponsored by the Consortium and the American Historical Association's Committee for the Collection of the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History. These organizations, working together with the assistance of the Social Science Research Council, have participated over the past year in a set of activities which make the conference timely and promise substantial dividends as a result of its being held. Three major themes will provide the foci of this conference: 1) utilization of varying levels of aggregation of data in the analysis of electoral behavior; 2) historical analysis by time series arrays and by direct measures of change in the parameters of aggregates; and 3) the interaction of political elites and political masses. The conference will include lectures, seminar discussions, illustrative use of high-speed computers in the solution of analytic problems, and demonstrations of alternative methods of measurement and approaches to the interpretation of data. Conference leadership will be provided by research scholars of national reputation, such as Professor Samuel Hays (University of Pittsburgh), Professor Charles Farris (University of Florida), Professor Lee Benson (University of

Pennsylvania) and Dr. Milton Cummings (Research Associate of the Brookings Institution).

This conference on selected methods of historical analysis will be offered primarily for college and university teachers in American political history and in political science. Participation should be limited to approximately twenty historians and ten political scientists. Participants will include leading scholars whose research needs and interests have led to the plans for the conference. This group includes the four men named above, and such men as Professor C. Vann Woodward (Yale University), Professor James Prothro (University of North Carolina), Professor Austin Ranney (University of Wisconsin), Professor H. D. Price (Syracuse University), Professor Allan Bogue (University of Wisconsin), Professor Murray Murphey (University of Pennsylvania), Professor Thomas Pressly (University of Washington), Professor Dewey Grantham (Vanderbilt University) and Professor Richard McCormick (Rutgers--The State University). Other participants will be drawn from the academic community at large and selected in accord with the general criteria outlined by the National Science Foundation and without regard for their affiliation or nonaffiliation with the sponsoring organizations. Announcements of the conference will be made in the relevant official journals of the archivists, historians and political scientists, as well as in such journals as the Public Opinion Quarterly, Behavioral Science and the American Behavioral Scientist. The conference would most probably be held during late July and early August, 1965 and should cover approximately three weeks.

The impetus for the conference comes from two related sources. In the first instance, the generality of much of the theory now coming out of

political behavior research--based on contemporary data--desperately needs to be tested "through time." Up until the current time, researchers working on modern data were left to wait patiently for the future to provide significant test situations. However, the assembly of crucial data through the Consortium repository now holds out the possibility, still to be explored, that there are enough precise materials from the historical past to permit a good deal of illumination.

The second source of demand comes from scholars who have been working with the documents of history for some time, yet who suddenly are faced with new universes of quantitative material in a totally unaccustomed scope. For those whose concern has been with the generation of large and powerful theories of political behavior and development through the analysis of fragmentary data, many limits on the design of major research projects may be notably relaxed. Through the collective efforts of scores of individual historians, archivists and political scientists, traditional difficulties in locating near-fugitive data have been, or are being, removed for large sectors of basic information. As the repositing of such data continues, common efforts reduce or eliminate the initial steps of data recovery that have demanded so much of the energy and the expertise of the individual scholar. And the human resources thus liberated can be turned to the fashioning of research heretofore out of the reach of even the most dedicated and industrious scholar. But the design of new research must, in turn, rest on the development of workways appropriate to the new dimensions now possible.

On both sides, the new possibilities are exciting, yet at the same time pose important questions concerning the adequacy of established methodologies and techniques of research.

One class of problems to be examined flows from the use of aggregates as units of analysis. With the notable exception of manuscript census materials, virtually all of the data on mass behavior prior to World War II are aggregated data. The units range from nation, region or state down to town, ward or precinct. We have at best only primitive experience to guide the interpretation of data within or across different levels of aggregation. Economists have struggled with this kind of problem for a long time, and while some experience has accumulated, there is limited awareness of these problems and little experience among non-economists. Furthermore, there is reason to wonder how transferable economic experience may be: while economists may do a great deal with variables like "the money supply" without establishing close links to microcosmic behavior, much of the non-economic interest in aggregative data is hinged on the assumption that it can illuminate microcosmic behavior patterns.

Robinson's classic article on the ecological fallacy underscores the possibility of discontinuities between individual and aggregated data. Even here, virtually nothing is known about the boundaries of the problem. What phenomena, under what conditions, are likely to be the subject of what kinds of indeterminacies or misinterpretations? Contemporary data from survey research allow us to generate estimates of aggregates from individual data, and this procedure often produces data supporting identical interpretations at both individual and aggregated levels. But we know this only casually, for we have generally lacked the rich store of aggregated data to compare with individual-level data for the brief recent period in which both are available. We are now on the threshold of examining this problem, which will become quite crucial in establishing the limits of inference from those decades of aggregated data from the historical past.

Among scholars who have been forced to use aggregates as their units of analysis, various conventions have developed. Out of concern over problems like the ecological fallacy, it has been assumed that the smallest units are the best. For some classes of problems, this belief is undoubtedly true; but there is intuitive reason to doubt that it is true for all classes of problems. However this may be, up to now the question has been left a matter for conjecture. Now with large masses of data aggregatable across several levels of geographical grossness, and with computers possessing the capacity to take quick strides through these materials, the first systematic assessment of consequences of working at different levels of aggregation for different types of problems can be made.

Assuming that there will remain some types of problems which will be treacherous to deal with save at the level of the finest civil subdivisions, then clearly theories and methods for sampling these units must be developed. Up to this point, practice has been primitive: comparisons between the ten "most" and the ten "least" wards have been juxtaposed with comparisons between "typical" wards purposefully chosen to represent the presence and absence of some attribute. The development of sampling strategies needs much attention.

The increased power of the panel study over the study based on a series of independent samples has long been a part of the methodological lore of survey research. Nevertheless, it is only in recent years that significant panel studies--actually employing repeated measurement--have been carried out. We still know remarkably little about their necessary place in the study of social change. The aggregative analogue is fully as obscure. There is, for example, little more than intuition to guide the

decision to undertake or to avoid the laborious task of reconstructing boundaries of aggregates to assure that the same units are studied in each case. And even where problems of locating physical boundaries do not intrude, little is known in a systematic fashion about the analytic problems caused by turnover in personnel.

These problems and possibilities are illustrative of the methodological and technical ground which should be entered to prepare for full utilization of the data now being assembled in the Consortium repository. The conference would be a beginning in the solution of recognized problems, the definition of new problems, and the sharing of knowledge about problems where there has been differential experience.

The conference will be organized by the Survey Research Center staff to the Consortium under the direction of Professor Warren E. Miller, Executive Director. Conference plans have been formulated by the Consortium Council and have been developed from suggestions made by the American Historical Association's Committee for the Collection of the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History. As a working conference, the agenda will reflect three resources: 1) the data resources generated for the Consortium by the AHA Committee with the assistance of the Social Science Research Council, 2) the technical resources available in the Consortium data repository personnel and computers, and 3) the professional resources represented by the research scholars who will be the conference leaders and participants.

Application to the National Science Foundation
for Funds for the Support of a Research Conference

On behalf of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research the Survey Research Center of The University of Michigan requests support for a research conference on theoretical models for the analysis of community power structures.

The conference would be held during the summer of 1965. It would be located on The University of Michigan campus in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and would be held in conjunction with the Consortium-sponsored program of research training through advanced science seminars.

The conference will be sponsored by the Consortium. It will be organized around a re-examination of data available from the leading studies of community politics, decision-making and civic leadership. The goal of the conference will be the explication of major contemporary research problems including both substance and method. Conference participants will be concerned with exploring the most significant--most pressing and most troublesome--conceptual problems confronting innovative research. Their attention will be directed to alternative methodological postures and to the assessment of available research methods and analytic techniques. The conference will be led by the principal investigators in these studies and will include such men as Professor Robert A. Dahl (Yale University), Professors Donald Matthews and James Prothro (The University of North Carolina), Professor M. Kent Jennings (The University of Michigan), Professor Robert Agger (University of Oregon), and Professor Bert Swanson (Swarthmore College).

Virtually all of the leading models for the analysis of community decision-making are now represented by significant data collections. The conference will be organized to provide a unique opportunity for research scholars to confront the authors and the results of complementary and

competing works. Through the use of the data-processing facilities of the Consortium, conference participants will engage in a dialogue between theoretical questions posed by the confrontation of alternative theories and the empirical evidence relevant to the question. Conference leaders and participants will be concerned with identifying the lacunae in the evidence pertaining to major concepts and segments of theory as well as with defining unresolved problems in the explication of empirically based theory. The conference will probably be scheduled for a two-week period in late June and early July. Between ten and fifteen faculty members might be expected to participate.

