

ICPSR
Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research

Annual Report,
1965-1966

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

P.O. BOX 1248 • ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106 • AREA CODE 313, 764-2570 • TECHNICAL SERVICES: 764-8396

June, 1966

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

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

Subject: Fourth Annual Report, 1965-66:

- I Summer Program
- II Data Repository Activity
- III Administration
- IV Budgets

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. <u>Summer Program</u>	
Proposal to the National Science Foundation for summer training . .	3
Proposal to IBM for summer training for historians.	17
Report on Research Conference on the Historical Analysis of Quantitative Data	25
Report on Research Conference on Community Power Systems.	39
Proposal to the National Science Foundation for a Conference on Comparative Research in State Politics.	47
Summary of participation, 1963-1966	58
II. <u>Data Repository</u>	
State of archival holdings.	67
Report on recovery of election data	77
Proposal for collection of comparative historical statistics. . . .	81
Proposal to NSF for continuation of archival development.	97
Inventory of use of archival facilities	121
Archival processing costs	133
Summary of servicing costs and distribution of data	134
Guidelines to be followed in use of archival resources.	137
III. <u>ICPR Administration</u>	
Memorandum of Organization.	143
Membership and official representatives	151
Council membership.	155
Staff	156
Report on local arrangements.	159
IV. <u>Budgets</u>	171

I. SUMMER PROGRAM

Continued growth of interest in the summer program was matched during the past year with increases in financial support. The participation base is expanding as additional schools join the Consortium and as increased numbers of students and faculty members are able to plan their schedules a year or more ahead. Enrollment in the major course offered in 1965 exceeded expectations by some 10 percent. It now appears that there will be a much larger increase in participation in 1966. Following a detailed review of the operation of the past summer's program, Council and staff have made plans both to expand the number of course offerings and to accommodate a large increase in the number of participants. The single eight-week seminar will be replaced by two eight-week offerings. The Proseminar in Behavioral Research Methods will be offered as an advanced introduction to the research process with particular attention to problems of research design. The Research Seminar in Quantitative Political Analysis will be offered at a more advanced level and will focus on problems of analysis design. It is expected that enrollment in these two courses will represent approximately a 50 percent increase over the enrollment in the combined course this past year. A third course, Mathematical Political Analysis, also carrying six hours of credit and lasting the entire eight weeks of the summer program, will be offered under the joint sponsorship of the Consortium and the Mathematical Social Science Board. Enrollment will be limited to approximately 25. One two-week research conference on Comparative State Politics will complete the roster of Consortium courses.

Following a successful three-week conference on Quantitative Methods in Historical Analysis held last summer there have been numerous expressions of interest on the part of historians seeking training in quantitative research techniques. We expect that approximately fifteen historians will participate as regular members of the summer program. Most of them will attend the Proseminar on Behavioral Research Methods.

Where the 1965 summer program was supported by approximately \$100,000 to offset direct costs, we expect to have approximately \$140,000 to underwrite the 1966 program. Again the largest single contribution will be provided by the National Science Foundation with two grants totaling some \$77,000. University of Michigan contributions are expected to combine for a total of slightly less than \$45,000. A grant from the Mathematical Social Science Board will provide approximately \$13,000. The first year of a three-year grant from IBM will contribute \$5,000 to the support of historians participating in the summer courses. Although minor parts of each grant will go to administrative and instructional costs the major increase is in funds to subsidize participation. As a consequence we expect the total enrollment for the summer to reach 215, including some 40 participants attending the two-week seminar.

Application to the National Science Foundation
Advanced Science Education Programs (ASEP/GES)

Title: Proposal for Advanced Science Seminars
on Quantitative Political Research

Dates of Program: June 1, 1966 to August 31, 1968

Amount requested from NSF: \$201,745

Date submitted: July 21, 1965

On behalf of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan requests support for two, eight-week, Advanced Science Seminars on Quantitative Methods in Political Research, to be held in each of three successive years, 1966, 1967 and 1968. Consistent with the basic rationale for the existence of the Consortium, the seminars will be offered as unique opportunities for the development of research resources--in this instance human resources. The seminars are intended to overcome critical deficiencies in the professional training of political scientists and other social scientists committed to careers in political research. The general objective is to introduce the methodologies and techniques of behavioral science pertinent to research on political phenomena. The specific objectives of each seminar, and its successive presentations, are shaped to meet a particular class of needs defined by the emerging opportunities for research and by the availability of relevant training elsewhere. A brief review of the history of the seminars may suggest the manner in which the details of the seminars are specified.

One of the original and continuing incentives for institutional affiliation with the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research has been the possibility for participating schools to acquire for students and staff training opportunities that the schools cannot provide through existing facilities. The first seminar, offered as a sequence of two distinct graduate courses in 1963, gave substantial attention to elementary problems of research design and data collection. Inasmuch as only a handful of the associated schools required statistical

training of their students, the seminar's approach to data analysis was necessarily informal and stressed concepts and applications that could be comprehended by a largely untrained clientele. The subsequent swift upgrading of graduate instruction in research methods in the political science departments of many of these schools led directly to successive reformulations of our seminar content in each of the next two years. The equally rapid growth of research facilities at schools such as Illinois, Yale, UCLA and Wisconsin relieved the pressure to provide some elements of rudimentary research experience. The imminent availability of new and different data resources further changed the context in which the seminar was offered. As a consequence of these and related developments, the seminar offered this current year differs markedly from its predecessors.

In the same brief interval, however, Consortium membership has expanded from the original twenty schools to the present set of fifty. Given the fact that the charter members tended appropriately to be those with the leading political science departments, the more recent additions include many less advanced departments. Seminar participants from these schools now constitute a large group for whom this year's seminar may be too advanced and too specialized. The pedagogical problem posed by their needs is exacerbated by the size of the entire group; where approximately sixty participants enrolled in at least one of two courses in 1963, some 120 people are enrolled to participate in the entire eight-week sequence this year. Numbers and the heterogeneity of formal background preparation thus make a major restructuring of future seminars both possible and necessary.

Each of the two seminars proposed for subsequent years will consist of an eight-week sequence of lectures and data-analysis tutorials. The total of 64 contact classroom hours in combination with the research tutorials will carry a minimum of 3 semester credit hours for each seminar in the University of Michigan Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Study. The topical content of the two seminars will be similar but the seminars will differ on two dimensions: the more advanced seminar will concentrate on "cutting edge" problems in the methods and techniques of data analysis and will treat problems that occur earlier in the research process only where necessary for explication of alternatives in the treatment of data; the other seminar will give more explicit attention to the full range of operations involved in the conduct of quantitative research, problems of data analysis will be handled more briefly and on a less advanced level.

At this early point in time, before completion of this year's seminar, the attached "Syllabus" provides perhaps the best guide to the anticipated evolution of the subsequent seminar offerings. With a more select group of participants, the more advanced seminar will give greater attention to the topics subsumed under the headings of parts IV-VII: multivariate analysis, causal inference, sampling inference and special topics in the innovation of quantitative analysis. The other seminar will be more concerned with the decisions on design, data collection and data organization that lie behind the feasibility of developing options in the subsequent analysis of data. Although we would expect some intra-school heterogeneity in the choice between

the seminars, by and large we would expect the former seminar to be appropriate for persons from the more advanced departments where formal and informal experience equivalent to that offered by the less advanced seminar is more readily available. The less advanced seminar, in turn, would serve the needs of the participants from smaller or less advantaged schools.

In the first year of the new sequence of seminars, we would expect the less advanced seminar to be offered at about the same level as was the first Consortium seminar three years ago. The speed with which the seminar will change to maintain its function as a leading, innovating experience for the participants will depend, of course, on the rate of change and development in the relevant subset of member schools. In this connection it is pertinent to note that the upgrading of training and preparation in the schools first associated with the Consortium has been quite remarkable. Each year the staff has collected information about the details of participants' preparation. In the face of a vastly broadened base of participation, drawing a large number of less well-grounded participants into the program, the rapid improvement in the quality and depth of preparatory work at the other schools has maintained the same relative over-all distribution of backgrounds observed in the first year. Whether or not as a result of the standard-setting role of the Consortium program, the changes that have recently taken place in graduate training open to political scientists are most dramatic. In the long run, this reshaping of the graduate curriculum in political science may eliminate the need for much of the present

Consortium training program. For the foreseeable future, however, it promises no more than a constant impetus to the reshaping of the program that must occur if it is to continue to make a significant and unique contribution. Across the years contemplated in this proposal, we would expect to continue our regular efforts to assess the changing context in which we operate. Indeed, it is difficult at this time to be more explicit about the seminars to be offered in 1966 precisely because they should be shaped by our experience with the 1965 program, which is scarcely begun as this proposal is written, and by the subsequent descriptions of training needs that will be supplied by the institutional representatives of the Consortium schools.

Although the seminars will be organized for the graduate students and faculty members at institutions associated with the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, they will be fully available to all other qualified applicants as well. Even though the grant date in 1965 was too late to permit widespread publicity in the professional journals, we have acquired a short list of potential applicants for next year's program from individual inquiries that have reached us over the late spring and summer. We are also in the process of negotiating an agreement with the UNESCO-supported International Social Science Council that would bring perhaps as many as six foreign scholars to the Consortium program each year beginning in 1967. It is of course true that the present and probable Consortium membership¹ ranges widely enough to

¹Allegheny College; The University of Arizona; Ball State University; The University of British Columbia; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; The University of Chicago; Columbia

include virtually all of the schools that provide the potential participation in the program. Nevertheless, faculty members a few years beyond graduate work and now located at smaller universities or undergraduate colleges, and occasional students from these institutions, constitute a significant reservoir of interest and we are anxious to serve their needs wherever possible.

Organization and Administration

The advanced seminars, as well as the other aspects of the Consortium 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. Each seminar will be conducted by a senior member of the staff: Dr. Donald E. Stokes, Professor of Political Science and Program Director of the Survey Research Center will be responsible for the more advanced seminar; Dr. Miller will

(continued)

University; Cornell University; DATUM (Bad Godesberg, Germany); Duke University; University of Florida; The Florida State University; Georgetown University; The University of Georgia; University of Illinois; Indiana University; The University of Iowa; The University of Kansas; University of Kentucky; University of Maryland; The University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; University of Missouri; State University of New York at Buffalo; S.U.N.Y. Graduate School of Public Affairs; New York University; The University of North Carolina; Northwestern University; The Ohio State University; University of Oregon; University of Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania State University; University of Pittsburgh; Princeton University; Queen's University (Kingston, Ontario); The University of Rochester; Southern Illinois University; Stanford University; University of Strathclyde (Glasgow, Scotland); Syracuse University; Temple University; The University of Tennessee; Vanderbilt University; University of Washington; Washington University; Wayne State University; The University of Wisconsin; Yale University

assume responsibility for the second seminar. Each senior man will be assisted by one or more junior staff members in the classroom. The junior personnel, under the direction of the senior man and with the support of the Consortium Technical Services Staff, will be in charge of the research tutorials. The seminars will be held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on the campus of the University of Michigan. They will be offered concurrently between mid-June and mid-August of each year as a part of the University summer term, IIb.

Estimated Costs and Proposed Budgets for National
Science Foundation Support

I. Direct cost to University of Michigan, based on anticipated costs of 1965 program as adjusted to reflect changed format in 1966:

Administrative salaries*

Director's salary, 1 1/2 month @ \$1800/month	\$ 2,700
Administrative Assistant, 4 months @ \$625/month	2,500
Secretary, 4 months @ \$400/month	1,600
	<hr/>
	\$ 6,800

Teaching salaries*

Professor Miller, 2 1/2 months @ \$1950/month	\$ 4,875
Professor Stokes, 2 1/2 months @ \$1625/month	4,065
Dr. Clausen, 2 months @ \$1080/month	2,160
Mr. Marks, 2 months @ \$750/month	1,500
Mr. Shanks, 2 months @ \$750/month	1,500
Miss Algeo, 2 months @ \$750/month	1,500
Mr. Niemi, 2 months @ \$750/month	1,500
	<hr/>
	\$17,100

Administrative costs

Supplies, materials, communications	\$ 4,500
-------------------------------------	----------

Instructional costs

Technical services support: cards, tapes, paper, computer setups, special-purpose programming, technical consultation	\$ 7,500
Computer rental	
65 hrs. of 7090 time @ \$187/hr.	\$12,155
130 hrs. of 1401 time @ \$50/hr.	<u>7,150</u>
	<hr/>
	\$19,305
	<hr/>
	\$55,205

Indirect costs @ 15% on all except computer rental 5,385

Total \$60,590

*Includes fringe benefits but no indirect costs

II. Proposed contributions to offset direct costs to University of Michigan:

Tuition from participants, 100 participants paying an average of \$180/person*		\$18,000
National Science Foundation grant to ICPR	\$21,295	
Contribution by University of Michigan	<u>21,295</u>	
		<u>42,590</u>
		\$60,590

*With an enrollment of 120 in 1965, at least 25 participants made no payment of tuition or auditor fees to the University of Michigan.

III. Proposed budget requested from the National Science Foundation:

Participant support for 80 participants

Subsistence stipend @ \$50 per week for 8 weeks, \$400	\$32,000	
Travel @ 8¢ per mile, average of 1500 miles round trip, \$120	9,600	
Dependency allowance @ \$15 per week, 40 dependents for 8 weeks, \$120	<u>4,800</u>	\$46,400
Tuition support for students without adequate institutional or personal resources, @ \$180 per student, 10 students		1,800
Contribution to direct operating cost of program*		18,520
Indirect costs on \$18,520 @ 15%	<u>2,775</u>	\$69,495

*Total of \$21,295 equals half of total costs of \$42,590 after tuition.

Our estimates of over-all costs of the Consortium program, including costs to participants and unreimbursed direct costs to the University of Michigan indicate an outlay of approximately \$1000 for each six semester hours of graduate work taken by participants. With the support of the above budget, the National Science Foundation would be carrying about 60 percent of the total cost in 1966; the University of Michigan would contribute another 20 percent and the participants, and their home institutions, would supply the remaining 20 percent.

IV. Estimated costs for 1967 and 1968:

	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>
Administrative salaries, 5% increase	\$ 7,140	\$ 7,490
Teaching salaries, 7% increase	18,300	19,600
Administrative costs, 5% increase	4,725	4,950
Instructional costs, 5% increase	<u>7,900</u>	<u>8,400</u>
	\$38,065	\$40,440
Indirect costs @ 15%	<u>5,710</u>	<u>6,065</u>
	\$43,775*	\$46,505*

*By 1967 the Consortium expects to acquire a computer and thereby be relieved of all rental costs for teaching purposes as well as for the primary use in data processing.

V. Proposed contributions to offset direct costs to University of Michigan:

	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>
Tuition from participants, 100 participants paying an average of \$180/person	\$18,000	\$18,000
National Science Foundation grant to ICPR	\$12,900	\$14,250
Contribution by University of Michigan	<u>12,900</u>	<u>14,250</u>
	<u>25,800</u>	<u>28,500</u>
	\$43,800	\$46,500

VI. Proposed budgets requested from National Science Foundation, 1967, 1968:

	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>
Participant support, 90 persons in 1967, 100 persons in 1968	\$49,300	\$52,200
Tuition support	1,800	1,800
Contribution to direct operating costs*	11,215	12,390
Indirect costs @ 15%*	<u>1,685</u>	<u>1,860</u>
	\$64,000	\$68,250

*Estimated to equal the University of Michigan contributions of \$12,900 and \$14,250 to direct costs of program over and above amount collected for tuition.

VII. Summary of budget support requested

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>
Participant support	\$46,400	\$49,300	\$52,200
Tuition support	1,800	1,800	1,800
Direct costs	18,520	11,215	12,390
Indirect costs	<u>2,775</u>	<u>1,685</u>	<u>1,860</u>
	\$69,495	\$64,000	\$68,250

Total requested, 1966-1968: \$201,745

Application to the International Business Machines Corporation

Title: Request for summer program support
for historians and for seminar in
data processing

Time period: Summers of 1966, 1967, and 1968

Amount requested from IBM: \$56,000

Date submitted: February, 1966

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH
Box 1248, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

February, 1966

Mr. Edmund A Bowles, Manager
Professional Activities, Corporate Education
International Business Machines Corporation
Armonk, New York 10504

Dear Ed,

I was pleased to hear that it is now appropriate again to explore with you some of the problems confronting the extension of the social scientists' and humanists' use of the computer. The rapid growth of the Consortium--some sixty universities and colleges are now members--is dramatic evidence of the demand for such an extension. It is also pertinent to note the increased support for relevant EDP work, particularly from governmental sources. From our experience of the past two or three years, however, we have concluded there are at least two areas in which added support of Consortium activities might now make a particularly significant contribution to much broader utilization of the computer in the exploitation of our growing data resources.

We have in mind two very different additions to our present program of training: 1) we want to extend the training to include historians on a major scale, and 2) we need to give more explicit attention to training in those techniques of data processing and computer utilization particularly relevant to the Consortium's archival resources. As you know, we are investing a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars in the creation of an archive of data for political research. These resources are being readied at the same time that historians are contemplating major changes in historiography, giving major attention to systematic analysis in the use of quantitative data. The data archives will support the new intellectual concerns of the historians, but only if they acquire the methodological and technical training essential for exploitation of the data. The Consortium can provide that training, at least in the first stages of this exciting intellectual revolution, if some additional budgetary support can be found.

Following last summer's conference on quantitative methods in historical analysis (see Appendix A), we have sought money to permit an expansion and

extension of our regular summer program to accommodate the needs of the historians. The search has had limited success. The National Science Foundation has agreed that a limited number of historians might participate in the advanced science seminars we conduct with their sponsorship and financial support. However, NSF was not able to increase our basic budget to this end. Moreover, since they do not recognize history as any variety of science, they will not support a training program that is deliberately shaped to meet the special needs of historians. Having been unable to locate any other source of support, we now suggest the following to IBM: 1) An immediate grant of \$5,000 to be used in 1966 to subsidize the participation of historians in the summer program described in Appendix B. We would expect the historians to participate in P.S. 687, Proseminar in Behavioral Research Methods. Funds would be allocated in accord with the following budget:

Subsistence allowance, tuition and travel stipends	\$ 4,200
Direct administrative costs	345
Indirect costs	<u>455</u>
	\$ 5,000

2) A grant of \$10,000 to be used in 1967 to increase support for participation of historians and to provide special staff personnel. By the summer of 1967, historical data will be available in significant quantity from the Consortium archives and special training in its use can be offered if an appropriate staff is on hand. The proposed budget would be as follows:

Subsistence allowance, tuition and travel stipends	\$ 6,100
Data-processing costs of programming, machine operators and supplies	1,000
Instructional staff	1,200
Direct administrative costs	800
Indirect costs	<u>900</u>
	\$10,000

3) A grant of \$15,000 to be used in 1968 to increase support for participation and to permit the offering of a separate training program expressly designed for historians. The budget would be:

Subsistence allowance, tuition and travel stipends	\$ 8,000
Data-processing costs of programming, machine operators and supplies	1,500
Instructional staff	3,000
Direct administrative costs	1,135
Indirect costs	<u>1,365</u>
	\$15,000

Over the three-year period, from thirty to forty-five historians would have received a rigorous and demanding introduction to the workways of behavioral science. Although their training, if limited to this single program, would scarcely be complete, they would all be better trained in this regard than virtually any of today's historians. This would have been accomplished with a very modest investment of funds, less than \$1,000 per man, because of the core support provided by the existence of the Consortium and the major funding provided by other sources.

Our interest in developments among historians is complemented by a broader concern for the improved training of others whose research and teaching demand expertise in modern methods of data processing. Both the nature of the technology of processing social science data and the central role of the computer in modern society argue for special attention to the present and future needs of scholars and their students. The swift growth of interest in the use of computers by social scientists and humanists has not, however, been matched by the diffusion of competence in relevant data processing. We have for some time considered offering an intensive course in data processing and computer utilization as a part of the Consortium training program. Until the present time, the Council and staff have not been convinced that an adequate demand existed nor that other prior needs had been properly attended to. In our judgment the time has now come to make explicit plans for a pertinent course offering in 1967.

We propose to build on experience gained through curricular development in the graduate program in Political Behavior of The University of Michigan Department of Political Science. As in the departmental sequence, the Consortium data-processing course would be offered as a sequel to the graduate proseminar in behavioral research methods (P.S. 687). The course would thus be taken by those who had a background of formal training and actual professional research experience. An illustrative course outline, organized to show its relationship to the research methods course, is attached as Appendix C.

An additional consideration in the timing of the first course offering of this type through the Consortium concerns the availability of appropriate staff. As of the summer of 1967 we will have a number of potential staff members who all possess 1) high competence in data processing, 2) a sophisticated command of pertinent methods of statistical and mathematical analysis, 3) intimate familiarity with the range of technical problems imbedded in the data of the archives, and 4) substantive training as professional scholars. We are not unaware of the usefulness of the more routine modes of training in the use of EDP equipment; we are persuaded by very extensive experience that the last three elements mentioned above must be added if the needs of political scientists and historians are to be met with maximum efficiency. Other disciplines, with different traditions of research training, may find a sharper division of labor quite satisfactory, but we are convinced that our extended constituency needs an approach that reflects all four elements of the analytic process.

An appropriate budget for the proposal course might be as follows:

Subsistence allowance, tuition and travel stipends	\$12,000
Data-processing costs of programming, machine operators and supplies	5,000
Instructional staff	4,985
Direct administrative costs	1,650
Indirect administrative costs	<u>2,365</u>
	\$26,000

The course would be offered as an adaptation of our graduate pro-seminar, Political Science 682: Data Processing and Computer Utilization in Political Science and will carry six hours of graduate credit through The University of Michigan Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Study. Additional support for instructional and direct administrative costs will be provided by the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research and The University of Michigan.

There are, as you well recognize, yet other serious problems that demand attention. We now tend to think quite explicitly in terms of the human environment that is needed to sustain the kind of intellectual revolution in which we are both so vitally interested. Time and again we have witnessed situations in which lively interest is thwarted, despite the presence of adequate hardware and routine staff support. The modest training proposals described above will support minimal efforts to make the most committed historians and political scientists self-starting users of computers. Sustained and expanded use of the new data and data-processing

resources will rest on continued improvement of the human facilities that make such research possible. I hope it will be possible for us to explore some of the ideas our staff has developed in thinking about the problems of supporting new research efforts.

In preparing this proposal I have been acutely aware of the extent to which the efforts of the Consortium rest on external assistance. Although the amount of money I have suggested is not large when considered in the context of the needs we are trying to meet, it would be a vital addition to our present resources. Consequently, I know I speak for both Council and staff as well as for a large number of scholars across the nation when I express appreciation for your willingness to consider the proposal for possible funding by IBM.

