ICPSR
Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research

Annual Report, 1968-1969

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research

ICPSR 4006

March 2004

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

Annual Report

1968-1969

INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

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

SURVEY RESEARCH ARCHIVES: 764-8396 • HISTORICAL ARCHIVES: 764-5199

November 1969

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

FROM: The Executive Director of the SRC Staff of the Consortium

SUBJECT: Annual Report for the Seventh Year, FY 1968-1969

The Annual Report, one of several documents published periodically by the Consortium staff, is prepared in the early fall of each year and contains the funding proposals, conference reports, and administrative and fiscal information for the previous fiscal year.

The other documents to be published separately include a newsletter which is sent out to the members, usually in conjunction with the annual meeting and council meetings; a "handbook" to assist in utilizing the archives, summer training programs, or other Consortium services; and a pamphlet containing background information on the Consortium.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

IV. ICPR ADMINISTRATION

I. INTRODUCTION

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

Considerations Leading to the Establishment of the ICPR.--The Survey Research Center believed that substantial gains could be made in the areas of study with which it is concerned by joining its interests and resources with those of scholars outside its own staff. Over the years many fruitful associations have developed with individual scholars who have drawn on the Center's archives of data or have used the services of its technical personnel. These experiences led the Center to seek ways in which groups of scholars or institutions with common interests might become associated with one or another of the research programs at the Center.

The Survey Research Center has developed an extended program of research on political behavior. A series of studies, supported by grants from the Carnegie Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the SSRC have been conducted and reported in the scientific literature. This series has included an elaborate program of studies of the political perceptions, motives and acts of the American electorate. In recent years the Political Behavior Program of the Survey Research Center has also embraced studies of organizational communications, primary group influence, the interaction of constituents and congressional representatives, and the congressional campaign. In collaboration with scholars abroad it has included work in comparative analysis of European and American electoral behavior as a major extension of earlier activity.

The Center has made a continuing effort to bring outside scholars into contact with this program. In 1950 a grant was obtained from the Carnegie Corporation which made it possible to bring two post-doctoral fellows from the field of political science to the Center for a two-year period. In the summer of 1954 and again in 1958, under the sponsorship of the SSRC, post-doctoral training institutes were conducted in political behavior research. In recent years a number of political scientists have come to the Center on fellowships or sabbatical leave. The Center increasingly has served as a source of data for scholars who are acquainted with our studies in this area. Many of these individuals have published articles or books based wholly or in part on information provided by the Center. The development of the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research was not intended to displace these contacts with individual scholars, which are valuable and rewarding, but to create a mechanism for a more intensive program of collaboration.

Organizational Premises.--The time, effort and expense which an Inter-University Consortium requires can only be justified if it holds promise of scientific advances beyond the present level of accomplishment. We are confident that the Consortium, based on the following principles, can indeed lead to important gains.

1. Institutional rather than individual participation.--The Consortium has been organized on the basis of institutional rather than individual participation. There is considerable evidence from recent years that an individual's freedom to acquire new skills is relatively meaningless without subsequent support for and facilitation of his efforts to utilize those skills. The most productive members of previous Survey Research Center Political Behavior seminars have profited from active and continued support from their home departments. Seminar members who participated solely on their own initiative or who came from departments not equipped to sustain the interests and exploit the skills developed in the seminar may have returned home no worse for the experience; but these people have found it very difficult to maintain their interests, and the effort expended in their training appears to have been largely dissipated.

With a formal introduction to new research problems and methods through summer seminars and other organizationally sponsored contacts, and with sustained departmental support, it is reasonable to expect individual Consortium participants to continue to enhance their own contributions to knowledge and to graduate instruction. This will result in part from their ability to share intellectual interests with one or more departmental colleagues who are participating in the same program, and in part from the opportunity to organize better training experiences for selected graduate students. Continued benefits from participation also should result from continuing cooperation and active contact with members of other departments sharing the same general interests. Although Consortium sponsored data collections cannot hope to satisfy all of the developing research interests of participants, new data acquisitions should encourage continued fruitful activity by each of them.

The Consortium, organized on the basis of university participation, provides a unique channel of communication among interested scholars in the universities, both in the United States and abroad; in particular it facilitates contact among the younger men on these faculties. It also guarantees a substantial measure of institutional support for those individuals who are attracted by the research opportunities this arrangement makes available.

2. Continuing rather than episodic relationships.--The Consortium is organized on the assumption of long-term association. The advantages to be gained by the creation of groups of scholars with continuing commitments to given subject matter areas are substantial. The exchange of ideas will be maximized through the continued interest, over time, of academic departments committed to the endeavor and represented by their appropriate staff members and graduate students. The cumulative effect which results from building closely on one's own work and the work of colleagues will be exploited. The sporadic work of individuals with diverse interests and little or no direct association with the work of predecessors or contemporary colleagues often produces worthwhile results but through the Consortium the power of extended and cumulative programs of research can also be realized.

3. Facilitation of advanced training in research methods.--The scholars who have made effective use of the Center's political data have almost invariably been people of considerable sophistication in research methodology. People who lack experience in behavioral research but who could acquire

research skills from continuing contact with our resources are unlikely to find an opportunity to do so without the aid of some organizational device such as the Consortium.

Training in the broad array of techniques now associated with the exploitation of the survey method constitutes a major interest of the Consortium. Beyond the selection of samples, the construction of questionnaires and the conduct of interviews lies the extensive repertoire of analysis procedures which are useful to researchers and which are best transmitted through the research practicum. Advanced graduate students as well as faculty members will be able to develop skills relevant to many of the newer types of analysis now being explored as well as to the established concerns of behavioral research. The many methodological and technical problems of integrating different kinds of data in a single study design receive systematic attention. Considerable emphasis is placed on combining survey information with the results of content analysis of the communications media, with the public records of legislative bodies, and with aggregated census and election statistics.

Both the training experience and the research materials will be directed in part toward the facilitation of subsequent teaching in the classrooms and seminars of Consortium participants. The Consortium is intended to serve not only the research interests of the participating individuals but the training of their students as well.

4. Efficient access to major bodies of data.--The integration of microcosmic and macrocosmic analyses, so crucial to many problems of concern to the student of political behavior, often depends on the availability of massive collections of data. This constitutes a major impediment to significant research when even the single definitive collection of election returns, census statistics or judicial or legislative materials from the public record is as much beyond the capabilities of the individual scholar as is the execution of a national or cross-national sample survey. Through the Consortium, the administrative, technical and professional resources of the Survey Research Center are organized to develop and maintain a major repository of data.

The scope of the repository was originally defined by the data collected by the Center's research program in political behavior. Expansion of the repository will continue to follow the lines laid down by the active research needs of the entire Consortium constituency. Major acquisitions of recent years, and those planned for the immediate future, reflect widely shared interests in electoral, legislative and judicial behavior.

A major goal in the operation of the repository is to relieve the individual researcher of all possible costs in carrying out his research. Since time is one of the scholar's most valuable commodities, the repository is organized and administered to minimize the lag between specification of data needs and access to the data. A corollary of the emphasis on institutional support for all Consortium activities calls for elimination of all capital investment and overhead charges to the individual user of the repository. An extension of the premise of institutional participation has led to the policy of levying marginal or incremental costs of data

retrieval and processing for research needs only where very major analysis projects are involved. All costs of consultation and technical assistance and most costs of data preparation for dissertations and small monographs are borne by the operating budget and are, therefore, essentially free to individual Consortium participants. This policy will be implemented as long as it is financially practicable to do so.

5. The stimulation of new research.--The general commitment to facilitate research may be expected to result in a number of activities less programmatic than the training and repository efforts. Given the heterogeneity of the Consortium constituency, it is probably not reasonable to expect the organization to conduct specific research in the name of the collectivity. Nevertheless, Consortium resources can be devoted to encourage both individual and collaborative research efforts. In this connection the Consortium has participated in the organization of a number of research conferences. By providing a vehicle for the widespread sharing of new data collections, the organization has also added to the promise of research proposals advanced by both the Center and by the scholars from other participating institutions.

The specialized summer seminars sponsored in conjunction with the training program may be used to bring together researchers with mutual interests in new research endeavors. The initiative that results in new research plans remains with individuals, but the seminars can be shaped by interested individuals to maximize the possibliity of direct research results.

In an even more decentralized fashion, individual research efforts are supported by the Consortium staff and by professional members of the Center staff. Personnel are made available for consultation on a wide range of problems, from research design and data collection to procedures for analysis and complex processing of data. The members of the Consortium staff are explicitly commissioned to offer these services; they also provide liaison with relevant technical and professional personnel on the SRC staff.

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 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.

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 graduate degree programs. They are eligible for limited services such as data for class instruction and faculty research, for faculty participation in summer seminars, and other services that may be determined by the Council.

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 $3,500 per year, for Categories B and C, $2,000 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 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.

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 nine 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. Three new members will be elected EACH year TO SERVE THREE-YEAR TERMS. The chairman will ordinarily be selected from among the members who will be serving the second year of their terms and will, in turn, normally serve a two-year term as chairman.

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. FIVE MEMBERS WILL CONSTITUTE A QUORUM FOR COUNCIL ACTION.

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 members, or four members of the Council.

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 obligation 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.

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 costs. 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 the expenditures in planning and executing the conference.

II. SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAM

POLICY STATEMENT ON RESEARCH TRAINING FOR ADVANCED GRADUATE STUDENTS AND FACULTY MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN ICPR ACTIVITIES

Formal training and research experience in quantitative analysis must be provided for a relatively large number of persons if the Consortium is to do more than facilitate the work of already established research scholars. Only a minority of participating universities are prepared to offer a full range of professional research training in behavioral methods to their graduate students. Among member institutions, the burgeoning interest in behavioral research has been reflected in major curricular changes in a number of programs of graduate study; and, more generally, limited staff resources are being rapidly expanded. Often, however, the new staff members are not well prepared to offer formal training in research to their students. A relatively large number of participating faculty members are essentially self-taught practitioners of the research arts and are interested in extending their competencies in the actual conduct of their own research. The pressures produced by these situations, as well as those stimulated by the successful operation of other elements of the Consortium program of activities, have been reflected in a demand for training in research methods and techniques open to faculty participants as well as advanced graduate students.

Each summer since its inception the Consortium has sponsored two series of training and research seminars, one designed mainly to give instruction in research method, the other to provide a substantive review of work in specialized research areas.

Training Seminars.--The training program arose out of the belief of Consortium members that it was desirable to supplement the methodological training offered graduate students at a majority of member institutions and to permit faculty members to extend their methodological training. Although the evolution of training programs offered at member universities may eventually reduce this function, the demand for training seminars has risen steadily over the first several years.

During its brief history the Consortium's training program has changed a good deal in response to the changing needs of member schools, the increasing number of participants, and the growth of the Consortium's data archives. In 1963 and 1964 the program consisted of two consecutive four-week seminars, the first on research design, the second on data analysis, each carrying three hours' credit. In 1965 the entire eight-week period was devoted to a single seminar on data analysis, carrying six hours' credit. In 1966 three differentiated eight-week seminars, each carrying six hours' credit, were offered: the first on research design, the second on data analysis, the third on applications of mathematics to political research. The first and second of these seminars were distinguished partly by the broader range of research topics covered by the seminar on design, partly by the greater statistical preparation expected of participants in the seminar on data analysis. The pattern was similar in 1967 and a special eight-week course tailored to the needs of historians was to be added in 1968. A more detailed description of the offerings is given in memoranda prepared for each summer program.

The training program makes extensive use of the Consortium's archives and data-processing facilities. Each participant in the seminars on research design and data analysis is expected to participate in analysis projects during the seminar period, typically using data from the archives. He is assisted in this by members of the Consortium's technical staff through frequent consultation, amounting in many cases to tutorial sessions in data-processing.

There has been a marked change in the degree of preparation, as well as the number, of participants over past summers. Persons attending from universities which have participated in each summer program have shown a steadily higher average level of preparation. This trend has been partly offset, however, by the lesser average preparation of persons attending from newer member institutions, many of which have smaller graduate departments and give less methodological training on their own campuses.

Although the training seminars are organized primarily for graduate students and faculty from member institutions, they are available to other qualified applicants. It seems probable, for example, that as many as six foreign scholars will attend each summer's program under an agreement with the International Social Science Council. Some faculty members from smaller universities or colleges which are not Consortium members, and occasional students from these instititions, can also be expected to participate.

Specialized Research Seminars.--Each summer two seminars are organized to review research in various substantive areas. In 1963 one seminar dealt with comparative political research, another with research on judicial behavior. In 1964 one seminar dealt with research in developing nations, a second with research on legislative behavior. In 1965 one seminar dealt with research on community power structures, another, sponsored jointly with a committee of the American Historical Association, dealt with quantitative historical research. More recently they have dealt with the research problems in the areas of political socialization, political elites and strategies for studying the political processes at the state level. Tentatively planned are special seminars related to international relations and international organizations, roll call analysis, small group analysis and curricula changes necessary to incorporate stronger methodological training in undergraduate education.

In view of the proliferation of research findings and of the presence of unresolved problems of method, the Consortium seeks to provide the systematic inquiries and confrontations necessary to aid further research. Preliminary plans for research conferences are initiated in response to requests for a conference expressed by prospective participants. A judgment that a conference could make a significant contribution to a major domain of behavioral research usually depends on two related considerations: (1) during the preceding years, major resources will have been invested in a number of independent research projects and the data from many of the projects will be available for reanalysis; (2) it will be evident that a series of crucial problems of conceptualization, design, and measurement have emerged and should be attacked with the combined resources of the new evidence and experience produced by contemporary work.