Conference personnel, apart from the conference leaders, will be selected from qualified applicants. Announcement of the conference will be made in the relevant journals of the sociologists, political scientists and social psychologists, as well as in such journals as the Public Opinion Quarterly, Behavioral Science, and the American Behavioral Scientist.

The Consortium is prepared to underwrite all of the direct costs except those which must be borne by the participants. Consequently, no planning and preparation funds and no administrative or instructional funds are sought. Our request is limited to three categories:

Per diem, for fifteen participants, ten days at \$15 per day	\$2,250
Travel allowance, average round trip to and from conference estimated from comparable activities in 1963 and 1964 at 1,500 miles, at 4¢ per mile	900
Indirect cost at 15 per cent of request	<u>475</u>
TOTAL	\$3,625

II. Data Repository Activity

- A. Data recovery and processing
- B. Data Repository Committee
- C. Data retrieval
- D. Relations with other archives
- E. State of the Archives, June, 1964
- F. Data requests from Consortium users

Addenda:

1. Proposal to the National Science Foundation for funds to support the addition of data to the ICPR Data Repository, with amendment
2. The Consortium as a Research Facility for Historians

II. Data Repository Activity

A. Data recovery and processing

In the course of the past year the Consortium moved to take advantage of a number of events relevant to the data repository. Early in the year, Professor Burnham was given additional support by the Social Science Research Council to enable him to recover the data he was originally commissioned to inventory. The recovery effort was made possible, in large part, because of the activities of a newly organized committee of the American Historical Association, the Committee to Collect the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History. This committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Lee Benson, established a nationwide organization of state committees to collect data not readily available through standard library resources. By the end of the summer, some 85-90 percent of the complete county election returns, for president, senate, congress, governor and a second state office, from 1824 to 1962, should be in the repository files. These data will be processed and made accessible through the Consortium repository as a result of a second major grant from the Social Science Division of the National Science Foundation.

The grant also supports a new ad hoc staff position, that of Director of Data Recovery. The position will be filled this coming year by Professor Howard Allen of Southern Illinois University. Professor Allen will take over the functions of Professor Burnham and will assume much of the burden carried this past year by Professor Benson. The first task will be to complete the recovery of election returns. The second order of business will be to inventory and then collect, through the agency of the AHA Committee, all vote records of state referenda, again at the county level and extending from 1824 to the present. Professor Allen's third major task will be to organize and initiate the collection of a wide variety of demographic data.

B. Data repository committee

To guide the Consortium staff in these and other efforts at data recovery, the Council this past year created an ad hoc Data Repository Committee. Current membership on the committee includes Professors Benson, William Chambers, David Easton, Charles Farris, Herbert Jacob, Theodore Lowi, Dwaine Marvick, James Prothro, and Joseph Tanenhaus. Sub-committees of the Repository Committee and the AHA Committee will meet to consider the substantive and technical problems of additional data collections. Their meetings will be supported by funds specified for that purpose in the NSF grant.

C. Data retrieval

The increasing size and complexity of the archives make necessary an automated retrieval system. Such a system is being developed by the ICPR Technical Services staff under the direction of Ralph Bisco. Many basic considerations of design, and the skeleton of the system, are described in an article in the June, 1964 issue of American Behavioral Science.

While we deem the basic design sound, it is necessary to conduct research into the kinds of questions that have been asked, are being asked, and might be asked of an automated system. A pilot project is necessary to test the present design, and to experiment with and evaluate user-system interaction. For example, we need information about cost, about how use of the archives is increased or decreased by having an automated system, and we would like to know whether or not the proposed system would lead to more powerful exploitation of the data. In order to conduct these experiments, we are drafting a proposal to be submitted to a branch of the National Science Foundation.

Summarizing the ABS article, the automated retrieval system proposed consists of several information files: (1) complete texts of questions and codes, (2) abstracts of studies, (3) content and user-oriented dictionaries and thesauri of key words appearing in question text or in analytic concepts. The system includes computer programs to combine, sort, and otherwise organize information in these files according to user requests. A potential user might obtain, as an answer to a particular retrieval request, brief descriptions of studies useful to his research needs, the text of questions and codes which operationalize needed variables, or a list of variables operationalized by a particular study.

For input to the retrieval system (and to facilitate the ordinary duplication of codebooks) the complete text of codebooks is now being key-punched and eventually will be put onto magnetic tape. Also, for the survey materials in the archive, a "master question list" has been prepared, containing the text of a question and a list of all studies in which the question has appeared. To facilitate the location of questions, this information has been keypunched and organized by KWIC techniques (see Professor Kenneth Janda's article in the June 1964 issue of ABS). All official representatives are to receive a copy of the keyword-in-context indexed questions.

The "KWICed" question list is by no means a solution to the retrieval problem: it only organizes information in a general way--the user must visually search for items of interest to him. Concepts and many powerful descriptive terms do not appear in question text, and therefore, are not indexed. The KWIC list provides only a modest facilitation of the location of sets of questions--it can only locate a single variable at a time. Finally, the KWIC list in no way facilitates the location of non-survey materials. However, we feel that the KWIC list is a potentially useful interim retrieval mechanism. It is quite inexpensive to prepare, and does quickly and easily group questions in many useful ways.

D. Relations with other archives: The "Committee of Eight."

In one of its first meetings after the organization of the Consortium, the Council took under consideration some of the problems which might arise due to the development of numerous data archives around the country. It was the sense of the Council that the Consortium should try to promote increased coordination and division of labor between these archives, and toward this end it established a "Committee of Eight," made up of both Consortium representatives, staff, and non-Consortium people involved in the development of

major archives. Over the course of two meetings, this Committee drew up a proposal for an 18-month study of the problem, with the expectation that at the end of this period an organizational and technical design for a full-fledged network of data archives in the United States might be completed, as part of a major proposal for funds to help underwrite the network. This initial proposal found sponsorship in the National Science Foundation as of December, 1963, with the grant being made by common consent to the Survey Research Center at Berkeley. Currently explorations are being made as to interest in participation in the network, under the more formal title of "The Inter-University Council on Social Science Data Archives." During the 18-month planning period, Robert Mitchell of the Berkeley SRC is serving as executive secretary.

While these developments have been occurring in the United States, somewhat comparable developments have occurred in Europe with the stimulation of the International Social Science Council and UNESCO. As in the United States, numerous archives have been established or are projected: the Zentralarchiv at Cologne, and beginnings at Amsterdam, Cambridge and Paris. Efforts are being made to coordinate these archives into a functioning network, and it is quite natural to expect that the American and European systems will proceed insofar as possible on a joint footing, with the hope of comparability of format and ready interchangeability of data in the future. Toward this end, the Committee of Eight has maintained close contact with developments in Europe. A Conference on Data Archives now scheduled to take place in Paris just after the Geneva IPSA meetings (September, 1964) will involve both Europeans and Americans active in these developments. The Consortium will be represented at these meetings by the Executive Director and by Ralph Bisco, Director of the ICPR Technical Services staff.

STATE OF THE ARCHIVES

June 1, 1964

Cards from any study are available for distribution or for analysis on request to the Consortium staff immediately following the distribution of the codebooks to the Official Representative.

	<u>Codebook distributed</u>	<u>Analysis materials distributed</u>	<u>Basic storage data complete, code being reproduced</u>	<u>In process</u>	<u>To be acquired</u>
<u>SRC Political Behavior Program Minor Studies</u>					
1. 1948 Election Study	x	(1)			
2. June, 1951, Foreign Affairs Study	x	(1)			
3. October, 1953 Study	x	(1)			
4. October, 1954 Domestic Affairs Study	x	(1)			
5. October, 1960 Study	x	(1)			
6. October, 1958 Study				x	
7. Fall, 1962 German Embassy Study				x	
8. December, 1963 Study				x	

SRC Political Behavior Program Major Studies

1. 1952 Election Study	x	x
2. 1956 Election Study	x	x
3. 1958 Election Study	x	x
4. 1960 Election Study	x	x

Initial distribution will include only basic data as coded directly from the interviews. A large number of special indices and summary measures will be added later.

SRC Economic Behavior Program Studies

(2)

<u>Codebook distributed</u>	<u>Analysis materials distributed</u>	<u>Basic storage data complete, code being reproduced</u>	<u>In process</u>	<u>To be acquired</u>
---------------------------------	---	---	-----------------------	---------------------------

Consortium Studies

1. 1962 Election Study

x

x

-
- (1) An SRC Analysis Book, containing manuals for interviewers and coders, interviewer instructions, sample design, and other information, was distributed as a separate item. While designed primarily for the SRC major studies, the book has considerable information which is generally applicable to all SRC studies.

Analysis materials for the Five Nation Study were distributed for insertion in the codebook.