Sincerely,

Warren E. Miller

RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON POLITICAL DATA:
HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

July 26-August 13, 1965
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Sponsored by the Inter-university Consortium
for Political Research

Report prepared by: Professor Samuel P. Hays
University of Pittsburgh

Professor Murray Murphey
University of Pennsylvania

Introduction

For the past two years the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research and the American Historical Association Committee to Collect the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History, with the financial assistance of the National Science Foundation and the Social Science Research Council, have been engaged in the collection and computer storage of American historical political data. This project is now well advanced. Attention, therefore, is turning to the use of this data archive in historical political research. During the summer of 1965, from July 26 to August 13, a conference was held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, to stimulate this use. The following is a brief report on the aims, the conduct, and the results of the conference.

Purpose

The aim of the conference was twofold. One major objective was the stimulation of interest by researchers in quantitative methods in historical political research in general and the Consortium data archive in particular. Through the conference it was hoped that scholars would become better acquainted with the Consortium's archival program and thus more knowledgeable about the available data and its possible use for research by themselves and their students. It was also hoped that historians, whose statistical competence was known to be minimal, could be encouraged to improve that competence for themselves and to urge their students to do likewise. Finally, by the presentation of substantive problems which rested on both data in the archives and acceptable statistical methods, it was believed that those interested could be given some sense of the concrete possibilities for quantitative political research.

The second major objective of the conference was to determine the need for and nature of a summer training program for historians in quantitative methods in political research. Although some elements of such a program were presented in the conference itself, the conference was not intended to be, in any sense, a training program. But it was hoped that the conference would enable both the Consortium and the AHA Committee to develop a better sense of what such a program should entail, of how well it would be received, and of the size of the potential clientele. It was especially hoped that the conference would provide a clearer sense of the existing statistical competence of historians and their receptivity to improvement in that competence.

Organization

Participants in the conference were invited by the Consortium and the Committee; they were selected because of knowledge of their interest

in quantitative research in political history. For this purpose the contacts established through the AHA Committee and its state committees were extremely helpful. Thirty-one historians and four political scientists constituted the group of regular participants. Of these, thirteen were graduate students and twenty-two were faculty members. A list of the conference members is appended. Although some of those invited could not attend, it was felt that the conference included most of the historians who are currently and actively interested in quantitative methods of political research. In addition, from ten to fifteen members of the Consortium's summer training course in quantitative methods for political scientists elected to attend the sessions as observers, in varying degrees of regularity.

Since the conference did not constitute a training seminar, but was more of an attempt to stimulate interest in the activities of the AHA Committee and to acquaint participants with data available in the Consortium archive, considerable emphasis was placed upon opportunities for informal interchange. To facilitate this aspect of the conference, the sessions were held and most of the participants were housed in a sorority house made available for the summer. This permitted the spontaneous organization of discussion groups, especially in the evenings, and considerable flexibility in scheduling to follow up developing group interests.

The conference leaders were drawn from a variety of sources. Statistical expertise was provided by Professor Murray Murphey of the Department of American Civilization at the University of Pennsylvania. The substantive content of research problems in American political history was provided by Professors Lee Benson of the Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania and Samuel P. Hays of the Department of History of the University of Pittsburgh. Considerable assistance as seminar leaders was provided by the ICPR staff, especially Professors Philip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes, and by other scholars such as Professor Waldo Tobler of the University of Michigan, Department of Geography and Professor David Butler of Nuffield College, Oxford University. On occasion, individual conference participants were drawn upon for leadership. The conference was under the general direction of Professor Miller, executive director of the Consortium and Professor Benson, chairman of the AHA Committee.

Conference Sessions

The conference was organized in two parallel sequences, the morning sessions involving general statistical methods, and the afternoon sessions emphasizing substantive problems of voting and legislative research. Although the main emphasis of the conference was on the analysis of specific content problems in popular voting and legislative behavior, it was generally recognized that the participants would have, in most cases, a limited statistical training and that sufficient statistical competence to grasp the possibilities of statistical analysis would have to be

developed during the conference itself. A series of lectures in introductory statistics was, therefore, provided during the fifteen morning sessions by Professor Murphey, and participants were urged to read three recommended statistics books prior to the conference as background for these lectures.

The lectures on statistics were arranged so that the specific statistical techniques required to comprehend the substantive problems presented in the afternoon would be dealt with during the preceeding morning. The lectures ranged over a variety of topics. Half of the sessions provided an introduction to univariate description, linear regression and simple correlation, multiple and partial correlation and contingency coefficients. Three sessions were devoted to techniques of data reduction as applied to legislative roll calls, primarily scale analysis, with some brief mention of factor analysis and other techniques.

Two statistics sessions were devoted to problems peculiar to ecological correlation. It had been hoped that relevant minor civil subdivision data for one state, Wisconsin, might be available for the conference, but technical problems delayed completion of data processing until after the end of the conference. The problem posed by ecological correlations, therefore, was dealt with in general statistical terms rather than through a case-study comparison of correlations at different levels of aggregation. Professor Stokes presented an especially suggestive method of describing the relationship of variables in subgroups of aggregates by a least squares estimate of the internal cell proportions when only the aggregate data is known. Professor Murphey reviewed and extended the treatment in a later session.

The afternoon sessions were devoted to substantive problems of political behavior. Six sessions concerned popular voting data. For these sessions, political change in the East Central States between 1888 and 1900 had been selected for analysis, because it was felt that a statistical treatment of voting behavior in this region might well revise traditional views about the politics of the 1890's. In his lectures Professor Hays examined these traditional views in the light of data from the Consortium archives, using univariate description of the political data, intercorrelation of the political data, and simple and multiple correlation of political and demographic data. Although the treatment was limited and tentative, it was possible to demonstrate that quantitative methods could add considerable to and revise current historical description and interpretation.

A second series of lectures was devoted to legislative analysis. These were under the general direction of Professor Benson. These lectures focused on the 24th Congress and more especially on the slavery controversy as represented by a series of votes on the issue of the proper disposal of petitions to Congress on slavery, an issue which was resolved in the resolution known as the "Gag Rule." Through this specific study Professor Benson illustrated the usefulness of scaling in classifying legislators in terms of their position on issues, and in relating those classifications to other variables.

Although most attention during the conference was devoted to the analysis of historical voting and roll call data, several other lectures were given in order to suggest possibilities for further types of quantitative analysis. Professor Miller, for example, described a study of the 85th Congress which involved survey, as well as documentary, data, and which raises the possibility that one might discover surrogates for the study's socio-psychological variables in the documentary data. Professor Converse described the findings of the Survey Research Center in its contemporary election studies and suggested ways in which these findings might be tested with documentary historical data. In an especially suggestive lecture, Professor Tobler described the methods by which geographers analyze spatial distributions and the uses of computers in such efforts. Finally, Dr. Butler, currently senior author of the Nuffield British election studies, recounted the history of the Nuffield studies and the progress of British election analysis to date.

During the conference an effort was made to acquaint participants with the technical aspects of data processing. For many this was an initial experience with computer techniques. During one afternoon session, for example, Mr. Gregory Marks and Mr. Merrill Shanks, members of the Consortium's Technical Services staff, described the processing of the election data used at the conference, from its original manuscript form through the final output. They paid special attention to the technical problems of merging data, one of the most serious processing problems with election data, how some of these had been solved, and how others were being approached. At the same time, participants were acquainted with computer print-out by making available to them for use throughout the conference manipulations of the election data used in the lectures, including tables and matrices of correlations.

Finally, a special effort was made to encourage conference participants to become acquainted with relevant literature and to become involved with statistical manipulations of data during the conference itself. For the former, a reading list was provided prior to the conference and copies of the literature were made available both at the University Library and the sorority house during the sessions. For the latter, two calculating machines were provided and were well used. Some participants had brought data from their own projects on which they worked during the conference. For others, print-outs of raw election data, in the form of party percentages of the total vote, by county, was provided for the East Central states for the 1888-1900 period; groups of counties were assigned to individual conference participants for which they could perform statistical manipulations. Although not every participant became so involved with the data, a number, some faculty members but especially the graduate students, did.

Results

The conference as a catalyst. The conference was highly successful in its efforts to serve as a catalyst in the development of quantitative approaches in historical political research. The conference made

strikingly apparent the degree to which individuals often stand alone in their respective institutions in their interest in quantification, and the relief at being able to converse with others of like mind without constantly having to argue through basic assumptions. But the conference also made apparent the need for continuing focal points of common endeavor, such as communications which provide information about the development of research resources, new methodologies or research projects; conferences which provide exchange concerning research which is well advanced; or publication media which are more receptive to quantitative research than are most historical journals.

It is apparent that the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, though not capable of filling all the needs of the political historian interested in quantification, will play an increasingly important role as an institutional focal point. The mere fact of the vast importance of the Consortium as a data archive was made apparent to all. The further role of the Consortium as an agency of training in quantitative methods--which is dealt with more extensively below--otherwise unavailable to historians, also became apparent to the participants. But it also became clear that the subject-matter scope of the Consortium's role in historical research will, in the future, be far greater than more narrowly-defined political history. For with the collection of demographic data the Consortium becomes a repository of considerable interest to historians not strictly political in their interests, such as economic and social historians. Moreover, the Consortium's growing interest in international data exchange and comparative political analysis extends its usefulness for the historian far beyond the confines of American political history. Three members of the conference had research interests in areas beyond the United States. It is evident, therefore, that the Consortium will serve as a focal point for interest in quantification far beyond the narrower limits of this conference, which was confined, for the most part, to American historians.

The conference confirmed the belief that, once the data archive is fully ready for use, there will be a considerable demand upon it for data by historians. Some participants had already been in touch with the Consortium to provide data, and further arrangements were made during the conference. Others began to formulate possible research projects for the first time. Almost all expressed a desire to guide their graduate research seminars in this direction, and to encourage students to make use of training seminars which might be offered at the Consortium in the future.

In the past the Consortium has organized conferences which focus on the presentation of research findings in areas relevant to the Consortium's concerns. It seems appropriate that the Consortium play such a role in the application of quantitative methods to political history. But because of the limited amount of research now underway it does not seem appropriate to hold such a conference in the very near future. Once the Consortium archives are widely available, however, and once research is underway on a number of fronts, such a conference would be

highly useful. It is hoped, therefore, that the Consortium and the AHA Committee would make plans for such a conference when it appears that sufficient research is in progress to warrant it.

Statistical Competence. In planning the conference it was generally suspected that the statistical competence of historians would be minimal. This the conference bore out. It is clear that historians have a long way to go in mastering the techniques which will enable them to cope with masses of political data. At the same time, it was hoped that those attending the conference would be stimulated to acquire for themselves and to encourage others, for example, their students, to acquire a higher level of statistical training. To make clear the level of competence required, a relatively high level of standards, for the beginner, was established in the morning sessions. It was fully recognized that not much ground could be covered in three weeks, but it was hoped that sufficient progress would be made to render the substantive material meaningful and to make clear the degree to which further statistical ability was required for meaningful political research.

The results of this aspect of the conference were most gratifying. Although participants were invited on the grounds of their known or suspected interest in quantification, it was not clear to what extent they would accept the proposition that their own statistical competence should be greatly advanced. But reaction to the conference indicated a widespread recognition of the need for greater statistical training. For some of the senior members of the conference the prospect of a time commitment to such training seems remote; yet among them there was a clear sense of the necessity of making sure that their students have such training. There was a far clearer sense that younger faculty members would undertake such training themselves. In a considerable number of cases participants expressed the desire to return to their home institutions and take courses in statistics.

The level of interest in training in quantification became clear in the reactions to the least squares method of treating aggregate data. For although the statistical implications were not fully understood by a group which had been introduced to linear regression only one week before, the possibilities of such a treatment were fully recognized. Although the participants frequently had to reach to comprehend the method, the awareness of problems inherent in ecological correlation aroused considerable interest in it. Some attempted to work out the method in specific case problems during the conference, and most expressed a desire to keep informed of attempts to develop it more fully.

It thus seems apparent that some of the current generation of historians will undertake further training, but that statistical competence will come much more rapidly with the newer generations of historians, beginning with those now involved in graduate work. It is for this reason that a major recommendation of this report is that a summer training program for historians be established at the Consortium to facilitate the acquisition of skills in quantitative analysis.

Results: Section II

It was the unanimous verdict of all those who participated in this summer's project that a more extended training course ought to be attempted next year. It was also agreed that this course ought to be designed for the training of graduate students rather than faculty, although the possibility that some junior faculty might attend was not excluded. For such a course to be successful, it must be based on a realistic assessment of the problems of both the graduate students and the Consortium.

So far as the Consortium is concerned, the purpose of such a course would be both to advance the field of political research in general and, more specifically, to provide future researchers with the knowledge and skills necessary for them to make the most effective use of the data archive and services of the Consortium. This is not a very restrictive condition, since the plans for the development of the Consortium itself call for a broad range of activities in the future, but it does suffice to establish priorities as to training in the next few years. Moreover, if the course is to become a part of the regular summer program of the Consortium, it will have to fit into the regular scheduling of the summer activities, which means that an eight-week course with eight contact hours per week is the approximate unit for teaching available. The problems for the Consortium, then, are to design an appropriate course, to find a teaching staff for the course, and to recruit appropriate students.

The history students who attend the course will be coming in the hope of learning a new body of knowledge and method broadly applicable to historical research in general, and of exploring the archival resources of the Consortium. But it appears quite clear that these students will have had only minimal training in political science, and will be for the most part totally innocent of quantitative methods. While it may be suggested, or even required, that they read some elementary works on statistics before coming, it seems very clear from our discussions with the faculty members here this summer that we cannot realistically require that they take a course in statistics as a prerequisite. Accordingly, next summer's course will have to include some training in statistical concepts and their applications as well as more purely content materials.

It should also be borne in mind that the Consortium's venture into history will open a new field of exploration to political science students, and that there may be considerable demand on the part of students in the regular summer courses in political science for knowledge and training in the use of these new resources. It seems obvious that this demand ought to be met, and assuming that the differences in mathematical competence and research sophistication are not too great it might be of great advantage to both sets of students if they were combined in a single course.

A third set of problems arise with respect to the selection of students to attend. At the present time, we can see no way to estimate how many graduate students may wish to come, or what level students they will be. Even those faculty members who were in attendance this summer were unable to give us very firm estimates of the number of students from their own schools who are likely applicants. Accordingly, it seems to us that the method of selection of students should be left as flexible as possible, but with the general understanding that a small group of excellent students is preferable to a large group of mediocre students.

It seems to us that these problems can best be met by the following recommendations. We propose:

- 1) that the Consortium offer next summer an eight-week course designed as an introduction to contemporary and historical political research;
- 2) that applicants must be nominated by faculty members at their own institutions, that the nominations be submitted to Warren Miller, and that the selection be made by Dr. Miller, with the advice of the Ad Hoc Committee of the AHA;
- 3) that the course be open both to the history graduate students and to political science graduate students of comparable mathematical and research backgrounds who are interested in developing competence in historical research;
- 4) that the basic responsibility for teaching the course be given to Warren Miller, but that several senior historians currently engaged in relevant research be asked to participate during portions of the course (particularly, Bogue, Aydelotte, Shapiro).

The Course

The course to be offered should be designed to give the students a basic grounding in scientific procedure, a set of concepts and tools which they can employ effectively, and a knowledge of the Consortium archive and of the use of its materials. To this end, we propose the following course as an introduction to contemporary and historical political research.

PART I. Research Design

A. Analysis of research problem

1. Specification of units of interest

- a. Problems arising from different types of units of interest
- b. Problems arising when the unit of interest and the unit of observation are not the same

2. Specification of relevant variables
 - a. "Relevance"; grounds for deciding which are relevant; use of past research and theory
 - b. Description of variables
 - 1) Measurement: nominal, ordinal, interval, ratio
 - 2) Univariate distributions
 - a) Characteristics: mean, variance, standard deviation
3. Specification of relations among variables
 - a. Causal or functional relations; model construction
 - b. Use of statistical concepts to test existence of relations among two variables
 - 1) Bivariate distributions
 - a) Association: contingency coefficients
 - b) Covariance and correlation

PART II. Data Collection and Processing

- A. Data Sources
 1. Documentary; mss, published documents, census, indices, etc.
 - a. Choice among competing sources. "Best" sources
 2. Live respondents
- B. Sampling
 1. Basic concepts of sampling
 - a. Simple Random Samples
 - 1) Estimation from S.R.S.
 - a) Distributions of sample statistics; central limit theorem; confidence intervals and point estimates
 - 2) Hypothesis testing
 - a) Types of Error
 - b) Null hypothesis and levels of significance
 - c) Power
 - b. Stratified sampling
 - 1) Allocation
 - c. Cluster sampling
 - d. Systematic sampling
 - e. Multistage sampling

2. Applications to historical data
 - a. Sampling manuscript and documentary sources
 - b. Sampling historical populations
3. Applications to contemporary data
 - a. Survey research
 - 1) Survey research data as historical source material

C. Data Collection

1. Contemporary data; questionnaires, interviews, observation
2. Historical data
 - a. Uses of historical statistics--data quantified in the past
 - b. Quantification of qualitative data
 - 1) Scaling
 - 2) Content analysis
 - a) Underlying assumptions
 - b) Varieties of use: documents, open-end questions, etc.
 - c) Types of content analysis
 - d) Choice of indices; problems of alternative indices; recording and context units; adaptation to particular document; enumeration unit.
 - e) Reliability
 - f) Problems of inference from
 - i. Properties of medium per se
 - ii. Properties of producers of content
 - iii. Properties of consumers of content

D. Data Reduction

1. Scaling
2. Agreement analysis
3. Factor analysis

E. Data Processing

1. Translation to machine-readable form
 - a. Coding
2. Programming
3. How to make economical use of the machine

PART III. Analytic Procedures

- A. Regression analysis
- B. Multivariate distributions

- C. Multiple regression and correlation; partial correlation
- D. Simon-Blalock "causal" models
- E. Analysis of Variance
- F. Time Sequential analysis
 - 1. Classical time series--trend analysis
 - 2. Stochastic processes
 - a. Markov chains
 - 3. Applications to various types of units
- G. Ecological, or levels of aggregation, problems
 - 1. Least squares and maximum likelihood estimates of cell probabilities

Although this outline is heavily methodological in form, the data used to illustrate these methods, and the particular research designs provided or developed, would involve a solid content of both substantive and theoretical value. It is our opinion that such a course would provide an introduction to research on past and present political behavior which would be valuable in itself for the students, and which would also promote the utilization of the Consortium data archive and facilities by these students in future years.

Participants in Conference on the Historical Analysis
of Quantitative Data, July 26-August 13, 1965

Professor Thomas Alexander
University of Alabama

Professor William Aydelotte
University of Iowa

Mr. James M. Banner, Jr.
Greenwich, Connecticut

Professor Allan Bogue
University of Wisconsin

Mr. David L. Brye
Madison, Wisconsin

Professor James B. Christoph
The Ohio State University

Professor Richard O. Curry
University of Connecticut

Professor Charles B. Dew
Wayne State University

Mr. Charles M. Dollar
University of Kentucky

Mr. Ronald P. Formisano
Wayne State University

Professor William Freehling
University of Michigan

Professor Louis P. Galambos
Rice University

Mr. Laurence A. Glasco
c/o State University of New York
at Buffalo

Professor Dewey Grantham, Jr.
Vanderbilt University

Professor James F. Guyot
University of California
at Los Angeles

Professor Van Beck Hall
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Michael J. Halpin
University of Pennsylvania

Professor H. James Henderson
University of Maine

Professor J. Rogers Hollingsworth
University of Wisconsin

Mr. Richard Jensen
Yale University

Professor Richard S. Kirkendall
University of Missouri

Mr. Paul J. Kleppner
University of Pittsburgh

Professor William E. Leuchtenburg
Columbia University

Professor Alvin W. Lynn
DePaul University

Professor Lynn Marshall
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Rowland L. Mitchell
Social Science Research Council

Professor Gerald D. Nash
University of New Mexico

Professor S. Walter Poulshock
Wayne State University

Mr. Leonard G. Ritt
University of Tennessee

Professor Elmo M. Roberds
Southern Illinois University

Professor Joel Silbey
University of Pittsburgh

Miss Susan Stoudinger
University of Maryland

Mr. David E. Sumler
Princeton University

Professor C. Vann Woodward
Yale University

Mr. Robert Zemsky
Yale University

RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY POWER SYSTEMS

July 5-16, 1965
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Sponsored by the Inter-university Consortium
for Political Research

Report prepared by: Professor William H. Flanigan
University of Minnesota

The two-week conference on community power was divided into three parts. The first sessions reviewed the major studies of the recent past, several sessions covered current research, and the final sessions explored a few projected studies. All the landmark studies of the past fifteen years were discussed extensively with advocates and critics emerging on almost every major point. Since most participants in the conference were familiar with these works, these discussions evoked wide participation and helped prepare the group for two weeks of unusually lively discussion at times when the sheer number of conferees, temperature and humidity, and physical arrangements would have dictated apathy.

The review of present and future studies emphasized a few selected major themes such as: ideology as an explanatory variable, comparative community studies, and the application of quantitative techniques to community analysis. Our intention to focus on the comparative analysis of the relationships between socio-economic status and forms of political participation was a victim of the pressure of time and the unfeasibility of assigning the unexpectedly large number of participants analytic exercises during the two weeks. One major new project totally unrepresented by conference participants, the Harvard project of Banfield and Wilson, was assigned reading and critically evaluated as an approach to the study of ideology.

Although no time was specifically set aside for participants to report on their own future research interests, there were occasional enthusiastic contributions to the discussion while a participant described his plans or the research of a colleague. For the most part, however, these discussions of research plans were held outside the formal conference sessions with one or two members of the staff and never dominated the development of the conference agenda.

Briefly the ten days of the conference covered the following subjects:

First day--Jennings presented an introduction to the community studies field and discussed the seminal role of Hunter and his Community Power Structure in the field. Jennings also discussed the issues raised by Hunter and his follow-up study, Community Influentials, of Atlanta. Scoble discussed his study of Bennington as typical of the early response among political scientists which Hunter's study provoked. There was general class discussion of the now classic arguments of "reputation."

Second day--Flanigan discussed Dahl's Who Governs? and the drawing of lines of combat between the elitists and pluralists. Flanigan discussed in some detail the research design and history of the study. Agger discussed The Ruler and the Ruled as one of the comparative studies that set out to resolve the controversies generated by Hunter.

Third day--Agger continued to report on The Ruler and the Ruled and the major analytic techniques introduced there while explaining in some detail the new five-city project which is an elaboration of his earlier work. The role of ideology in the research design was emphasized.

Fourth day--Scoble described the research design and current activities in the Wisconsin study of four cities. He related his approach to Agger's study and described the role of political culture and ideology in his analysis.