Therefore, a conference usually is organized around examinations and reanalyses of data available from the leading contemporary studies. The goal of a conference will be the inspection of major research problems, both of substance

and of method, and conference participants are concerned with exploring the most significant problems of concept, method, and technique confronting innovative research. A conference seeks to provide an opportunity for research scholars to engage in discussion with the principal investigators of the major projects. Through the use of the data-processing facilities of the Consortium, conference participants engage in a direct exchange between theoretical questions and the empirical materials relevant to these questions. Conference leaders and participants are concerned, as well, with identifying the lacunae in the evidence pertaining to major conceptual constructions and with defining unresolved problems for empirically-based theory.

Financial Support.--The summer training program is financed by pooling diverse sources of support. Direct costs of operating the program are shared by the Consortium, the University of Michigan and various external funding agencies. Recently the National Science Foundation has become the primary outside source of support for both operating costs and special research seminars. Where the Consortium operating budget once provided virtually all of the financing, these other sources of support now carry the major share of the administrative and instructional costs. In like manner, the cost to participants is distributed among a variety of sources of support, and again, it is now the case that the National Science Foundation has become the primary source. Funds available to the Consortium for subsidizing participation are, by established practice, used to make up the difference between the basic cost of participation (including travel, tuition and living expenses) and the money available to the prospective participants through their schools. In recent years these funds, supplementing the operating budget which is based on the members' annual subscription fees, have offset much as half of the total costs to participants. Experience has indicated that it is possible, over the long run, to balance the diverse objectives of maintaining participation at the level set by the availability of staff and teaching facilities while achieving an equitable distribution of supplementary funds among the member schools.

Selection of participants, within the limits imposed by the availability of funds and the need for their equitable distribution, is the province of the member institution. The usual procedure is one in which the Official Representative nominates candidates for participation, indicates the financial resources of each nominee--including funds available from the institution, and provides some preference ranking for the guidance of the staff. Selection is then made by a special Admissions Subcommittee of the Council which is guided by the aforementioned criteria. Difficult decisions are made in the consultation with the relevant Official Representatives.

FINAL REPORT ON CONFERENCE ON THE MEASUREMENT OF PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AMERICAN STATES, JULY 28-AUGUST 3, 1968

The principal stimulus of this conference was the 1966 conference on state politics, also sponsored by the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research.* The committee members believe that the major progress in the field of state politics since that conference can be subsumed under the label of comparative state policy analysis. To further the work that had already begun, we organized this conference under the theme of measuring state public policies and related phenomena. Invitations were sent to people known to be working in several related aspects of state policy analysis. We sought to include economists and other social scientists, as well as political scientists in the group. We expected to focus the conference around a group of papers already known to the committee members. On the basis of suggestions made by the invited participants, however, we re-opened the agenda and included a number of papers representing projects at various stages of refinement. An appendix to this report includes the Conference Agenda and a copy of each paper. The various issues discussed at the conference included:

1) The development of policy analysis as a topic of increasing interest in political science literature;
2) The conception and measurement of judicial policy;
3) The conception and measurement of public service policy;
4) The conception and measurement of attitudes toward policy by means of survey and aggregate data;
5) Economic issues in education and welfare policy;
6) The influence of legislative structure on policy;
7) Socio-economic and historic influences on policy;
8) The initiation of policy;
9) The conception and measurement of policy impacts;
10) New directions in the collection and dissemination of policy-relevant data.

As a result of the formal papers and their discussion, it is evident that political scientists--and economists--are working on several dimensions of comparative policy analysis. A number of items testify to progress made since the 1966 conference:

1) Several explicit and operational models of policy processes have been developed. While each of these derives from the systems theory described by David Easton, a number of variations on the basic model have been developed. Professor Dye described his model which includes socio-economic and political inputs, and the outputs of policy. Professor Hofferbert presented a model which differs from Dye's in making explicit the role of decision-making elites in the policy process, in its sensitivity

---

*Funds in support of the conference were provided by the National Science Foundation Division of Social Sciences and The University of Michigan.

to the historical nature of policy-making, and in pointing out those factors that can make environmental conditions salient for the policy process. Professor Sharkansky introduced a model that illuminated the multidimensionality of what may appear to be homogeneous "policy," "policy outputs," and "policy impacts."

2) The development of new measurements for policies, the factors which provide influence to policy-makers, and the factors which reflect the influence of policy. Professor Wilson reported his progress in developing "social indicators" for the quality of racial opportunities, education, and social welfare in the states; Professors Glick and Vines reported their work in measuring and assessing certain judicial policies in the states; Professor Hofferbert reported his discovery of consistent dimensions (factors) in the socio-economic characteristics of the states over the time span of 1890-1960; and Professor Dye reported experiments with Gini indices of state personal income; he demonstrated the utility which measures of resource distribution--as opposed to measures of central tendency--may have in the future of comparative state policy analysis. The papers by Professors Miner and Kasper led to a discussion of the use of planning-programming-budgeting. At several points during the conference, the participants discussed this and other ways in which the work of the academic policy analyst might assist the public official. Professors Lipsky and Walker, in particular, urged that academicians include within their models variables which might respond to the decisions of policy-makers. In this way, policy-makers might gain some insight about the likely interaction of their own "policies" with other elements of the policy process. There were also frequent recommendations that policy analysts consider variables for policy or policy-determinants that did not rely on expenditures or other readily-measured phenomena, but which sought to capture some of the more subtle aspects of the policy process. Some of the work reported at the conference seems to meet these requirements, e.g., that of Professors Walker, Jennings and Zeigler, Hawkins, Leuthold, Wilson, Hofferbert, Glick and Vines.

3) The use of the policy-analysis orientation to investigate various aspects of state politics. Professors Leuthold, Grumm and Hawkins reported about the salience of various features of state legislatures--including changes in the scheme of apportionment--for the nature of state policies; Professor Sharkansky reported some findings pertaining to the formal powers of the governor and his relations with the legislature as they affect state budget policies; Professor Wright assessed certain federal grant-in-aid programs with respect to their objectives, and their political and fiscal consequences for other aspects of state and federal affairs. Professors Zeigler and Jennings reported some findings from their study of the salience of state government for citizens. Their data show several distinctive characteristics about those individuals for which state government is salient, and they raise some further questions about the capacity of state policies to feed back to state officials through their stimulus of the public. Several papers indicate that policy processes differ with the "level of aggregation" employed; thus suggesting the importance of state--as opposed to local or sub-local--governmental structures for policy.

4) The explicit focus on the process of policy-innovation, and the conditions which may encourage or retard innovation. Professor Walker has discerned some patterns in the timing of program adoptions by state governments, and in the traits of those states that group together with respect to their speed of innovation. Professor Morss described the conditions that support major increases in state government expenditures. Professor Hofferbert's study of elites promises to clarify some of the elements which permit state governments to adopt new measures. Professor Hawkins' report on the effects of reapportionment in Georgia described how the process of reapportionment worked to alter the participants and leadership in the Georgia legislature, and is facilitating bills that serve urban interests. Professor Sharkansky's study of the "routines" used by policy-makers, in contrast, identifies some of the decision processes that retard innovation.

5) The focus on individual areas of policy-making. Papers by Professor Miner (on education) and Professor Kasper (on public assistance) dealt with items of specific interest to each field of policy. They provided an important counter to the efforts of many political scientists who seek to generalize about the full range of public policies. There may be much about each policy segment that is peculiar to its own realm. Further research might well profit by holding open the possibility that policy-making processes differ significantly from one field of service (e.g., education, welfare, transportation, health, natural resources, public safety) to another.

6) The continued development of tools for policy-analysis. Professor Fowler reported on a technique of causal modelling which is useful for inferring the direction of causal flow among three or more variables. Mr. Weber described the work he is doing in conjunction with Professor Munger with respect to the estimation of the attitudes of state populations from the responses of national samples to specific policy questions. Several participants quarreled with the use of correlation coefficients as the primary tool for policy analysis and urged the use of devices that are more sensitive to patterns of interaction among the variables of a model.

The committee feels that the political science of policy-analysis has reached a level of sufficient maturity and professional interest to be useful as subjects of study and research by graduate and undergraduate students. To facilitate both research and instruction, it will be desirable to provide data that is not currently available to teachers, and not conveniently available to scholars. Insofar as the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research has proven itself a useful mechanism for the distribution of data to social scientists, we recommend that the Consortium's Committee on State Data explore with relevant data collecting agencies of the Federal Government the desirable priorities for acquiring and storing data relevant to the measurement and analysis of public policies in the American states.

Ira Sharkansky,
Conference Committee Chairman
John G. Grumm
Richard I. Hofferbert
Jack L. Walker

AGENDA

I. Policy Analysis in Recent Literature of Political Science

Michael Lipsky, "Outputs, Structure and Power: An Assessment of Changes in the Study of State and Local Politics"

Discussion: Thomas R. Dye, Jack Walker, Ronald Weber

II. A. The Conception and Measurement of Judicial Policy

Henry Robert Glick and Kenneth N. Vines, "Law Making in the State Judiciary: A Comparative Study of the Judicial Role in Four States"

Discussion: Michael Lipsky and Richard I. Hofferbert

B. Edmund Fowler: A Discussion of Causal Modelling

III. Economic Issues in Education and Welfare Policy

Jerry Miner, "Financial Support of Education"
Hirschel Kasper, "Welfare Payments and Work Incentive: Some Determinants of the Rate of General Assistance Payments"

Discussion: Robert Harlow and Clara Penniman

IV. Socio-economic and Historic Influences on Public Policy

Thomas R. Dye, "Influences on Public Policy: Politics vs. Economics"
Richard I. Hofferbert, "Socio-economic Dimensions of the American States: 1890-1960"

Discussion: Edmund P. Fowler, Dennis Riley, John O. Wilson

V. The Initiation of Policy

Jack L. Walker, "The Adoption of Innovations by the American States"
Elliott R. Morss, "Fluctuations in State Expenditures: An Econometric Analysis"
Richard I. Hofferbert, "Elite Decisions and Non-decisions in State Policy Initiation"

Discussion: Thad L. Beyle, Harmon Zeigler, James Hogan

VI. The Conception and Measurement of Public Service Policy

John O. Wilson, "Inequality of Racial Opportunity--An Excursion into the New Frontier of Socioeconomic Indicators"

Discussion: John Crittenden, Robert Harlow

VII. Legislative Structure and Public Policy

David Leuthold, "Findings in Missouri and Michigan: Reapportionment"
Brett W. Hawkins, "Findings in Georgia: Reapportionment"
John G. Grumm, "Structure and Policy in the State Legislature"

Discussion: Thad L. Beyle and Andrew T. Cowart

VIII. The Impact of Policy

A. Deil S. Wright, "Federal Aids: Aims, Advantages and Disadvantages, and Consequences"
Ira Sharkansky, "Problems of Theory and Method: Environment, Policy, Output, and Impact"

Discussion: Vincent L. Marando, Edward Flentje, Kenneth Vines

B. The Conception of Measurement of Attitudes and Policy: Survey and Aggregate Data

Harmon Zeigler and M. Kent Jennings, "The Salience of State Politics and Public Policy"

Discussion: Henry Glick and Deil S. Wright

APPLICATION TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FUNDS FOR SUPPORT OF ADVANCED SCIENCE SEMINARS ON QUANTITATIVE POLITICAL RESEARCH
(Summer 1970)

Summary

Since its beginning in the early 1960's, the Consortium summer training program has developed into an important instrument for instruction in data gathering and analysis for political science and other social science students and faculty. During this time the instructional setting has evolved from standard classroom lecturing to offering topics in modular course "elements" incorporating analysis projects aided by the use of computers. Both real and contrived data have been used extensively to provide the student an opportunity to become actively involved in a simulated research experience.

Both the modular plan of course organization and the commitment to the student's active participation in data analysis are innovations which arose from the experience of six summer programs between 1963 and 1968. The modular plan has shown itself to be advantageous both for students and instructors. It makes it possible for the participants to select from a highly differentiated collection of course elements a set which best matches their preparation and professional interest. This allows us to move a further step toward the ideal of an individualized and intensive training experience well beyond what could be accomplished in the more heterogeneous course format typical of most conventional teaching environments. By the same token, instructors find it possible to concentrate in depth on guiding participants with similar background preparation and research interests through a well-defined subset of data analytic problems. The practicum experience, moving participants from a passive to an active role, is in our view essential to the development of the analytical skills required in later research.

Plans for 1970

Our plans for the period covered by this proposal continue to develop this perspective. The modular course elements will be organized within broad regions of data analytic methods. In 1969 we are extending this program, begun in 1968, by offering modules within four such regions: (1) dimensional analysis including metric and non-metric scaling; (2) dynamic analysis including time series analysis; (3) causal analysis; and (4) applied statistics. For example, the separate modules within the region of applied statistics will be regression analysis,

cross-level inference, transformations, analysis of variance and covariance, and Bayesian statistics. In 1970 the work in each region will be formally designated as a separate Advanced Science Seminar.

The advantages of the approach are threefold. The student will be able to select those modules which are relevant to his interests and yet do not duplicate previous course work. For example, if a student were already familiar with regression analysis he could take all the modules in the applied statistics region but that one.