- (2) A memorandum describing how to order SRC Economic Behavior Program materials, and a booklet indicating the kinds of data available have been sent all Official Representatives. No special cleaning is done, and codebooks are in limited supply.

	<u>Codebook distributed</u>	<u>Analysis materials distributed</u>	<u>Basic storage data complete, code being reproduced</u>	<u>In process</u>	<u>To be acquired</u>
<u>Consortium Repository Additions</u>					
1. Almond-Verba Five Nation Study	x	x			
2. OCSR Seven Nation Study				x	
3. NORC 1944 National Study			x		
4. NORC 1947 National Study			x		
5. NORC 1948 National Study			x		
6. BASR Erie County, 1940				x	
7. BASR Elmira Study, 1948				x	
8. New Haven Study				x	
9. State Legislative Research Project				x	
10. Stouffer "Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties"			x		
11. Purdue Opinion Panel, High School Attitudes, 1947-1962 (Raw data in storage; to be processed only on financed request)					
12. Brookings Institution, American Occupational Values				x	
13. National Council of Churches, Census of Religious Membership by County for 1950				x	
<u>Roll Call Records</u>					
1. U. S. Senate, 1946-1962				x	
2. U. S. House of Representatives, 1946-1962				x	

	<u>Codebook distributed</u>	<u>Analysis materials distributed</u>	<u>Basic storage data complete, code being reproduced</u>	<u>In process</u>	<u>To be acquired</u>
<u>Census Materials and Election Statistics</u>					
1. 1950 Census Code for selected variables from <u>1952 County and City Data Book</u> (Ready for reproduction)			1 x		
2. 1960 Census Selected variables from <u>1962 County and City Data Book</u>			1 x		
3. Scammon Election Data from Vols. 1-4, <u>America Votes</u>				x	
4. <u>America at the Polls</u> data					x
5. Population of state legislative districts prior to Baker vs. Carr (March 25, 1962)					x
6. County election returns--President, Congress, Governor, 1824-1962				x	

Memoranda Distributed to Individual Participants

Nov. 1963 News Bulletin
Jan. 1964 Requests for Analysis Decks
Requests for Data

March 1964 Policies and Standards for Coding
Data
Appendix: Archive Preparation to
Date

¹Data have been checked, for completeness, and some corrections have been made. In order that the Census materials can more easily be combined with survey and roll call information, the state and county codes will be converted to a new ICPR standard code in the near future.

June 1, 1964

Data Requests from Consortium Users, by Study

Below is a summary of data supplied by the Consortium staff over the past year (July 1 to present). It reflects only information compiled from correspondence and thus does not record requests made in person or by telephone except as these have been recalled by the fallible memories of the staff.

The best indication of the level of services is that, since July 1, 1963, the equivalent of over one million IBM cards have been distributed to members.

Our best estimates indicate that 35 universities have requested data from the archives. Because we do not seek information about seminar and other types of multiple usage, we can only say that a minimum of 500 different persons have used the data.

Study 400, 1952 Election Study

- at least 10 analysis decks
- at least 5 original source decks
- a minimum of 5 complete sets of source decks

Study 417, 1956 Election Study

- 19 analysis decks
- 6 complete sets of source decks

Study 431, 1958 Election Study

- 5 analysis decks
- 5 complete sets of source decks

Study 440, 1960 Election Study

- 18 analysis decks
- 6 complete sets of source decks

Study 714, 1962 Election Study

- 8 analysis decks
- 39 sets of complete study (one set routinely sent to the Official Representative of each member school)

Five Nation Study, Almond-Verba

- 70 analysis decks
- 16 complete sets of cards

Minor Studies

7 decks

Miscellaneous Requests

Complete set of cards for 1962 County and City Data

Complete set of Dahl data from Who Governs

Services to non-members: There have been approximately 10 requests for data from non-Consortium members. These requests were filled by the staff; the Consortium was reimbursed by the recipient.

In addition to supplying data on cards or magnetic tape, the staff has provided other services to members.

A number of members have been given technical and statistical consultation on analysis problems. Also, a number of persons have requested direct computer output, e.g., regressions, tables, etc.

February, 1964

A PROPOSAL FOR FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE ADDITION OF DATA TO
THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH
DATA REPOSITORY

Summary

The development of a viable archive of social science data under the sponsorship of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research has encouraged other social science agencies--most notably, the American Historical Association and the Social Science Research Council--to sponsor large-scale collections of basic data on American political and social history. This means that in the near future, several important bodies of raw data can be deposited with the Consortium archive at negligible expense to the Consortium itself, on the expectation that the archive can carry out the organization of the materials and the processing of the data onto punched cards and magnetic tape.

Such processing is necessary in order to "activate" the raw data for distribution and research use. The need to complete this step is urgent, in view of the number of scholars who are donating time, energy, and financial resources to the data-gathering phase and whose interest and support will need to be vindicated by early access to active materials.

Hence this proposal seeks funds to permit the Consortium archive to undertake the processing of the materials and the execution of necessary related activities, beginning July 1, 1964.

The Proposal

In April, 1963, the National Science Foundation awarded a sum of \$95,000 to the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research to support the development of a data archive accessible to a wide range of scholars interested in research on political behavior. The original proposal specified a sequence of technical developments and data acquisitions to be completed over the eighteen-month period for which support was sought. It also sketched out somewhat more broadly some of the directions which the repository expected to follow in its subsequent phase.

Now, eight months after the beginning of the grant period, two major developments have reshaped the situation:

- 1) Externally, two prominent agencies related to the social sciences--the American Historical Association and the Social Science Research Council--have helped to organize other (non-Consortium) parties in the general task of locating and retrieving in substantial quantity some of the important bodies of data that the Consortium repository had intended to begin locating and processing once its technical facilities were established.
- 2) Internally, a number of fortunate circumstances have combined to permit the Consortium repository to approach the completion of its initially-specified (and grant-supported) technical and data-acquisition goals much more rapidly than its original proposal anticipated.

The first development means that in the next few months data considered to be of high priority for Consortium acquisition, and presumed by both agencies sponsoring the collection effort to be best located in the Consortium repository, will begin accumulating in raw or unprocessed form. The collection will be of a breadth which the Consortium alone could not have envisioned, and will come about at negligible Consortium

expense. However, neither agency is in a position to subsidize the processing of the raw tabular materials onto punched cards or tape, or to help with the technical expansions to the repository which the bulk of the envisioned materials will require.

The second development means that the Consortium staff is in a position much sooner than anticipated to begin the processing and assimilation of these materials.

Therefore we are seeking funds to permit the addition of a relatively large mass of basic data to the repository offerings. With the funds requested, the following objectives would be accomplished:

1. A definitive collection of election statistics would be added to the repository. The data would be for all elections from 1824 to the present. They would embrace the complete votes for President, the House of Representatives, the United States Senate (from 1914), state governors, and a second major state office in all off-years, as reported by county. All told, data from some 700,000 "county elections" would be collected for the Consortium (without cost to the Consortium) and processed for inclusion in the repository.
2. A design for the collection of additional county data and selected data from the minor civil subdivisions (within county) would be developed. Research scholars and technical experts would establish priorities for the subsequent collection of data on social, economic, and political attributes of wards, towns, townships, and counties.
3. Pilot collections of minor civil subdivision data from a limited number of states would be processed and added to the repository.
4. Plans would be made for the addition to the repository of various data relevant to systematic studies of judicial behavior and public law.
5. A first set of data on federal court cases, those terminated in United States Courts other than the Supreme Court in 1961, would be processed and added to the repository.

(Activities necessary for the collection and processing of additional

data pertinent to legislative behavior will be supported by funds already available or to be sought elsewhere.)

Background

The Aid and Interest of Outside Groups. The location and recovery of data for repository acquisition can pose problems of varying magnitude. Where the data have already been brought together in a single collection the problem virtually disappears. Thus the judicial records covered by this proposal will simply be shipped in their punched-card form to the repository. The costs of acquisition are literally the costs of shipping ten cartons of cards. The county data and the minor civil subdivision data are quite a different matter. Some of the former, particularly the presidential election returns, have been brought together in an ad hoc series of publications, including Burnham's Presidential Ballots, 1836-1892, E. E. Robinson's The Presidential Vote, 1896-1932, and the America Votes series edited by Richard M. Scammon. Even so there are many omissions and corrections for which new data must be supplied. For the lesser offices the collection task is much more difficult, and for the smallest reporting units the problem of collection has heretofore seemed unmanageable. However, a series of related activities sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the American Historical Association now promise the possibility of an efficient solution.