Fifth day--Flanigan presented data from the five Oregon communities in Agger's study and the four Wisconsin cities in Scoble's study, as well as from Dahl's New Haven data on socioeconomic status and several forms of political participation. Although the communities are of different sizes and the data were collected in different periods, a remarkable similarity of patterns emerged somewhat undermining the proposed explanation of the many differences to be found. A discussion of Banfield and Wilson's article and research proposal was tied to Agger's emphasis on ideology and the relevance of status differences.

Sixth day--Flanigan presented some quantitative techniques and results of analysis which he and Scott have generated in their work on the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. Their quantitative techniques for analysis of political and census data were compared with Banfield and Wilson's.

Seventh day--Alford reported on aspects of the Wisconsin study and related them to Scoble's interests. He also reported on a survey of standard metropolitan areas and their analysis of political and social characteristics associated with them.

Eighth day--Jennings reported on political socialization and related it to the earlier discussions of ideology and political culture. The role of leadership in community analysis was also discussed.

Ninth day--Several different individuals involved in National Opinion Research Center work discussed their flouridation study and their proposal for a data-collection agency which would serve students of comparative urban research.

Tenth day--The final discussion included a critical evaluation of several of the proposals for future research as well as the views of the discussion leaders on their expectations for future research in the field.

The impression given by the above summary is that the discussion leaders dominated the conference but this in fact was not the case. Throughout two weeks there was considerable discussion and questioning among the discussion leaders and the participants. There was never a

time when one individual held the center of attention for very long, and in many ways the general discussion was the best part of the seminar. It is difficult to say what encouraged this participation, but I would offer two partial explanations: First, the first two days we dealt with material with which everyone was thoroughly familiar and probably felt confident to discuss; and second, during the first two days especially the conference leaders interrupted one another and disagreed with one another.

While the size of the group seemingly did not inhibit discussion, it prevented formal work in the secondary analysis of the data we had prepared for the conference. We had anticipated two or three sets of investigations--one on socio-economic status and political participation, one on attitudes toward public policy, and one on ideology--but given the number of participants and the difficulty of manipulating the data rapidly, implementation of these plans seemed out of the question. Still, on another occasion secondary analysis more or less of the sort initially envisioned should be tried. (Obviously for the two-week conference this entails a considerable speeding up of the data handling and analysis.)

The physical setting of the conference could have been improved by arranging to hold the conference itself in the sorority house (used for the History Conference). We all felt it would have encouraged a useful discussion of the conference topics to be in a setting where we could adjourn for a coffee hour where all interested parties would feel free to remain. These arrangements would also have made the sorority house much more of a focus for the interests that bring together the participants in the research conference. Last summer the benefits to be derived by easy access to the staff members were limited to those individuals who actually lived in the sorority house.

The participants drawn to the conference were of two types and were not served equally well. One group had a special interest in community studies and was naturally involved in and concerned with most of the topics. A second group of participants, and probably larger than the first, appeared to be individuals with an intelligent awareness of community studies but no special interest in them. This second group seemed to be motivated by a desire to come to Michigan for other academic purposes but they were not particularly engaged by the topics we presented and would have probably attended the two-week session regardless of its substantive content.

By the end of the two weeks I felt that the majority of the graduate students who had benefited considerably from observing the conference came from the large number of students from the eight-week course who wandered in initially as spectators but found something of interest to sustain them. At least it was in this group where I found the most pointed and fruitful informal discussions of possible research projects in the community studies area.

It was extremely useful for the conference leaders to meet in February to plan the outlines of the conference program. It was our feeling that it would also have been useful for us to get together four to six weeks before the beginning of the conference in order to plan our program in more detail. We felt that we would have needed at least four weeks to prepare for the conference and that to meet immediately prior to the session would not have been so useful. In other words, we did not feel that in the case of our conference it would have been fruitful for us to spend the week before the start in Ann Arbor. Quite possibly each set of discussion leaders and each topic should be treated differently.

In the future, a fairly extensive reading list and discussion of the conference should be sent to the expected participants by the middle of May or the first of June at the very latest. It is not clear to me just why we failed to generate the letter and reading list we discussed and had intended to send out, but this may have resulted from the failure to have a single individual obviously in charge and responsible for the planning if not the daily conduct of the conference.

Participants in Conference on Community Power Systems

July 5-16, 1965

Professor Robert E. Agger
University of Oregon

Professor Robert Alford
University of Wisconsin

Mr. John A. Baden
University of Kentucky

Mr. John Brand
University of Strathclyde

Mr. Bernard Bray
University of Kansas

Mr. Steven R. Brown
University of Missouri

Mr. Michael J. Cody
Vanderbilt University

Mr. John N. Colas
Washington University

Mr. George Cole
University of Washington

Dr. Robert Crain
National Opinion Research Center

Mr. Frederick H. Damaske
University of Minnesota

Mr. Maurice K. Dorton
University of Minnesota

Miss Bonnie H. Erickson
University of British Columbia

Mr. Andrew Glassbert
Yale University

Mr. Daniel Gordon
University of Wisconsin

Miss Milda Hedblom
University of Minnesota

Professor Irving Howards
Southern Illinois University

Mr. Gordon W. Kirk
Michigan State University

Mr. F. Gerald Kline
University of Minnesota

Mr. Bruce M. McCrone
Ball State University

Mr. Jerome Mileur
Southern Illinois University

Mr. Kenneth E. Miller
Duke University

Mr. Robert D. Putnam
Yale University

Professor Donald Rosenthal
SUNY-Buffalo

Mr. Sherwood S. Sandweiss
Washington University

Professor Thomas Scott
University of Minnesota

Mrs. Pamela Wilcox
Northwestern University

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

Title: Research Conference on the Comparative
Study of American Political Behavior
Related to State Government and Politics

Dates of Conference: August 1-12, 1966

Amount requested from NSF: \$15,288

Date submitted: September 24, 1965

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 comparative study of American political behavior related to state government and politics.

The conference would be held during the summer of 1966. It would be located on The University of Michigan campus in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and would be held in conjunction with the Consortium-sponsored summer program of research training. Participants would be selected from among the research scholars who are committed to the conduct of related research in the near future.

The conference will be scheduled for a two-week period in early August. In addition to the thirty participants for whom support is sought in this proposal, an additional ten-twenty observers, including some advanced graduate students, will probably choose to attend while participating in the basic Consortium summer program.

Given the variety of professional associational meetings and publication outlets available for transmission and exchange of knowledge, the case for the ad hoc research conference probably should be made rather infrequently and then only in the face of exceptional circumstances. This is particularly true when the conference objective concerns the substance of research findings. At the same time, recent experience with the progress of the behavioral sciences, particularly in the newer fields, indicates that there are strategic instances in which the existing academic institutions do not provide badly needed contact among the

several scholars who share active or incipient research interests. One of these instances occurs when interest begins to crystallize around new research topics, in the period before a spate of research activity draws a number of researchers into active work on closely related problems. It seems fair to argue that the relative success of the major electoral studies of the 1950's and 1960's was due in part to the several specialized conferences in the late 1940's and early 1950's that brought together the scattered score or more scholars since identified with much of the prominent research. On the other side, it is also appropriate to note that the absence of such efforts at intellectual coordination and clarification has meant that much of the work on political behavior at the level of state government and state politics has been unique to the particular research site and almost totally noncumulative; opportunities for comparative research have generally been ignored (the Wahlke-Eulau four-state study of legislative behavior provides virtually the only exception), and the successive additions of new data have not supported any increase in the level or the power of theoretical generalization.

The Consortium is almost uniquely equipped to meet emerging needs for contact among a subset of research scholars about to embark on work of common interest. The very fact of an emerging communality of interests becomes identified and visible through the general set of formal and informal communications channels that the organization of the Consortium provides. Once convincingly aware of the need for at least a brief period of structured interaction among identifiable individuals, the Consortium Council and staff can exert a modicum of leadership and

attempt to provide the facilities whereby the relevant persons can meet and set about the task of organizing their various efforts.

For many years the traditional fields within the discipline of political science included the field of "state and local government." The implied interest in the phenomena of government and politics at the state and local level was one of the last to be touched by the workways of behavioral science. In recent years, however, the concern with problems of local government has been transformed into concern with problems of urban growth and problems of community structure. The growth of research of one or another aspect of the local political community has been sufficient to warrant Consortium sponsorship of a conference reviewing research problems of the new field. Urban studies have of course become of central interest to a great variety of behavioral scientists and have produced an immense body of research findings.

Despite the work of such men as the late V. O. Key, Jr., in his book on American state politics, a comparable growth of research interest on the state level has been delayed. There have been some major exceptions, such as that provided by the Wahlke-Eulau comparative study of four state legislatures, but in the main, political scientists have been slow to exploit the fifty "natural laboratories" provided by the American federal system of government.

In very recent years, however, more and more established members of the research community have been turning their attention to the problems of systematic studies based on a comparison of state political systems. Most recently, Professors Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines have collaborated on the book Politics in the American States, which promises

to stimulate a new series of research undertakings. Their interests are shared by a substantial number of the younger members of the profession, and they have been joined by many of these individuals in recommending that the Consortium sponsor a research conference to facilitate the coordination and division of labor in the field. The attached memorandum, submitted by Professor Titus of the University of Kansas, summarizes the various petitions that have been presented to both Consortium Council and staff.

A number of objectives should be served by the conference. Although it is probably unwise to strive for agreement on conceptualization at this early stage, a conference might be justified if it no more than permitted a systematic review and common exposure to the variety of conceptual approaches that are shaping current research plans. Such tasks as that of designing a general program of research or resolving anticipated problems of measurement would, however, be more clearly susceptible to joint consideration by the members of the conference. The experience of recent years in other domains of political research contains many examples of research projects that could have profited individually and collectively from greater attention to the coordination of study designs. The early and necessarily crude mapping of the terrain to be explored in subsequent research by conference members would inevitably indicate ways in which the amplification of individual study designs would lead to increased comparability as well as to improved excellence within each individual study. Similarly, many problems of measurement can be anticipated and the repertoire of possible solutions examined in concert and before the fact. The results may be

agreement on selection of identical techniques for comparable problems, agreement to undertake empirical investigations of the considerations governing specific choices among alternate techniques, or simply agreement for researchers to go their separate ways. At least there would be a shared awareness of the hypothetical nature of such problems in the execution of research; it would seem unreasonable, however, not to expect that both individual and collaborative efforts would be altered and improved as a result of such prior discussions.

Yet another important purpose is to be served in inventorying the existing and the proposed collections of data. The conference could be expected to provide the beginning of standardization in the collection of information pertaining to legislators and legislatures, administrative officials and administrative systems, political leaders and political organizations, or other classes of phenomena relevant to the range of common research interests. One of the major barriers to the growth of research on state government has been created by the variety of modes of data collection and storage. Shared interest in state legislative behavior has foundered on the noncomparability of data gathered for various state legislatures. Studies of political organizations have been nonadditive because of crucial differences in the way in which pertinent data were recorded. Quite apart from the desirability of achieving consensus on the utility of various conceptual approaches and developing agreement on directly comparable designs for research, the less pretentious ambition to develop comparability of data resources that later can be put to a multiplicity of uses is an important ambition

and one that could be well served by a research conference held at this time.

All of the foregoing suggests that there is a wide range of topics open for discussion and a variety of problems on differing levels to be appraised by conference participants. The volume and variety of possible objectives for the conference demand very careful attention to the organization and conduct of the conference. Preliminary discussions have produced agreement that the conference should be organized under a collegial leadership provided by three or four scholars possessing a substantial range of interests and competencies. Responsibility for organizing the content and leadership of the conference should be vested in a single person, but the implementation of plans should be shared. Preparation for participation in the conference should be stimulated and guided by a well-organized set of working papers produced by the conference leaders well in advance of the conference itself. All of this argues for substantial effort on the part of conference leadership and adequate administrative support to carry out the plans evolved in preparation for the conference. The proposed budget attempts to anticipate these needs as well as the activities of the conference itself.

Prospective conference leaders include Professors Herbert Jacob, University of Wisconsin; Professor Kenneth Vines, Tulane University; Professor Samuel Patterson, University of Iowa; and Professor H. Douglas Price, Harvard University. Those invited to participate would include persons such as Professor James Titus, University of Kansas; Professor Deil Wright, University of Iowa; Professor Heinz Eulau, Stanford University; Professor Jack Walker, University of Michigan; Professor Morris Ogul, University of Pittsburgh; and Professor William Keefe of Chatham College.

Proposed Budget

Preparation of conference materials

Clerical salaries	\$1,200	
Reproduction of papers	1,500	
Expendable supplies	1,000	
Travel and telephone	<u>1,800</u>	\$ 5,500

Direct administrative costs

Director's salary	\$ *	
Secretarial salary	*	
Expendable supplies	500	
Travel and telephone	<u>250</u>	750

Stipends for participants (30)

Per diem @ \$210 per person (\$15 per day for 14 days)	\$6,300	
Travel @ \$60 per person	<u>1,800</u>	8,100

Stipends for conference leaders

*

\$14,350

Indirect administrative expense at 15% of
cost excluding stipends**

938

TOTAL

\$15,288

* Items will be supported by the University of Michigan, through direct allocation or through the ICPR operating budget.

** Inasmuch as virtually all participants will be holders of the doctoral degree, no tuition will be collected by the University of Michigan from the persons supported by this proposal and the budget requested includes a major portion of the total cost of the conference. At this point our best estimate is that the University will be asked to provide some \$5-6,000 in direct costs, primarily for the Director's salary and for the stipends for conference leaders.

Copy

July 15, 1965

To: Dr. Warren Miller
Director
Inter-university Consortium for Political Research

From: James E. Titus
Department of Political Science
The University of Kansas
Official Representative, ICPR

Subject: 1966 Summer Conference

Much of the organized, cooperative, grant-sponsored political research that has been done since World War II focused upon national institutions, the national electorate, and national (including international) policy formulation. Looking back, this can be viewed as a natural outgrowth of the times, the problems we faced and the things political scientists felt they needed to know. Now I sense a different trend. There seems to be a felt need to discover more about the subsystems of our national political machinery and to apply research techniques developed on the national level to elements in these subsystems. At the National Science Foundation Conference on Mathematical Applications in Political Science in Dallas last summer, I talked with at least five young political scientists who were applying definitions and techniques developed by members of the Survey Research Center in various publications to state and community politics. Again at the June meeting of the Official Representatives to the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research this year, I detected an undercurrent of interest in multi-state or interstate, coordinated research. This stemmed, in part, from a realization of what development of the archive data would mean to the discipline in a year or two. Here will be a central source of data in usable form for interstate comparative studies.

We are beginning to realize, I think, that a number of unknowns hamper our ability to generalize about the political system of the United States. We do not know enough about legal, institutional, political, and socio-cultural customs and arrangements at regional, state and community levels. This lack of specific information tends to weaken generalizations about voting preference, party preference, levels of political participation, and so forth.

Studies of state politics, party systems, legal arrangements, and institutional structure have found their way into the literature piecemeal. Far too many have been narrowly defined case studies. The efforts of the Citizenship Clearing House to sponsor books on state politics enhanced the efforts of individual scholars, but revealed vast differences in scholarly quality and methodology. A major reason for this impasse is the enormous task the individual researcher faces in gathering accurate

data, data that are often detailed and complex. This is a particularly acute problem when interstate comparisons are involved. A reading of a state voting registration statute, for example, is inadequate if one wants to understand how the provisions affect voting participation or party strength in operational terms. The latter type of knowledge belongs to those who have had some actual experience working with the registration procedures. (I suppose there are "good" political reasons why Michigan's governor vetoed the four-year registration law--but I, for one, do not understand what they are.)

This is to say that if ever the discipline reaches the point where interstate generalizations are possible, where patterns of similarities and differences are measured and explained, where the deviant case makes sense in terms of its context, then cooperative research is an essential prerequisite. Such cooperative efforts should be structured by at least two common elements: some consensus upon the problems to be studied, and some consensus upon methods.

The Consortium, to my knowledge, is the only existing organization that has the capacity to gather interested scholars from at least a majority of the fifty states into a working relationship. I suggest, therefore, that the Council seriously consider establishing a conference on interstate political research in the summer of 1966.

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

1966 Summer Program Attendance

	<u>687</u>	<u>787</u>	<u>788</u>	<u>782</u>	<u>583</u>	<u>584</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>616</u>	<u>617</u>	<u>684</u>	<u>687</u>
Credit	43	46	11	4				4	5	1	
Auditor	9	40	7	20	1	1	6	1	6	3	4
Ph.D. Guest	11	8	4	26			1		1		
Visitor			1	5							
	<u>63</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>

ICPR	PS 687	Proseminar in Behavioral Research Methods
	PS 787	Seminar in Quantitative Political Analyses
	PS 788	Seminar in Mathematical Political Analysis
	PS 782	Comparative Research in State Politics
SRC	Psych 583	Introduction to Survey Research I
	Psych 616	Analysis of Survey Data
	Psych 684	Case Studies in Survey Research
	Psych 584	Introduction to Survey Research II
	Psych 617	Computer Applications in Survey Research
	Psych 615	Case Studies of Organization in Surveys
	Psych 687	Methods of Survey Sampling

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

1965 Summer Program Attendance

	<u>687</u>	<u>787</u>	<u>781</u>	<u>782</u>	<u>583</u>	<u>584</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>617</u>	<u>687</u>
Credit	62	62	9	10	11	2	1	7	4
Auditor	35	36	34	36	6	1	1	11	2
Ph.D. Guest	16	15	9	21	1			2	1
Visitor	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>
	115	114	55	76	18	3	2	20	7

	PS 687) —	Research Design and Data Analysis
	PS 787)	
ICPR	PS 781	Seminar on Theoretical Models for the Analysis of Community Power Structures
	PS 782	Seminar on Methods of Historical Analysis
	Psych 583	Introduction to Survey Research I
	Psych 584	Introduction to Survey Research II
SRC	Psych 615	Case Studies of Surveys in Organizations
	Psych 617	Computer Applications in Survey Research
	Psych 687	Methods of Survey Sampling

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

1964 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>585</u>	<u>687</u>	<u>615</u>
Credit	23	19	18	14	3	4	1	2	2	1
Auditor	19	16	22	17	3	2				1
Ph.D. Guest	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>
	48	43	56	35	7	7	1	2	3	2

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

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	10	6	13	11	2	2			
	<u>46</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>

ICPR	PS 687	Proseminar in Behavioral Research Methods	
	PS 781	Seminar in Comparative Political Analysis	
	PS 787	Seminar in Quantitative Political Analyses)
	PS 782	Seminar in Research on Judicial Behavior) second 4 weeks
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

II. DATA REPOSITORY

Archival developments of the past year implemented earlier decisions defining the nature of the repository. Greater familiarity with the problems of adding historical data to the archives led to a substantial expansion of the Technical Services staff, but work in which they have been engaged follows the outlines set in the grant from the National Science Foundation. The expanded base of participation was reflected in a preliminary proposal seeking funds to add aggregative historical data for non-American--primarily European--nations in historical depth comparable to the growing American collection. During the year efforts were also made to extend the support necessary for the acquisition and processing of congressional materials.

The Consortium staff continued a relatively high rate of activity in cooperative inter-archival plans. A proposal submitted to the National Science Foundation on behalf of the Council of Social Science Data Archives contemplates some increase in Consortium developmental activity that will ultimately enhance our ability to benefit from data resources generated and held by other archives. The Executive Director and the Head of the Technical Services staff were named to an International Social Science Council standing committee on social science data archives. They participated in meetings of the committee held in London and Ann Arbor. The Head of the Technical Services section and his staff organized the Fourth Technical Conference of Social Science Data Archives, held in Ann Arbor in late Spring.

In addition to data-processing activities related to archival growth and service, the Technical Services group has been increasingly occupied during the past year with plans for the installation of a new computer. The computer will be acquired by the Institute for Social Research with the assistance of the Consortium and will provide a crucial increase in data-processing capabilities at a reduced cost for the years immediately ahead. Pending installation of the new machine new policies were established to control the amount of data processing provided for Consortium participants without charge.

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

Archival Holdings, with Annotations

Studies for which data and codebooks have been cleaned, and the codebooks and supporting documentation have been sent to official representatives.

Survey Research Center, Political Behavior Program--Major Studies. These are cross-section national surveys with between 1,000 and 2,000 respondents each. Respondents for the 1958 election study were interviewed only after the Congressional elections of 1958; for the remaining studies, interviewing was conducted both before and after the general election. The average interviewing time was about one and one-half hours. Many questions are replicated across all of these studies. However, each has questions not asked in any of the others. The SRC Study number given is one which was assigned to the original research project of the Survey Research Center of the Institute for Social Research. These numbers are often used in referring to specific studies. See Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, The American Voter (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960, or abridged paperback, 1964) for a description of the contents of these studies.

1. 1952 Election Study--SRC Study 400 (1,899 respondents, 8 cards of data per respondent). For an explanation of the Forms A and B used in the post-election survey see the interviewer instructions for that survey in the ICPR Analysis Book. Every deck has at least 100 dummy cards. This is not mentioned in the codebook.
2. 1956 Election Study--SRC Study 417 (1,762 respondents, 9 cards of data per respondent). For an explanation of the Forms B and C used in the post-election survey see the interviewer instructions for that survey in the ICPR Analysis Book.

3. 1958 Election Study--SRC Study 431 (1,450 respondents, weighted to 1,822; 7 cards of data per respondent). Before making requests the user should be familiar with the information on using weighted data given in the section on custom analysis decks in this manual.
4. 1960 Election Study--SRC Study 440 (1,181 respondents, weighted to 1,954; 10 cards of data per respondent). Before making requests the user should be familiar with the information on using weighted data given in the section on custom analysis decks in this manual. Some users may also wish to refer to the sample types coded in column 4 of deck 1. As is indicated several subsamples of the 1956 and 1958 Election studies are in fact panel studies. At some future date these studies in the form of panels will be added to the archive. Until then it should be noted that constructing a panel from the existing data files is impossible because interview numbers do not match across years.
5. 1964 Election Study--SRC Study 473 (1,571 respondents, 13 cards of data per respondent). Before making requests the user should be familiar with the background material included in the first section of the codebook.

Survey Research Center, Political Behavior Program--Minor Studies. A restricted set of political items are sometimes added to Survey Research Center studies having other major purposes. Political, demographic, and other items of possible interest are extracted from the large study to form these minor studies.

1. 1948 Election Study SRC Study 46 (662 respondents, 1 card of data per respondent).
2. June 1951, Foreign Affairs Study SRC Study 101 (999 respondents, 1 card of data per respondent).
3. October 1953 Study SRC Study 613 (1,023 respondents, 1 card of data per respondent).