A second advantage is that it will be possible to offer a specific module more than once during a summer. It has been found in the past that students were not always able to attend the modules of their choice due to conflicting schedules and differing individual priorities. By repeating modules at various times during the summer it will be possible to maximize the availability of these modules to the students and, at the same time, minimize class size. Increasing use of this sort of repeated scheduling will be made during the coming years.

The differentiation of analysis regions into modules leads to a third advantage. Individual instructors can concentrate their teaching on a smaller number of topics and therefore provide better instruction. An instructor expert in factor analysis but not in non-metric scaling can teach factor analysis while an expert in non-metric scaling can devote his skills to that module.

In addition we propose to strengthen the modular system in several levels of complexity, each suited to different levels of background preparation by the student. Since the students come from many graduate schools and with varying mathematical and statistical competencies, they will be better served as the modules are more closely tailored to their needs. This differentiation is beginning in 1969 and will be continued in 1970 and beyond.

Even with several levels of instruction, students with better training in mathematics and statistics benefit measurably more from the more advanced modules. In order to enhance background preparation in these areas, we propose to offer early in each summer, remedial modules in mathematics and statistics. These modules will be specifically tailored to the requirements of later modules, and they will greatly facilitate the instruction in these later modules.

There is a continued need to keep the instructional material in the regions and modules current and relevant. This means adding regions as well as keeping existing modules up to date. For 1970 we plan initially to add a fifth region in the area of simulation of political and social processes.

Background

The entire Consortium training program has changed substantially during the past six years. Its growth in sheer numbers of participants --and therefore its change in role to that of a national research training facility--has been more than matched by the change in level of experience offered and in diversity of content. In 1963 some 46 faculty members and advanced graduate students from 20 schools were exposed to a single course of instruction that was offered by the Consortium but differed only marginally from the basic courses in survey research method that were traditionally offered by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. By the summer of 1970 we expect nearly 300 students and staff members from 120 colleges and universities to participate in one or more of seven seminars, the least of which will be at a level significantly more sophisticated than virtually all of the program offered in 1963.

Since 1965, the core of this program has been, and should continue to be, the work that has been supported by the Advanced Science Seminar Program of the National Science Foundation. Given the rapid change which has marked the recent state of the relevant social science disciplines, the meaning of "advanced science" as applied to the core activity of the training program has changed every bit as much as have the pedagogical techniques associated with it. The methodology and techniques of the behavioral sciences have advanced almost exponentially over the past decade. It seems fair to suggest that a large fraction of the established research scholars in Political Science have been sufficiently outdistanced by the rapid pace of change to make it difficult for them to appraise much of the research currently reported in the American Political Science Review; their ability to sustain their roles as innovative scholars has been diminished in like manner.

In the face of the many obstacles to a full and swift diffusion of methodological advances via the standard professional literature, the more advanced portions of the Consortium training program provide one of the few available means for rapidly expanding the cadre of researchers equipped with a knowledge of the newest and most powerful research tools. The diversity of program elements, however, is also intended to reach the younger scholars whose home institutions can at best provide comparable training experience in only a subset of the research domains encompassed by the Consortium program. The trained ability of a large number of faculty members and students to exploit the level of work now offered by the Consortium reflects a dramatic change over recent years and now challenges the Consortium teaching staff to maintain a fast pace of innovation in the substance of each year's program. For the least experienced and least advantaged, the less complex portions of the program still constitute advanced training that goes well beyond that which would otherwise be open to them. We are acutely aware that the grossly unequal distribution of resources across the nation's universe of schools is not well matched by the distribution of talent, particularly at the graduate school level. Although the eight-week summer program can

scarcely be assumed to reshape very many careers, its value to the most capable participants is almost certainly inversely proportional to the resources of their respective schools. Its value to the community of scholarship is consequently that of facilitating the development of a great deal of talent that will add to the skilled manpower now so scarce and yet so vital to the growth of a powerful and useful behavioral science.

The range of program offerings is, of course, limited, but it has mapped the concerns of at least one discipline, political science, sufficiently to have made the program a national resource for that discipline. If one assumes that 75 percent of the advanced graduate students who participate in the program ultimately complete work for the Ph.D., the 142 students involved each year constitute about 36 percent of the 300 Ph.D.'s awarded annually in Political Science. In less speculative terms, some 565 students from 140 schools have received a significant part of their research training through the Consortium program in the past three years.

In recent years, recognition that the program is concerned with problems facing the behavioral science researcher in other disciplines has been followed by a broadening of the disciplinary base of participation. Indeed, there has been sufficient interest on the part of historians to permit a "spin-off" in the form of a seminar in quantitative methods in historical research now offered through the University of Michigan Department of History as a regular part of the Consortium summer program. As attached Appendix B indicates, participants in the 1969 core program are expected to include a substantial number of people from still other disciplines.

Beyond stimulating and then supporting the work in quantitative historical methods, the core program of advanced science seminars has also provided the locus for a number of related training and research activities. In three of the past four years the summer program has included an advanced seminar in mathematical models for political analysis. During the past six years the program has also provided the intellectual as well as administrative context for some ten research conferences. A fair number of these conferences have in turn, marked the initiation of collaborative research activities that would, at best, have developed more slowly without the occasion and the impetus of the conferences. In 1970 we expect the summer program to include new versions of the history and mathematical models seminars, an advanced science seminar in research design, four advanced seminars in data analysis, and as many as three research conferences.

In line with the broader aims of the Consortium, the summer program has also contributed, however directly or indirectly, to the strengthening of local training in research in the member schools. At the end of the fifth year of Consortium activity, a somewhat incomplete assessment of the organization's impact indicated that some 128 courses had been created in 61 schools as an attributed direct result of the Consortium's existence. Appendix C summarizes this assessment. Given the fact that the Consortium is only one of many sources of institutional support for the developments to which it is committed, its unique contribution to this proliferation of training in research remains a matter of conjecture. In any event, it was possible for the first time this current year to adopt a general policy that excluded most students in the major graduate departments across the nation from participation in the least advanced portions of the 1969 program on the grounds that the Consortium's role is to provide training more advanced than would normally be available to the prospective participant on his home campus.

The explicit exceptions to this policy are again indicative of the utility of the program. Although many schools such as Stanford, Northwestern, Oregon and North Carolina now offer work that is a direct match and more for much of the Consortium's program, the same schools do sometimes have students in special programs, such as area studies, that preclude formal training in methodology of the type emphasized in the Consortium offerings. It was thought necessary to make explicit provision for selected students needing such training to take advantage of the Consortium summer program. For these students, who are appearing in increasing numbers, the Consortium program fills some of the needs envisioned by various specialized pre- and post-doctoral training fellowship programs specially designed to support scholars who belatedly discover a need for training not normally included in their regular courses of study.

Despite the financial economies of scale that will continue to concentrate the Consortium summer program on the University of Michigan campus in the immediate future, we foresee and are agreed upon an ultimate decentralization--or regionalization--of the training program. Quite apart from savings on travel costs for participants from either coast or the South, decentralization of at least some parts of the present program would certainly further strengthen the behavioral sciences at the added host institutions. Decentralization would doubtless also permit a reinforcement of the Consortium's dedication to remain a center of innovation and rather special competence. With or without decentralization, the Consortium will remain a center for specialized training. The cost of such advanced specialized training will certainly long remain too high for some of the major universities and for many of the small or developing institutions. Throughout the foreseeable future there will continue to be a crucial role as a national training facility that must be taken either by the Consortium or by some similarly national institution.

Structure of Advanced Science Seminars in Consortium Program, 1970

The seminars for those with limited experience in empirical research will embrace research design as well as data analysis. As in the past years seminars in research design and quantitative methods in historical research will give attention to the full range of operations that constitute the conduct of empirical research, but they will give increased attention to the need for experience in handling data and executing actual data analyses. It will also be possible for participants to take advantage of selected modules prepared for the analysis seminars.

In addition to participating in selected modules from the data analysis seminars, and being exposed to two or more extended series of lectures supplementing the basic material available in the standard methodological literature, each seminar participant will design and carry out a special project in data analysis. A variety of data sets from the Consortium archives will be available in fully documented form for use in the projects. Participants will be organized in small groups and each group will be supported by a junior staff member who will provide technical assistance in the use of the computer and in understanding the idiosyncracies of each data set. Senior staff will review each project with the participant and provide a limited tutorial review of work as it progresses. Finally, a full, elementary course in statistics will be offered to all seminar participants in need of such an introductory course or remedial review.

The participant in the data analysis seminars will concentrate his study in two regions during the summer. In one of the regions the first four weeks will be devoted to intensive course work, followed by four weeks of research and study seminars. This will be the student's primary region.

Study in the secondary region usually will begin after the fourth week and not include as extensive research experience as in the primary region. The research and study seminar will offer the participant a unique opportunity to discuss informally the application of acquired techniques to his own research design and receive consultation from the staff and other participants on how to use the quantitative methods of the region in his research.

The possibility of providing intensive experience in data analysis is greatly enhanced both by developments of computer technology and by the presence of the extensive political data which the Consortium has archived. These make it possible in certain respects to simulate the data environment in which an investigator would work as he applies analytical tools to a range of substantive problems of political research. Indeed, a carefully prepared analysis project can confront the partici-

pant, over a relatively brief span of time, with a number of the strategic choices and issues of interpretation which might arise in any fairly extended and complex analysis of research data.

Computer developments also make it feasible to contrive a complex set of data, a procedure which was used with high success in the 1967/68 seminars. By utilizing a data-simulation or model sampling routine to construct data appropriate to various analytic techniques, participants can gain remarkable insight into the logic and assumptions of the techniques. Indeed, the insight gained from this sort of gaming extends also to questions of research design: by constructing data appropriate to certain types of analysis, rather than working only with data already gathered by prior research, participants are led to a more sensitive understanding of directions in which existing research design and data collection need to be extended. For example, constructing a data set representing a process with important reciprocal causation or feedback creates an understanding of the importance of future studies based on observations over time.

Special Curriculum Development Project

To develop the simulated analysis projects required by the several "modules," the Consortium has received a major grant from the National Science Foundation's Office of Computing Activities. The materials being produced by this special project over a three-year period will ultimately be available for use beyond the Consortium's own training program. But a close bond exists between the development project and the Consortium's seminars in the immediate future. On the one hand, the materials developed by the project enhance the value of the training seminars. At the same time, the seminars provide the major arena for testing and improving these experimental curricular materials.

Such testing will begin during the summer of 1969 and will continue during the period of this proposal. In addition to the evaluation of curricular development materials, it will include the investigation of major pedagogical problems such as the effectiveness of time-sharing vs. batch computer systems, the optimal use of hand and computer problem sets, and the effect of teaching methods on participant attitudes.

Indeed, in the context of our concern with strengthening the training capabilities of member schools, the tie with the curricular development effort provides a strong supporting reason to attach importance to the continuation of the Consortium's training program through the summer of 1970. This effort is part of an evolutionary process of developing an integrated package of substantive instruction materials, and computing support, from which others at other institutions may select those components necessary to meet needs on their own campuses.

As part of its regular servicing work for members the Consortium staff is now distributing, upon request, the computing system for the IBM 360/40 developed at ISR. In the next few months the Consortium will augment this system with the analysis routines used on the 360/67 for the summer courses. The service will include extensive technical and operational assistance and will be extended beyond users of IBM equipment, with special initial emphasis for CDC users. Funding for these activities to give broader access to some of the major products of the summer seminars is not requested in this proposal since these costs are met by the membership directly.

Personnel

The seminars have so far been taught mainly by members of the faculty and advanced graduate students in political science at the University of Michigan. In addition to people in these categories we propose to draw on the professional talents of faculty at other institutions. Another source of personnel lies in the group of advanced graduate students at member schools who have been outstanding participants in previous Consortium summer programs. Their participation in the actual conduct of the seminar would constitute a very significant addition to their own professional training while they contribute to the training of others.

The anticipated scope of activity reflected in this proposal will mean an intensive practicum in pedagogy for six to eight pre-doctoral students who are soon to become teachers and researchers in their own right. Even though future enrollment is not extended greatly beyond the numbers enrolled in 1967, 1968, and 1969, an increase in instructional manpower at this level is mandatory. Beyond the set of lectures and senior assistants, both the professional and supporting personnel will be drawn from personnel now associated with the Consortium or with allied social science disciplines at the University of Michigan.

Computer Utilization

The heavy concern with statistical analysis in the content of the seminars makes it essential that the computational capacity of the University of Michigan IBM 360/67 be utilized.[1] During the summer of 1969 two developments in software will be utilized and their usefulness evaluated. The first concerns the area of "user interfaces," or control languages designed to facilitate the use of computing equipment by data analysts unfamiliar with computer programming skills. Free-format verbal specifications will be used by participants in submitting analysis requests to the computer. It is expected that this feature, which has been incorporated both into the system of individual canned analysis

[1] Generous provision of access to the computer has, indeed, been a substantial and vital contribution of the University of Michigan to the program in recent years. In 1969, $25,000 was made available for computer use during the summer program.

programs and into the system supervisor and control routine dealing with the environment of the Michigan Terminal System on the IBM 360/67, will aid users in enlisting the power of available computing equipment. At the same time, such experience as is gained with the use of this facility by seminar participants will be extremely valuable in assessing its strengths and weaknesses for the benefit of further development of user interfaces.