The SSRC Committee on Political Behavior took a crucial first step two years ago. In response to an earlier memorandum prepared by

Professors Lee Benson, currently at Wayne State University, Charles Sellers, Berkeley, Samuel Hays, Pittsburgh, and William Riker, Rochester, the SSRC Committee asked Professor W. Dean Burnham, then of Kenyon College, to assess the problem of data collection in selected states. Following his first explorations the Council commissioned him to spend the current year completing his inventory and undertaking an exploratory recovery of data. Professor Burnham is spending this year as a guest of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. In the course of the year it has become apparent that a complete recovery of the entire collection of county data can be effected. The SSRC has recently awarded Professor Burnham a supplementary grant to finance the completion of this collection.

Encouraged by the action of the Social Science Research Council and the existence of the Consortium data repository, the American Historical Association has recently established a Committee to Collect the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History. This committee, at present under the acting chairmanship of Professor Benson, has been officially charged to cooperate with the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research. It is the nucleus of a rapidly developing, highly decentralized organization that will, in the first instance, assist Professor Burnham in the recovery of the county data. The extended organization of the AHA Committee at the state level is also being pursued immediately in selected states. More precisely, state organizations are now being established in the five states in which Professor Burnham has been commissioned to recover data at the minor civil subdivision level.

Implications of Such Outside Interest for the Repository. The active participation of these outside agencies has a variety of implications: (1) It results in the donation of invaluable resources; (2) It makes possible the broadening of the base of judgment as to priorities for data acquisition; (3) It provides a snowballing clientele and increased levels of use for repository facilities; and (4) It creates a certain urgency about activating the raw materials into usable form.

The first is the most obvious implication. The desire on the part of the Consortium members to store ultimately all of these kinds of data was foreshadowed in the request for the initial funds to establish the repository. Yet concrete steps for their location and assembly could not be specified at that time, these steps being the most difficult part of the operation for the Consortium staff itself. Now suddenly we are proffered the essential resources, partially in the form of money but more notably in manpower and professional expertise, to cover exactly these steps.

Secondly, the awakening of outside interest provides assurance that the schedule of data-acquisition priorities suggested by the repository staff in response to demands of its political science membership matches the sense of research priorities in other interested professional groups. Thus an active corps of historians agrees that aggregate voting returns should be first on the list of historical priorities. The Board of Directors of the American Council of Learned Societies has endorsed this project, and the relevant committee of the Social Science Research Council has demonstrated its approval of the enterprise. We may expect similar collaboration with the Consortium in

establishing further data priorities as well. Thus, for example, the Social Science Research Council has given a grant to the Consortium to sponsor a conference of twenty or thirty leading research scholars to specify prime research objectives and data priorities in the area of legislative behavior as a preface to the collection of relevant data in that area (this prospective collection is not included as part of this proposal). In like manner, the existence and desirability of the materials on judicial behavior included in this proposal were made clear by the participation of Professors Walter Murphy of Princeton and Joseph Tanenhaus of New York University in a research-oriented seminar held last summer on the topic of judicial behavior. In the domains covered most directly by this proposal, there will be increasing need for broadly-based decisions as to acquisition priorities, and here the creation of the AHA Committee and its high interest in the venture broadens further the base of scholarly participation. While the planning activity envisaged as a collaborative enterprise between the Consortium and this Committee only requires a minor part of the total budget required below, such broad participation in acquisition decisions is a crucial element in the Consortium's concept of proper repository development.

Third, such a broadening of awareness of research possibilities represented by the archive can only lead to an increased volume of use. The level of use of materials acquired under the terms of the first National Science Foundation grant is already mounting rapidly. During the initial eight months of active service, even while the staff was engaged primarily in creating the facility, some 750,000 cards were

requested and shipped to participants. There is a substantial backlog of demand building up for portions of the data still being processed. About eighty man-hours of work a week are now being given over directly to the servicing of data requests (apart from other necessary technical and developmental activity). However, the spread of awareness of the Consortium facility to historians, along with the assimilation of major bodies of data which they have helped to organize, may well double the clientele requesting research materials from the repository.

The final implication is of a more imperative sort. The organization of historians to aid in the location and assembly of the materials covered by this proposal may well turn out to be the prototype for a data-collection mechanism of much greater extent and time duration. However, the people involved who will contribute time and energy to the project naturally expect some ultimate reimbursement in terms of much readier access to research materials of much broader scope and better quality than any they could expect to have assembled individually. Since there will be no "payoff" in this sense until the raw materials are processed, there is a strong feeling among all of the organizers that it is imperative that the raw data be transformed into active materials just as rapidly as possible. A lag at this point in time will threaten to undermine the morale and good will of the contributors, and endanger further use of this kind of vehicle in data collection. We would, moreover, lose much of the value of Professor Burnham's present assignment were he to return to his regular academic duties before the organization of materials necessary for data processing is well launched. It is for these reasons that we are stressing the urgency of the data-processing task.

Resume of Proposal

Funds are presently available from the Consortium operating budget and other sources for the following activities directly related to this proposal: (1) Providing data or data analyses requested by research scholars (ICPR); (2) Planning for the recovery and collection of legislative data (SSRC, American Political Science Association, ICPR); (3) Recovering all county-level election data (SSRC, AHA); and (4) Recovering selected data for minor civil subdivisions (SSRC, AHA).

Additional funds are needed and hereby requested for the following activities:

1. County electoral data, to be retrieved by Professor Burnham with the assistance of the American Historical Association Committee, will be processed, put in machine-manipulable form and stored on tape. The estimated cost of these operations is \$50,000.
2. Plans for the collection of the selected minor civil subdivision data and for subsequent additions of county-level data should be made in a series of conferences. Support is needed for travel, communications, and expenses for meetings of the American Historical Association Committee for collecting political data, for the five state committees to be charged with the recovery of data, and the Consortium Repository Committee. Present plans call for at least two joint meetings of the AHA Committee, and one meeting each of the state AHA committees. The estimated cost is \$15,000.
3. Selected minor civil subdivision data, to be collected by the AHA committees, will be processed, put in machine-manipulable form and stored on tape for an estimated cost of \$10,000.
4. Plans for the collection of additional data relevant to studies of judicial behavior and public law would be made in a single major conference. The estimated cost is \$3,000.
5. The first set of data to be supplied by the administrative office of the United States Court system (punch cards on some 100,000 cases terminated in 1961) would be processed, put in machine-manipulable form and stored on tape. The estimated cost is \$10,000.

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

BOX 1248 • ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106 • PHONE: AREA CODE 313, 663-1511, EXT. 2255

April 9, 1964

Dr. Murray Aborn
Program Director for Special Projects
Division of Social Sciences
National Science Foundation
1951 Constitution Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20550

Dear Dr. Aborn:

This letter is to request consideration of an addendum to the proposal for Data Acquisitions for the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research Data Repository transmitted to the National Science Foundation in February, 1964, by the Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan, on behalf of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research. Events of the past few weeks have led us to the conclusion that the data repository activities covered by the proposal would be greatly enhanced by the temporary addition of a limited staff to direct the immediate recovery of correlative data.

At the time the proposal was submitted, plans had been completed to have those data referred to in the proposal collected by ad hoc committees of professional scholars. The committees were to be formed under the leadership of the American Historical Association's Committee for the Collection of the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History. That work has gone forward very successfully and is nearing completion. It is now evident, however, that success was possible only because of the devoted labor of Professors Lee Benson, Dean Burnham, and Robert Scotheim. Professor Benson, as chairman of the AHA committee, and his colleague, Professor Scotheim of Wayne State University, have contributed many hours of professional consultation and have made extensive use of their departmental secretarial facilities in the organization and guidance of the data recovery in the field. Professor Burnham, supported by the Social Science Research Council for this purpose, has worked full time on the development of plans, specification of data requirements, the actual recovery of large quantities of data through skillful use of local library facilities, and on assembling and organizing the collected data.

We have thus had a happy demonstration that a highly decentralized apparatus for data recovery can be created and can produce results. We have also become convinced, in accord with earlier advice offered by Professor Easton, that the effective recovery of data suitable for inclusion in the repository depends absolutely on the presence of professional personnel directing the operation. Unfortunately, next year we

shall lose the direct participation of all three men who were so vital to this year's work. If data-collection activities are to continue without serious interruption beyond the summer, the work of these men must be carried out by someone else. A full-time staff man, with appropriate secretarial assistance and a minimum supporting budget, should be added to avoid a damaging hiatus in data collection and a loss of the capital investment in the organization of professional manpower achieved this year.

With the recovery of the election data at the county level now assured, the next logical step is the recovery of correlative county data. These should include data pertaining to the demographic characteristics of the county populations and data describing responses to specific issues of policy decided by popular referenda. These two kinds of data are basic to the systematic analysis of electoral behavior because they contain the major sets of explanatory variables.