4. October, 1954, Domestic Affairs Study SRC Study 623 (1,139 respondents, 1 card of data per respondent).
5. October, 1960, SRC Study 695 (1,390 respondents, 1 card of data per respondent).
6. 1962 Election, SRC Study 714 (1,297 respondents, 2 cards of data per respondent).
7. Fall, 1962 German Embassy Study, SRC Study 706 (1,234 respondents, 4 cards of data per respondent). A national survey in the United States with special focus on American attitudes toward Western Germany; the usual Survey Research Center political and demographic variables are included.
8. December, 1963 Kennedy Study SRC Study 734 (1,540 respondents, 4 cards of data per respondent). A national survey in the United States conducted after the assassination. A number of items pertaining to perceptions of the presidential transition and to political preferences; the usual Survey Research Center political and demographic variables are included.

Consortium Repository Additions

1. Almond-Verba Five Nation Study. A cross-national survey of five western nations--the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Mexico, and the United States. (Number of respondents for United Kingdom, 963; Germany, 955; Italy, 995; Mexico, 1,008; weighted to 1,295; the United States, 970; each sample has 4 cards of data per respondent).

Emphasizes variables about political partisanship, political socialization, and attitudes toward the political system and culture as a whole. Before making a request reference should be made to the descriptive material at the front of the codebook. At present the codes for some variables are not the same for different nations. Before requesting the Mexico data the information on using weighted data in the section of the manual on custom analysis decks should be understood.

The weight field is columns 9 and 10 of deck 4. This information is not in the codebook. Careful attention should also be devoted to certain variables which are mentioned in the first three decks of the codebook, but for which the data is actually obtained from deck 4. An example is deck 1, column 49 for which the data is now located in deck 4, columns 45-47. All these potential problems are to be rectified in the near future. See Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), for a description of the contents.

2. Cross-Polity Survey Data. A collection of aggregated "hard" and "soft" data on 115 nations, 1 card per nation. A variety of variables pertaining to population, literacy, type of government, etc. Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor, A Cross-Polity Survey. (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1963).

3. Yale Political Data Program Information. "Hard" aggregated data collected from the United Nations, Census Departments, and other official organizations--about 151 different political units. There are 4 cards of data per country. See Bruce M. Russett, World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964).

4. Press Data on Legislative Reapportionment. (1,255 data cards). Aggregated population and representation totals for all legislative districts of both houses of the American National and fifty state legislatures. The codebook is included in the data cards. Glendon Schubert and Charles Press, "Measuring Malapportionment," American Political Science Review, Vol. LVIII, No.2 (June 1964).

5. NORC 1944 National Study. (2,564 respondents, 3 cards of data per respondent). A national survey conducted before and after the 1944 Presidential Election. Before making a request, review the information at the front of the codebook. Particularly interesting since many questionnaire items are phrased almost like those in later Survey Research Center surveys. See Sheldon J. Korchin, Psychological Variables in the Behavior of Voters. (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1946).

6. NORC 1947 National Study. (1,287 respondents, 2 cards of data per respondent). A national survey pertaining mostly to general political attitudes.

7. 1954 Stouffer Study: Cross-section Sample. (4,933 respondents, 3 cards of data per respondent). Leadership Sample. (1,500 respondents, 3 cards of data per respondent). A national survey of the American public and of local notables about attitudes toward Communism. A variety of variables pertaining to underlying dimensions of these attitudes; e.g. conformity, tolerance, etc. are included along with some measure of partisanship and past political behavior and standard demographic variables. Samuel A. Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Inc., 1955).

8. New Haven Study. (525 respondents, 4 cards of data per respondent). This data is the New Haven cross-section survey number two used in Robert A. Dahl's Who Governs. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961). The study focuses on respondent's information about and attitude toward community problems.

9. Roll Call Records for the United States Senate and House of Representatives: Continental Congress to the Present. Prepared from decks purchased from the Congressional Quarterly. The following years are available:

Senate 1955-1964

House 1955-1964

It should be noted that codebooks for many of these materials simply reference Congressional Quarterly descriptions.

10. Schmidhauser, Supreme Court Justices Study, Background Data. (92 respondents, 1 card per respondent). A specification of the party identification, religion, ethnic background and other personal historic variables of the United States Supreme Court Justices. The last Justice included being Potter C. Stewart who was appointed in 1958. John R. Schmidhauser, "The Justices of the Supreme Court: A Collective Portrait", Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol.3, No.1, February 1959.

11. 1959 Wahlke-Eulau Legislative Study. (504 respondents, 20 cards of data per respondent). A survey of legislators in four state legislatures. In addition to the usual political and demographic variables, many items pertain to perceptions of the political system.

John C. Wahlke, Heinz Eulau, William Buchanan and Leroy C. Ferguson, The Legislative System. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962).

12. Stanley, Higher Civil Service Study. (3,096 cards, 367 respondents). A study concerned with specifying the educational and occupational data of higher civil service employees. The data includes present and past positions held, the branch or branches of government in which the respondent is currently employed, as well as the number of activities, bureaus and installments with which he is concerned within the designated branch.

13. Data from the 1952, 1956, and 1962 County and City Data Books, Bureau of the Census. Each file contains, in machine readable form, population, manufacturing, agricultural, and other data for the United States. The data cards and tapes we have are copies of those used by the Bureau of the Census to prepare the County and City Data Books. The following specific sets of data are available:

- 1952 County data with standard county codes
- 1952 State total data
- 1956 County data (no standard county codes)
- 1956 State total data
- 1962 County data with standard county codes
- 1962 State total data
- 1962 City data

14. Scammon Election Data from Volumes 1-4 of America Votes: County election data for President, Senator, and Governor. Generally the votes for Republican, Democrat, and "other" are given. The standard county codes are merged with the data.

15. 1960 Congressional District Data Book, Bureau of the Census. Election, population, and demographic information compiled by the Bureau of the Census, but not available from them in machine readable form.

Materials Being Actively Processed into the Archive

The cleaning of data and codes, and keypunching of codebooks are underway.

1. Brookings Institution, Study of Occupa-

tional Values and the Image of the Federal Service. Variables are the values and goals Americans find or try to find in their occupations, and perceptions of the federal government as an employer. Interviewing was conducted during 1960 and early 1961. Interviews were with more than 5,000 persons (unweighted) of various occupational groupings; there are about 20 data cards per respondent. See F. Kilpatrick, M. Cummings, and M.K. Jennings, Source Book of a Study of Occupational Values and the Image of the Federal Service (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1964).

2. Roll Call Records for the United States Senate and House of Representatives: Continental Congress to the Present. Houses and sessions not listed above are being added to the repository. A number of scholars are coding roll calls, to be punched and distributed by the ICPR staff. Coding is according to a standard format and code scheme was developed by the ICPR staff.

3. Historical Election Materials, by County, 1824 to the Present. Using the facilities and resources of state committees, the raw data--on microfilm, handwritten copy, Xeroxed copies, etc.--have been collected and deposited in Ann Arbor for keypunching and processing. These raw data are for the offices of Governor, Senator, Congressman, and President.

For a number of reasons, including cost, the data are being punched in a form not immediately usable by standard computer programs. Data were not recorded in a standard form, so we cannot punch them in a fixed format without considerable delays and increased cost. Rather than try to rearrange the data arrays by hand, we are punching data in the order presented and tagging each field in each data card with special codes indicating what the field is.

Because of the size of this data base and the complexity of its coding, we are preparing to do most processing of the data on an IBM 360, Model 40, to be available to the Consortium during the second quarter of 1967. Some limited servicing from this data will begin late in 1966.

4. Feierabend, Cross National Data Bank of Political Instability Events. (5,000 events, 5,000 cards, 1 card per event). This study is concerned with the

amount of aggression directed by groups and individuals in the prevailing political system against other groups or persons whether they are members or non-members of this same system. The data covers 84 nations over a 15 year interval (1948-1962) and utilizes 28 classes of events to categorize the 5,000 intranational events studied. Data was derived from the Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbooks and Deadline Data on World Affairs. Ivo K. Feierabend "A Note on the Comparative Method"; The Western Political Quarterly, September 1962.

5. The China Study. (1,502 respondents, 4 cards per respondent). This SRC Minor Study conducted in May 1964 contains data on attitudes of Americans toward China.

6. Matthews and Prothro, Negro Political Participation in the South. A study of the changing political position of the Southern Negro. All levels of political involvement are of importance whether voting, demonstrating or evidencing political interest via conversation. The Negroes and Whites sampled were drawn from comparable areas within four representative counties. Sampling and field phases of the project were carried out by the SRC of the University of Michigan. Registration figures, obtained from the United States Civil Rights Commission, Report, were analyzed using multiple correlation and residual analysis with 21 demographic factors as independent variables. An analysis of variance was also carried out which used both political and demographic factors as independent variables. Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro "Political Factors and Negro Voter Registration in the South", American Political Science Review, Vol.57, No.2, June 1963.

7. SRC Panel Study 440: 1956, 1958, 1960 Panel. This study represents an interviewing program across 3 studies i.e. the 1956 Presidential, 1958 Congressional and 1960 Presidential Pre and Post election studies. Three panels are available: 1956-1958, 1958-1960 and 1956-1958-1960.

8. Rummel, Dimensions of Nationality Study. This study is comprised of 3 interrelated but distinct sets of data. The first is an analysis of foreign conflict behavior covering long periods of time. Over 3,000

events such as "border clash", "severance of diplomatic relations" and "threats" have been scored on 236 descriptive variables for 232 nations. The source of the data as well as its reliability have also been coded. The periods of time covered so far, include 1955-1957, 1962-1964, and the first 6 months of 1965, with additional time spans to be added as the data becomes available. The second represents the "raw data" which is made up of 51 domains with 82 nations per domain. The domains represent cultural, social, ethnological, political, agricultural, demographic and other descriptive variables. All data circa 1955. The third data set is derived from the second and represents logarithms and other transforms of the raw data.

9. OCSR Seven Nation Study. A study of teachers' attitudes, in seven Western European countries, toward their occupations, international affairs, and citizen influence over governmental decisions. The director for the coordination of these studies was Eugene H. Jacobson, Michigan State University.

10. National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States. Census of religious membership by county for 1950.

Materials to be Processed into the Archive.

1. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia: The Erie County Study, 1940. These are the data on which Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, The People's Choice. (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1944) was based.

2. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Elmira Study, 1948. Empirical base for Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and McPhee, Voting. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

3. NORC 1948 Election Study. A study based on samples in three states--New York, California, and Illinois.

4. Purdue Opinion Panel, High School Attitudes, 1947-1962. Collected by Professor Remmers of Purdue. The raw data are in storage and will be processed only

on financed request.

5. Historical Census Data. This material is now being gathered for editing and keypunching. The initial archiving effort will focus on the decennial population censuses from 1820 to 1950.

June, 1966

Subject: Progress Report on Collection of Basic Historical Data
for American Politics

From: Howard W. Allen and Jerome M. Clubb

I. PROGRESS OF ELECTION DATA COLLECTION

The following is a summary by major offices of the county election data (1832-1962) in our files as of June 1, 1966.

<u>Office</u>	<u>Percentage of Data Recovered</u>
President	99%
Senate	99%
House of Representatives	95%
Governor	99%

The missing election data are itemized below by office and state:

<u>State</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Governor</u>
Alabama			1874(at large) 1932,1934	1902
Arkansas			1862(CSA), 1864(CSA), 1910	1860
Delaware			1894	
Georgia	1824,1828,1832	1918	1896-1920	1825,1827, 1904-1910
Idaho			1896	
Kentucky		1918	1896-1918, 1932	
Louisiana	1836,1848		1824-1832, 1836,1843, 1845,1861(CSA), 1863(CSA),1864, 1874,1876	

<u>State</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Governor</u>
Maine	1824		1824-1836, 1840-1845, 1850-1858	
Mississippi	1824,1856, 1868,1944		1825-1831, 1835,1839, 1841,1857, 1861(CSA), 1863(CSA), 1888,1890, 1892,1904, 1906,1916	1825-1833
N. Hampshire	1824		1831,1833, 1835,1837, 1843,1880	
New Jersey			1836,1846	
Ohio			1824-1832	
Pennsylvania			1824-1832, 1836,1844, 1846,1848	
Rhode Island			1827,1829	1831
S. Carolina			1824-1841 (partial), 1930	
Tennessee			1863,1886, 1938	1861,1900
Texas			1845	1845,1855
Vermont	1824		1832,1840, 1846,1848, 1850,1852, 1854	
Virginia			1825-1833, 1837,1841, 1845,1861(CSA), 1863,1910	1863

During the past few months our energies have been devoted primarily to locating missing returns; to editing data not already keypunched; and to editing and correcting computer printouts of data that was processed in the past. State chairmen have been asked to search again for missing election returns and in many cases they have managed to supply at least partial returns to close gaps in the data collection. Notices will shortly be published in relevant historical and geneological publications requesting aid in locating missing returns, and it is anticipated that some returns will be found in this way. It appears, however, that at least some of these missing returns no longer exist and that the election data collection is very nearly as complete as possible.

Most of the data in our files has now been edited and keypunched and processing of the remainder will be completed within the next two months. The final editing and correcting of the election data is now in process and a comprehensive annotation for the collection is being prepared. It is not yet possible to predict when election data can be made generally available. Basic computer programs for rapid and economical retrieval of data are not yet fully operational, and since little more than a beginning has been made on the tasks of editing and correcting the data, it is impossible to state when they will be completed.

Plans for publishing the basic election statistics are now relatively firm. John Wiley & Sons has agreed to publish these statistics in ten to twelve volumes, the first of which will probably appear sometime in 1967.

II. CONGRESSIONAL ROLL CALL RECORDS

Roll call records for the following Congresses are now in the archive. It should be noted, however, that these data are in varying states of readiness. The coding system is not consistent for all Congresses, and codebooks identifying roll calls are not yet in machine-readable form.

<u>Senate</u>	<u>House</u>
19th Congress (1825-1827)	19th Congress
20th Congress (1827-1829)	20th Congress
21st Congress (1829-1831)	21st Congress
22nd Congress (1831-1833)	22nd Congress
23rd Congress (1833-1835)	23rd Congress
24th Congress (1st session only 1835-1836)	24th Congress (1st session only)
55th Congress (1897-1899)	55th Congress
56th Congress (1899-1901)	56th Congress
61st Congress (1909-1911)	
62nd Congress (1911-1913)	
63rd Congress (1913-1915)	

<u>Senate</u>	<u>House</u>
67th Congress (1921-1923)	
68th Congress (1923-1925)	
79th Congress (2nd session only 1946)	79th Congress (1945-1947)
80th Congress (1947-1949)	80th Congress
81st Congress (1949-1951)	81st Congress
82nd Congress (1951-1953)	82nd Congress
83rd Congress (1953-1955)	83rd Congress
84th Congress (1955-1957)	84th Congress
85th Congress (1957-1959)	85th Congress
86th Congress (1959-1961)	86th Congress
87th Congress (1961-1963)	87th Congress
88th Congress (1963-1965)	88th Congress

III. HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The process of locating, cataloguing and selecting demographic data for inclusion in the archives has been started, and basic computer formats for these data have been prepared. In selecting demographic data the general guide lines provided by the Report of the Conference on Historical Demographic Data at Fels Institute, The University of Pennsylvania, October 16, 1964 have been followed. The actual conversion of this material to machine-readable form will begin within the next two months.

May, 1966

Submitted to: American Historical Association

COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL STATISTICS: A PROPOSAL

SUMMARY PARAGRAPH

The American Historical Association, on the advice of its Standing Committee on National Aid to Historical Research, requests support to begin a very major collection of comparative historical statistics. The ultimate goal is the creation of primary research resources of data which can be processed, stored, retrieved and manipulated by the newer generation of electronic computers, and thereby harnessed for full intellectual use. In the course of assembling and processing the data, one or more major compendia of historical statistics should be published and an ancillary bibliography of other statistics not in the archive will be compiled. Both of these activities, however, will be undertaken to facilitate a large-scale international collaboration in creating a computer-oriented archive of economic, political and social statistics for comparative historical research.

Some research needs can be met quite effectively by money and organization; others can not. Of those that can, the most pressing is to put the computer at the service of historians. By manipulating statistics on an entirely new scale, the computer is quite evidently going to produce a revolutionary extension in the range and character of historical knowledge. For one thing, historians will be able to make increasingly sophisticated comparisons over time and space. Since the right statistics not only enhance greatly the reliability of comparative statements but also suggest fresh hypotheses, historical inquiry can gain in breadth as well as precision.

Much of the problem for the traditional historical scholar is to secure access to relevant and genuinely comparable statistical series without having to expend an amount of effort that would defeat his other aims. In order to serve the widest variety of prospective demands, a beginning should be made at three different levels of codification and refinement:

- 1) There should be published one or more general compendia of historical statistics, giving the best available demographic, economic, and political data for regular intervals in the history of all major countries and all periods of their development. Such a work should not attempt anything like the volume of data achieved in the Census Bureau's Historical Statistics of the United States (1960), but a similar effort at consistency and comparability would be essential. Thus, these volumes would (a) bring together in a way that invites comparisons data already somewhere in print, and (b) provide in footnotes some analysis of the reliability of individual series.

- 2) For purposes that go beyond the basic statistics described above and below, an extensive bibliography of other historical statistics should be compiled. During the past century, many individual scholars, business

corporations, and governmental agencies have worked out statistical tables of a historical nature for specific purposes. If their existence were known, these tables might be invaluable to scholars with very different interests. What is needed, therefore, is a well-indexed, classified guide to selected series of statistics available in certain categories of primary and secondary sources. Presumably this bibliography might be published in segments after a working pattern and priorities are established (e.g., "Guide to Historical Statistics on International Relations and Trade Since 1000 A.D.").

3) Both of the above projects will help to prepare the way for a centralized historical data bank, capable of storing and processing information and answering questions submitted by any authorized researcher. With the aid of substantial funds from the National Science Foundation, a beginning has been made in the area of American political history by the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research working under the aegis of the Survey Research Center of The University of Michigan. It has established machine control over large categories of voting statistics and census data for the United States since 1824. The Consortium is currently extending the data base of their archives into the 18th Century and into other content domains. The ultimate goal of the present proposal is to create a similar resource for comparative research by facilitating a truly massive, international collaboration in computerizing historical statistics.

PROPOSED PROCEDURES FOR THE CREATION AND UTILIZATION OF
AN ARCHIVE OF HISTORICAL STATISTICS

Scope of Archival Development

An early and continuing task will be that of defining the scope of the data collection. Attempts to fix boundaries at the beginning of the project would run the extreme risk of establishing premature and inappropriate limits on the final utility of the collection. At the same time, the failure to create some firm guide lines would invite capricious growth and would suggest an unsupportable appetite for unlimited funding of an unending project. The guiding principle of archival development we propose to follow is that of responding to the active needs of the research community. Rejection of the concept of unqualified, general purpose development will, in this instance, mean commitment instead to incremental growth in accord with priorities set in consultation with the widest possible range of research scholars. With a schedule of priorities in view and subject to continual reassessment, funding for each increment can be evaluated on professional grounds. The disposition of each specific case need not jeopardize other developments nor lead to commitments that overextend available resources. Growth may continue as long as the additional investment of resources seems justified by the probable research product. The ultimate dimensions of the data collection will be determined by the course of on going research activity over the years.

Caution must be exercised to prevent an unduly conservative posture from stifling innovative research that does not carry an iron-clad guarantee of success. The enterprise must also be protected against serving a too narrow set of research interests. Initial priorities will be set through a series of conferences and by extended consultation with interested research

scholars. Continuing surveillance will be provided through the organizational mechanisms to be described below.

Sources and Collaborative Support for Archival Growth

Archival development provides classic proof of the axiom that information is only acquired at a cost. The best current strategies of data acquisition seek a balance between the theoretical importance of a data set and the costs entailed in acquiring it and converting it to a form amenable to wide and efficient use. Such costs can vary across an astonishing range for data sets that are quite equivalent in sheer size, since many important sets have already been partially resurrected and given modern organization by recent scholars, and hence can be acquired with a minimum of further effort. Indeed, where foreign historical data are concerned, our current proposal has become viable in no small measure through the recent rapid growth of data archives in several foreign countries. Important sets and series of data have, of course, been generated by various American scholars and research organizations. These will obviously be plumbed for their contribution to the archive. The wider set of materials will, however, be sought through contact with foreign colleagues and their respective national institutions. (See Appendix A, especially pages 100-106.)

A variety of considerations, including serious concerns of international relations and a regard for personal and professional relationships with colleagues abroad, dictates an immediate investment in fostering close working relationships with our foreign counterparts. We have assurances of strong mutual interest already developed in some quarters. In other instances there is every prospect of generating enthusiastic collaboration. In many cases it is clear that some additional support for efforts already

underway will pay handsome dividends and result in marked efficiencies for our own work. Once again, the confluence of archival developments already well along in the United States will give the present project invaluable support and permit it to move more rapidly, more efficiently, with greater promise and less cost than would any similar effort less fortunately situated.

Acquisition of Data

Data will be acquired in at least four forms. Where desired data are already incorporated in computer-oriented archives in machine readable form, acquisition and incorporation in the proposed archive may be very straightforward. In some cases, however, we must be prepared to make a substantial additional investment to reformat and reorganize the data so that processing is compatible with the overall design for the archive. In the second instance, data may be acquired as published material. In such cases some substantial processing will usually be necessary to permit integrated incorporation in the archives. The third form in which data will be found will be the familiar manuscript or hand copied document. Here we may expect larger problems of verification and documentation as well as the common problems of transformation to machine readable format. Finally, we may commission the creation of data collections by foreign colleagues who possess special expertise or who have appropriate facilities for generating data in the desired form.

Technical problems of data format aside, the most efficient acquisition of data will depend on our ability to command a wide range of talent and cooperation. Where there is a choice among alternate data sources we must have access to disinterested but informed professional counsel. When a

set of data is being sought there must be assurance it does not exist before we commission a reconstruction of the set. Where alternate avenues for acquisition are present, decisions must be based on the fullest possible information about the alternatives. The array of persons and organizations involved in data acquisition will doubtless be more limited than the constituency of archive users, but the now-familiar problems of large scale acquisition suggest the importance of direct participation in the project on the part of an organization that has all available information and experience at its command.

Processing of Data

The very concept of this proposal, no less than the prospect for successful implementation, rests on the existence of modern computer technology and on the existence of appropriate organizations capable of supplying the technology to realize our objectives. A detailed discussion of the principles and particulars of the data processing methods that will be used will not be presented in the body of this proposal. Appendix B suggests the way in which processing, storage and retrieval will be organized.