The second development in this area is an experimental project aimed at exploring new potentialities offered by a time-sharing environment. Some modules in 1969 will, for the first time, make use of a fully interactive system of data analysis software which is designed to enable the analyst to "interact" with his data in an incremental, iterative fashion by taking advantage of immediate feedback in a way not heretofore possible in batch environments or with barch-type software. The initial experience joined with its use by summer participants will allow us to obtain relevant information about the analytic and pedagogical implications of the time-shared computer. There are practically no precedents in this area, and we look toward experimental use in the summer of 1969 as the main source of guidance for further development of this project, which is part of the curricular development plans covered by a separate NSF grant.

Administrative Arrangements

Substantive, procedural and technical changes in the training program have been matched by changes in fiscal and administrative support. The summer program of 1963 was supported exclusively by the Consortium Operating Budget, which is funded entirely by the annual institutional membership fees. It rapidly became evident that substantial added funding was necessary if the program were to meet the needs to which it was addressed. In particular, the social sciences' traditional failure to support summer research or training costs for students or staff made it impossible for many would-be participants to accept the financial burden of a removed and therefore relatively expensive increment to their professional training. As a consequence, support was sought and received from the National Science Foundation.

The costs of an experimental program, added to the costs to the participants, were the basis for a series of grants from the Foundation. Given the scope and size of the program, funding of direct costs was placed on a rather generous cost-sharing basis. The Consortium carried a larger portion of the administrative and instructional costs while the foundation supported the balance of those costs and all of the stipend and expense support that made it possible for enrollment in the program to expand.

As the summer training program, offered through the University of Michigan Rackham School of Graduate Studies, became an established feature

of Michigan's graduate program, a third phase of funding was begun. Over recent years a tripartite division of support has emerged. The University has assumed a major role in funding the direct instructional costs. The National Science Foundation has supported the remainder of the instructional costs, a fraction of the direct administrative costs and all of the increasing costs of participant stipends. The Consortium has carried the balance of the administrative costs in increasingly large amounts. Despite steadily increasing demands on the Consortium Operating Budget from other organizational activities, we have willingly increased our budgetary support of the administrative costs to permit the limited NSF funding to go more heavily to the stipend support of participants.

In the face of the rising costs of education, economies of scale and innovative pedagogical techniques have permitted us to carry out the program with relative efficiency and a very low cost per credit hour of instruction received. This economy of operation has added to the University of Michigan's willingness to increase its support of the program. Unfortunately, none of these considerations has eased the financial burden of the individual participant.

In order to facilitate participation in the program, we have consistently maximized the impact of NSF funding by making only partial stipend grants to participants. Thus, as our annual reports to the Foundation show, we have supported each year a much larger number of participants than nominally indicated in the formal budgets. Over the last two years, tuition and fees, cost of living, and cost of transportation have continued to rise sharply. At the same time the number of potential participants able to make use of the summer training facilities has increased dramatically. And program support has remained virtually unchanged in total dollar volume. In an ultimately ineffectual attempt to offset these factors, we have agreed to have a larger and larger fraction of each NSF grant go to stipend support; thus the Consortium's acceptance of an ever increasing proportion of the direct administrative costs.

Despite the increased costs of providing and obtaining professional research training, it seems that the basic problem lies elsewhere: the national growth and dispersion of training facilities has not kept pace with the rise of effective demands that should be met. Although the work in our basic seminar in research design can now be offered at a number of the most prestigious universities and new centers of excellence, developing institutions introducing new doctoral programs and undergraduate institutions striving to maintain quality by supporting research activities of talented younger staff members are increasingly turning to the Consortium to provide training opportunities that they are not able to offer themselves. At this level the number of persons who need further training and who deserve access to some of the nation's resources for training is large and growing rapidly. They are not many in any single institution, but they aggregate in their large numbers from many schools spread across the entire nation.

The more advanced seminars in the Consortium program are duplicated at still fewer schools within our membership. There is, however, a large and dispersed reserve of faculty talent that, if properly supported, could begin to provide large segments of the entire program to their home compuses. If our curricular development project proceeds to a successful conslusion and then is, indeed, as "exportable" as we expect, some of the demand now directed to the Consortium as a national resource will certainly abate. However, under the most optimistic of schedules we do not expect to feel major relief for at least three or four years. In that period, the demand for training and research competence, beyond that supplied by the limited number of graduate departments that sustain their own training needs, will assuredly grow. The other necessary resources for research - relevant and significant collections of data and the technical machinery for exploiting the data - are increasing at an unprecedented rate. The demand from society at large, as well as from the academic cloisters, for better information and understanding of the society's socio-political problems will surely accelerate. The academic community as never before is attuned to respond to both internal and external demands for more and better social research. But at the same time other forces are constraining if not diminishing the support of necessary growth and expansion.

As the resources for education suffer greater and greater pressures and demands, and as the needs to be met by those resources increase, we are attempting to adjust the allocation of resources available to the Consortium. We now propose a fourth phase in the funding of the Consortium summer training program. Our goal is to increase access to the program by relaxing somewhat our current stringent limits on admission and by increasing the number and size of stipends available to qualified participants. The goal can be reached only through a further drastic change in the allocation of NSF funding made available to us, combined with a substantial increase in the level of the funding.

We now propose to shift all funding of direct costs, both instructional and administrative, to the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research and the University of Michigan. Preliminary conversations indicate that the University's College of Literature, Science, and the Arts is willing, and may be able, to provide a significant increase in their already substantial support of the program's instructional costs. Unfortunately, it will not be possible to have an authoritive decision on this matter before mid-fall, looking then to the financial prospects of a fiscal year now more than twelve months away. In this situation, the Consortium is prepared and, with the lead-time we will have for budgeting expenditures from the Operating Budget for 1970-71, will be able to assume those instructional costs that connot be met by other University resources. The Consortium will also bear the full burden of the program's administrative costs; given the exigencies of the past two years this will not constitute any significant change from the current funding arrangements.

Budget

As the following budget proposal indicates we are requesting an increase in stipends and travel from $66,000/year, granted for the 1969 program, to $147,000/year for 1970. At the same time we are eliminating the $27,000 allocated to direct and indirect costs in 1969. The proposed 60% increase in the total grant will provide a 120% increase in the funding available for the expenses of the participants.

The financial ability of the Consortium to bear a significant increase in instructional and administrative costs is indicated by the budget statements attached as Appendix D. The first portion of the Appendix indicates the steady and rapid increase in the operating budget over the past six years. With no change in the membership fee base, the annual average net addition of some ten members would bring the totals for 1970-71 and 1971-72 to $425,000 and $449,500, respectively. Any change in the membership fee structure would, of course, be enacted only to increase the funds available for those years.

The second portion of Appendix D indicates the discretionary latitude available to Consortium Council and staff in distributing funds among organizational activities. In particular, the amounts allocated to archival development work in 1969-70 could, if necessary, be allocated to include support for increased summer program costs in 1970-71 if the expected increment in Collegesupport is not forthcoming.

National Science Foundation funds would, therefore, be used to enable social scientists, including sociologists, economists, social psychologists and historians as well as political scientists, to participate in one or another of the six seminars that will constitute the Consortium summer program in 1979. (Participation in the mathematical models seminar) or the research conferences will be separately funded.) All of the direct and indirect costs of instruction and administration will be borne by the University of Michigan through the College of Literature, Sciences and the Arts, the teaching departments, or the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research. Enrollment will be permitted to expand to at least 300, including both faculty and advanced graduate students.

Advanced Science Seminar Project

Proposed Budget

Summer 1970

A. Participant Support

1. Subsistence stipend for 245 for 8 wks. @ average of $60/wk. ($60 x 245 x 8)	$117,600	
2. Travel @ $120/participant average ($120 x 245)	29,400	
Total Participant Support		$147,000

B. Direct Operating Costs

Contributions toward Direct Operating Costs: 1) Tuition, $65,000; 2) University of Michigan, $72,000 and Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, $25,000 for a total contribution of $162,000.

Total Amount Requested from NSF	$147,000

APPENDIX B

ICPR SUMMER PROGRAM, PARTICIPANTS OUTSIDE POLITICAL SCIENCE

Anthropology:	Robert Heath, American University
Economics:	Gordon Goodfellow, University of Texas Jan Jorgensen, McGill University John Latcham, Kent State University
Educational Psych.:	Prof. Paul A. Games, Pennsylvania State University
Geography:	William Strong, University of Texas
International Relations:	Gary Hoggard, University of Southern California Patrick Irwin, University of Pennsylvania Charles Kegley, Syracuse University Thomas Tappan, San Francisco State College
Mathematics:	Frank Hinkle, University of Michigan
Philosophy:	Prof. Daniel Kubat, University of Waterloo
Sociology:	Thomas Carter, Louisiana State University Janet Clark, McGill University Robin Dinerman, Bowling Green State University Richard Farrell, University of California, Davis Prof. A.J. Gregor, University of California, Berkeley Gordon Hoff, Bowling Green State University Prof. Emory Kimbrough, Washington and Lee University Prof. Arthur Liebman, SUNY-Binghamton Joan Lyons, University of Waterloo Nathan Weinberg, University of California, Davis Jerrold Seaman, Tulane University Gene Zdrazila, Louisiana State University
History:	John Bachman, American University Prof. Richard Berginer, California State College, Fresno Eric Chapman, University of Michigan Peter Dixon, Nuffield College Prof. Jack Eblen, University of Connecticut Alfred Eckes, University of Texas Charlotte Goodman, University of Michigan Reid Holland, Oklahoma State University Prof. Keith Kavenagh, SUNY-Stony Brook Robert McCaa, UCLA Russell Matteson, CUNY Thomas Moore, University of Iowa Gary Ness, Duke University Prof. John Resch, Dennison University Gary Sanders, Louisiana State University Prof. Bruce Stave, University of Bridgeport

APPENDIX C

IMPACT OF ICPR SUMMER PROGRAM ON COURSE DEVELOPMENT

Summary

Institutions Covered	81
New Courses in Existence	
1. Graduate Methods	59
2. Graduate Substantive	12
3. Undergraduate Methods	47
4. Undergraduate Substantive	10
Total New	128
Revised Courses	
1. Graduate Methods	13
2. Graduate Substantive	9
3. Undergraduate Methods	6
4. Undergraduate Substantive	19
Total Revised	47
Proposed or Planned Courses	
1. Graduate Methods	30
2. Graduate Substantive	9
3. Undergraduate Methods	17
4. Undergraduate Substantive	14
Total Proposed or Planned	64

APPENDIX D

I. ICPR Annual Operating Budget Summary as Supported by Membership Fees for each Fiscal Year from 1962-63 with projection through Fiscal Year 1971-72:

Year	Income	Year	Income
1962-63	$ 60,000	1967-68	$325,000
1963-64	$ 79,000	1968-69	$370,000
1964-65	$ 95,500	1969-70	$400,500
1965-66	$132,700	1970-71	$425,000
1966-67	$171,750	1971-72	$449,500

II. ICPR Annual Operating Budger, 1969-70, as presented to the Annual Meeting of Official Representatives, May 24-25, 1969.

A. Technical Services to Members

(1)	Historical Archives Servicing	$44,000
(2)	Survey Archives Servicing	85,000
(3)	System Distribution	25,000
	Total	$154,000

B. Survey Archive Development $160,000

C. Summer Program $ 22,000

D. Consortium Administration $ 64,500

GRAND TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET $400,500

E. Expected Income from Membership Fees

(1)	91 Class "A" @ $3,500	$318,500
(2)	41 Class "B" @ $2,000	$ 82,000
	Operating Budget Total	$400,500

F. Projected Operating Budget

(1) Fiscal Year 1970-71

a.	94 Class "A" @ $3,500	$329,000
b.	48 Class "B" @ $2,000	$ 96,000
	Total	$425,000

(2) Fiscal Year 1971-72

a.	97 Class "A" @$3,500	$339,500
b.	55 Class "B" @$2,000	$110,000
	Total	$459,500

ICPR SUMMER PROGRAM ATTENDANCE, 8-WEEK SEMINARS

	1969				1968				
	687	787(788)	H799	Total	687	787	788	H799	Total
Credit	29	29	5	63	54	49	6	14	123
Audit	34	67	7	108	28	27	4	5	64
Ph.D. Guest	16	14	6	36	17	24	6	8	55
Total	79	110	18	207	99	100	16	27	242

	1967				1966			
	687	787	788	Total	687	787	788	Total
Credit	36	73	9	118	43	46	11	100
Audit	14	59	6	79	9	40	7	56
Ph.D. Guest	10	14	3	27	11	0	6	17
Total	60	146	18	224	63	86	24	173

687	Research Design
787	Data Analysis
787(788)	Data Analysis (Statistical Module)
788	MSSB-sponsored Mathematical Political Analysis
H799	Historical Data Analysis

	1965		1964		1963	
	687/787		687/787		687/787	
Credit	62	62	23	19	12	11
Audit	35	36	19	16	24	19
Ph.D. Guest	18	16	6	8	10	6
Total	115	114	48	43	46	36

687/787 Research Design 1st 4 weeks, Data Analysis 2nd 4 weeks

Number of member schools participating:

1969: 92 of 129, 71%
1968: 93 of 112, 83%
1967: 77 of 95, 81%
1966: 56 of 73, 76%
1965: 36 of 58, 62%
1964: 27 of 38, 71%
1963: 20 of 25, 80%

III. DATA REPOSITORY

POLICY STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE ICPR DATA REPOSITORY

One explanation for the belated interest in rigorously empirical investigations of political phenomena rests on the paucity of relevant data available for political research. The economists and sociologists have been the beneficiaries of an immense range of data collected for other purposes. Political science and history, among the social sciences, have been willing to remain bound to sources of evidence more appropriate to legal, literary, or philosophic traditions than to a concern with scientific investigation. Even those aspects of the public record which offer rich prospects for systematic analysis--legislative and judicial records, census and election statistics--have been inadequately exploited to those ends. Indeed, it is only within the last decade that professional effort has been exerted to prevent such basic information as presidential election returns from becoming fugitive materials lost to the study of electoral behavior.