The stimuli which provoke electoral response are, at one level of analysis, the social, economic and political events of the election campaign and its temporal context. The responses are the recorded votes (now being accumulated for processing and inclusion in the data repository). The electoral responses to the circumstances and events of the campaign are shaped by predisposing characteristics of the voters. These characteristics, particularly for the years prior to the development of survey research, are recorded primarily in census data or in the results of popular referenda.

These data, as the election returns, have never been collected and organized for scientific use except on the most limited basis. Fortunately they are largely a part of the public record and can be retrieved. Their recovery in historical depth on the county level will pose problems comparable to those already encountered in collecting the historical election returns. With the appropriate professional skills immediately available to the Consortium staff, their recovery can proceed at once upon the completion of the electoral files. The addition of these materials to the archive of election data will add greatly to the value of the election data, as they will permit an exponential increase in the analytic possibilities open to the research scholar.

The recovery of demographic data and referenda results should begin in the fall of this year (1964) for optimal integration with the other phases of repository development. The collection effort will follow on the heels of the completion of the recovery of election data and will proceed while the election data are being processed and stored. The assimilation of the election data into the archives will, in turn, be completed as the recovery of the correlative data nears completion. Processing of the correlative data can be scheduled to begin as we finish processing the election returns. This complementary phasing of recovery and processing promises a high degree of efficiency for the entire operation. It also facilitates planning for each subsequent

acquisition without encumbering commitments which would necessitate additional funding in order to redeem a large prior investment. With the smaller costs of data recovery further reduced by proficient use of the facilities of the AHA Committee, support for processing a bloc of data need be sought only after the problems of recovery are well in hand.

Our recent experience suggests that each new effort to recover data may well be directed by a different person, one more or less uniquely equipped by talent and training for the particular task. This conclusion is, in part, a reflection of our most satisfactory experience of this year. It is also based on the assumption that a man competent to discharge the professionally demanding portions of the job of directing a major data recovery may not be content to play the administrative role for an extended period of time. Consequently, we have been searching for candidates who might accept the position as an ad hoc assignment for one- or two-year periods. It is, of course, difficult to recruit personnel for such short periods. Nevertheless, we have been encouraged in our assessment of the importance of the task by the expressions of interest on the part of scholars we have approached.

I have had extended conversations with two men this past week, Professor Alan Clem and Professor Howard Allen. Both have expressed serious interest in the post should support for it become available. Professor Allen, in particular, comes well recommended by Professor Benson and by another member of the AHA Committee, Professor Pressly of the University of Washington. Allen could, in all probability, obtain a year's leave from his present institution, Southern Illinois University, and would look with favor on a one-year appointment. As one of the rare persons who has been trained (under Pressly) in the systematic collection of historical data, he is well suited to our needs. I am confident that his presence on the repository staff would permit us to move forward as desired with the collection of the correlative data essential to the analytic exploitation of the electoral data.

Given the fact that the task is very largely one of communicating with a far-flung network of individual scholars, archivists, libraries, and other relevant institutions, it is necessary to provide both budgetary and secretarial support for the position.

The proposed budget for the year is as follows:

Director of Data Recovery, including personnel benefits	\$13,600
Secretary, including personnel benefits	5,950
Travel	2,500
Telephone and postage	2,500
Reproduction of data records	5,000
Supplies	1,500
Indirect costs at 20 per cent	<u>6,200</u>
	\$37,250

A negative response to this request will not jeopardize any of the activities contemplated in the original proposal. Support for the request will, however, add immensely to the ultimate value of the data that would be processed under the terms of the proposal.

On behalf of the Consortium Council and staff I would like to express our appreciation for permission to submit this supplementary request. If I can supply any further information pertaining to it, I shall, of course, be pleased to do so.

January, 1964

To: Lee Benson

From: Warren E. Miller

Re: The Consortium as a Research Facility for Historians

The intent of the Consortium is to offer comparable facilities to the complementary objectives of the political scientist and the political historian. Realization of this objective will rest on an expansion of the data repository, some redirection of the training program, and a continuation of efforts to bring political scientists and historians together in common enterprise. All of this is most reasonable under the assumption that some members of both disciplines share an interest in the study of intrinsically comparable phenomena. This memorandum presents one perspective on the potential, if not the present, commonality of interests.

Only in very recent work has the systematic, empirical study of political behavior by political scientists taken more than casual cognizance of the context of the phenomena under investigation. Their research has typically centered on individual behavior observed at one point in time. Despite awareness that the individual is always located in a complex institutional setting, exposed to a continuous barrage of external stimuli, few attempts have been made to associate individual variation with contextual variation in the same rigorous mode used for the analysis of co-variation among individual behaviors, cognitions, evaluations, and expectations. At the same time, virtually no student of political behavior has assumed his work to have relevance only for

the unique set of phenomena captured in his study. The entire collective enterprise has been devoted to the development of generalizations applicable to other individuals in other situations in other times.

The continuity of research efforts through recent years has now produced a natural--if extremely limited--ability to assess the assumption that such generalization is possible. Repeated verification of relationships among individual attributes has been obtained, for different people in different settings. This natural variation in contexts through time has encouraged speculation about generalizations across social space and through larger segments of time. Comparative, cross-cultural and cross-national investigations are being pursued in direct extensions of work completed in more homogeneous populations. And impatience to validate other theses--along with a desire to meet the explicit challenge to their applicability--has turned attention to historical materials. Thus the search for powerful generalizations about electoral behavior in America has produced a number of conclusions that are supported by data from the contemporary scene. These conclusions are not thought to be unique to the middle years of the 20th Century. If they have a more general relevance, they should be manifest in an appropriate examination of historical data.

The definitive test of their relevance in years past rests on the solution of the most important and most perplexing intellectual and methodological problem of behavioral science--that posed by the conceptual relationship between the individual and the aggregate as units of analysis. We know that one moves facilely from one unit of analysis

to another with great risk. We also know that disciplinary insistence that one or the other is really real breeds sterile polemicism. But we clearly do not know as much about the potentialities for integrating data from different levels of aggregation as we can learn from empirical exploration. The raw materials needed for such exploration have typically not been collected in even the most ambitious research undertakings. (The Matthews-Prothro study of political participation stands as a notable exception to this assertion.)

One of the strengths of the Consortium data repository lies in the commitment to bring together an extensive if not exhaustive array of differing types of data that share relevance to common problems of interpretation of political behavior. For the contemporary period the data include individual data from survey research and from public records of elite attributes and behaviors, e.g., congressional biographies and roll call votes. These can and should be extended to public records of individual behavior such as the record of individual electoral participation obtainable from poll books. Contemporary data also include aggregate materials from election returns and from census reports. With a modest effort it would be possible to generate counterpart measures of aggregative attributes from the series of survey research data collections carried out by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. In small part through repository holdings, and in much larger part through our contacts with the Survey Research Center and Institute for International Studies at Berkeley and the Political Science Research Library and the Yale Political Data Program

at Yale, Consortium participants also have an avenue of access to counterpart materials for foreign countries.

The extension of the data collection to embrace the greatest possible time depth will be continued as fast as resources can be developed. Collection of election returns at the county level is well under way. These data must be supplemented by correlative data on the ethnic, religious, social and economic attributes of the county (populations) with the total collection eventually embracing the entire history of national popular elections in the United States. With a comprehensive and yet practicable recovery scheme, comparable data should be added for a large national sample of the minor civil subdivisions. The mutual interests of historians and political scientists in the affairs of Congress have prompted plans for extending the definition of the units of analysis to include the congressional district. Data pertaining to constituencies, Congressmen, congressional institutions and actions are to be included in the Consortium repository.

Finally, it should be noted that the major principle defining the limits of the repository is that of responsiveness to the research needs of participating scholars. Present organizational resources are too limited to permit the collection of data in the vague hope that someone someday may use them. By the same token, the resources of scholarly talent directed to the task of comprehending political behavior are too limited to warrant a decision to withhold support from any serious commitment wherever that support can be provided. For better or for worse, Consortium resources will be allocated in response

to the best judgment of the research scholars that are its constituency in an attempt to facilitate their work. The active participation of historians in an enterprise originated by political scientists promises only to enrich the work of both, but that enrichment will be maximized only if the historians accept responsibility for sustaining the organization and for helping to shape the organizations' activities.