It is appropriate, however, to sketch out the general nature of the task here. The sheer existence of computer hardware and software generally appropriate to the task of developing and maintaining an archive devoted to serving a community of research scholars is obviously necessary, but it is not sufficient. The archive, even while still in the process of acquiring additional data, will be a carefully devised system for handling data from the input of raw material to the output of complex combinations of data and computations based on data. It will be capable of transforming

large and extremely heterogeneous masses of data into data suitable for close, comparative analysis. This clearly implies professional as well as technical personnel equipped to make judgments and decisions that will not diminish the utility of data while accommodating them to the requirements of the computer. Equally vital is the capacity to respond to the varied and complex needs of research scholars who will present a diverse array of interests conditioned by a wide variety of methodological postures. If reasonable efficiency is to be achieved in meeting the needs of the relevant research community, innovative work in the development of appropriate information retrieval systems must be undertaken and completed. Systems of data management must be tailored to the nature of the data and to the style of their use. Analytic procedures for summarizing, transforming and evaluating data in accord with the researchers' needs must be an integral part of the system. In short, the archive must be the meeting place where the nature of the data, the nature of the computer and the nature of the scholar are reconciled to the benefit of the scholar and without detriment to the data.

Training in Data Analysis

The entire enterprise described up to this point can be carried out successfully and still fail unless those for whom it is intended can make use of it. Another important consideration making this proposal timely and appropriate lies in the existence of relevant opportunities for training scholars in the modes of analysis made possible by the computer oriented archive. The specialized training program sponsored by the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research has responded to the needs of historians and increasing numbers of advanced graduate students and faculty members are learning the workways of the new technology. (See Appendix C.)

Support for advanced training in methods and techniques of quantitative analysis is currently provided by a number of agencies, including such private organizations as IBM, governmental agencies such as NSF and academic sources including the universities and the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research. Adequate funding is relatively certain for the next two years, but a major increase in demand for training and a necessary elaboration of the training particularly for historians are both predictable and will be anticipated in the work of those involved in this project.

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION FOR ARCHIVAL DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE

Following the decision to pursue the undertaking outlined in this proposal, officers of the American Historical Association and members of the sponsoring Committee on National Aid to Historical Research explored possible means of carrying out a project of such large dimensions. As we have indicated, the project clearly depends on the existence, or the creation, of an organization able to sustain many interrelated activities over a substantial period of time. The Inter-university Consortium for Political Research seems well suited to our needs and we have concluded mutually satisfactory discussions with representatives of the Consortium. (See Appendix D) We would now propose that, in the event of a favorable response to this request for support, Professor Warren E. Miller, Executive Director of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research should be designated as the principal investigator and the Consortium should be charged with the responsibility for carrying out the work. The American Historical Association would be represented at all times by an officially designated advisory committee, most probably a special subcommittee of the Committee

on National Aid for Historical Research. The advisory committee will be responsible for authorizing all major policy decisions taken in the course of the project.

The alternative to commissioning the work by an organization such as the Consortium is not attractive. The task of recruiting a staff with the necessary professional, technical and administrative skills would be difficult. It would be even more difficult to provide such a staff with the requisite administrative facilities and with an appropriate computer installation unless sums very much larger than those included in the present proposal were added to it. Put more positively, the Consortium is already in existence as an "academic organization...committed to the several objectives of an inter-disciplinary, inter-university research and training facility. These include:

- 1) creating an archive of multi-purpose data that will serve a variety of research and training needs;
- 2) developing computer-oriented systems of data management and information retrieval designed to maximize the utility of data archives for the individual scholar;
- 3) developing training programs shaped to enable scholars to make optimal use of the archival data;
- 4) providing a staff of professional and technical personnel to achieve these primary objectives; and
- 5) supporting cooperative efforts to expand the total set of resources through the development of other major data archives and centers for training and research."

Consortium membership is now held by more than seventy universities. In many of the member institutions personnel from departments of history are already participating through use of the archival resources and the Consortium training program. The Consortium's commitment to the support of historical research antedates the preparation of this proposal by at least

three years and was, indeed, partially responsible for the thinking and discussions that led to the present proposal. The interests that history and political science share in comparative research simply add to the Consortium's enthusiasm for the proposed project. Moreover it should be noted that the Consortium has demonstrated its ability as well as its desire to work in close collaboration with the historians. Its major archival investment in American historical statistics was stimulated by the AHA ad hoc Committee to Collect the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History and that committee has played a major role in establishing the priorities for acquisition which, in turn, have determined archival content in that domain.

Planning for Archival Acquisitions

The AHA advisory committee would make its largest contribution in the earliest stages of the project. It would be responsible for ascertaining research needs and assisting the Consortium staff in setting priorities for the acquisition of data. It would also be expected to play a major role in locating sources for data. Perhaps much after the pattern set for the collection of American statistics, the committee would be responsible for obtaining widespread cooperation among American historians and archivists who have special knowledge about the location of needed data. (See Appendix E) Members of the committee would also be expected to work with the Consortium staff in establishing relationships with foreign scholars and foreign sources of data.

A first opportunity for formal contact in Europe will be provided by a UNESCO-ISSC sponsored conference on ecological archives which is to be held in Evian, France during the second week in September this year. The Consortium will be represented by Professor Miller, his colleague Professor

Philip E. Converse, and by Mr. Ralph Bisco who is Data Processing Section Head for the Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan and Director of the Technical Services Staff of the Consortium. Miller and Bisco are also members of the International Social Science Council Standing Committee on Social Science Data Archives. The Evian conference and subsequent conferences called by the International Social Science Council group would provide optimal occasions for AHA and Consortium personnel to further the collection of data for comparative historical research. Such ventures may be approached with optimism because of the demonstrated mutual interest of most of the European data archives in the creation of resources for comparative research.

Archival Development

The subsequent and continuing tasks of processing data for incorporation in the archive and of developing the data management, retrieval and analysis systems would fall largely to the Consortium staff. As the budget indicates, however, their current experience with the American historical data suggests the wisdom of adding one or more historians as ad hoc members to their regular staff in order to have often needed professional expertise readily at hand. Such staff personnel would doubtless be recruited with the assistance of the AHA advisory committee and could be expected to strengthen the ties between the evolving data resources and the historians who make up the constituency of potential users.

Although this proposal does not contemplate major work with any organization other than the Consortium, it should be noted that any ultimate goal for historical research comprehending all regions of the globe through even recent centuries would clearly demand a division of the labor among many archives. We have been assured that a subsequent extension of this project

to other interested archives, were they to appear, would be thoroughly consonant with the Consortium's interests. Indeed, in the interim the Consortium would expect to make every effort to enlist the support and assistance of other American archives in pursuing the immediate objectives of this proposal. Cooperation might be expected in a number of specialized areas, drawing on the experience of such groups as the Yale Data Program, the Survey Research Center at Berkeley, or the Wisconsin Social Systems Research Institute.

Access to Data

Upon completion of each sequence of archival work, the Consortium would expect to make the data available for rediffusion to other archives as well as through its own service section. Data would be disseminated to other archives at cost of reproduction and transmission. Individual scholars could obtain data and data processing services from the Consortium in accord with their established procedures.

Publication of Data

The Consortium is currently preparing the American historical election statistics for publication in a major fifteen volume series. A contract with Wiley-Interscience will make this possible on a standard commercial basis without subvention. The Consortium has agreed to carry out similar plans for the core materials produced by this proposal. Although it is impossible to predict the feasibility of publications plans at this remove, successful experience with the American series would undoubtedly enhance the opportunity for publication of comparative data. In any event it should be noted that standard procedures of documentation for machine readable data will insure the availability of all the ancillary information that would be needed for the annotation of published statistics.

Appendix F: Proposed Budget

The following estimates reflect Consortium experience over the past three years of similar activity. The estimates attempt to match a probable level of production among the various sources of data with a feasible expansion of present Consortium capabilities. If European archival development, and the subsequent availability of data, moves more rapidly than expected, the rate of Consortium activity should also increase, and an extension of the budget might be necessary before the end of the three-year period. Experience both in the United States and abroad suggests, however, that the proposed budget represents a reasonable estimate for the innovative activities involved.

	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
A. <u>SALARIES</u>			
<u>Senior Personnel:</u>			
Principal Investigator ^(a)			
Warren E. Miller, ICPR, 1/3 time	\$ 9,500	\$ 10,750	\$ 12,000
Senior historian, full-time equivalent for consultation and supervision ^(b)	17,500	20,000	23,000
Gregory Marks, ICPR, Asst. Dir. of Technical Services, 1/3 time	<u>3,000</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>4,500</u>
	\$ 30,000	\$ 34,750	\$ 39,500
<u>Other Personnel:</u> ^(a)			
Research Assistant for biblio- graphic work, full time	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,500	\$ 9,000
Data Processing, including editors and keypunchers ^(c)	7,000	21,000	30,500
System Development, including programmers @ average of \$8,500	<u>15,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>
	\$ 30,000	\$ 39,500	\$ 49,500
B. EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	\$ 5,000
C. DATA ACQUISITION	\$ 25,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 50,000
D. STAFF TRAVEL FOR CONFERENCES, CONSULTATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	\$ 7,500	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000

- continued -

	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>
E. CONFERENCE EXPENSE, NON-STAFF TRAVEL AND PER DIEM	\$ 9,500	\$ 7,000	\$ 5,000
F. INDIRECT COSTS @ 46 PER CENT OF SALARIES, INCLUDING FRINGE BENEFITS ^(c)	<u>\$ 27,500</u>	<u>\$ 34,200</u>	<u>\$ 41,000</u>
Subtotal	\$134,000	\$159,950	\$195,000
G. COST SHARING CONTRIBUTION BY GRANTEE @ 5 PER CENT OF TOTAL ^(d)	<u>\$ 6,700</u>	<u>\$ 8,000</u>	<u>\$ 9,750</u>
Net sum requested	\$127,300	\$151,950	\$185,250
<u>Total request:</u>	\$464,500		

- (a) Fringe benefits are included in the salary figures.
- (b) A number of different individuals may occupy this position, varying with institutional and substantive changes occurring during the project.
- (c) The figure for 1968-69 includes \$15,000 for preparation of data for publication; the reduction in the residual sum reflects anticipated access by the Consortium to the necessary computer installation in that year.
- (d) Indirect costs and cost sharing figures reflect current policy of the Consortium parent institution, The University of Michigan.

Application to the National Science Foundation
for Funds for Supplementary Support of a Sp^cialized
Facility for Social Science Research

Title: Data Acquisitions for the Inter-
university Consortium for Political
Research Data Repository

Period: January 1, 1967 to December 31, 1968

Amount requested from NSF: \$272,365

Date submitted: July 19, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proposal

- APPENDIX A: Data Acquisitions for the Inter-university Consortium
for Political Research Data Repository (NSF Grant GS 881)
- APPENDIX B: Progress Report on Collection of Basic Historical Data
for American Politics
- APPENDIX C: List of Official Representatives to the ICPR
- APPENDIX D: Inventory Use of Archival Facilities
- APPENDIX E: Data Analysis Projects, Consortium Summer Training
Program
- APPENDIX F: Report on Research Conference on Political Data:
Historical Analysis of Quantitative Data
- APPENDIX G: Listing of Specific Requests for Historical Data
Received Before July 1, 1966

Summary

With the beginning of the second year of work under the terms of NSF Grant GS881, the need for additional support, even beyond that originally requested, is evident. The grant proposal, submitted in February, 1965, requested a total of \$375,385 for the development of data archive resources by the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research. The funds were to be expended over a three-year period from July 1965 to early 1968, with expenditures to be disproportionately high in the first stages of work. The proposal was approved in the amount of \$260,400 for a period of approximately 24 months. Under the initial schedule of expenditures, we would have expected to exhaust funds in this amount well before the end of the second year of the grant. The rate of expenditure in fact ran approximately 15 percent above these expectations. The need for an extension of funds in the course of this second year is therefore most pressing.

Moreover, the experience of the past year has exposed a number of errors in the estimates on which the original proposal budgets were based. Some of the errors turned out to be mutually compensating, but others make clear the need for supplementary funds over and above the original request.

Finally, the continuing proliferation of interest among potential users of the archive argues strongly for an extension of the scope of the project. The arbitrary date of 1824 bounding the beginning of the collection now being completed, reflects little more than the particular substantive research interests of those historians most actively engaged in the earlier phases of our archive development activity. More recent

contact with research scholars interested in the formation of new nations, the origins of political parties and other problems associated with late 18th and early 19th century American history suggests the need to explore the feasibility of extending systematic data resources to the period prior to 1824.

This proposal seeks funds to permit completion of the work specified in the original request and to support an exploration of the costs of extending the work to cover the earlier historical period. With the exception of the latter objective (a very minor exception in terms of needed funds), this proposal is concerned entirely and exclusively with budgetary changes needed to pursue the original set of objectives described, explained and justified in the original request, attached to this proposal as Appendix A. Consequently, we will proceed to describe the request by identifying the desired extensions and supplementations of funds with the initial budgetary and functional allocations of the original proposal. Given the change in the mode of identifying and computing indirect costs, we will, unless otherwise noted, make comparisons in direct cost figures only. In these terms, a summary of this request is as follows:

1. Remainder of direct cost funds requested in original proposal but not granted	\$ 94,460
2. Extension to cover unanticipated increased costs	110,765
3. Supplement to permit exploration of costs of extending the project	8,000
Total requested for direct cost support	<hr/> \$213,225

After computing the indirect costs of the project and taking into account the University of Michigan contribution to cost sharing, the

total amount requested is \$272,365. In accord with the original time table, these funds would be expended over the two years 1966-67 and 1967-68. All of the objectives of the original grant would be met by the expiration of this period.

Progress report

Work begun in 1964 and supported by NSF Grants GS528 and GS881 is proceeding on schedule. With the requested funds in hand, all of the specified election returns and the core set of census data should be fully available for use in 1968 as indicated in the proposal for GS881.

One major administrative task of the past year has been achieving a balance among three phases of the activity: data acquisition, data preparation, and keypunching. The first and third operations have moved much more swiftly than anticipated and have created severe problems for the staff of historians and their assistants. Our original estimates of the sheer amount of data embraced by the defined limits for the archive proved to be quite wrong. In particular we had underestimated the amount of pertinent census data. Fortunately, the error was discovered early as unexpectedly easy access to data sources resulted in a very fast tempo of data acquisition.

The error in estimating the sheer bulk of the data to be processed might have proved even more serious had we not also underestimated the production speed of keypunching. Early trial runs with experienced keypunchers who were, nevertheless, not accustomed to handling large quantities of tabular material led to this underestimation. By maintaining a reasonably stable staff that rapidly acquired great expertise in this

demanding but routine job, the productivity rate was raised to unexpectedly high levels in the past year and the per unit cost dropped appropriately.

The ready availability of data to be processed, and the demand created by the speed of keypunching, found us grossly understaffed for the intermediate steps. The continuing heavy influx of data created a need for a more efficient filing system for the raw data. The heterogeneity of published and manuscript data sources also created a very substantial job of editing material before it was sent to the keypunchers. Even though we had amended our early plans and had shifted substantial resources to the staff of professional historians by early January, the necessary hand processing of the original data records proved a bottleneck until a junior staff was added to double the number of man hours available.

With the ongoing experience of the past year very much with us, it is hard to recapture the assumptions that led us to make so little provision for professional and sub-professional personnel. During the past six months the two senior professional historians now on the staff have been working 70- and 80-hour weeks as a matter of regular routine. We plan to use only one of the two in a full-time capacity over the next two years, but he will be supported by a substantial junior professional staff and it is clear that this is no more than a minimal provision now tailored to the pace of the other phases of the archival development activity. On the other hand, the adjustments of the staff of senior and junior historians did allow us to redeem our expectations concerning data processing involving the Consortium Technical Services staff.

A second major problem encountered in the first year of work under GS881 resulted first from a change in performance specifications of the smaller models of the IBM 360 computer series and then from a major delay in the anticipated delivery date for a new machine. Inasmuch as the historical archive data must be organized for processing on the new computer, that organization has been delayed by the postponement in delivery of the computer. With the computer grant from NSF now in hand, we expect that delivery will occur on or about March 31, 1967.

In the meantime, the staff has been deeply involved in intensive training for the IBM 360 Model 40. There has been extended participation in formal IBM training sessions as well as in seminars and planning sessions organized by our own staff members. In many ways the delay has simply permitted us to be better prepared to utilize the new hardware once it is installed. From another perspective, however, we are now behind schedule in the actual preparation of programs to accommodate some of the problems that must be resolved in the course of responding to requests for historical data. Three topics, in particular, will be on our agenda for the next two years with the same commitment of manpower as was projected in the original grant proposal. These topics are: organization of data by spatial as well as temporal coordinates, identification of interpretive problems posed by boundary changes for the units by which the data are recorded, and techniques for handling so-called missing data problems. The latter problem has already received serious attention by staff members interested in formal mathematical techniques, but the derivation of optional solutions and their translation into workable computer programs is now scheduled for the next two years.

At one point we had concluded that the delay in the delivery of the new computer would necessarily also mean an equal delay in our ability to begin responding to the growing file of requests for historical data. It is now clear that this need not be the case if we are willing to accept a small long-term loss in exchange for the short-run ability to use the 7090 during the next year. A very major portion of the program development needed to enable us to process data on the 7090 would be used when we move over to the 360/40. We estimate that about 75 percent of the investment would be transferable, with the remaining quarter (of some \$14,000 needed) lost with the change in hardware. The \$3500 at stake would mean having the ability to handle many requests by September, 1966 rather than waiting until June, 1967.

The third set of problems that were not entirely appreciated in the original proposal has to do with the complexity of the data and their sources--particularly on the side of the election data. For example, early advice that we should be prepared to code and keep track of perhaps 100 different political parties has been replaced by our knowledge that there may have been as many as 800 different party labels used over the past 140 years. The documentation of candidates and parties has thus been a larger task for the historians than we had expected. Related or similar problems have not had a major budgetary consequence but they have added to the burdens of the professional staff members.

Finally, we should report on the disposition of two minor objectives specified in the original proposal. We have decided not to process data for the fifth political office that was described as a

"second state office." Many returns are now in hand for elections of Secretary of State, Attorney General, Lieutenant Governor and the like. There is, however, no consensus as to which of these should be added to the four major offices we are covering (President, U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives and Governor). Rather than risk funds that would be used to archive data that might well languish unused, we are prepared to continue to acquire such data but make them available only on special request where the potential user can pay for the special purpose processing involved.

We have also decided to discontinue for the time being further efforts to process minor civil division data. A major investment of manpower and computer resources was devoted to the topic last year. Using the needs of the summer conference on quantitative methods in historical analysis as a strategic opportunity, we pursued the collection of MCD data for Wisconsin at the turn of the century. Even though we were fortunate in securing the services of a number of skilled and diligent historians, and even though we detailed some of our best computer programmer talent to work on the project, over \$10,000 was spent on personnel and machine time without producing a usable end product. Every problem of name spelling, name change, boundary change, or missing data encountered in the county data was magnified many times by the state of the records of the MCD data. Moreover, the very large number of units involved, even at a single point in time, argues that a colossal investment would be needed for a definitive assault on the problem.

The experience did not suggest any diminution of the importance of the objective of obtaining information on units smaller and more

homogeneous than the county. It did suggest that the cost of a comprehensive frontal attack on the problem doubtless outweighs the relative rewards. We expect to add MCD materials to the archive as individual scholars develop them. We would not expect such piecemeal acquisition ever to approach comprehensive coverage; the data added to the universe each election are assuredly many times more numerous than the data recovered every two years by individual scholarly effort. Our own conclusion is that greater efforts should be turned toward the derivation of approximate solutions to the problem through mathematical models.

The preparation of this supplementary request has provided the occasion for a detailed review of original expectations and subsequent accomplishments. Despite a number of missteps borne of our lack of experience with some aspects of the project, we are only slightly behind schedule in moving toward the major objectives. With the exceptions noted above, we have not had cause to question the technical or administrative feasibility of the project. The cost is visibly greater than we had estimated, but even with the addition of the needed funds the total investment still seems well in line with the expected value of the final product.

Use of Archival Resources

The archival activities of the Consortium rest on the thesis that behavioral science data resources must be created on a scale commensurate with the scope and complexities of the problems that define behavioral scientists' research interests. Given the almost total

absence of prior institutional commitments to the generation of such resources for political research, the thesis, by implication, calls for a massive investment in the creation of data archives. The basic thesis also assumes that a large constituency of scholars eagerly awaits the new data and will proceed to make use of them on a scale that will redeem the investment in their creation.

At the same time, there is little question but that those who might use the data customarily have not been given the professional and technical training so necessary for the exploitation of quantitative materials. Therefore, the program of the Consortium has also proceeded on the assumption that training in the methods of quantitative research must precede or at least accompany the development of data resources. As yet, with the Consortium training program only in its fourth year, it is too early to know with assurance whether that program is indeed transferring latent interest into active research using the data.

However, given the very large sums that have been used to generate massive additions to the Consortium archives, and given the magnitude of the present request, it is not too early to be concerned with the question of who is actually going to make use of the data. One indirect answer is provided by the continued growth of Consortium membership. From the beginning, access to data has been one of the most tangible benefits of association with the Consortium. In innumerable discussions with prospective participants, and no less with their departmental chairmen and deans, the vision of new and unique data resources has been the idea most readily communicated and most enthusi-

astically received. Certainly the mounting enthusiasm of the historians has been fed by the thought that the Consortium is endeavoring to do once and for all the immense clerical and computational task of organizing data, a task that otherwise would continue to drain the energies and time of each individual scholar. (See Appendix B)

In any event, as of July 1, 1966, some 73 colleges and universities have assumed the continuing obligations of Consortium members. As the appended list indicates (Appendix C), the roster includes undergraduate colleges and developing institutions as well as virtually all of the universities of national rank. If our record of past experience is a reliable guide, almost every one, including the newest and least well-prepared members, will make some use of the data archives over the next twelve months.

As our recent proposal for support for the new computer facility detailed, the volume of data processing in response to requests from established members has grown exponentially over each of the past three years. During the twelve months of calendar 1965, the Technical Services staff distributed over 4,000,000 data cards or card images (on tape) along with more than 300,000 pages of computer printout. This was almost exactly double the output of 1964 and quadruple the volume of activity in 1963. However, even with the continuing growth of membership, we do not expect these figures to continue to rise, certainly not at the recent rate. This is so at least in part because of the growth of local data facilities at member schools. More and more often the Consortium supplies the basic files of data and thereafter the local facility handles the data processing. Each new data

set added to the archives thereafter produces a single request for the basic data from each such member school, but the subsequent data processing done by the Consortium staff is limited to a fraction of the total use being made of the data.

Thus far, of course, our experience is almost entirely confined to that part of the archive created two and three years ago. The record of use is the return on the initial NSF investment in Grant GS204 and from the continuing Consortium operating budget support for acquisition of major studies and data collections. The appended "Inventory (of) Use of Archival Facilities" (Appendix D) provides our most current summary of use of these data across the nation. The inventory was completed only by schools that have been affiliated with the Consortium for some time. It appears that in this group of schools, very heavy use of data is now made in both undergraduate and graduate courses. It is also clear that despite a good record of use in completed research articles, monographs and books, the lag in adapting to the use of new resources is only now being eliminated as many more participants have research in progress using Consortium data.