The will to engage in behavioral research has been seriously handicapped by the magnitude of the task of data collection. The scholar who is interested in understanding or explaining a theoretically significant or politically important phenomenon is often, almost by definition, faced with the task of collecting data from an immense if not infinitely large universe of persons or events. Without the modern techniques of data collection, processing and manipulation, comprehensive and rigorous investigation has often been impossible. But with the advent of the methods and techniques currently used by psychology, sociology and economics, a number of impressive data collections pertinent to political research have been mounted and successfully completed.

One of the major functions of the Consortium is to establish, maintain and service a unique data repository. Within the nominal limits established to give priority to the ongoing work of Consortium participants, data and data-processing services will be available, as a matter of policy, to all scholars whether or not their institutions are members of the Consortium. Administrative and staff arrangements will, of course, favor the scholar whose school maintains a continuing affiliation with the Consortium. For either event, the successful administration of the repository will do much to minimize present inequities in access to data and to remove impediments which have served to limit the real utility of data resources heretofore available to scholars.

Moreover, the value of such a repository will be greatly enhanced by its association with the research and training activities of the Consortium. Inadequate as past data resources have been, they have been under-used. Their potential contribution to political research has not been realized because too few interested scholars have possessed the skills necessary to their exploitation. Through the Consortium, research scholarship and relevant data are brought together.

The presence of a professional staff, such as that supported by the Consortium, is vitally necessary to the successful operation of a data repository of the kind contemplated by the Consortium. Given the current state of research methodology in the social sciences, each important data collection is more or less unique in respects that have crucially important consequences for the subsequent use of data. Intimate familiarity with a study, acquired only through repeated experiences with the processing of data from the study, is absolutely essential in many instances if gross errors in data processing and interpretation are to be avoided. In some utopian future, social science data may be produced by procedures commonly understood or shared by a real community of research scholars. The processing of these data may then be routinized for handling by a bureaucracy of administrators and relatively unskilled personnel. In the unavoidable present, secondary analysis of data must rest on highly specialized judgment in the preparation of data ("cleaning" of data, codebooks, and other documentation; standardization of coding categories; consistency checking; error detection and correction; etc.) for widespread distribution if discontinuities between research procedures and research objectives are to be avoided.

The scope of the repository will be determined primarily by the active research interests of its users. The repository will include the only comprehensive collection of American national election statistics maintained in a form readily amenable to efficient manipulation and analysis. For example, it will include United States census materials of political relevance, similarly recorded on tape or direct access media and available for immediate analytic use. The legislative records reflected in House and Senate roll calls for the national Congress will also be a unique part of the archival holdings, as will the judicial decisions of the United States federal court system. In addition to these and other data provided in primary sources by the public record, a limited number of more specific sets of data collected in major research investigations will be included. These will be drawn from those studies which command widest interest among Consortium participants and which reflect the best in contemporary research procedures.

Apart from an initial interest in readily available data pertaining to the United States, priorities have not been established to define the limits of the possible data acquisitions. The goal is to maximize access to data for the extended range of all research interests represented by the faculty participants in Consortium activities. This will certainly include interest in comparative cross-cultural and cross-national research. Consortium resources will not be expended in the acquisition and processing of data possessing only an unspecifiable potential for use, nor will they be used in collecting data of inferior quality. The ultimate state of the Consortium archives may well find a very large body of materials pertaining to an extended range of research interests. Nevertheless, the data will represent only some fraction of those potentially available because the function of the Consortium repository is less that of establishing a general data library and more that of providing an efficient, discriminating facilitation of specific research and research plans of participating research scholars.

Another unique feature of the Consortium data repository pertains to the financial and administrative arrangements affecting access to the data. Part of the rationale behind the members' financial support of the Consortium is provided by the conviction that capitalization through various forms of institutional support is necessary to reduce marginal costs of access to research facilities. The charges for data services, for example, must be at a level commensurate with the limited funds available to advanced graduate students and members of the teaching faculty. Through creation of a permanent staff and provision of a budgetary allotment for data processing, the Consortium is able to provide data and services to participants with no cost to the individual. The same assistance is available to non-members for the basic marginal costs incurred.

On the administrative side, the Consortium staff and the data-processing facilities of the Survey Research Center and the Computing Center of the University of Michigan provide services of several kinds and levels of complexity. Where the participant has adequate facilities available on the home campus, he may simply request copies of any and all survey data for deposit in his own storage facilities. To meet other needs, the staff will construct special data summaries (analysis cards) or may carry out requested data processing--including simple tabulations or compilations as well as high-speed computer analysis. There is sufficient flexibility to adapt staff services to any level of demand, from provision of data cards or tapes to extended consultation on research design.

The development and maintenance of the data repository is supplemented by various efforts to improve Consortium participants' access to other data collections. Descriptions of data collections held by individuals as well as institutions, both within and outside the Consortium, will be provided to participants. Limited data collection, of no more than occasional relevance to the dominant research interests of the participants, will thus nevertheless remain visible to the possible users. Moreover, a decision not to give the Consortium administrative control over a data collection need not remove that collection from the resources available to participants. Indeed, wherever the person or agency responsible for a collection of data has the facilities for its administration and is willing to provide access to outside scholars, the Consortium has no desire to duplicate these services and is quite willing to do no more than publicize their existence. In this spirit the Consortium has assisted in the creation of the Council on Social Science Data Archives and is committed to supporting the efforts of the International Social Science Council in developing international cooperation among archives.

Finally, in anticipation of demands which may be felt in the near future, the Consortium is vitally interested in the development of data-processing and retrieval systems adapted to the constituency-oriented needs of the Consortium data repository.

The Strategy and Tactics of Repository Expansion.--An outline for the strategy of data collection has been suggested by our experiences in defining the county election data collection described in the 1964 proposal to the National Science Foundation and by the procedures now set for the recovery of an extended set of legislative materials. The basic principle defining the concerns of the Consortium repository has been applied in both instances: the scholars who are doing the research and using the data should establish the priorities for data collection. At some point the intellectual utilities must be balanced against the costs in expenditures of scarce and limited resources. But we assume the calculus of decision should be one in which the users establish the alternatives.

As an illustration, it may be useful to review the means by which we hope to bring about the recovery of a major collection of legislative materials. The strategy of collection--establishing data specifications and priorities for recovery--was laid in a series of meetings of the twenty or thirty leading research scholars. The first meeting was a conference held in April 1964. The conference was sponsored by the Consortium and financed by a grant from the Social Science Research Council. The objectives for this meeting were three: (1) identify major research objectives, (2) specify data needs for objectives, and (3) define the technical and methodological problems associated with use of the data. The same objectives were pursued in a second conference in late spring 1964--under the assumption that consensus beyond easy agreement on major data needs would not be easy to achieve.

With these preliminary conferences as preparation, the major effort was made in the course of a two-week seminar held as a part of the 1964 Consortium summer program of training in research. All told, those giving intellectual leadership to the systematic study of legislative behavior considered the problems of research strategy and tactics for a period of six or seven months. Their considerations were given point by the nature of the ultimate objective: the collection and processing of data presently not accessible to the research community, activities now funded and in process. Comparable efforts are needed in other domains. Although this planning activity can be supported with a minor part of the financial resources of the Consortium, it is of crucial importance to the Consortium's concept of repository development. The ideal of generalized data collections is certainly worthy of support and should remain the ultimate objective of the effort to improve the research facilities available to social scientists. At present, however, the resources to realize this aspiration do not seem to exist. Questions of organizational format and technical capacities aside, there are current research demands to be met and future demands to be anticipated. We have concluded that both immediate and long-run interests can be well served by an attempt to tailor archival growth to the active and emerging needs for data. This seems to offer the best prospect for maximum response to present deficiencies in our research establishment as well as for maximum return on the investment of resources.

It has never been the objective of the Consortium to collect, process, store, and service all data specifically relevant to current research demands of social scientists within its own archive. To

provide for other data needs, the ICPR financed another series of meetings which ultimately led to National Science Foundation support for the establishment of the Council on Social Science Data Archives: basic principles of this newly established body for cooperation among archives are that archival data should be rediffusable among archives and users, and that data should be readily available to any academic researcher. The Council on Social Science Data Archives provides important communication channels and other facilities for useful cooperation with the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, the International Data Service and Reference Library at Berkeley, and other academically based archives within the United States. We are also engaged in cooperative efforts to make data of the United States Government and transportation and regional studies more readily accessible to interested members.

In addition, we are cognizant of the importance of data produced outside the United States. Consequently, we have established or are developing working relations with the Zentralarchiv, University of Cologne; the Steinmetz Stichtung, Amsterdam; DATUM, Bad-Godesberg, Germany, and other archives abroad. The European community is actively working to establish a European Council on Social Science Data Archives. and we have had participant-observers at all of the organization and planning meetings which have been held.

PROPOSAL TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION TO SUPPORT DATA PROCESSING AND DOCUMENTATION FOR THE HISTORICAL ARCHIVES

I

INTRODUCTION

This request by the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research is for funds to complete work supported by Grants GS-1435 and GS-1435-A1. The archival objectives supported by these prior grants are in no way changed in the present proposal. The proposed additional work is directed toward final processing and organization, for effective archival management and use, of the data collections assembled under the earlier grants; for servicing user needs there is special emphasis on improving our computer-based ability to supply these data economically and in an adequately organized and documented form. As indicated in parts II and III of this proposal, the experience of the past year has enabled us- and forced us -to recognize many of the obstacles that stand in the way of widespread use of the data as presently stored and retrieved. This has led to an extended and careful reappraisal of problems and resources related to the use of the data.

Through filling a large number of requests for data during these months we have been able to identify more precisely the needs of users and the limitations of the computational facilities available to many of them. At the same time we have come to appreciate more fully the demands imposed upon us by changing research goals, by methodological innovations and new pedagogical interests. Our experience has also allowed us to recognize the need for more effective descriptive information and documentation for the collection in order to permit potential users to gauge more effectively the content, size, and complexity of the various data sets.

Without additional preparatory work, the rapidly increasing number of large and costly data requests will in the near future strain the resources of the servicing archive beyond its financial and technical capacity. Moreover, the beneficiaries of the services that can be provided will be the scholars and students at the larger, well-financed and well-equipped universities. Potential users who do not have access to substantial funding or who are not well supported by elaborate social science computational facilities will not be able to exploit our archival resources unless we are able to carry the project through to completion. The urgency of the further work on data processing and documentation described in this proposal can hardly be over-estimated; without it, much of the return on the capital already invested will be foreclosed and the expanding demand for data to be used in teaching and research will perforce not be met.

This proposal describes in some detail the unanticipated problems and obstacles that prevented realization of the original objectives with the funds that were made available. Errors in preliminary calculations resulted in underestimating the bulk and the complexity of the data to be archived. Initial errors in assessing the computer hardware and the task of developing adequate associated software capabilities to process, manage and supply these data to users produced a further unexpected drain on available funds. In particular we have had to cope with the complexities and shortcomings in daily use of the computer system that supports the archive by developing a more technically skilled and more costly staff, and by allocating more time to preparation of data and to processing work. It should be clear, however, that the largest problems have been identified and clearly defined only during the current year in the course of meeting the needs of archive users, and that these problems were quite unpredictable as to scope or cost without the rich fund of actual experience we have now acquired in pursuing the project objectives.

The progress toward achieving the intended goals, particularly during the past year, provides assurance that past problems have now been largely overcome and makes us confident that project objectives can be achieved with the funds and within the time period proposed in this request for additional support. It is relevant to note in this connection that the Consortium staff now possesses what we are convinced is a rare and unusually appropriate mix of professional and technical skills to carry out the remaining project work and effectively meet the needs of users of the collection.

The budget is presented in six months' intervals in order to reflect the shifting emphasis planned for the various programming, editorial, and data processing activities that must be completed before the archive of historical data will be fully accessible and open to the widespread use that will redeem the investment already made in data recovery, processing, and preliminary documentation. As the budget calendar indicates, the budget period for the grant would begin on January 1, 1969 and continue through December 31, 1970. We expect most of the work to be completed during the course of 1969 and the first six months of 1970, with final work on programs and documentation to complete the full range of user support being conducted in the final six months of 1970. A special note on the budget of GS-1435-A1 is also included to reflect the present decrease in rate of expenditure, with the remaining budget of the project to be expended during the second half of 1969.

II

Progress Report on NSF Grant GS-1435 and GS-1435-A1, Data Acquisitions for the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research Data Repository

Recovery of Election Data. County-level election returns for well over ninety percent of all presidential, gubernatorial, and congressional elections during the years from 1824 through 1952 have been recovered and integrated into the repository. It appears unlikely that any significant body of the remaining data can be found in the immediate future, although it is possible that some of the still missing data will be located in the more remote future as practicing scholars, motivated perhaps by interest generated by the Consortium collection, are moved to carry out specific intensive searching efforts. The collection is, of course, organized to permit rapid integration of such data as may be recovered in the future.