In the research training program, for example, there has been virtually no attention given to the evolution of methodologies and techniques of historical analysis. The course work now offered is not consciously a-historical but it certainly gives little attention to any time dimension in analysis beyond that demanded by panel data. Of course, it would seem reasonable to assume that the historian would benefit every bit as much as the political scientist from a command of the research skills that are covered by the current Consortium summer program. Certainly many of the specific problems of interest to the historian differ from those of interest to the political scientist only in the date of their occurrence. The task of reconstructing a description or explanation is often not fundamentally different and is often carried out with very similar data resources. At the same time, historians often do take unto themselves problems of a different scope than do most contemporary behavioral political scientists. The Civil War, as a national decision, and our entry into the Korean War, as an occasion for national decision making, represent two very different concepts of the decision-making process and demand very different methodologies for research. The training program of the Consortium might

well be amplified to reflect the needs of historians. Such amplification would be consonant with the general decision to offer training that will fill lacunae in existing programs of graduate study of political behavior.

The Consortium also presents a potential for communications and collaborative organization only laboriously possible on an ad hoc or individual basis. In addition to the growing collection of data held in the repository, the Consortium staff has distributed to the membership an inventory of other data collections held by various individuals and institutions around the country. This inventory of resources will be maintained over the years and supplemented by an ongoing inventory of active or planned research projects being carried out by individual scholars. It should be possible for the AHA Committee on the Collection of the Basic Data of American Political History to utilize Consortium resources to provide similar inventories of extant data collections and ongoing research activities concerning American political history.

A series of conferences and research seminars on Congressional research is being sponsored by the Consortium during the coming year (1964). A number of historians are expected to participate in some of these activities, particularly those concerned with the development of data resources for historical research. It is reasonable to expect that special conferences and seminars will become an increasingly common feature of Consortium activities if they can be designed to serve unique functions in the facilitation of research. In this general area, as well as in repository and training activities, the Consortium should be

seen as an opportunity for experimentation and innovation. The first specification of its functions reflected the demands which were being expressed by a relatively small number of political scientists. In shaping a program to meet those demands, other demands have been generated and still more are being anticipated. The organization will succeed on its ability to meet the expectations of an established constituency. It will prosper in its capacity to respond to new demands and anticipate new expectations.

ar

Enclosures

III. Membership

Consortium membership now includes 37 universities, an increase of 12 during the past year. Present indications are that the total will exceed 40 in the course of the next year.

In recent meetings the Council has discussed the new plan of the Roper Public Opinion Center to establish an organization of International Survey Library Associates. Members of the staff have accepted earlier invitations to join with members of the Roper Center board and its director, Professor Philip K. Hastings, in the discussion of these plans. In response to a request for our reaction, the Council approved a statement which said, in part, "There (is) general agreement that your plan should prove attractive to many schools and research organizations." We also went on to note that, "paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 7 on pages seven and eight must preclude membership in the Association itself on the part of any repository, unless it wishes to terminate its repository services." Various Consortium Representatives, responding to Professor Hastings' invitation to have their institutions become Roper Associates, have reacted to these and other provisions and have asked for guidance in terms of their responsibilities as Consortium members. The Council and staff are agreed that each school should feel completely free to consider its relationship to the Roper Center on its own merits. As with membership in the Consortium, each school must make its own evaluation of the benefits to be derived from formal affiliation in contrast with those available on a cost basis to non-members. The Roper Center has been invited to join the Inter-university Council on Social Science Data Archives. We are hopeful that future developments will not only permit but encourage the free flow of data among archives as well as from archival centers to research personnel.

IV. Related Research Activity

Addenda:

1. Survey Research Center proposal for a study of the results of citizenship education among high school seniors in the United States
2. Survey Research Center proposal for a study of the national electorate: 1964

IV. Related Research Activity

Immediately after the completion of basic data processing in 1965, the data from one if not two new major Survey Research Center studies will be made available to all Consortium participants. Data will be collected in a unique national study of political socialization during spring, 1965. Planning for the study will begin in the summer of 1964. Any Consortium participant seriously interested in participating in the design or analysis should contact the Executive Director. The study budget does not include funds to support personnel beyond those of the Survey Research Center study staff, but the magnitude of the study is such as to lead the SRC to seek wide participation in the exploitation of the opportunities it affords.

The Survey Research Center hopes to conduct a 1964 presidential election study in the mode established in the 1952, 1956 and 1960 studies. Present indications are that there may be limited room for a few additional questions beyond those proposed by the Survey Research Center staff. Questions for inclusion have already been discussed on the topic of the Supreme Court and on financial contributions to political campaigns. Other suggestions should be given to the Executive Director. If support for this study is forthcoming, all data would be available to Consortium participants by spring, 1965. The only delay will be imposed by a commitment to prepare data and codebooks in the standard form for ICPR distribution. Plans could certainly be laid for major analyses to be carried out in the summer of 1965.

Survey Research Center
The University of Michigan

Political Behavior Program
April, 1964

To: The American Heritage Foundation

From: The Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan

Re: Proposal for a study of the results of citizenship education
among high school seniors in the United States

The Proposal

There is general agreement that where the development of key attitudes toward citizenship and politics is concerned, students just completing their high school education can serve as a crucial focal population for study. There are more difficult choices to be made when it becomes necessary to specify the character of a study design adequate to make a definitive contribution to our understanding of the socialization process and the development of citizenship.

It would be possible to select an adequately representative sample of high schools in the nation and, assuming access to them could be gained, to collect material concerning the images of and attitudes toward government and citizenship held by high school seniors. Such a study would provide simple information concerning the current distribution of attitudes among those members of a particular age cohort which has succeeded in arriving at the final year of high school.

At least grossly comparable studies of this sort have been done before, although probably not with a good sampling of the nation's schools. They have some "stock-taking" interest. However, they provide

little basis for explaining why some high school children have developed healthy citizenship attitudes and others have not. Hence they contribute relatively little to advancement of theory concerning political socialization, and give little direction to action programs which are seeking for the most efficient points to apply pressure in order to upgrade the quality of such attitudes.

We are interested in a far more useful study design which would gather data not only on student attitudes toward and understanding of politics and government (the things to be explained), but also on the full nexus of events and forces which one can reasonably suppose have had something to do with molding these student attitudes. These forces have their locus not only in (1) the education system; but also in (2) the peer group; (3) the family; and (4) facets of the broader community context.

The fact that we already know that each of these aspects of the student's "life space" is likely to make some kind of contribution to the shaping of his attitudes is one reason why the simpler study design is no longer of much interest. A simple study would certainly show that education experience aside, children from homes of higher social status are likely to have citizenship attitudes of greater quantity and quality. Since we know from other studies that parents of higher social status tend on the average to hold "better" attitudes too, it is reasonable to infer that the family makes some contribution to the shaping of these attitudes in the adolescent. However, a good study should go well beyond this point: it should gather the data necessary to confront, for example, the impact of various experiences in the family with various facets of

citizenship-related experiences in the education system, thereby permitting a sorting out of the different weights which different forces have in generating such attitudes among different types of students. Such data do not stop with the conclusion that many experiences have some effect. They go on to tell us how much effect they have, and hence suggest the more useful points of leverage for action programs as they enrich our understanding of the processes which underlie the shaping of the attitudes.

Therefore we would want to collect data necessary to assess reliably these several kinds of influences. The study would still have its primary focus on the varied aspects of the formal education experience, but would be prepared to assemble data going well beyond the core collection of student attitudes and beliefs relevant to public affairs. These additional data necessary for significant explanation of the student attitudes would include:

- (1) The Education System. Several broad categories of data would be collected:
 - (a) Formal Curriculum: Inter-school variations in timing, duration and content of courses relevant to citizenship would be assessed. Student interest in such courses could be measured with the basic student questionnaire. Exposure to such courses and performance in them could be recaptured from formal school records.
 - (b) Extracurricular Activity: A number of extracurricular activities, most notably student government, are supposed to aid in the building of good citizens. Participation in such programs would be measured at the level of the individual student; inter-school variations in quality and success of such programs could also be measured. Such factors as the amount of autonomy and responsibility accorded student governmental bodies would provide particularly interesting measures.