The data are also heavily used in the Consortium training program. In 1965, some 90 participants, students and faculty members, carried out more or less major pieces of data analysis. This year, with an even larger enrollment, we expect between 120 and 150 participants to gain research experience through use of the data in analysis projects. In both years, as the appended memorandum on Analysis Projects indicates (Appendix E), the first sets of aggregative historical data were used. In addition, the special seminar for historians in 1965 was the occasion

for some thirty participants to make use of the Northwest Territory data. A very large volume of preparatory data processing involving the expenditure of more than \$20,000 for personnel and machine time made these data the focus of a major portion of that seminar and available for subsequent use in research projects. (See Appendix F)

Beyond making this limited set of data available at an early date, we have been most explicit in responding to inquiries by saying that we do not expect any general release of historical data prior to late 1966. Despite this retentive posture, and certainly with no publicity indicating that data are available, a steady stream of specific requests is being received from those who have heard informally about the developmental activity underway. The appended list of these requests (Appendix G) provides another substantial indication we may expect extended use of the resources pertinent to this proposal.

Request for renewal and extension of support

This request could be considered to have three parts: 1) an extension to cover the balance of the original proposal (\$94,460), 2) a supplement to cover increased costs and inadequacies in the original proposal (\$110,765), and 3) new funding relevant to a possible expansion of the project (\$8,000). The total sum needed is thus \$213,225. Given the interrelationship of the first two parts, it seems simplest to present first a single amendment to highlight the major changes proposed for the original project budget. To this end we will first present two budget pages. The first page will contain a new proposed total three-year budget, the second page will present each proposed

change in budgetary allocation. The sum of all the proposed changes is \$118,765--the total of the second and third items above. The changes in the budget for 1965-66 reflect actual expenditures already made. The total estimated expenditure for 1965-66 (\$172,750) in direct costs is well within the current grant (\$218,255 for direct costs) but it is, as noted earlier, higher than expected.

Following a brief additional discussion of the major reallocations, a proposed request for a supplementary budget of \$213,225 in direct costs will be presented. Each item in the requested budget will be specified as the difference between the sum budgeted for the two years of 1966-67 and 1967-68 and the sum estimated as available from the remainder of GS881 as of July 1, 1966.

Finally, a complete budget, including the respective contributions to cost sharing, will be presented as the basis for the total request of \$272,365.

DATA ACQUISITIONS FOR THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR
POLITICAL RESEARCH DATA REPOSITORY:
Budget Revision, June 1966

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
A. <u>SALARIES</u>				
<u>Senior Personnel:</u>				
1) Program Director ($\frac{1}{2}$ time, first year only	\$ 5,300			
2) Research Associate: Co-Director of Data Recovery (full time)	11,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 13,500	
3) Research Associate: Co-Director, one year	6,000	3,000	3,000	
4) Director of Technical Services ($\frac{1}{2}$ time for each of 2 years, $\frac{1}{2}$ time for third year)	<u>6,250</u>	<u>7,000</u>	<u>3,750</u>	
	\$ 29,050	\$ 22,500	\$ 20,250	\$ 71,800
<u>Other Personnel:</u>				
1) Assistant Study Director (Assistant to Director of Data Recovery, 2/3 time)	4,500	4,750	5,000	
2) Programmers (varying full- time equivalents @ an average of \$7,000)	22,500	20,000	16,500	
3) Key-punchers (varying full- time equivalents @ \$4,100)	22,500	24,000	22,500	
4) Secretary to Director of Data Recovery (full time)	4,500	5,000	5,250	
5) Clerical Assistance	8,000	14,200	11,200	
6) Secretary to Technical Services ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)	2,500			
7) Technical Assistance (hourly)	<u>3,000</u>	<u>2,500</u>	<u>2,000</u>	
	\$ 67,500	\$ 70,450	\$ 62,450	\$200,400
<u>Fringe Benefits</u>	11,600	11,155	9,925	<u>32,680</u>
				\$304,880
B. <u>EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES</u>	29,600	15,000	12,500	57,100
C. <u>TRAVEL</u>				
1) Domestic	3,000	10,500	1,500	15,000
D. <u>OTHER</u>				
1) Computer time and machine rental	<u>32,000</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>7,500</u>	<u>54,500</u>
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	\$172,750	\$147,105	\$111,625	\$431,480
Indirect Costs (20% of Direct)	<u>28,150</u>	<u>24,680</u>	<u>21,710</u>	<u>74,540</u>
TOTAL	\$200,900	\$160,580	\$133,260	\$494,740

DATA ACQUISITIONS FOR THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR
POLITICAL RESEARCH DATA REPOSITORY:
Modifications of Original Proposed Budget

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
A. <u>SALARIES</u>				
<u>Senior Personnel:</u>				
1) Program Director ($\frac{1}{2}$ time, first year only)	+\$5,300			
2) Research Associate: Co-Director of Data Recovery (full time)		+\$12,500	+\$13,500	
3) Research Associate: Co-Director, one year	+ 6,000	+ 3,000	+ 3,000	
4) Director of Technical Services ($\frac{1}{2}$ time for each of 2 years, $\frac{1}{2}$ time for third year)	+ 1,200	+ 1,500	- 2,250	
				<u>+\$ 43,800</u>
<u>Other Personnel:</u>				
1) Assistant Study Director (Assistant to Director of Data Recovery, $\frac{2}{3}$ time)	- 4,500	- 4,750	+ 5,000	
2) Programmers (varying full-time equivalents @ an average of \$7,000)	+ 7,500	+ 2,500	+ 3,000	
3) Key punchers (varying full-time equivalents @ \$4,100)	- 5,800	- 6,000	-17,500	
4) Secretary to Director of Data Recovery (full time)	+ 2,000		+ 250	
5) Clerical Assistance	+ 8,000	+14,200	+11,200	
6) Secretary to Technical Services ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)		- 2,500	- 2,500	
7) Technical Assistance (hourly)	+ 1,935	+ 1,625	+ 1,275	
				<u>+\$ 14,935</u>
<u>Fringe Benefits</u>	+ 2,615	+ 2,650	+ 1,795	
				<u>+\$ 7,060</u>
B. <u>EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES</u>	+19,600	+ 5,000	+ 5,000	
				<u>+\$ 29,600</u>
C. <u>TRAVEL</u>				
1) Domestic	+ 500	+ 8,000		
				<u>+\$ 8,500</u>
D. <u>OTHER</u>				
1) Computer time and machine rental	+17,000		- 2,130	
				<u>+\$ 14,870</u>
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS				<u><u>\$118,765</u></u>

Approximately half of the net increase in the total budget relates to salaries. Most of this increase, in turn, is to support the two professional historians who have been added as ad hoc members of the Technical Services staff. Despite the addition of a major item for clerical assistance (Item 5 under Other Personnel), substantial savings in keypunching costs hold the net increase for other personnel to less than 10 percent for the category.

The very large increase in Item B, Expendable Equipment and Supplies reflects the unanticipated bulk of data and the heavy cost of the experiment in acquiring minor civil division data. Although we have decided to limit our future work with MCD data, the acquisition of the standard county census data remains a major item for the next two years.

The increase in the proposed travel budget is almost entirely a function of the interest in extending the data collection to the pre-1824 period. Following our reasonably successful experiences with other conferences devoted to planning for the acquisition of data, it has been suggested that a major conference be held in joint sponsorship with the Williamsburg Institute of Early American History and Culture. For a variety of reasons, historians of early America are currently heavily engaged in quantitative research. The members of the American Historical Association Committee to Collect the Basic Quantitative Data of American Political History are well persuaded that this interest could and should lead to a modest extension of the present project in order to add strategic information to the archives.

In cooperation with Professor Lee Benson and Professor Van Beck Hall we have already indicated our interest in this extension by developing

contacts with historians who would form the nucleus of a new data location and acquisition effort. Before undertaking such an activity, however, we would want assurance of its utility on the part of established scholars interested in the period. In the absence of solid evidence that the data would be uniquely relevant to important theoretical concerns, we would be most hesitant to commit scarce resources to the further acquisition and processing of historical data. At this point, the probability of exciting and significant research emanating from such data does seem sufficiently high to warrant the modest initial investment in an exploratory conference of interested research scholars.

Major changes in the provision for computer time and machine rental reflect two quite different developments. The very large expenditure in 1965-66 was made in an attempt to capitalize on the 1965 research Conference on Quantitative Methods in Historical Research. Three major bodies of data were processed. One set focused on the 24th U.S. House of Representatives. Election results by county as well as demographic information on slavery, occupations, literacy and farm land value were combined with House Roll Call records. Professor Lee Benson used these data as evidence for his views on the role of party and the slavery issue in that congress.

The second major body of data collected was for the Old Northwest Territory; Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio. Election results by county for President, Governor, and U.S. Representative for the years 1888-1900 were included, along with ethnic, religious, occupation, and land value data from the Census. A large number of differences of proportions of the vote were generated as well as complex

adjustments of the nativity data. Using these basic data with the techniques of scatterplotting, Pearsonian correlations, and partial correlations, Professor Samuel Hays explored the impact of the Populist party on the electoral patterns of the period.

The final data collection processed for the summer seminar was minor civil division election data for Wisconsin for 1892 and 1892 and matching census data for the most appropriate near census year, 1905. Data pertaining to nativity, occupation, and agriculture as well as vote for President and Governor, were used. We entered into the preparation of a strategic set of MCD materials well advised as to the potential importance of a significant demonstration of their analytic utility. We did so, however, with little understanding of the problems posed by the natural state of the data. Once committed, we persevered until it became evident that the problems could not be conquered within the limited time period of the conference. The net result was a valuable learning experience for our Technical Services staff, but no product in the form of usable data. In retrospect there is little argument over the conclusion that a mountain of resources produced a veritable molehill of results. Valuable lessons were learned, but the budget bears the scars.

On the other hand, assurance of free access to the IBM 360/40 permits an eventual reduction in the budgetary provisions for future computer utilization. In the face of a very fluid situation defining hardware performance and software capabilities, we think that the relevant archival development will proceed somewhat more efficiently than the original proposal anticipated. In the course of the next two

years we thus expect a small reduction in projected costs of computer use. We now conclude that there can be a somewhat greater transfer of function from University hardware on which we will rent time; only the delay in delivery of our own computer limits the savings that we now anticipate will result from its use.

A two-year grant of \$213,225 for direct costs, available in January would permit the completion of this phase of Consortium archival development. Present funds will certainly be exhausted at the end of the current calendar year with the total project standing at the half-way mark.

	1966-68 Combined Budgets (from page 13a)	(less) Balance of GS 881 (est. as (of July 1)	(equals) New Grant Request (for period 1/1/67 to 12/31/68)
A. SALARIES			
<u>Senior Personnel:</u>			
1) Program Director ($\frac{1}{2}$ time, first year only			
2) Research Associate: Co-Director of Data Recovery (full time)	\$ 26,000	\$	\$ 26,000
3) Research Associate: Co-Director, one year	6,000		6,000
4) Director of Technical Services ($\frac{1}{2}$ time for each of 2 years, $\frac{1}{2}$ time for third year)	10,750	3,750	7,000
<u>Other Personnel</u>			
1) Assistant Study Director (Assistant to Director of Data Recovery, $\frac{2}{3}$ time)	9,750	9,000	750
2) Programmers (varying full-time equivalents @ an average of \$7,000	36,500	5,255	31,245
3) Key punchers (varying full-time equivalents @ \$4,100)	46,500	8,000	38,500
4) Secretary to Director of Data Recovery (full time)	10,250		10,250
5) Clerical Assistance	25,400		25,400
6) Secretary to Technical Services ($\frac{1}{2}$ time)			
7) Technical Assistance (hourly)	4,500	3,000	1,500
<u>Fringe Benefits</u>	21,080	8,000	13,080
B. EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES	27,500		27,500
C. TRAVEL			
1) Domestic	12,000	1,500	10,500
D. OTHER			
1) Computer time and machine rental	22,500	7,000	15,500
	<u>\$258,730</u>	<u>\$45,505</u>	<u>\$213,225</u>
Indirect Costs @ 46% of Item A			<u>73,473</u>
			\$286,698
Less 5% University Contribution			<u>14,335</u>
			<u>\$272,363</u>
Total amount requested, rounded to			\$272,365

May 16, 1966

To: Official Representatives, ICPR

From: ICPR Staff

Subject: Inventory Use of Archival Facilities

The following data were gathered from member schools within the Consortium regarding their use of ICPR archival facilities as of Spring 1966. The questionnaire was sent to forty-five schools and responses were received from forty schools.

The data are divided into six main categories and a brief description is listed for the selected schools in each category. There were a substantial number of schools whose reports provided incomplete information.

I. Instructors Use, Undergraduate Courses, Undergraduate Student Use

TABLE I

Number of Instructors Using ICPR Data in Preparation of Lectures	85
Number of Schools Providing Information	31
AVERAGE	2.7

Thirty-one universities reported instructors using ICPR data in preparation of lectures. Selected schools are listed below showing the specific instructors and courses for each school.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Professors L. W. Milbrath and K. F. Janda have used Consortium data in preparation of lectures for their courses; Public Opinion and Voting Behavior, Fundamentals of Political Analysis, and Political Research Seminar.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Professors RePass and Flanigan have used Consortium data in preparation of lectures for their Political Behavior courses.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

At Princeton, Consortium material is used by instructors in preparation of lectures in both the political science department and the sociology department. In the political science department Professor Kelly has used ICPR data for his Parties course; Professor Strange in his State and Local Government course; and Professor Verba for Comparative Government and Methodology courses. In the sociology department Professor Hamilton has used ICPR data in two courses: Political Sociology and Democratic Theory; and Professor Michelson has used ICPR data for his course in Urban Sociology.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Professor John Grumm uses Consortium data for two courses: Seminar in Politics and Political Behavior. Professor Herman Lujan uses ICPR data in preparing lectures for his Technique of Political Analysis course.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Professors Jones, Joyner, and Freeman of the political science department use ICPR data for courses in Public Opinion, Political Parties, and Honors Courses in American Government.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Two faculty members in the political science department have used Consortium data for preparation of lectures: Professor Zeigler for his course in State and Local Government; and Professor Selegman for his course in Political Parties.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Professory Lyman Kellstedt is the only instructor using ICPR data in preparing lectures for his course in American Government and undergraduate and graduate course in Public Opinion.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Three instructors use ICPR data in preparation of lectures. Professor Wayne Francis for his course in Computer Applications in Political Science; Professor H. D. Price for his Seminar in American Politics; and Professor Michael O'Leary for his Seminar in Comparative Politics.

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

Professor Ian Budge and Mr. Michael Margolis are using ICPR data for a course in political behavior.

DUKE UNIVERSITY

ICPR data is used in American Political Parties seminar and Scope and Methods seminar by Professor Allan Kornberg.

QUEENS UNIVERSITY

Professor John Meisel has used ICPR data for a seminar on Parties and Elections.

YALE UNIVERSITY

Six professors at Yale have used ICPR data in their courses. Professor Robert Dahl for a course in Scope and Methods; Professor James David Barber--Introduction to Political Analysis; Professor Richard Merritt--Introduction to International Relations; Professor Robert E. Lane--Public Opinion and Policy Formation; Professor Russell D. Murphy--Political Parties; and Professor Joseph LaPalombara--Comparative Government.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK - BUFFALO

Professor Richard Johnson has used ICPR data in his Empirical and Analytical Theory course.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Professors Charles Powell, Joseph Zikmund, and Steve Whitaker have used Consortium data in preparation of lectures for courses in Political Parties and Research Methodology.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Professor John Orbell has used ICPR data for his course in Public Opinion. Professor James Christoph uses ICPR data in his course in Comparative Government.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Professor Zimring and Professor Conway utilize Consortium data for a course in Political Behavior and Legislative Process.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Two instructors have used Consortium data for preparation of lectures for two courses: Political Opinion and Propaganda, and Political Sociology.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Professor Goldberg has used Consortium data (such as in The American Voter) in preparation of lectures in two of his courses: Introductory American Government, and Scope and Methods.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - BERKELEY

Four instructors have used ICPR data for one Methodology course. They are Professors Glock and Summers in 1964-65, and Professors Gold and Morrison in 1963-64.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Professor Downing utilizes ICPR data for three courses: Political Behavior, Scope and Methods in Political Science, and Analysis of Political Behavior. Professor Legee uses Consortium data for his courses in Survey Methods, Voter Behavior and Attitudes, and Problems in Public Opinion. Professor Leuthold uses ICPR data for the following five courses: Political Parties, Voter Behavior and Attitudes, Pro-Seminar in Political Science, Scope and Methods in Political Science, and Analysis of Political Behavior. Professor Wood uses ICPR data for his course in Comparative Politics. Professor Wells uses ICPR data for his course Administrative Regulation of Business. Professor Watson utilizes Consortium data for three courses: Political Parties, The American Presidency, and Pressure Groups.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Professor G. R. Boynton utilized ICPR data for his course in Voting Behavior and Elections.

TABLE II

Number of Undergraduate Student Use	1051
Number of Schools Providing Information	25
AVERAGE	42.0

The number of undergraduate students using ICPR material at each individual school is as follows: Ball State University (30); State University of New York - Buffalo (15); University of California - Berkeley (6); Cornell University (12); Florida State University (80); Georgetown University (14); University of Iowa (100); University of Kansas (20); University of Kentucky (40); University of Minnesota (100); University of Missouri (17); University of North Carolina (22); Northwestern University (20); Ohio State University (8); Pennsylvania State University (20); Princeton University (200); University of Pittsburgh (40); University of Strathclyde (30); Temple University (16); University of Tennessee (70); Vanderbilt University (120); Washington University (30); Wayne State University (30); University of Wisconsin (1); Yale University (10).

The following examples illustrate how undergraduate students have made use of ICPR material.

At the University of North Carolina, twenty-two undergraduate students in Professor James Prothro's Public Opinion course use ICPR data to test propositions in the literature they have read.

Sixteen undergraduates in Professor Whitaker's Methodology Seminar at Temple University utilized the 1948 election data in learning to use unit record equipment, the 1620 and 1401 computers. This class learned the basics of punching, coding, and interviewing with the assistance of ICPR manuals, codebooks, and analysis books.

Professor Benjamin Walter of Vanderbilt University has undergraduate students using ICPR material in his Scope and Methods course to learn the principles of questionnaire construction and how the results may be used to test hypotheses.

II. Graduate Student Use and Graduate Courses

TABLE I

Number of Graduate Students Using ICPR Data	818
Number of Schools Providing Information	28
AVERAGE	29.2

The number of graduate students using ICPR data for each school is as follows: Ball State University (7); State University of New York - Buffalo (20); University of California - Berkeley (120); City University of New York (2); Duke University (30); University of Florida (15); Florida State University (2); Georgetown University (3); Indiana University (5); University of Iowa (32); University of Kansas (30); University of Kentucky (25); University of Minnesota (25); University of Missouri (41); University of North Carolina (90); Northwestern University (25); Ohio State University (30); University of Oregon (20); Pennsylvania State University (40); Princeton University (10); Syracuse University (20); Temple University (60); University of Tennessee (6); Vanderbilt University (10); Washington University (20); Wayne State University (20); University of Wisconsin (80); Yale University (30).

Two examples are shown to illustrate graduate student use of ICPR data.

At Washington University, Professor LeVine has had several graduate students use ICPR material for research design purposes, e.g. codebooks, in a seminar in comparative politics.

At Temple University, the primary use of ICPR data by graduate students has been in the three graduate classes in research methodology. About sixty students have made use of Consortium data in learning to use unit record

equipment and the 1620 and 1401 computers. They used simple techniques such as cross-tabulation of variables.

TABLE II

Number of Graduate Courses	13
Number of Schools Providing Information	8
AVERAGE	1.6

Listed below are the eight universities that reported ICPR material used for graduate courses.

University of Arizona
 University of California - Berkeley
 Cornell University
 Duke University
 Georgetown University
 University of Iowa
 University of Oregon
 Syracuse University

A number of schools reported courses utilizing ICPR data, but neglected to indicate whether they were undergraduate or graduate courses.

TABLE III

Number of Courses NA Undergraduate or Graduate	48
Number of Schools Providing Information	14
AVERAGE	3.4

III. Seminar-Research Papers, Completed Thesis-Dissertations, Thesis-Dissertations in Progress

TABLE I

Number of Seminar-Research Papers	291
Number of Schools Providing Information	17
AVERAGE	17.1

Seventeen universities indicated graduate student use of ICPR data for seminar or research papers. The individual schools and the number of papers for the respective schools are as follows: Ball State University (4); State University of New York - Buffalo (20); Cornell University (2); Georgetown University (3); Indiana University (5); University of Kansas (30); University of Minnesota (10); University of Missouri (4); University of North Carolina (63); Pennsylvania State University (40); Princeton University (4); University of Rochester (26); Syracuse University (18); Temple University (1); Vanderbilt University (10); Wayne State University (12); University of Wisconsin (2).

TABLE II

Number of Completed Thesis-Dissertations	24
Number of Schools Providing Information	11
AVERAGE	2.1

The eleven schools that reported completed thesis-dissertations using ICPR material are listed below showing the number of thesis-dissertations for each school.

State University of New York - Buffalo	1
Florida State University	1
University of Georgia	2
Indiana University	1
University of Kansas	2
University of Maryland	2
University of Minnesota	4
University of North Carolina	4
University of Pittsburgh	3
Vanderbilt University	3
University of Wisconsin	1

TABLE III

Number of Thesis-Dissertations in Progress	58
Number of Schools Providing Information	22
AVERAGE	2.6

A sizeable number of thesis-dissertations are in progress using ICPR data at a little more than half of the schools that responded to the archival questionnaire. The following twenty-two schools are listed showing the number of thesis-dissertations in progress at each school: University of Arizona (2); Ball State University (3); University of British Columbia (2); University of Chicago (2); Cornell University (1); Duke University (2); Florida State University (2); Georgetown University (4); University of Georgia (1); Indiana University (3); University of Iowa (3); University of Kansas (4); University of Maryland (1); University of North Carolina (7); Ohio State University (2); Pennsylvania State University (4); University of Pittsburgh (4); University of Rochester (1); University of Strathclyde (1); Temple University (5); Wayne State University (1); Yale University (3);

IV. Staff in Research; Completed Articles, Monographs; Completed Books; Work in Progress

TABLE I

Number of Staff in Research	71
Number of Schools Providing Information	27
AVERAGE	2.6

Twenty-seven schools reported staff members utilizing ICPR material. The number of staff members at each university is as follows: University of Arizona (4); Allegheny College (1); Ball State University (4); University of British Columbia (1); University of California - Berkeley (1); Cornell University (2); Florida State University (2); Georgetown University (1); Indiana University (2); University of Iowa (5); University of Kansas (2); University of Maryland (3); University of Minnesota (4); University of North Carolina (2); Northwestern University (1); University of Oregon (2); Pennsylvania State University (2); University of Pittsburgh (2); Princeton University (3); University of Rochester (2); University of Strathclyde (3); Temple University (3); University of Tennessee (1); Vanderbilt University (1); Washington University (6); University of Wisconsin (7); Yale University (4).