Our original expectation was that information for the elections after 1952 could be obtained in machine-readable form from the Government Affairs Institute (The America Votes data) and integrated directly into the repository. However, the fact that these data are available only with the minor party vote aggregated to a single "other" category, coupled with an apparently high error rate in the machine-readable version of these data, has rendered this strategy impractical. Thus, it has been necessary to collect these data independently. At this time, data for the years from 1954 through 1966 have been collected, keypunched and added to the collection.

Processing of Election Data. During the past months, processing of county-level election data has progressed at a rapid rate, and, given the current rate of progress, it now appears that initial processing of these data can be completed prior to the end of the present calendar year and within the current budget. The collection has been organized for use on the Institute for Social Research IBM 360 Model 40 computer, and basic programs for processing, retrieving, and working with these data are now operational. A variety of processing steps designed to check the recorded data for accuracy and to organize the collection for efficient use have been carried out, and errors and discrepancies discovered through these procedures have been corrected. The spelling of county names across the entire data set has been standardized. Final proofing of the collection is now well under way and it is expected that this work can be completed and errors discovered can be corrected by the end of December, 1968.

These problems have now been largely overcome, although only at the cost of much larger expenditures of time and financial resources than expected. On the other hand, these larger expenditures incurred

in creating the archive of election statistics have been to some degree repaid in terms of subsequent ease and economy in processing historical census and congressional roll call materials. Computer routines developed for processing, proofing, and managing election data have proven highly useful in the preparation of census data and of considerable value in other phases of the work of the Consortium, and experience gained by the staff in working with the election data has contributed significantly to more rapid and efficient processing of census and other materials.

Recovery and Processing of Census Data. An appendix provides a summary description of the demographic data now being processed for integration into the repository. While the focus of the collection is upon county--level data, relevant state-level information has been processed in the absence of equivalent county materials. All county data is organized to allow aggregation to the state level and, where practical, to the congressional district level in order to allow use of the states and congressional districts as units of analysis, but these steps must be carried out at a later date.

With limited exceptions, the data described in the appendix were selected from federal census publications and when possible materials have been obtained in machine-readable form from the Bureau of the Census. However, in these latter cases substantial unexpected additional processing has been found necessary to eliminate coding idiosyncracies, correct errors, and to achieve a form and organization adequate for integration into the repository. Data have been selected for processing in accord with the general guide-lines provided by the report of the 1964 conference on historical demographic data held at the Fels Institute under Consortium auspices. (The text of the report is to be found in the Consortium Annual Report for 1964-1965).

During the past year, processing of demographic census data has progressed at a more rapid rate than was originally expected. The equivalent of approximately two million card images have been keypunched, covering over ninety percent of the data described in the appendix. Data for the years from 1790 through 1870 were made available to users beginning in February 1968, although only on a very limited basis. Assuming continuation of our present rapid rate of progress in processing these data, it is expected that the remainder of the data can be made available by the end of the present year. At that time limited error checks will have been conducted, and the spelling of county names will have been standardized and will be compatible with the election data collection. As in the case of the election data, comprehensive machine-readable codebooks are being prepared and will be substantially completed by the end of this year, but the size of these codebooks will be such that abbreviated versions will also be necessary.

Use of Election and Census Data. Despite difficulties in converting to the new computer and in the face of barriers that prevent rapid, effective, and economical access to these data, a very substantial beginning has been made in meeting the requests of historians, political scientists, and other social scientists for election and census data needed for research and teaching purposes. During the first ten months of this year some ninety-seven requests for historical data from individuals at forty-six member and non-member institutions had been filled, and an additional nineteen requests were pending. At the least sophisticated level, scholars have requested and received xeroxed or microfilmed copies of raw data, but in the main, requests have been for machine-readable data, usually in large volume. During these months the equivalent of over 4,000,000 card images recording these data have been supplied, and it is estimated that pending requests will require transmission of an additional 1,000,000 card images. Nor is there any indication of diminution in the flow of data requests. Over the past months the number of requests received has steadily increased as has receipt of more general inquiries which usually result in concrete requests. There is every reason to believe that demand for these data will continue to grow rapidly in the future, and indeed, there is now ample indication that this demand will exceed our expectations of even as short a time as a year ago.

Our experience in attempting to meet these demands, as no other experience, has brought our attention sharply to the limitations of our present capabilities and the shortcomings of the organizational characteristics of the collections. Our existing programs for retrieving and transmitting data to users can best be seen as providing interim capabilities and are such that extensive staff and machine time are required to fill each individual request. As a consequence, the cost of filling data requests is high, and upon receipt of requests considerable time is required to retrieve data, thus delaying transmission of requested materials to the users. As the additional bodies of data in the collections become available at the end of this year, and the number of requests mounts, the limitations of our present capabilities will doubtlessly result in more prolonged delays in supplying data and a much larger staff will be required. Indeed, in terms of present capabilities, it is virtually certain that mounting demands for data shortly will require computer time and staff services far in excess of what can reasonably be provided.

Moreover, the programs now in use are severely limited in terms of capabilities to retrieve specified subsets of the data, to modify the organization of the data to fit specific research and technical requirements, and to perform simple computations needed by the users. As a result, we are now sometimes compelled to supply larger bodies of data than actually needed. Costs to the Consortium and the user are thereby increased, and our ability to meet user needs diminished.

In a growing number of cases, limitations within which potential scholarly users must work have meant inability to supply usable data, and the frustration of research and educational goals has followed. At present our programs for retrieving and transmitting data are being modified, and within the next few months our capabilities in these respects will be markedly greater. Even so, these capabilities will still fall well short of those required to make these data generally and readily accessible to those members of the scholarly community who do not have direct access to large and well-supported computer facilities such as exist at no more than a handful of universities.

Summary of Current Project Status. At present rates of expenditures the National Science Foundation funds available for processing historical election and census materials (Grants GS-1435 and GS-1435-A1) will be exhausted by the end of December, 1968, with some remaining funds spent during fiscal 1960-70 under the NSF budget stretch-out. The recovery and initial processing phases of the historical county election data project are now nearing completion, and the data are available for distribution by that date as well.

Moreover, in addition to completion of initial processing, some more advanced work toward achievement of project goals will have been carried out by the end of the current year. For example, the characteristics of the raw census data required that these data be keypunched in the form of approximately one thousand separate data sets. In many cases the format of these data sets varies from state to state. Before the end of the current year it will be possible to reduce the number of census data sets to approximately five hundred, and in many instances, to standardize formats from state to state. Thus, problems of data management and retrieval created by the large number of idiosyncratic data sets that were originally processed will be significantly alleviated. However, additional programming and data processing will be required to reduce the remaining five hundred data sets to a more limited and more manageable number of larger data sets which can then be used as the basis for efficient integration and subsetting.

In a somewhat different vein, within the limits of presently available funds it will probably be possible to complete the processes of proofing and correcting errors found in the collection of historical election data, and limited tests for error in the recorded census data can be carried out. It will not be possible, however, to carry out comprehensive error and contingency checks to ascertain and correct our errors in transcribing census data and to fully identify and record substantive and definitional idiosyncrasies characteristic of the tabulations in the original sources. Additional work beyond that now budgeted will also be required in the interest of more effective documentation and description of the collections for users and to provide potential users with information necessary to assess the size and

content of the collections and more rationally formulate their requests. Additional editorial, programming, and data processing work will also be required to allow ready aggregation of county-level data to the state and congressional district levels so that these units may be used for analytic purposes.

In sum, our accomplishments during the current year will mark significant progress toward achievement of original project goals. On the other hand, currently available funds will not permit completion of work necessary to facilitate efficient and economical management and servicing of the collections, nor will these funds be sufficient to develop the advanced computational facilities necessary to supply these data in forms fully appropriate to the needs of users. Although the entire collections of census and election data will be available for distribution at the end of the current year, the costs to the Consortium and the user of supplying these data will be high, and the data will usually not be in optimal form when received. As a consequence, extensive additional processing that could more efficiently be carried out once and for all by the archive will necessarily be done by each user before the data can be employed for analytic or instructional purposes. Thus the cost of utilizing the data will be further increased and their value to the scholarly community significantly lessened. In the following pages, the nature and sources of these problems and our proposed solutions are described in some detail.

III

The Need for Additional Support

A. Exceptional Costs Incurred

As a result of delay in the delivery of the IBM 360 Model 40 and other delays in developing operational software on that new machine, computational costs were significantly higher than expected. These delays necessitated longer use of the University of Michigan's 7090 computer at higher costs, as well as additional special purpose programs in order to avoid more serious delays in processing historical data. The first phases of the historical election data project also required a significantly greater investment of staff and machine time than was originally expected due to our inability to estimate accurately the complexities and the size of this body of information. The expenditure for keypunch work was also greater than was budgeted due to the very large volume of census data and to some unanticipated keypunching needed to correct errors discovered in the election data. However, the much higher productivity achieved by the staff, particularly on the Mohawk Data Recorders used since the second half of 1967, has permitted some compensating reduction of these expenditures.

Programming costs have been approximately twice the amount planned primarily because the IBM 360 Model 40 proved to be considerably more complex and troublesome to use than was expected based upon advance specifications, descriptive literature, and previous experience. Thus, programming for the staff resulted from the serious inadequacies of the supporting software and documentation provided by IBM. These difficulties greatly increased the cost of developing the basic capabilities that now exist on the new machine. They have also seriously slowed the development of the more advanced capabilities necessary for effective processing, retrieval and transmission of historical materials while greatly restricting the financial resources available for attaining these latter capabilities.

The very large size and complexity of these collections and the extensive machine processing necessary to prepare these data for integration into the repository have required very substantial expenditures for computer time. Much of these costs have been defrayed by funds provided under National Science Foundation Grant GS-1231 Amendment Number One. These funds will be exhausted by approximately March 1969 in support of project work now underway. Thus it is necessary to request computer use support for the work described in the present proposal. It is important to note in this respect that recent policy changes, effective August 1, 1968, have resulted in a fifty percent reduction in the cost of use of the IBM 360/40. The new rate of $52.00 per hour for the use of this machine compares favorably with rates at other installations and will make further developmental and servicing costs much more reasonable than in the past.

The exceptional early costs were borne not only by National Science Foundation funds provided for processing historical census and election data, but also by funds provided by the Ford Foundation for processing other historical materials, by the Consortium Operating Budget supported by membership dues paid to the Consortium by member institutions, and by the data processing facility of the Institute for Social Research. Yet despite having taken advantage of these other sources of support, the strain upon National Science Foundation funds available for processing historical census and election data was severe indeed.

B. Exceptional Needs

Quite apart from difficulties with the computer and its software support, it is now clear that early estimates of the software capabilities needed to process these data and to meet the needs of users were excessively modest. While it was well recognized that the election and census data collections would necessitate development of a very carefully designed, broad-ranging, and powerful array of software capabilities, the size and detailed complexity of these collections, the wide variation in research interests of users, and the differences in the technical capabilities accessible to users were still underestimated. Problems that were not properly appreciated in their full intricacy include the processing of variable length records which are characteristic of the historical election data; the necessity of combining, through concatenation or merging, data sets of varying size and organizational characteristics; and the variation in the units and the tabulation categories in which data were available in the original sources.

All of these problems have presented technical difficulties beyond even the substantial set originally anticipated. Moreover, these difficulties have been further compounded by the dynamic nature of the social sciences. Changing research interests and strategies and methodological innovations demand that we develop capabilities to supply data in hitherto unanticipated forms. As an example, growing interest in analysis of time series data, stemming apparently primarily from work in econometrics, will require that we develop the capability of supplying county level data in that form. To do so, however, will require additional programming and make problems of boundary changes and comparability of data from one time period to the next more pressing.

At the same time, the range and variation of potential users of these data, reflected in part by the growth in Consortium membership, have further increased the need for more advanced computing capabilities. The present basic abilities for filling requests for these data may meet most of the needs of users at a few of the larger universities where advanced hardware and software facilities are available. However, computational facilities available at many institutions are much more limited, and it is doubtful that these institutions will, in the near future, develop the kinds of capabilities necessary to allow maximum use of these data in the form in which they can now be supplied. Hence

Consortium servicing with the available limited capabilities to reformat, merge, subset, and derive basic measures from these data would seriously limit, if not deny, the utility of these data for a sizable segment of the research community.

C. Proposed Work to be Done

Election Data

Files providing total returns for congressional districts and states must be prepared by summing county returns to these higher levels. For many research purposes, the congressional districts and states constitute appropriate units of analysis. In many cases, however, scholars lack the facilities required to carry out necessary summations efficiently and economically. The derivation of standard files to facilitate more economical servicing of these data must also be explored. Experience in supplying data to users may, for example, permit identification of a fixed and limited subset of parties for inclusion in a standard servicing file. Creation of such a file, or files, would allow us to fill many categories of requests without the great expense of reprocessing the entire basic data files to fill each individual request.

Substantial effort must also be invested in the preparation of documentation for the collection of election returns. Existing lists of candidate names must be organized as documentation to provide assistance to potential users in identifying required data and to provide interpretive information necessary for effective use of the data once obtained. The work of preparing complete source citations and annotations describing idiosyncrasies and shortcomings of the data must also be completed. Even this work will not suffice to provide potential users with all the information necessary to formulate data requests effectively. The richness and complexity of the election data is such that in most cases potential users cannot now formulate requests for data without examining sizable segments of the actual data. Thus we have concluded that publication of the election data is an essential element in providing potential users with the information necessary for optimum use of the collection. Our experience to date in filling requests for election and census data has demonstrated that without these supporting aids the collections cannot be used with maximum efficiency and economy.