- (c) School Agents: It would be important to have interview materials with relevant teachers and with school principals. The teachers' own attitudes toward politics and some of the realities of citizenship should be measured. Also their attitudes toward the amount and kinds of politically relevant materials which are sufficiently "noncontroversial" to be formally communicated to public school students in the classroom should be examined. Interviews with principals would provide information as to use of authority, latitude given student governmental bodies and the like.
- (2) The Peer Group. Numerous studies of the dynamics of student groups in high schools have pointed to the importance of peer groups in channeling or muffling the intended effects of the formal education system. Some treatment of the peer group subcultures within each school would probably require no additional questionnaires; however, the collection of data from students and teachers which would permit us analytically to organize data from given schools according to the location of individuals in informal cliques--the "ins" and the "outs" make a good example--would be of utility in evaluating differences in impact of the formal education experience.
- (3) The Family. A number of studies have attempted to examine the relationship between parents' and children's attitudes, and some of these have been conducted in the area of politics. However, few of these have dealt with adequate samples of large-scale populations. Similarly, few studies have actually interviewed both parent and child directly; most of such studies have asked children to recall parents' attitudes, or parents to recall children's, despite the known unreliability of such procedure. No study has combined both of these virtues at once (i.e., significant population with parent-child interviews). In our estimation a definitive assessment of the relative impact of the family, as laid against that of the formal education system, would require such a design. It would be possible to interview only a portion of parents of the total set of students yielding data, and thereby reduce additional field costs somewhat. But the design of any definitive study in the area of citizenship education must have information on parental attitudes and behaviors relevant to citizenship.
- (4) The Community. Some smaller investment should be made in systematizing relevant data on the community context. As one example, there would be marked differences from community to community in the apparent "cleanness" or "dirtiness" of local politics within the recent lifetime of the students. It would be reasonable to suppose that communities plagued by graft and

unresponsive local government would create an atmosphere breeding a kind of cynicism about politics and political participation in the new generation of young which would be less prevalent in communities with more salutary governmental bodies.

A long-range consequence of such a study might be to conduct it in such a way that a reinterview with the same people ten or fifteen years later would be feasible. Where the first study (that study herein proposed) is concerned, this will only involve the gathering of certain information useful in tracing the students later, and hence will not add in any visible way to the cost of the study. Furthermore, there is no necessity to seek immediate funding for anything beyond this first study, and we leave open the question of a follow-up in later years. Nonetheless, the possibility of such a panel design is a very exciting one.

Utilization of Study Results

The proposed study of citizenship practices and beliefs among high school seniors should be of great practical as well as academic importance. It will be designed to provide a genuine and definitive contribution to both theory and practice in the areas of politics, education and citizenship. The study will be timely because it can now be informed by the very considerable research which has been completed in the study of citizenship participation of adults. Although many hard decisions remain to be made in the final design of the study, it is clear that we will select for particular attention those attributes which are demonstrably relevant to the quality of adult electoral behavior. The various components of adult behavior--sense of citizen obligation, belief in the

efficacy of individual action, cynicism toward politics, sophistication in comprehension of government, ideological commitment or preference-- can be specified with some confidence because of their known contribution to electoral behavior. The theoretical focus of the study will be on understanding variations in the development of these and other comparable traits in the high school senior.

Insofar as the theoretical foundation is well conceived, important action implications or directives may be anticipated. Given the rather complex, multidimensional structure of the basic design, it should be possible to evaluate the contribution of each major facet of the young adult's world to his performance as a citizen. It will then follow that those facets which are shaped by public policy can be assessed in terms of desirable change. In particular, it should be possible to define those changes which might be effected in the schools. For this purpose the somewhat novel inclusion of the formal curriculum, extracurricular activities, and the administrative and instructional systems of the schools as explicit variables in the study assumes paramount importance.

It is one thing to know what courses of study conform to the best educational standards; it may be a somewhat different thing to know what contribution each of a variety of curricular elements makes to the various components of citizenship values and beliefs. For example, much has been written and argued about the possible ways in which the social organization of the school and the experiences it provides in leadership, group membership and individual participation contribute to the civic education of the child. This study will test many of these

assumptions and differentiate between those practices that are really effective and those that are not. We may well discover that administrative structures and forms of nonacademic activity which serve the interests of the staff are less than efficient in the shaping of responsible young citizens. And we may discover that well-intended promotion of such activities as student government gives early visibility to students who would become civic leaders without that experience while teaching the rest that the form of self-determination is a sham and that the reality of politics is self-aggrandizement.

In short, the study will attempt to assess the actual contributions of specific elements in the educational system, in the context of the full nexus of factors influencing student attitudes, to the development of citizenship.

Study Design

A probability sample of approximately 1,800 high school seniors, representing the total population of high school seniors in the United States as of spring, 1965, would be selected by the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Center. Confidential interviews lasting an hour or more would be taken with each student. Separate but comparable interviews would be taken with at least one parent or guardian of each student. The interview schedules would be designed by the Survey Research Center staff in collaboration with appropriate advisors and would be administered by the regular members of the nationwide field staff employed by the Survey Research Center. Interviews would also be conducted with the relevant social studies teachers of the students.

Additional information about relevant experiences provided by the school would be collected from the teachers or from appropriate administrative officials in the schools. Finally, the interviewers would gather data about local politics and government from designated public officials and from other sources such as the local newspapers or appropriate local civic groups such as the League of Women Voters.

In planning the study, the Survey Research Center staff would rely on the professional advice of a committee consisting of Dr. David Easton, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago; Dr. Herbert Hyman, Chairman, Department of Sociology, and Associate Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University; Dr. Robert E. Lane, Professor of Political Science, Yale University; Dr. Howard Wilson, Dean, School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles; and Dr. Franklin Patterson, Director, Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University. These men would bring special competencies in the fields of citizen education and political socialization to the study. As a part of its resources the Survey Research Center also has available the complete set of data on high school students collected by Professor H. H. Remmers of Purdue and will have access to the more recent collection of data carried out for The Brookings Institution study of attitudes toward politics. The latter collection includes a survey of public attitudes toward politicians and politics as a professional career, as well as an invaluable survey of high school seniors on the same topics.

Planning of the study and recruitment of junior staff members

should begin as of July 1, 1964. The study design should be complete in all details, and pretesting of the interview schedules should be accomplished, by late winter, 1965. Field work will begin in late winter and be completed by spring, 1965. Data processing and preliminary analysis will be undertaken immediately and selected data can be made available by mid- or late summer, 1965.

The feedback of results to relevant agencies and institutions concerned with citizen education is the primary objective of the study. Consequently, the relationship established with Dr. Wilson and Dr. Patterson should be expanded in the latter stages of the study in preparation for this process. It is our understanding that the active participation of the Lincoln Filene Center in both the planning of the study and in the exploitation of study results will be facilitated by a separate grant to the Lincoln Filene Center. Inasmuch as we covet their assistance in the planning stages and would be totally dependent upon them or similar institutions for the effective interpretation and dissemination of results for action, the relatively modest sums needed for these purposes would seem to be a necessary adjunct to this proposal.

May 13, 1964

A PROPOSAL FOR A STUDY
OF THE NATIONAL ELECTORATE: 1964

"Why do social scientists not take better advantage of major and foreseeable social change to study the processes and effects that are involved?...In not studying them when they occur, social scientists are losing priceless opportunities to learn more about the processes involved in major social change."
(Dael Wolfle, Science, 143, 3610, March 6, 1964.)

One of the few examples in this country of a continuing study of major national events is the Survey Research Center's program of research on the national elections. This program, initiated in 1948 and supported primarily by the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, has become the primary source of data regarding American electoral behavior, appropriate to the research needs of behavioral science, and available to American and foreign scholars with professional interests in political science, contemporary political history and political sociology and psychology.

The Survey Research Center now proposes to undertake a national study of electoral behavior in the 1964 presidential and congressional elections. This application for support has been delayed because of our intensive search for financing from sources other than the private foundations. A very substantial effort was made over the past eighteen months to reach agreement with first one, and then another of the major television networks for the support of a 1964 study. Although the complexity and uncertainties of the appropriate research effort ultimately combined

this year to dissuade those networks with which we had extended conversations, we feel the prospects for future arrangements for such support are much brighter than they have been in the past.

We should also note here, with reference to the proposed 1964 study, that the Citizens' Research Institute and the American Heritage Foundation have--with our explicit agreement--sought a small grant to supplement the larger request we are now submitting. Correspondence from Dr. Herbert Alexander, Director of the Citizens' Research Institute, indicates that an officers' grant may be forthcoming from the Rockefeller Foundation to support collection of a limited amount of information on citizens' financial contributions to politics.

Content of Study

The major objectives of the study we are proposing can be divided into two categories. One set of objectives concerns the long-term, longitudinal aspects of American politics. Given the detailed information now available from previous studies, each new data collection represents an increment that is exponentially more useful and valuable. With the 1964 collection, reliable indicators of stability and change in basic political attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviors can be assembled across a sixteen-year span embracing five presidential elections of four different Presidents. Few areas of inquiry of comparable social and scientific importance are represented by comparably rich resources of scholarly investigation.

In addition to extending the core materials needed for the study of time trends and long-term factors in American politics, the 1964 study will produce data essential for the study of the contemporary

scene. Primary attention will be paid to three topics: civil rights, foreign policy, and the contribution of the ultra-right to American politics.