TABLE II

Number of Completed Articles-Monographs	18
Number of Schools Providing Information	9
AVERAGE	2.0

Below are listed the completed articles-monographs employing ICPR data for each of the nine universities.

ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

"The Washington Congressional Delegation" published in the Midwest Journal of Political Science in March, 1964. "Cognitive Dimensions and Political Activity" published in the Public Opinion Quarterly in Fall, 1965. "Public Perceptions of the Supreme Court," Midwest Journal of Political Science, May, 1966. These three articles are by Professor John H. Kessel.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

One article by G. R. Boynton published in a recent issue of Public Opinion Quarterly, "Southern Conservatism: Constituency Opinion and Congressional Voting."

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Professor L. W. Milbrath has used Consortium data in the following article, "Latent Origins of Liberalism, Conservatism, and Party Identification."

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Professor Harmon Zeigler used Consortium data for the following publication, "Interest Groups in the States," in Herbert Jacob and Kenneth H. Vines, editors, Politics in the American States (Boston: Little, Brown, Inc., 1965).

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Professor Richard F. Hamilton has used Consortium data in a number of articles. "The Mass Support for an Air Strike--The 1952 China Case"; "A Note on Demography and Politics" (with Professor Raymond Wheeler); "The Myth of Business Conservatism" (with Professor Paul Eberts); "A Note on Skill Level and Politics," Public Opinion Quarterly XXIX:3 (Fall, 1965) 390-99; "The Marginal Middle Class: A Reconsideration," American Sociological Review (April, 1966); "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Reconsideration."

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

A forthcoming article by Professor Goldberg, "Discerning A Casual Pattern Among Political Data," American Political Science Review, December, 1966. An article by Professor Kramer, "A Decision Theoretic Analysis of a Problem in Political Campaigning," Mathematical Applications in Political Science II (Southern Methodist University Press, forthcoming).

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

One completed article using ICPR data, "A Comparison of Political Attitudes and Activity Patterns in Central Cities and Suburbs," by Professor Joseph Zikmund to be published in Public Opinion Quarterly (fall or winter, 1966-67).

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Two completed articles based on Consortium data: Professor Jack Dennis, "Diffuse Support for Party Systems" (American Political Science Review, forthcoming); Professor Herbert Jacob, "State Political Systems" in Jacob and Vines, Politics in the American States (1965).

YALE UNIVERSITY

A student, Robert Putnam, used ICPR data in an article to be published soon in the American Political Science Review.

TABLE III

Number of Completed Books	9
Number of Schools Providing Information	5
AVERAGE	1.8

The following five universities are listed showing the number of completed books using ICPR data for each school.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Charles O. Jones, The Republican Party in American Politics, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.

William J. Crotty, Donald M. Freeman, and Douglas S. Gatlen, Political Parties and Political Behavior: A Reader in Substance Theory and Methodology, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, Negroes and Southern Politics: Participation and Its Consequences (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, forthcoming, 1966).

Marian D. Irish and James W. Prothro, The Politics of American Democracy, 3rd edition, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

Ian Budge and D. W. Urwin, Scottish Political Behavior (Longmans-Green: forthcoming, June, 1966). (Five Nation British Sample)

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Herbert Jacob and Kenneth N. Vines, editors, Politics in the American States, Boston: Little, Brown, Inc., 1965.

YALE UNIVERSITY

Robert E. Lane referred to ICPR data in Political Life and Political Ideology.

Robert Dahl used ICPR data in Who Governs.

TABLE IV

Number of Work in Progress	52
Number of Schools Providing Information	23
AVERAGE	2.2

A little more than half of the schools that responded to the archival questionnaire indicated work in progress based on ICPR material. They are as follows: Allegheny College, University of Arizona, Ball State University, State University of New York - Buffalo, University of California - Berkeley, Florida State University, University of Pittsburgh, Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Kansas, University of Maryland, University of Minnesota, University of Missouri, University of Oregon, Princeton University, University of Rochester, University of Strathclyde, Temple University, Vanderbilt University, Washington University, Wayne State University, University of Wisconsin, Yale University.

V. Firm Plans for Work Based on ICPR Data; Schools Awaiting Future Additions to Archives for Staff Research on Writing

TABLE I

Number of Firm Plans	20
Number of Schools Providing Information	14
AVERAGE	1.4

The following fourteen schools indicated firm plans for work based on ICPR data:

University of Arizona
University of Florida
Indiana University
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Minnesota

University of North Carolina
Ohio State University
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
University of Strathclyde
Vanderbilt University
University of Wisconsin

Sixteen universities indicated they were awaiting future additions to the ICPR archives for staff research and writing. The awaited studies are shown below.

1. Historical election statistics
2. Congressional roll call data
3. Foreign data (Stokes)
4. (Historical) census data
5. Matthews-Prothro study
6. Community power structure
7. SRC - minor studies
8. Biographical data for members of Congress
9. Wahlke-Eulau legislative study

ARCHIVAL PROCESSING COSTS, 1965-66

<u>Presently Available Data</u>	<u>Cost; staff & machines</u>
Almond-Verba	\$1,835
1952 Election Study	998
1956 Election Study	627
1958 Election Study	671
1960 Election Study	914
1962 Election Study	88
1964 Election Study	2,121
Banks-Textor	116
Russett-Deutsch	96
Subtotal	<hr/> \$ 7,466
 <u>Data Not Yet Released</u>	
New Haven Study	1,110
Scammon Election	1,278
City & County Data Book	634
Wahlke-Eulau	1,031
Senate Roll Call	777
House Roll Call	1,043
1958 Representation	221
Congressional District Data	1,017
Brookings	6,282
German Embassy	635
Kennedy	441
Rokkan Seven Nations	1,803
Schmidhauser	353
Stanley	130
Rummell	236
China Study	1,687
Panel	427
Subtotal	<hr/> \$19,105 <hr/>
GRAND TOTAL	<hr/> \$26,571 <hr/>

SUMMARY OF SERVICING COSTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF DATA, 1965-66

	<u>Staff & Machines</u>	<u>Card Images</u>
Allegheny College	\$ 154	
University of Arizona	103	78,000
Arizona State University	33	
University of British Columbia	67	145,000
University of California, Berkeley	124	15,000
University of California, Los Angeles	546	142,000
University of Chicago	618	5,000
Columbia University	271	265,000
Cornell University	346	29,000
Duke University	504	23,000
University of Essex	17	
University of Florida	163	18,000
Florida State University	370	153,000
Georgetown University	259	213,000
University of Georgia	109	10,000
University of Hawaii	13	
Harvard University	169	9,000
University of Illinois	893	119,100
Indiana University	839	48,000
Indiana State University	32	
University of Iowa	181	54,000
University of Kansas	56	34,000
University of Kentucky	319	39,000
McMaster University	32	2,000
University of Maryland	307	28,000
University of Michigan	3,143	31,000
Michigan State University	381	27,000
University of Minnesota	226	8,000

	<u>Staff & Machines</u>	<u>Card Images</u>
University of Missouri	560	66,000
State University of New York at Buffalo	460	226,000
SUNY Graduate School of Public Affairs	732	131,000
New York University	49	42,000
University of North Carolina	276	43,000
Northwestern University	323	142,000
Ohio State University	122	88,000
University of Oregon	1,282	60,000
University of Pennsylvania	431	206,000
Pennsylvania State University	385	24,500
University of Pittsburgh	379	177,000
Princeton University	336	168,000
Queen's University	569	
University of Rochester	94	20,000
Southern Illinois University	14	
Stanford University	722	110,000
University of Strathclyde	276	85,000
Syracuse University	323	43,000
Temple University	87	7,000
University of Tennessee	108	19,000
Vanderbilt University	112	27,000
Washington University	324	201,000
University of Washington	135	
Wayne State University	587	52,000
University of Wisconsin	713	29,000
Yale University	227	94,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$19,901	3,555,600

January, 1966

To: Official Representatives

From: Executive Director and Director of Technical Services

Subject: Guidelines to be followed in use of archival resources

The past few years have provided the staff with a wide range of experience in serving the needs of your colleagues and their students. We are now in a position to assess our policies and practices and make adjustments necessary to maximize access to the resources of the Consortium archives. Without some major changes in present patterns of use, the continuing exponential increase in participants' requests for data services will undermine the financial base of the Consortium. Nevertheless, the new policies described in this memorandum attempt to stop short of imposing a monetary barrier of surcharges for service to participants.

The new policies are intended to take maximum advantage of the data-processing facilities at member institutions; they are not intended to restrict any individual's ability to utilize archival resources. Consonant with the fundamental policy of seeking to extend communal resources to the widest possible number of scholars, the new policies are dictated by our new knowledge of the variations in cost for performing different data-servicing tasks.

Transmission of "Bulk" Data

The direct cost of purchasing, punching, and shipping large numbers of punched cards is at least ten times the cost of transmitting the same data on magnetic tape. A single major SRC election study shipped as punched cards costs the Consortium from \$125 to \$155; the same data can be sent via tape for \$10-\$15 (assuming use of a loaned tape for transmission). The simple reproduction of data cards, whether for single decks from two or more studies, all decks of a study or of several studies, will henceforth be discontinued unless it is impossible for the requestor either to run tape at local facilities or produce cards from tape with local facilities.

When possible, a blank tape should be sent with the request for data; it will be processed by the staff and returned. Data will be shipped on a tape provided by the Consortium if the request includes a provision for paying for the tape. Our volume of service activity is too great to permit a capital investment in the number of tapes that would be needed if we were

to make them available on loan for data transmission; consequently, only in very unusual circumstances can we send out tape to be copied and returned.

The problem of shipping large quantities of data on punched cards is so severe that it would often be cheaper to send a person from the Technical Services staff to the member school for two or three days to assist in the punching of cards from tape than to ship cards from Ann Arbor. Indeed, where appropriate and feasible, this option may be exercised following consultation between staff personnel and the relevant local personnel.

Our experience has also indicated that substantial long-run savings will accrue from greater use of magnetic tape as the transmission and storage medium. Data users find that maintenance of local data files is simpler, and a generally lower error level is experienced, where tapes are used. If appropriate format requirements have been anticipated, access to local computers is often facilitated by bypassing the card-reading phase of getting data into the computer.

If no tape-to-card facilities are available to the requestor, transmission of data via cards obviously must follow. In this situation, however, we would urge serious reconsideration of the practicality of maintaining a substantial local bank of data stored on punched cards. Once again, experience is our guide, and we have concluded that large requests for stores of data on punched cards are soon followed by smaller and even more expensive requests for refurbishing and replacing lost, folded, stapled, or mutilated cards. Excepting most unusual circumstances, the creation of a local facility to manage a large quantity of Consortium data cards seems to be a rather wasteful duplication of the efforts of the Consortium staff.

The emphasis on magnetic tape as the proper medium for transmission and storage of data is complemented by the ability of the Consortium staff to generate special-purpose decks of "analysis" cards supported with custom-designed codebooks. The general-purpose transmission of data cards in bulk can be economically traded off for the generation and transmission of special-purpose, analytic subsets of data. Although the general advantages of tape over cards still obtain in this situation, the more important saving has taken place if mass shipments of storage decks has been forestalled. As earlier memoranda have indicated, decks specially constructed for analytic use can be produced most economically, along with detailed codebooks tailored to the content of the new decks, with the use of the computer. Where detailed data requirements are known in advance, both research needs and teaching needs can be met with the present resources of the Consortium staff. The demand in this domain could triple or quadruple with no serious implications for the staffing or financing of Consortium activities. Where tape-to-card facilities are not available, much greater use should be made of our ability to respond in this way to specialized requests for subsets of data.

The Analysis of Data

The generation of new variables and the extended computation of statistics are well within the technical capabilities of the staff. However, individual requests for the analytic processing of data more and more frequently place exorbitant demands on staff and facilities. Here, much more than with regard to the simple transmission of data in bulk, past policies can be faulted for making too few demands on local facilities and resources open to Consortium participants. Henceforth, direct costs for analysis or tabulation work in excess of \$100 will be billed directly to the member institution for payment unless the requestor provides evidence of a diligent but unsuccessful quest for financial support. The stipulated base figure of \$100 is obviously more or less arbitrary; the objective is to establish the principle that serious research always has a significant direct cost and that cost should be borne by those most intimately involved. At the same time, if local, regional and national resources are explored but financing is not obtained, the individual scholar should still be able to move forward with some claim on the resources of the Consortium community. The policy is not intended to raise new issues as to who supports what research; it is intended to encourage utilization of established or potential resources for support before testing the capacity of the Consortium. We do not intend nor expect the lack of support elsewhere to limit or restrict direct and explicit reliance on Consortium facilities. Particularly where the doctoral dissertation is concerned, we are prepared to continue to extend professional and technical staff service well beyond the \$100 limit; we hope we will not be asked to do so unnecessarily at the organization's expense.

Documentation of Data

The challenge of providing adequate information about data to an extended constituency of individual scholars, teachers and students is at least double-edged. Our relatively openhanded policy of distributing codebooks and analysis books upon individual request is apparently a most useful complement to the various local arrangements set up by the Official Representative. At the same time, the demand has reached a point where some economic constraints must be imposed. Rather than arbitrarily limit the supply of documentary materials, additional copies of the various items will henceforth be available for purchase at cost. Thus we will attempt to maintain the local "official library" at each institution by continuing our past policy of supplying initial copies without charge. Replacements or additional copies will, however, be provided only as items available for purchase.

The attached price list reflects only the direct, incremental cost to the Consortium. Items not included on the list or its subsequent addenda will continue to be available upon request without charge.

PRICE LIST FOR CODEBOOKS

	<u>In Looseleaf Binder</u>	<u>Without Binder</u>
Manual for Coders		\$1.15
Manual for Interviewers		2.40
*Minor Studies	\$3.40	1.85
Study 473	4.75	3.20
NORC 1944 1947	2.55	1.00
Stouffer Study	2.55	1.00
Study 400	3.40	1.85
Study 417	3.40	1.85
Study 431	3.85	2.30
Study 440	3.00	1.50
Five Nation Study	3.85	2.30

*Included in this group are the following studies: 46, 101, 613, 623, 695, 714, Cross Polity, and Yale World Handbook

The above figures include postage within the United States.

III. ICPR ADMINISTRATION

MEMORANDUM OF ORGANIZATION

The Inter-university Consortium for Political Research is conceived as a partnership between a group of universities (referred to hereafter as the member universities or the members) and the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan (SRC). The purpose of the Consortium is to promote the conduct of research on selected phases of the political process. It is expected that both partners will contribute to the success of the Consortium and that each will benefit from the association.

A. Principles of Membership

1. All institutions of higher education offering work in content areas such as political behavior, politics and government are eligible for admission. Membership will usually be initiated by departments of political science, but larger administrative units, research organizations and other departments such as sociology, history, psychology or communications will also be encouraged to participate.

Membership categories will be based upon use of Consortium facilities, as follows:

CATEGORY A

Institutions offering graduate work in appropriate content areas. Their faculty and graduate students are eligible for all services of the Consortium.

CATEGORY B

Undergraduate institutions and those with limited Master's degree programs. They are eligible for data for class instruction and faculty research and for faculty participation in summer seminars.

CATEGORY C

Educational institutions outside the United States and Canada. These will have full access to all Consortium resources except those general funds made available for support of travel.

Membership fees for CATEGORY A shall be \$2,500 per year, for CATEGORIES B and C, \$1,500 per year.

The decision as to whether two or more departments or research organizations from a single university provide the budgetary support for a single membership in the Consortium should be entirely a matter for decision by the institution concerned. If the relevant departments of a member university so decide, each could become an independent member of the Consortium on equal footing with all other members.

Each participating unit (department, division, inter-departmental committee, etc.) will be responsible for determining the eligibility of its faculty and students for participation in Consortium activities. Each unit will designate one of its faculty members as the official representative to sit on a Committee of Representatives and take action on behalf of the participating unit.

2. Membership requires the annual transfer of a membership fee to the Survey Research Center. These contributions are to be used exclusively to finance services to the member universities by an SRC staff to the Consortium. They are to be administered through the SRC ICPR Project Account.

The SRC staff to the Consortium will endeavor to insure equal services to each membership unit. Given the variety of functions, the limitations on time and space in the performance of some activities, and the variable pace of research activities by individual participants, the goal should be equality in service over a period of years. If over a period of years, use of the services of the Consortium varies markedly between institutions, additional charges may be levied or the fee adjusted by agreement between the Committee of Representatives and the SRC to reflect relative use.

3. Any member is free to withdraw at any time. However, a full year's notice of withdrawal should be given. The Consortium may require that research materials provided by the Consortium, including data, be returned upon termination of membership.

Budgetary inability to make a single year's annual contribution will not necessitate termination of membership provided the member university is willing to make up the deficit the following year. (If a member on a biennial budget is deprived of institutional support in the second year of a budget, assurance that the deficit will be eliminated the following

year will be sufficient to allow full continued participation in the Consortium.) Although payment of the annual contribution will be considered due on July 1, at the beginning of each fiscal year, payment may be made during the fiscal year of expenditure at the earliest convenience of the member.

Membership should be sought only with the full expectation that maximum benefits will accrue over several years' participation. Membership which contemplates only one- or two-year participation will not be encouraged. In general, it is expected that membership will be entered into only with the confidence that relevant officials of the member institutions understand membership to imply a continuing relationship and agree to attempt to provide the necessary funds on a continuing basis.

4. The Consortium is not designed to interfere with the research activities of any individual participant. There is no expectation that personal research interests need be related to Consortium activities other than insofar as those activities can be utilized by the researcher for his own purposes. There is no obligation to make personal research resources, including data, available for use by the member universities. However, whenever an individual makes use of Consortium data and facilities in an article, monograph, or book, he is expected to deposit two copies of the publication in a special collection to be maintained by the Consortium staff. If a thesis or dissertation is involved, then a copy of the abstract should be deposited.

B. The Organization of Member Universities

1. Each member university will be represented by one person chosen by each participating unit. That person will sit on the ICPR Committee of Representatives. There will be an annual meeting of the Committee of Representatives.

The Committee will be responsible for establishing policies regulating the participation of individuals in those activities where limited facilities preclude the simultaneous participation of all who might be interested. It also will be responsible for approving activities to be carried out on behalf of the Consortium such as seeking outside financial support or undertaking a major data collection.

2. The Committee of Representatives will elect a Council of five members at its annual meeting to serve until the next annual

meeting. The Council will choose a Nominating Committee prior to each annual meeting of the Committee of Representatives. The Nominating Committee will be composed of the outgoing chairman and two representatives not members of the Council. It will present to the annual meeting the names of a proposed chairman and Council members. Two new members will be elected in every even-numbered year; three new members will be elected in every odd-numbered year; the chairman will ordinarily be selected from among the members who will be serving the second year of their two-year terms.

The Chairman of the Council, serving without compensation, will also act as Chairman of the Committee of Representatives. He will have responsibility for calling meetings of the Committee and signing documents which are the joint responsibility of the member universities.

The Council will be the executive committee of the Representatives and will have authority to act on behalf of the Committee of Representatives. It will recommend the creation of standing committees to the annual meeting of Representatives. It will create interim ad hoc committees when necessary. The Council will normally meet at least three times during each year.

The Council will receive an annual report from the executive director of the Consortium regarding the staff's activities during the previous year. It will also receive general statements of expenditures from Consortium accounts held by the SRC. The Council will transmit these reports and its recommendations to the annual meeting of the Committee of Representatives.

The Council, or subcommittees created at its behest, will select and approve the participants in ICPR program activities. It will advise the staff to the Consortium in the execution of approved program activities and will have the authority to amend and supplement the decisions of the annual meeting of the Committee of Representatives. It will have the authority to arrive at agreements with the SRC; such agreements will constitute decisions by the ICPR and will be sufficient to authorize action on behalf of the ICPR.

A meeting of the Council may be called by the Chairman, the SRC staff member, or three members of the Council.

C. The Role of the Survey Research Center

1. The Survey Research Center will administer the activities of the Consortium through provision of the necessary professional

and technical staff and of the administrative services appropriate to the management of Consortium funds. The SRC will participate as a partner of the member universities in the development of training and the conduct of research by the ICPR.

2. In general, separate accounts will be maintained by the SRC for the operating budget, supported by the annual membership contributions to the ICPR Project Account, and for each research, conference or training grant received by ICPR. Budgets for each account will be created by agreement of the SRC and the Committee of Representatives or the Council. The SRC staff to the Consortium will submit a general statement of expenditures from each account to the annual meeting of the Committee of Representatives. Interim transfers of funds from the ICPR Project Account to another account may be made on agreement between the SRC and the Council.
3. The SRC staff to the Consortium will consist of a program director and such additional personnel as are deemed by the SRC to be necessary to accomplish the program objectives agreed upon by the Consortium. This staff will be supplemented as needed to accommodate unusual demands or special activities of the participants.
4. The SRC will cooperate wherever possible in the execution of Consortium activities. It will house the data storage facilities and make available the other facilities and personnel necessary for the reproduction and processing of data. The SRC staff to the Consortium may call upon the various units of the SRC for assistance on Consortium activities just as the same individuals would utilize the same resources in carrying out other projects which they have contractual obligations to complete.

The Survey Research Center will cooperate wherever possible in the execution of studies under Consortium sponsorship or under the direction of individuals from the member universities. It will provide technical consultation on sampling, questionnaire design, pre-testing, etc. It will provide data collection and processing facilities at cost, including sampling, interviewing, coding and data processing. Only capacity of relevant personnel and facilities will limit SRC support of Consortium research activities. Consortium members will not be under any obligation to use SRC facilities.

5. An authorized member of the Survey Research Center staff will normally be present at the annual meeting of the Committee of

Representatives and at regular meetings of the Council or the subcommittees created by it.

The SRC staff member will not be a voting member of the Committee of Representatives, the Council, or any of the subcommittees. Action by the ICPR will be taken by agreement between the SRC and the Committee of Representatives or one of its appropriate organs.

The SRC will select the personnel for the staff to the Consortium and will determine the availability of its facilities for research in residence. Beyond the clear obligation to provide a general statement of expenditures from ICPR accounts which it administers, the SRC staff to the Consortium will be free to pursue the agreed-upon program objectives of the ICPR within the general limits of the established budgets.

The SRC will also be free, as will each participating member, to pursue its own research objectives independent of the Consortium research program.