Attention must also be devoted to changes in county and congressional district boundaries. Earlier plans for meeting this problem by reconstituting counties from minor civil division information were clearly too ambitious in technical terms and are not feasible in terms of the availability of data for sub-county units. The proposed alternative is to document boundary changes as a part of the data collection, so as to prevent unknowing comparisons of data between one year and another on county units that retain the same names but which include partially or completely different areas. The identification of these boundary changes is a major research task, and it must be followed by substantial data processing to incorporate usefully the information as part of the archival holdings.

Census Data

Systematic but limited tests of the census data have been carried out as the data were keypunched and processed in order to gauge the level of accuracy of the recorded data. Although these tests have revealed only a negligible error rate, comprehensive contingency checks and other analytic tests must now be carried out to provide further assurance as to the fidelity of the recorded data to the original sources and to identify discrepancies and errors in the original sources themselves. Of course, should this work reveal an unexpectedly high error rate, then some additional keypunching would be required to make necessary corrections.

Experience in working with nineteenth century census data has revealed that tabulation categories are not always precisely defined in the original sources. In some cases, the meaning of particular tabulation categories can only be ascertained by summing and combining categories and comparing the result with other tabulations. Experience has also revealed discrepancies between tabulation categories. In a significant number of cases, categories that should sum to the recorded total population, or to the recorded total for some subgroup of the population, do not in fact do so.

Various scholars have observed that contemporary efforts to gauge the accuracy and consistency of most of the nineteenth century censuses were often not systematic and were at best inadequate. It has also been suggested that some estimate of the quality of these data could be gained through systematic internal comparisons and through comparisons with alternate sources. The Consortium is, of course, in a unique position to carry out much of this work which obviously would not be feasible to individual users of segments of the data. While it will usually be impossible to reconcile the discrepancies and correct the inaccuracies discovered through such a process, they must be identified and the information made available to users. Researchers will then be able to adjust their work to conform to the quality of the data, and the incidence of erroneous findings may thereby be reduced.

To economize in the editing and keypunching operations while retaining a high level of quality it was decided that the data from separate tables in the original census sources would be recorded as separate data sets. As a consequence, the census has been initially processed in the form of nearly 1,000 individual data sets. It was recognized, of course, that this multitude of data sets of varying size, format, and organization would constitute a sizable obstacle to efficient final processing, data management, and retrieval; therefore integration and combination of these data sets was planned. Our earlier schedule called for doing all of this work in the course of 1969, but considerations of economy of processing have dictated that the work of combining selected data sets defined by specific organizational and substantive characteristics be carried out by December, 1968. This final phase,

to be carried out during 1969, will be particularly difficult because within a given census the tabulation categories used sometimes vary from state to state. Finding and resolving these discrepancies across all states will require staff research work, and some additional programming will be needed to permit the proper manipulation and combination of documentation and data.

A great number of calculations on the original tabulation categories in the census data must be performed. Percentage and ratio figures which were printed in the original census documents were not retrieved when the raw data necessary for recomputation were being keypunched. This approach facilitated more rapid and economical initial processing, and it also was advisable because of doubts as to the correctness of the earlier nineteenth century census calculations particularly. Such derived measures are, however, of very great analytic value and must now be computed for the archived data.

Often data were keypunched from large multi-variable tables. As an example, occupational data in the census sources were at times recorded distributed across various age and sex categories. The collapsing or calculation of marginals must now be done to provide the distinct variables needed in most research; in the above case this would yield separate distributions for occupation, age, and sex. Of course the original cross-tabulated data would also be retained in the data files.

Different groupings of the sub-categories within a variable must also be calculated, particularly to ease the problems of comparing data from one census with another. To illustrate, one census may use the nationality category "Scandinavian," while another may distinguish "Swede," "Norwegian," "Finnish," and so on; a large proportion of the regroupings needed for comparability are obvious and our doing them would save considerable time and redundant work on the part of users. Simply noting all the variations in a printed document would be a very cumbersome and ineffective method of warning a potential data user about specific problems. A large number of requestors would still unknowingly receive data that would take long periods of work to make usable for analysis.

In addition to imposing an especially heavy burden on the user of the archive, shipment of data in raw form would often be more expensive than providing needed derived measures. This is because each variable or entry in the raw data generally has a field width of nine digits, and often several of these fields must be included if the user is to calculate a derived measure, which often results in only one field of three digits. Hence the investment of considerable skilled staff time in identifying and performing once the computations which need to be

done to handle most requests is of paramount importance for effective use of the data in the servicing archive. With the large amount of computation to be done it is essential that more efficient programs be completed, which will also be of immense importance for subsequent servicing of specific, tailored data requests.

Effective joint use of the election and census data requires that identification of congressional districts be added to the census files and that all the appropriate information on boundary changes that is prepared for the election files also be supplied for the census files. Without these two major efforts it will be extremely difficult for the user to utilize the congressional district as a unit of analysis or to do any elaborate trend or other time-series analyses. Although earlier plans had included completion of at least some of this work during 1968, it was felt essential to focus all available energy on the basic task of processing as much as possible of the desired census data to the point of being at least machine-readable and usable on a limited basis before proceeding with the task of merging data files.

Proper documentation of the census collection also poses difficult problems. Machine-readable codebooks are well along, running to almost 10,000 pages. Certainly a codebook of this size is very expensive to circulate in large quantities, and would be quite difficult to use in its entirety; but subsets of it will be essential to describe to the user the specific data he has received. To aid the user in identifying needed data, effective means still must be developed; condensed summary codebooks are being planned in conjunction with the effort to combine data sets and compute a range of summary and derived statistics. Without these interlocking efforts the utility of the data for all but the most determined and well-equipped users will be severely diminished.

Software

The array of computer software which we have, and still other software which we need, has been an obvious and pervasive element in all the work described. Hence the sequence of presentation given here, putting the tasks to be performed before the tools used in doing them, is most appropriate. However in designing and implementing programs it is highly desirable to make them generally useful beyond the immediate task. This is given special emphasis in this developmental project because so much of the computing software is relevant to efficient and meaningful servicing of this data from the archive.

Efficient capabilities to do totalling, ratio and percentage calculations, and other tabulations of the data within each county are central to a great deal of the processing work and the subsequent servicing to the user. The bulk of the data, the need for checking and recomputing tabulation categories, and the calculation of derived measures

are all points which have been discussed already. Overall costs, especially in the servicing of the data, can be reduced substantially by an investment now in carefully designed, efficient computer software to do this work.

The sheer volume of data to be passed and number of calculations to be done within each pass make it quite feasible to gain in efficiency over existing software. This would be done by having the statements of what calculations are to be done, expressed in a language oriented to easy and accurate use, translated by the program into some compiler language such as PL/I. The compilation of these translated statements would take some brief additional computer time, but this would be more than offset by the increase in the speed of actual processing on the data file. This change is as compared with the usual software for this type of function which works in an interpretive mode, rereading for every data case some translation of the user's original instructions and thereby having to execute many more total machine operations to complete the job.

Another software development task of equal importance is improving our ability to match-merge data sets and produce appropriate documentation of the resulting files. Existing capabilities do not provide adequate descriptions of the contents and locations of variables to the user of a merged file. Most important, the merging operation requires a separate pass for each specific election, or decennial census, or survey study which is to be added, matching on county for example, to a file to be sent to a user. This leads to particularly burdensome expense and delay where a number of different entities are being merged into the basic file for the user, such as when different offices are added and especially when different years are added as in time-series analysis; the basic file must be passed again with each distinct addition and it is growing larger each time. In most cases this problem cannot be left to solution by the user after receipt of the data because few have the necessary capabilities.

To solve these problems, we propose to develop new procedures integrating available sort-merge utilities as part of a series of routines merging many files in a limited number of passes, and providing proper documentaion of the output file. Since a good deal of merging of raw data is done to facilitate generation of derived measures, it is also hoped that simple computational capabilities can be incorporated in the merge routines in order to reduce the bulk on output and save an additional pass of the data.

Retrieval of specific data entries based on their particular characteristics is quite difficult with our existing programs. We plan to produce a program which selects data via controlled retrieval

on, for example, specific county names, or counties with a certain population, ethnic composition, or other characteristic. This can be very beneficial in reducing the bulk, and thereby the expense, of servicing the data.

The basic program, really a set of almost identical programs, which is presently used to service the election data must be made more efficient and easier to use so that these costs can be minimized. Specific attention must be given to making some form of this program exportable so that other installations can select subsets of the data as desired, much as is often done with our survey data sets now.

A modest amount of work must be put into the evolving software for handling machine-readable codebooks and other documentation. Much of this software grew out of experience with single survey studies and is based on a codebook structure that has inadequate features for keeping track of variables after merging, concatenating, or other manipulation of the data files. In the census data there is also a problem because dozens of variables derive from a single original table and hence it need be described only once, yet present codebooks handle this single reference in an extremely awkward fashion.

Servicing

Throughout this proposal the wide range of user needs which must be met and the potential heavy expenses of servicing the collected data have been emphasized repeatedly. One of the reasons for this emphasis is that staff and computer time for servicing is supported, among other things, out of the Consortium operating budget derived from membership fees. These are relatively finite funds and must be carefully handled in order to ensure appropriate and balanced service for all members.

If this proposal were not supported, the impact on users of the data would also be extremely serious. The prospective users would be forced to use what are often very limited local resources in an attempt to assemble even moderately useful data files. They would encounter substantial difficulties because of the multiplicity of unintegrated files, and the problems of combining these files would be substantially compounded by a lack of adequate documentation about such things as boundary changes and errors in the data. The task would be further encumbered by the necessity of working with the present bulky documentation in searching for variables which are comparable or which are needed in a derived measure. Most individual research would involve solving some of these problems, but the scale of these problems with the data as presently archived is tremendous.

The work described in this proposal is a critical major element in making the data usefully available within the very finite resources of the Consortium and the users of its services.

SERVICING REPORT, HISTORICAL ARCHIVE

July 1, 1968-June 30, 1969

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Alabama	Roll Call (1)	2,161
American University	Ecological (1)	1,594
Brigham Young University*	Election (1)	3,622
University of California, Berkeley	Ecological (1) Election (1)	68,927
University of California, Los Angeles	Ecological (1) Election (1)	11,641
University of California, Santa Barbara	Ecological (1) Election (1) Roll Call (3)	50,429
Carnegie-Mellon*	Election (1) Roll Call (1)	83,243
University of Chicago*	Roll Call (3)	18,682
University of Cincinnati	Roll Call (2)	10,520
City University of New York	Roll Call (1)	27,754
Columbia University	Roll Call (2)	76,690
University of Connecticut	Ecological (1) Election (1)	188,890
Cornell University	Ecological (1)	153,755
Denison University	Roll Call (2)	26,799
Duke University	Ecological (1) Election (1) Roll Call (1)	62,932
University of Georgia	Election (1)	1,862
Georgia State College	Ecological (2)	70,480
Harvard University	Ecological (2) Roll Call (1)	41,774
University of Illinois, Urbana	Ecological (2) Election (1) Roll Call (1)	113,989

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Indiana	Ecological (2) Election (1) Roll Call (1)	230,105
Indiana State University	Election (1)	41,776
University of Iowa	Election (1) Roll Call (3)	40,849
Johns Hopkins University	Election (1) Roll Call (1)	43,506
University of Kansas	Ecological (1)	5,200
University of Kentucky	Election (1) Roll Call (1)	29,719
Louisiana State University	Ecological (1) Roll Call (2)	52,069
University of Lund*	Roll Call (1)	2,011
University of Maryland	Roll Call (1)	4,891
University of Massachusetts	Ecological (1)	338,531
University of Michigan	Ecological (3) Election (3) Roll Call (4)	356,332
Michigan State University	Ecological (1) Election (1)	231,424
University of Minnesota	Ecological (1) Election (2) Roll Call (2)	53,489
University of Missouri at Kansas City	Ecological (1) Election (2)	32,973
University of Missouri at Columbia	Roll Call (1)	2,215
University of Montana*	Election (1) Roll Call (1)	976
University of North Carolina	Ecological (2) Roll Call (2) Election (1)	181,829

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
Northwestern University	Ecological (2) Election (5)	850,147
Ohio State University	Roll Call (3)	52,081
Oklahoma State University	Election (1)	8,755
University of Pennsylvania	Ecological (2) Roll Call (1)	137,471
Pennsylvania State University	Election (1)	8,900
Princeton University	Ecological (6) Election (2) Roll Call (4)	360,701
Republican National Committee**	Election (1)	57,640
Rice University	Election (1)	5,406
University of Rochester	Roll Call (1)	***
Rutgers University	Election (1)	52,320
San Francisco State College	Election (1) Roll Call (3)	61,583
Southern Illinois University	Roll Call (2)	7,570
Syracuse University	Roll Call (1)	64,229
Stanford University	Ecological (1)	86,076
Temple University	Roll Call (1)	6,012
University of Tennessee	Ecological (2) Election (1)	346,567
University of Virginia	Election (1)	93,376
Washington University	Election (1)	101,005
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Ecological (4) Election (2) Roll Call (5)	127,420
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	Roll Call (2)	15,748

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
Yale University	Ecological (2) Election (6) Roll Call (4)	266,964
TOTALS	Ecological (45) Election (48) Roll Call (65) Total 158	5,373,610