The analysis of the conflict over civil rights must reflect the confrontation of Negroes and Whites in the North as well as in the South. It must consider White reaction, including Northern White "backlash" of the kind suspected in the recent votes for Governor Wallace of Alabama, as well as the consequences for political participation of Southern Negroes. The investigation we propose to carry out would build on studies already under way or completed, including the principal contemporary study of Southern political participation based on data collected by the Survey Research Center in 1961 for Professors Matthews and Prothro of the University of North Carolina. The rather modest size of the national cross-section sample contemplated by this proposal would provide enough cases of Whites, both South and North, for extended analysis. However, the inter- or intra-regional study of Negroes would be possible only through supplementing the sample of Negroes. We therefore propose to triple the Negro sample and thereby obtain enough information (from 450 or more Negro respondents) to sustain the most important of the intra-regional, inter-racial analyses.

Assessment of the role of the foreign policy debate will involve extensions of investigations launched in 1956 and 1960. It is too early to know to what extent Cuba, Viet Nam, the test-ban treaty and other events on the international scene will become partisan issues. We would expect to inquire into these immediate issues as well as supplement our earlier probing of public reactions to the handling of American foreign policy.

Whatever the outcome of the Republican nominating convention, the visibility of Senator Goldwater and the organizational activities of ultra-conservative groups in California and elsewhere have already given vitality to a dimension of American politics which has shown itself with less force on earlier occasions during the recent past. The passion which the partisans of the ultra-right have shown and the apparent strength of their financial support suggest that this movement may become an even more significant force in American politics than it is today. The background of our earlier studies gives us an invaluable benchmark from which to follow the impact of this fervid ideology on the mass electorate, both on those who are attracted to it and on those who are repelled by it.

Utilization of Data

We propose to maximize the utilization of data from the study by an unorthodox--if not revolutionary--dissemination of the data immediately after their collection. We will be able to do this by taking advantage of the facilities for data processing and distribution that have been developed through the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research. With support from the National Science Foundation, as well as from the operating budget sustained by Consortium membership fees, the Survey Research Center has developed a major repository of American political data. An efficient system for storing, retrieving and processing data on high-speed computers has been created and is in operation. As a consequence of the staff support provided through the Consortium's normal budget, the data from all of the previous Survey Research Center election studies, as well as data from many other sources, are now readily available to the faculty and graduate students of the participating institutions

without cost to the individual users. As a matter of Center and Consortium policy, the resources developed through our joint efforts are available to all scholars, including those not affiliated with an institution participating in the Consortium. Tabulations will be provided on request and at cost to scholars outside the Consortium.

Past studies done by the Survey Research Center, including the 1958 and 1960 studies, have been made available to our professional colleagues only after we have carried our primary analyses to completion and have realized the stated objectives of each study. This has meant extended delays in making the data completely open to general use. In agreement with the Consortium Council, however, we now propose to make all of the data from the 1964 study available immediately upon completion of the basic processing and cleaning of the data storage cards. This will mean that a score or more of primary analyses will be undertaken by established scholars and their students at the same time the members of the Survey Research Center staff are undertaking their major analyses. Our colleagues will, of course, also have the full series of previous studies at their disposal and will thus be equipped to undertake innovative investigations utilizing the comparative and historical features of the total collection.

In accord with established Consortium policy, the only proprietary claim to data will be an honoring of the precedence which work-in-progress normally receives. The theoretical orientations and the analytic work-ways of the Survey Research Center staff are sufficiently unique to give assurance that our execution of the planned analyses will not seriously inconvenience--nor be inconvenienced by--the independent work of any colleague. Moreover, the very richness of the data resources which have

become available to researchers sharing this broad set of intellectual interests serves to minimize problems of priority and research jurisdiction.

The major product of the 1952 election study conducted by the Survey Research Center was the book, The Voter Decides by Angus Campbell, Warren E. Miller and Gerald Gurin. The addition of data from the 1956 study made possible the major volume of our series, The American Voter, by Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. A book length manuscript based on our 1958 investigation is nearing completion and will be in the hands of the publisher by September, 1964 ("Congressional Policy Representation." Miller, Warren E. and Stokes, Donald E. Approximately 350 pages. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: New York, 1964). The 1956-58-60 panel study conducted by the Survey Research Center will be published in 1965 as an analysis of stability and change in political attitudes and behavior by Professor Philip E. Converse. A collection of papers and articles authored by our group which have appeared since The American Voter will be published within the next year under the title "Electoral Analysis and Political Order."

Study Design

We propose to interview a national sample of the adult citizenry and a supplementary national sample of adult, Negro citizens. Given the major objectives specified for the study, each person would be interviewed twice. The first interview, lasting slightly more than one hour, would be taken in October. The reinterview, somewhat less than an hour in length, would be taken during November, immediately after the election. October interviews would be taken with a cross-section of 1650 and a

Negro supplement of 330 (for a total of 1485 Whites and 495 Negroes). On the basis of past experience we would expect to reinterview some 1500 members of the cross-section and a like proportion of the supplementary sample of Negroes. Given the nature of the study, we will extend special efforts to insure that Negro respondents will be interviewed by Negro interviewers.

Content analysis of the interviews and transformation of the information to punch card or magnetic tape would proceed during the interviewing and would be completed by the end of January, 1965. Experience has demonstrated that major analysis should not begin until an extended search for errors in interviewing, coding and punching has been completed and the data records "cleaned" of all detectable error. Given the projected length of the interviews and the size and complexity of the sample, this final phase of data preparation will doubtless extend into early Spring, 1965. While selected data could be made available somewhat earlier, we expect large-scale distribution of data to commence in April, 1965, in time for exploitation by scholars during the Summer of 1965.

V. ICPR Staff, 1964-65

- A. Regular staff
- B. Ad hoc Repository staff

VI. Budgets

- A. Revised budgets, 1963-64
- B. Proposed budgets, 1964-65

V. ICPR Staff, 1964-65

A. Regular staff

Executive Director
Associate Director
Associate Director
Administrative Assistant
Secretary

Director of Technical Services
Assistant Director of Technical Services
Secretary
Study Processor
Study Processor (half time)
Data Processor
Programmer (half time)
Programmer (half time)

B. ad hoc Repository Staff

Director of Data Recovery
Secretary
Key punch supervisor
Key punch operator
Key punch operator

VI. ICPR Budgets

A. Revised budgets, 1963-64

	<u>Operating Budget</u>	<u>Repository Budget</u>	<u>Combined Budget</u>
Administration			
Council Meetings, Committee of Representatives	\$ 7,000		\$ 7,000
Staff, unallocated	10,000	\$30,000	40,000
Data Repository			
Preparation and Processing of Data	10,000	55,000	65,000
Service to Participants	16,000	10,000	26,000
Bulletin	4,000		4,000
Research Conference	4,000		4,000
Training and Summer Program			
Planning and Administration*	15,000		15,000
Teaching	6,000		6,000
Subsidies	<u>12,000</u>		<u>12,000</u>
	\$85,000	\$95,000	\$179,000
Sources of Funds:			
Membership Fees	\$79,000		\$ 79,000
Surplus	- 4,000		- 4,000
University of Michigan grant	6,000		6,000
Grant from National Science Foundation		\$95,000	95,000
SSRC Conference Grant	<u>3,000</u>		<u>3,000</u>
	\$84,000	\$95,000	\$179,000

*This includes staff consultation with students, preparation of data and computer programs for seminars, reproduction of class materials and manuscripts used by participants, as well as direct costs of planning and administering the program.

B. Proposed budgets, 1964-65

	<u>Operating Budget</u>	<u>Repository Budget</u>	<u>1964-65 Combined Budget</u>	<u>1963-64 Combined Budget</u>
Administration				
Council Meetings, Committee of Representatives	\$ 8,000		\$ 8,000	\$ 7,000
Staff, unallocated	28,000	\$ 16,000	44,000	40,000
Data Repository				
Preparation and Processing of Data		110,000	110,000	65,000
Planning Conferences		18,000	18,000	0
Service to Participants	25,000		25,000	25,000
Bulletin	4,000		4,000	4,000
Research Conference	0		0	4,000
Training and Summer Program				
Planning and Administration	15,000		15,000	15,000
Teaching	8,500		8,500	6,000
Subsidies	<u>13,000</u>		<u>13,000</u>	<u>13,000</u>
	\$101,500	\$144,000	\$245,500	\$179,000
Sources of Funds:				
Membership Fees (38 members)	\$ 95,000		\$ 95,000	\$ 79,000
Surplus	(2,000)		(2,000)	(4,000)
University of Michigan grant	8,500		8,500	6,000
Grant from National Science Foundation		\$144,000	144,000	95,000
SSRC Conference Grant				<u>3,000</u>
	\$101,500	\$144,000	\$245,500	\$179,000