D. Relationship between Consortium Members and Other Scholars

Because of the Survey Research Center's established relationship with the academic community, prerequisites of membership for the constituency of the Consortium must conform to the basic principle of facilitating research by all responsible individuals. The SRC will undertake, however, to give priority to members of the Consortium in any claim on its archives, services or facilities insofar as they relate to the field of political research. Two general operating rules will cover the problem posed by the conflict between prior commitment of the SRC to professional services and current rights which Consortium members have established: 1) Service will be rendered to non-members by the SRC staff only where no handicap is thereby imposed on the Consortium participants; 2) When services, data or facilities are made available to non-members, they will pay full cost. The costs will compensate the staff for time expended in their role as SRC staff members and defray expenses by member universities in making possible or facilitating the provision of the services, data or facilities.

No general request for data storage cards from a non-member will be approved by the SRC.

1. Status of non-members, graduate student training

Participation in those graduate training functions supported by contributions by the member universities would not be open to non-members. Attendance at SRC Summer Institutes in Survey Methods will, of course, remain open to anyone heretofore eligible to enroll; but participation in the advanced seminar in analysis of political data or in special research conferences will be restricted to students from the member universities.

2. Status of non-members, faculty research, research conferences

In general, participation in special research conferences organized by the Consortium for faculty members from the member universities will not be open to anyone from a non-member school. On recommendation of the Committee of Representatives, however, it may be feasible to allow individual participation of a non-member for a fee based on the allocable cost per participating member for the expenditures in planning and executing the conference.

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

Membership
July 1, 1966

<u>Member</u>	<u>Official Representative</u>
Allegheny College*	John H. Kessel
University of Arizona	Donald M. Freeman
Arizona State University*	John B. White
Australian National University*	D. A. Aitkin
Ball State University	Ira Carmen
University of British Columbia	J. A. Laponce
University of California, Berkeley	Herbert McClosky
University of California, Irvine*	Deane E. Neubauer
University of California, Los Angeles	Dwaine Marvick
University of California, Santa Barbara	Carl Hetrick
Carleton University*	Muni Frumhartz
University of Chicago	J. David Greenstone
City University of New York	John G. Stoessinger
University of Cincinnati	Dieter Dux
Columbia University	Juan Linz
Cornell University	Allan P. Sindler
DATUM (Documentation and Training Center)*	Klaus Liepelt
Duke University	Allan Kornberg
University of Essex*	Jean Blondel
University of Florida	Charles D. Farris

Member

Florida State University
 Georgetown University
 University of Georgia*
 Harvard University
 University of Hawaii
 University of Illinois
 Indiana University
 Indiana State University*
 University of Iowa
 Johns Hopkins University
 University of Kansas
 Kansas State University*
 University of Kentucky
 McMaster University*
 University of Maryland
 University of Michigan
 Michigan State University
 University of Minnesota
 University of Missouri
 SUNY Graduate School of Public
 Affairs
 State University of New York at
 Binghamton*
 State University of New York at
 Buffalo
 New York University

Official Representative

Douglas St. Angelo
 Karl Cerny
 Thomas R. Dye
 H. D. Price
 Robert S. Cahill
 Denis Sullivan
 Leroy N. Rieselbach
 John Crittenden
 Samuel C. Patterson
 Milton C. Cummings, Jr.
 John Grumm
 William W. Boyer
 S. Sidney Ulmer
 Donald J. Grady
 Elmer Plischke
 M. Kent Jennings
 Frank A. Pinner
 William H. Flanigan
 David Leege
 James A. Riedel
 Paul A. Smith
 Richard Johnson
 Jules Cohn

Member

University of North Carolina
 Northern Illinois University*
 Northwestern University
 University of Notre Dame
 Nuffield College, Oxford*
 Ohio State University
 University of Oregon
 University of Pennsylvania
 Pennsylvania State University
 University of Pittsburgh
 Princeton University
 Queen's University
 University of Rochester
 Rutgers--The State University
 San Diego State College*
 Southern Illinois University
 Stanford University
 University of Strathclyde*
 Syracuse University
 Temple University
 University of Tennessee
 Vanderbilt University
 University of Washington
 Washington University
 University of Waterloo*

Official Representative

James W. Prothro
 William Johnson
 William W. Ellis
 Donald P. Kommers
 David Butler
 John Orbell
 Harmon Zeigler
 Thomas M. Watts
 Lawrence K. Pettit
 Carl Beck
 John H. Strange
 John Meisel
 William H. Riker
 Neil A. McDonald
 Ivo K. Feierabend
 Norman Luttbeg
 Heinz Eulau
 Ian Budge
 Wayne Francis
 Steven Whitaker
 Lee Greene
 Benjamin Walter
 Robert Warren
 John Sprague
 T. H. Qualter

Member

Wayne State University

University of Western Ontario*

University of Windsor*

University of Wisconsin

Yale University

York University*

Official Representative

Norman I. Wengert

A. J. R. Noel

Walter White

Herbert Jacob

Russell D. Murphy

D. V. Verney

* Associate Member

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

Council Membership1962-63

James W. Prothro, University of North Carolina, Chairman
David Easton, University of Chicago
Robert E. Lane, Yale University
Austin Ranney, University of Wisconsin
William H. Riker, University of Rochester

1963-64

Austin Ranney, University of Wisconsin, Chairman
Robert E. Agger, University of Oregon
Robert E. Lane, Yale University
Robert H. Salisbury, Washington University
John C. Wahlke, State University of New York at Buffalo

1964-65

John C. Wahlke, State University of New York at Buffalo, Chairman
William Buchanan, University of Tennessee
John H. Kessel, University of Washington (one year, filling out Agger's term)
Robert H. Salisbury, Washington University
Joseph Tanenhaus, New York University

1965-66

Joseph Tanenhaus, University of Iowa, Chairman
Carl Beck, University of Pittsburgh
William Buchanan, University of Tennessee and Washington and Lee University
Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University
Dwayne, Marvick, UCLA

STAFF ROSTER

Regular Staff, 1965-66

Executive Director - Warren E. Miller
Associate Director - Philip E. Converse
Associate Director - Donald E. Stokes
Administrative Assistant - Ann Robinson
Secretary - Grace Dunmore
Secretary - Theresa Thoma
Secretary - Jennie Congleton
Secretary - Maureen Kozumplik
Assistant in Research - Joan Eary

Director of Technical Services - Ralph L. Bisco
Assistant Director of Technical Services - Gregory Marks
Administrative Assistant - Carolyn Geda
Secretary - Mary Jane Williamson
Secretary - June Stuart
Study Processor, Supervisor - Henry Kerr
Study Processor - Gerlinde Erbring
Study Processor - Neil Kettlewell
Study Processor - Fred Steeper
Study Processor - Kathleen Zawadzki
Data Processor, Supervisor - Richard T. Lane
Data Processor - Harold Dode

Repository Development Staff

Co-Director of Data Recovery - Howard W. Allen
Co-Director of Data Recovery - Jerome Clubb
Administrative Assistant - Janice Plotkin
Secretary - Patricia Cartwright
Programmer - Donna Busfield
Programmer - Nancy Barkman
Programmer - Stewart Robinowitz
Programmer - Martin Barrett
Assistant in Research - Madeleine Shapiro
Assistant in Research - Eric Austin
Assistant in Research - Rama Krishna
Assistant in Research - Magdalena Bisco
Keypunch Supervisor - Marlene Nicol
Keypunch Staff -
 Carol Damroze
 Ziona Kopelovich
 Sandy Lanphear
 Carol Parmenter

Summer Staff, 1966Teaching Staff: Research Design, Data Analysis, and
Mathematical Political Analysis

Professor Hayward Alker
Professor Warren E. Miller
Professor Donald E. Stokes
Mr. Gregory Marks
Mr. Merrill Shanks
Miss Santa Algeo
Mr. Harold Cohen
Mr. Steven Coombs
Mr. Lutz Erbring
Miss Sue Koprince
Mr. Richard Niemi
Mr. Arthur Stevens
Mr. Herbert Weisberg
Mr. Arthur Wolfe

Seminar on State Politics

Professor Herbert Jacob
Professor John Grumm
Professor Samuel Patterson
Professor Douglas Price
Professor Kenneth Vines

May 5, 1966

To: Official Representatives, ICPR

From: ICPR Staff

Subject: Report on local arrangements as described in questionnaires collected in December, 1965.

The data were examined for evidence of differences associated with length of institutional membership. By and large it appears there has not been enough time for changes to take place in the structural arrangements for universities and colleges that have been members in the Consortium for three or four years. Differences implying some evolution in arrangements will be noted wherever they occur.

TABLE 1

DEPARTMENTS AND DISCIPLINES INVOLVED

	<u>Member Schools</u> (4 years or less)
Political science only	26
Political science and sociology	2
Political science and history	2
Political science, history, sociology	2
Political science and other	13
Other	1

The political science departments of the member schools are the most actively involved in the Consortium as shown in Table 1. There are instances of other departments and disciplines involved, but the length of membership does not seem to be the determining factor.

TABLE 2
ADDITION OF OTHER
DEPARTMENTS AND DISCIPLINES

	<u>Member Schools</u> (4 years or less)
Yes, add sociology	2
Yes, add history	2
Yes, add economics	0
Yes, add other social science combinations	6
No	14
Uncertain	6
Other	2
NA	14

While it is anticipated that other departments and disciplines within some of the member schools will become actively involved in the Consortium, there are members who do not expect any changes to take place in the near future. The same percentage (30%) of the 3-4 year member schools and the 2 or less year member schools do not expect any change. Thirteen per cent of both of these groups are uncertain about changes taking place in the near future.

TABLE 3
RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOCAL DECISIONS

	<u>Member</u> <u>(3-4 years)</u>	<u>Member</u> <u>(2 or less years)</u>	<u>N</u>
Official Representative	10%	13%	5
OR and Department Chairman	37	18	14
Departmental Committee (Regular or ad-hoc)	13	31	9
Interdepartmental committee	3	6	2
OR and other faculty	24	13	9
Other	3	13	3
NA	10	6	4
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>46</u>

Local decisions regarding the Consortium seem to be largely the responsibility of the official representative and the departmental chairman for those schools that have been members for 3-4 years whereas the newer members have initially delegated this responsibility to a departmental committee. The official representative is singly responsible for most of the decisions at a few (5) of the schools while at some of the other schools the official representative with the aid and advice of faculty members (on a more informal type basis than a departmental committee) constitute the decision-making body.

TABLE 4
BUDGETARY SUPPORT

	Member (3-4 years)	Member (2 or less years)	N
Department	44%	25%	17
College, dean	13	6	5
University, president	20	44	13
Graduate school, dean	10	6	4
Government research bur.,etc.	7	13	4
University library	0	6	1
Other	3	0	1
NA	3	0	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>46</u>

Sources of budget support for Consortium members are shown in the above table. The departmental budget handles the largest percentage of older member schools in contrast to the university budget supporting the newer member schools. The length of membership is more than likely a contributing factor.

TABLE 5
KINDS OF SUPPORT

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Routine	14
Ad-hoc or special	14
Other	3
NA	<u>15</u>
	46

Taking into consideration that fifteen universities did not answer the question regarding the kinds of support offered to them, this table simply shows that the same number of schools (14) receive their support on a routine basis or on an ad-hoc basis.

TABLE 6
ADDITIONAL BUDGET SUPPORT

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Membership fee only	24
Membership fee and secretarial	1
Membership fee and research	7
Membership fee, secretarial, research and fellowship	8
Yes - NA what	3
Other	0
NA	<u>3</u>
	46

Table 6 shows that twenty-four of the member schools receive budget support for only the membership fee but almost half of the schools do provide additional money for research assistants and secretarial assistance related to Consortium activities.

TABLE 7
LOCATION OF CONSORTIUM MATERIALS

	<u>Members</u> <u>3-4 years</u>	<u>Member</u> <u>2 or less years</u>	<u>N</u>
OR's office	7%	44%	9
Departmental office	30	12	11
Special room, dept. library	47	38	20
Computer Center, non-deptl.	10	0	3
University library	0	0	0
Other	3	0	1
NA	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>
	100%	100%	46

Table 7 shows the various locations of the Consortium materials at each member school. A greater percentage (44%) of the newer schools keep the Consortium materials in the official representative's office whereas the older member schools have made other kinds of arrangements, i.e. a special room or departmental library, departmental office or non-departmental location such as the computer center.

TABLE 8
ACCESS TO CONSORTIUM DATA

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Through official representative	4
Departmental secretary	5
Research assistant	1
Special staff (2 or more)	3
Computer center personnel	0
Archive or data center staff	4
Other	2
University library	0
NA	<u>27</u>
	46

With more than half of the schools not answering the question regarding the mode of access to Consortium data, the above table shows the various channels in operation at the remaining nineteen schools for access to code books, analysis books, etc.

TABLE 9
PERSONNEL AVAILABLE FOR CONSORTIUM USE

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Special staff (ICPR only)	1
Computer center staff	11
Graduate students	6
OR or other faculty	10
Archive or data center staff	12
Other	2
NA	<u>4</u>
	46

Table 9 shows the kinds of personnel available to individuals who want to use Consortium data or technical services. Computer center staffs and data center staffs are available for at least half of the schools. The official representative or other faculty are available for administrative or technical advice at some of the other schools.

TABLE 10

DATA PROCESSING FACILITIES

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Limited unit record equipment only	1
Full unit record equipment (reproducer)	0
Some unit record equipment; University computer; NA whose computer	39
Full unit record equipment; own computer	5
No facilities	0
Other	0
NA	<u>1</u>
	46

All of the schools have data processing facilities of one kind or another. The majority of the schools have unit record equipment (counter sorter) and a computer to use. Five of the schools have their own unit record equipment and own computer.

TABLE 11

SUMMER PROGRAM RECRUITMENT

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Selection by OR with faculty assistance	14
Selection by committee	8
Selection by departmental chairman	1
No experience	6
Other	2
NA	<u>15</u>
	46

Again, there are a number of schools that did not answer the question concerning the criteria for recommending summer participants; as well as six schools that had no experience in the summer program at the time these data were collected. Nevertheless, the schools that did respond show selection by the official representative with faculty assistance as the method most commonly used. A few of the schools selected their summer participants by committee recommendations.

TABLE 12

SELECTION OF OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
Appointed by department chairman	16
Voluntary	6
Department consensus	6
Other	3
NA	<u>15</u>
	46

Taking into account that fifteen schools did not respond with an answer to how the official representative is selected, the remaining group of schools that did answer indicated that the official representative is appointed by the department chairman at about half of the schools. The remaining number of schools indicated the position of official representative is filled on a voluntary basis or by a department consensus.

TABLE 13

POLICY OF ROTATING O.R. POSITION

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
No policy of tenure	22
Rotation established as policy	3
Permanent or indefinite appointment	1
Other	1
NA	<u>19</u>
	46

There is no policy established for rotating the position of the official representative for a large number of the schools that answered the question as shown by Table 14. Again, a fairly large number of schools did not answer the question.

TABLE 14

CURRICULAR CHANGES TO EXPLOIT ICPR FACILITIES

	<u>Members</u> (4 years or less)
No changes have been made	14
Coincidental changes	5
Changes stimulated by ICPR	21
Other	0
NA	<u>6</u>
	46

A greater number of universities indicated that curricular changes were stimulated because of their involvement in the Consortium as opposed to a few of the schools that indicated changes were coincidental. About one-third of the schools have not made any changes.

The following schools have indicated future plans to exploit ICPR facilities:

Albany GSPA	added political behavior seminar this year to use ICPR material
	political economists using ICPR material in winter term
Allegheny	methodology seminar to be taught for first time next quarter
Arizona	added graduate seminar in survey research, students encouraged to use Consortium material for research papers
	department considering recommendation to Graduate School to substitute program of statistics for 1 foreign language in Ph.D. program
Ball State	political science course in methodology of behavioral research and math courses in computer techniques and statistics for behavioral research
Chicago	stress on M.A. and Ph.D. thesis use of materials
Columbia	especially interested in any arrangements of collaboration of ICPR with foreign data archives
	idea of collecting more data on elites deserves more attention, perhaps further collection of older studies including those used for Ph.D. dissertations should be made
Duke	plans to activate courses in public opinion, voting behavior, political behavior which have not been taught for some time if at all
	add 1 or 2 faculty members with behavioral orientation
	added seminar on course and methods
	plans for course on legislative behavior next year
Florida State	two classes (1 undergraduate and 1 graduate) requiring use of ICPR material
Georgetown	quantitative techniques course set up
Hawaii	3 course methodology sequence to use Consortium material

Indiana	<p>research seminar to begin summer of 1966 to exploit ICPR materials</p> <p>undergraduate course in data analysis and political behavior also contemplated</p>
Iowa	<p>added advanced graduate course in research design and data analysis</p> <p>department approved Ph.D. field in philosophy and methods of political research</p>
Kansas	<p>add second semester courses in political science methodology</p>
Minnesota	<p>introduction of lab credits in junior and senior level</p> <p>few graduate seminars will begin to explore Consortium materials</p>
Missouri	<p>added courses in survey research methods, voting behavior and attitudes, seminar in problems of public opinion</p> <p>reorganized graduate and undergraduate courses to make better use of ICPR data in student reports and research papers</p> <p>possible addition of course dealing with statistical applications to political behavior</p>
North Carolina	<p>new graduate courses in research design computer application for political science and advanced political data analysis</p>
Pennsylvania State	<p>nature of scope and methods seminar has changed because of availability of Consortium data</p> <p>courses in political sociology, legislative process and political opinion will be oriented in part toward use of ICPR data</p>
Pennsylvania	<p>interdisciplinary faculty seminar and advanced graduate students on math models in political behavior research</p> <p>development of information retrieval system to include Consortium data</p> <p>develop a complete data archives</p> <p>develop research methods library information file about who is doing what research and where</p> <p>monthly newsletter</p>

Pittsburgh	<p>offering special courses on data processing for social science to graduate students and faculty</p> <p>Fortran recognized as second language depending upon department decree</p>
Princeton	<p>revise our language requirements</p> <p>establish two or three graduate level courses in political science in methods, technology of analysis</p> <p>recommendation for permanent Consortium representative with staff and research aids to maximize ICPR participation</p>
Queens	<p>hoping to develop a more vigorous program in methods in which ICPR facilities will play an important role</p>
Stanford	<p>Consortium seminar to teach secondary analysis</p>
Strathclyde	<p>one course designed to familiarize students with data processing made possible by ICPR materials--some special subjects will be based on these materials</p>
Syracuse	<p>graduate courses in survey research, statistical application and computer application</p> <p>graduate students may offer quantitative tool at either general or high proficiency instead of a language</p>
Temple	<p>graduate methodology seminar will become a two semester offering rather than one semester</p>
Tennessee	<p>undergraduate course in methods and techniques</p>
Washington University	<p>three graduate seminars related to research methods--the third designed to exploit ICPR data</p> <p>contemplate more extensive use of ICPR data</p> <p>discussions under way on how to implement the use of ICPR data at undergraduate level</p>
University of Washington	<p>introduce additional courses at graduate and undergraduate level to use Consortium materials</p>

Wayne State	plans to revise curriculum after move into larger lab quarters
	materials are being used by graduate students for Master's thesis
Wisconsin	plans formulated to centralize data collections for all social science
	develop an automated retrieval system

IV. BUDGETS

FINAL BUDGET 1964-65

	<u>Operating Budget</u>	<u>Repository Budget</u>
Professional and Administrative Staff		
Staff Salaries	\$ 32,000	\$ 16,000
Communications & Supplies		
Council and Annual Meetings	8,000	
Data Repository		
Preparation & Processing of Data	9,000	117,600
Conferences		9,300
Technical Service to Participants		
	23,500	
Administrative Salaries		
Machine Rental & Supplies		
Staff Salaries		
Memoranda and Reports to Participants		
	2,000	
	<u>\$ 74,500</u>	
1963-64 Deficit		
	4,000	
	<u>4,000</u>	
Summer Program		
Staff Salaries	15,000	
Supplies and Data	12,000	
Teaching Salaries	13,500	
Subsidies		
	<u>40,500</u>	
	<u>\$119,000</u>	<u>\$142,900</u>
Funds		
Members (39)	\$ 95,500	
	\$ 95,500	
Surplus	(13,500)	
	(13,500)	
University of Michigan	8,500	
National Science Foundation		\$142,900
Social Science Research Council		
	<u>8,500</u>	
	<u>\$ 90,500</u>	<u>\$142,900</u>
Net Deficit		
	\$ 28,500	- 0 -

FINAL BUDGET 1965-66

	<u>Operating Budget</u>	<u>Repository Budget</u>
Professional and Administrative Staff		
Staff Salaries	\$ 25,000	\$ 46,500
Communications & Supplies	7,000	39,600
Council and Annual Meetings	9,000	
Data Repository		
Preparation & Processing of Data Conferences	23,400	110,000
Technical Service to Participants		
Administrative Salaries	10,000	
Machine Rental & Supplies	18,000	
Staff Salaries	9,200	
Memoranda & Reports to Participants	<u>2,000</u>	
	\$103,600	
1962-1965 Deficit	<u>28,500</u>	
	28,500	
Summer Program		
Staff Salaries	8,000	
Supplies and Data	12,000	
Special Computing Costs	9,000	
Teaching Salaries	21,550	
Subsidies	<u>53,000</u>	
	103,550	
	<u><u>235,650</u></u>	<u><u>196,100</u></u>
Funds		
Members (58)	<u>\$132,750</u>	
	\$132,750	
University of Michigan	15,500	
Social Science Research Council	5,000	
National Science Foundation	<u>74,000</u>	\$260,400
	94,500	
	<u><u>227,250</u></u>	<u><u>260,400</u></u>
Net	(\$8,400)	\$ 64,300

PROPOSED BUDGET 1966-67

	<u>Operating Budget</u>	<u>Repository Budget</u>
Professional and Administrative Staff		
Staff Salaries	\$ 40,000	\$ 49,000
Communications and Supplies	10,000	12,000
Council and Annual Meetings	13,000	
Data Repository		
Preparation & Processing of Data Conferences	25,000	112,000
Technical Service to Participants		
Administrative Salaries	20,000	
Machine Rental & Supplies	23,100	
Staff Salaries	21,000	
Memoranda & Reports to Participants	<u>3,000</u>	
	\$155,100	
1965-66 Deficit	<u>8,400</u>	
	8,400	
Summer Program		
Staff Salaries	11,118	
Supplies and Data	17,093	
Data Processing	19,305	
Teaching Salaries	29,916	
Subsidies	<u>64,282</u>	
	\$141,714	
	<u>\$305,214</u>	<u>\$173,000</u>
Funds		
Members (73)	<u>\$163,500</u>	
	\$163,500	
IBM Corporation	5,000	
Mathematical Social Science Board	15,000	
National Science Foundation	77,555	\$ 64,300
University of Michigan	<u>44,159</u>	
	\$141,714	
	<u>\$305,214</u>	<u>\$ 64,300</u>
Net	- 0 -	(\$108,700)