* Non-member academic institutions

** Non-member non-academic institutions

*** Raw data in textual form

SERVICING REPORT, SURVEY RESEARCH ARCHIVE

May 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Alberta	14 D-52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, Almond-Verba, Dahl, Feierabend, Russett, China, German Embassy, Rummel Raw, Rummel Foreign Conflict	136,631
Allegheny College	2 A-58, 60	3,776
American University	2 D-Almond-Verba, 64 7 A-Almond-Verba 1 Special Request	49,422
Arizona State University	1 Special Request 11 A-64, Almond-Verba, Banks-Textor, 52, 60, 64 6 D-Stouffer LD&CS, Schmidhauser, 51, Dahl, Stanley	75,310
Bowling Green State University	1 D-Banks-Textor 2 A-60, 64	4,100
Brandeis University	7 D-Banks-Textor, Yale, Feierabend, Rummel, Almond-Verba, US, UK, & Germany. 2 Frequency Tables	22,405
Byrn Mawr	1 D-Almond-Verba	19,564
University of California Berkeley	12 D-66, China, 52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, Stouffer LD&CS, Almond-Verba, 7 Dictionaries-52, 56, 58, 62, 64, 66, Almond-Verba	215,444
Davis	10 D-48, 52, 56, 60, 62, 64, 66, Stouffer CS&LD, Dahl	105,641
Los Angeles	1 A-68	1,557
Santa Barbara	9 D-Almond-Verba, Banks-Textor, 64, 48, 56, 66, 57, News Media, 58, 62 3 S-64, 60	85,915
Carleton University	11 D-Stouffer CS&LD, Almond-Verba, 51, German Embassy, Dahl, Schmidhauser, Stanley, Banks-Textor, Feierabend, Yale	59,878
University of Chicago	1 D-Almond-Verba	19,564

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Cincinnati	1 D-51 3 A-60, 64, Almond-Verba	14,780
Colorado State University	11 D-Almond-Verba, Yale, Banks-Textor, 48, 51, Stouffer CS&LD, Schmidhauser, Stanley, 56, 60, 64	101,047
Columbia University	5 D-Yale, Banks-Textor, Kennedy, Dahl, Stouffer CS. 10 S-Almond-Verba, 52, 56, 60 Major, 64	29,131
University of Connecticut	38 D-52, 56, 58, 60, 64, 66, Dahl, Stouffer LD&CS, Almond-Verba, NORC 44, NORC 47, Stanley, Schmidhauser, Wahlke-Eulau, Yale, Banks-Textor, Schubert-Press, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, China 64 Negro, Rummel Transformed, Raw and Foreign Conflict, German Embassy, Kennedy, Banks-Textor-Russett-Deutsch, Eldersveld CS&LD, Radical Right, Lenski, County 65, Stanley, Men Who Govern	218,990
Cornell University	1 D-Russett's Regionalism	5,582
Dartmouth College	25 D-Dahl, Banks-Textor Raw, 64, Yale, Banks-Textor, Stouffer LD&CS, 60 weighted, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62. Almond-Verba, Kennedy, Schmidhauser, Stanley, NORC 44 & 47, 52, 56, 58, 66, Yale, 8 A-decks-52, 56, 64	185,302
DATUM	1 S Almond-Verba, 14 D-48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, 66, Yale, Banks-Textor, Radical Right, China, Stouffer LD&CS, Almond-Verba	70,563
Duke University	4 D-52, 66, Almond-Verba, Wahlke-Eulau	53,873
Emory University	9 D-Yale, Schmidhauser, Stanley, Dahl, 60, 66, Kennedy, Almond-Verba, 64	74,008

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Essex	15 D-51, 53, 54, 60, 62, Almond-Verba, Dahl, Stanley, 48, 56, 66, Banks-Textor, Yale, Stouffer CS&LS. 1 S-64	81,893
Florida Atlantic University	5 D-64, Almond-Verba, Banks-Textor, Yale, Feierabend	47,307
Florida State University	12 D-66, Almond-Verba, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 62, 60, Minor and Major, 65, 56	86,732
University of Florida	2 D-66, Almond-Verba 4 A-52, 56, 60, 64	35,787
Georgia State College	6 D-64, Kennedy, China, German Embassy, Stanley, 66	49,271
Georgetown University	3 D-66, Stouffer CS&LD	34,769
University of Bothenburg	3 D-with dictionary-64, 66, Almond-Verba	81,595
Harvard University	12 D-Dahl, China, German Embassy, 66, 48, 52, 56, 58, 60, 62, Panel, Matthews-Prothro County	95,794
University of Hawaii	2 D-66, Almond-Verba	28,601
University of Houston	11 A-52, 56, 60, 64 3 D-Yale, Eldersveld LD&CS	27,506
University of Illinois	28 D-48, 64, 66, Stouffer CS&LD, Yale, Kennedy, Dahl, Germany Embassy, Schmidhauser, Banks-Textor, Stanley, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, China, NORC 44&47, 56, 60, 52, 58, Almond-Verba, Wolfinger 66 Dictionaries-56, 66, 52, 58, Almond-Verba, Wolfinger	237,829
Indiana University	7 D-NORC 44, Stouffer CS&LD, Yale, 56, 66, Almond-Verba	78,447
Indiana State University	1 D-Yale	564

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Iowa	10 D-Almond-Verba, Stouffer CS&LD, NORC 44, NORC 47, 56, 60, Rummel Raw, Transformed and Foreign Conflict	97,229
Johns Hopkins University	Rummel Raw	5,074
University of Kansas	5 D-64, Yale, Feierabend, 66, Almond-Verba, 1 A-Federal Employees	60,669
Kent State University	18 D-48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 66, Banks-Textor, Yale, China, Stouffer CS&LD, German Embassy, Kennedy, Dahl, Schmidhauser, Stanley, NORC 44, NORC 47	72,481
University of Kentucky	5 D-Yale, Banks-Textor, Rummel Raw, Transformed and Foreign Conflict	15,138
Louisiana State University	11 D-Kennedy, Dahl, Banks-Textor, Yale, Stouffer CS&LD, Almond-Verba, 52, 56, 60, 64	123,019
Loyola University	1 S County Chairman 1 D-64	22,687
University of Maryland	11 D-Dahl, Stouffer CS&LD, Wahlke-Eulau, Almond-Verba, 62, 56, 60, 66, 52, 58. 17 A-Almond-Verba, 64, 66, 52, 56, 58, 64, 66, 60	158,370
University of Massachusetts	2 D-Banks-Textor, 64	24,140
Memphis State University	6 D-Yale, Banks-Textor, China, Almond-Verba, Wahlke-Eulau, Matthews-Prothro	49,015
Miami University	4 A-52, 56, 60, 64	7,186
University of Michigan	8 D-66, Banks-Textor, Rummel Foreign Conflict, Dahl, Matthews-Prothro, County Chairman, 64, Eldersveld Section, Eldersveld Leadership. 11 D and T-Card Dictionaries-Almond-Verba, China, Tale, Stouffer LD&CS, Banks-Textor,	207,373

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
University of Michigan (continued)	52, 56, 58, 60, 64. 9 D with dictionary-48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, 66, Yale-Banks-Textor, Wolfinger. 4 A-Almond Verba, 1 S-56, 1 dictionary-Almond-Verba	
Michigan State University	5 D-66, Almond-Verba, China, Stouffer CS, Schubert Press, 1 Special Request	55,596
*Middlebury College	1 S-64	
University of Minnesota	18 D-64 Negro Supplement, 66, Almond-Verba, Banks-Textor, Yale, Feierabend, Stouffer LD&CS, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, 52, 56, 58 1 Special Request, 2 A-decks-64	144,706
University of Missouri Columbia	7 D-52, 56, 58, 60, 64. Almond-Verba, 66	108,404
Kansas City	1 D-64	21,994
St. Louis	6 A-52, 56, 60, 64, 58 3 D-Banks-Textor, Almond-Verba, Yale	30,509
McGill University	12 D-51, 62, 64, 66, Yale, Banks-Textor, Almond-Verba, 48, 56, Kennedy, Dahl, Stanley	81.885
McMaster University	7 D-Deutsch French and German Elite, Rosenau Foreign Policy, 52, 56, 60, 64, Almond-Verba	90,173
University of New Hampshire	3 D-Rummel Transformed, Raw and Foreign Conflict	13,999
University of North Carolina	18 D-66, Stanley, Rummel Raw, Transformed, and Foreign Conflict, Feierabend, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, Yale, China, Banks-Textor, Stouffer LD&CS, 56	85,998
Northern Illinois University	4 D-64, Yale, Banks-Textor, Dahl	25,233

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
Notre Dame University	1 D-Schubert	2,243
Northwestern University	1 Data and Dictionary-66	15,037
Nuffield College	4 D-Banks-Textor, Yale, Stouffer CS&LD	26,871
Oberlin College	10 D-Kennedy, Banks-Textor, Tale, Dahl, Schmidhauser, 56, 60, 62, 64, 66	70,784
Ohio State University	9 A-52, 56, 60, 64. 7 D-66, Almond-Verba, 60, 64, 52, 56, Rosenau. 1 Special Request	108,001
*Ohio University	1 D-64	23,565
University of Oklahoma	1 D-64, 1 A-NORC 44	24,558
University of Oregon	7 D-52, 56, 60, 64, Almond-Verba, Feierabend, Rummel Raw, 1 S	96,534
University of Pittsburgh	13 D-66, Feierabend, Russett, Rummel Foreign Conflict, Rummel Raw, Rummel Transformed, Almond-Verba, Stouffer CS&LD, Yale, Banks-Textor, China, Yale-Banks-Textor	86,721
Princeton University	7 D-DAS Lenski, Eldersveld CS&LD, 66, China, Feierabend, 66. 8 D with dictionary-48, 51, 54, 53, 60, 62, 66, Jennings	64,628
Purdue University	6 D-Yale, Banks-Textor, Schmidhauser, Almond-Verba, Stouffer CS&LD	46,527
University of Rochester	2 D with T-card dictionaries-66, China	13,967
*Rosary Hill College	2 A-Dahl, Banks-Textor	640
Rutgers University	8 D-52, 56, 60, 64, Rummel Raw and Transformed, Stouffer LD&CS	97,218
San Diego State College	5 A-56, 64 4 D-Yale, Rummel Raw, Transformed and Foreign Conflict	22,606

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
San Francisco State College	21 D-Banks-Textor, Yale, NORC 44&47, Schmidhauser, Stanley, German Embassy, Stouffer CS&LD, Dahl, Kennedy, China, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, 56, Almond-Verga	108,821
University of Southern California	26 D-48, 51, 53, 54, 60 Minor, 62, China, Banks-Textor, Yale, Stouffer CS&LD, 56, 58, 60 Major, 64, 66, Schmidhauser, Kennedy, Stanley, NORC 44&47, Almond-Verba, German Embassy, 52, Dahl, Feierabend 1 A-Almond-Verba	179,116
Southern Illinois University	4 D-Yale, Banks-Textor, Schmidhauser, Stanley, 64 Negro Supplement. 4 S-52, 56, 60, 64	5,766
Stanford University	1 S-Dahl 11 D-52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 51, 53, 54, Almond-Verba	103,223
State University of New York - Binghamton	1 D-Stanley, Men Who Govern	2,790
Buffalo	13 D-Stouffer CS&LD, NORC 44, Schmidhauser, Almond-Verba, 48, 51, 53, 54, 56, 60, 62, 64	100,972
*Oneonta	1 A-66	3,873
Stony Brook	1 D-Almond-Verba	19,564
University of Strathclyde	2 S-56, 64, 15 D-48, 51, 53, 54, 56, 60, 62, 66, Banks-Textor, Yale, Dahl, German Embassy, Kennedy, Almond-Verba	68,510
Temple University	20 D-56, 66, 58, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, Almond-Verba, Stouffer CS&LD, Yale, Banks-Textor, China, German Embassy, Dahl, Schmidhauser, Stanley, NORC 44&47	105,177
Texas A & M University	2 D-Feierabend, Jennings	8,560

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
Tulane University	2 D-Yale, Schmidhauser	656
Vanderbilt University	6 D-64, Feierabend, Matthews-Prothro, Almond-Verba, 56, 60, 2 S-60, 64	86,090
University of Virginia	2 A-Almond-Verba, Banks-Textor	10,471
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1 D-Stanley	1,116
Washington State University	10 D-56, 64, 66, Almond-Verba, Yale, Schmidhauser, Stouffer CS&LD, Banks-Textor, China	99,494
University of Washington Seattle	3 D-Rummel Transformed, Rummel Raw, Rummel Foreign Conflict	13,999
Washington University St. Louis	5 D-Dahl, Stanley, Schmidhauser, 66, China	18,353
Washington and Lee University	4 D-66, Wahlke-Eulau, Scammon, 1969 Student	52,756
Wayne State University	13 D-51, 53, 54, 60, 64, China, Yale, Banks-Textor, Stouffer CS&LD, Radical Right, Feierabend, Kennedy, 2 A-Almond-Verba, Banks-Textor	81,309
Williams College	9 D-64, 48, 52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 66	114,752
University of Wisconsin Madison	20 D-Yale, Stouffer CS&LD, Banks-Textor, China, Matthews-Prothro, Feierabend, Rummel Transformed, Rummel Raw, Rummel Foreign Conflict, 51, 53, 54, 60, 62, 66, 56, Almond-Verba, Gurr	117,527
Milwaukee	15 D-German Embassy, Kennedy, Dahl, Banks-Textor, Yale, Feierabend, Wahlke-Eulau, Schmidhauser, Schubert-Press, Rummel Raw, 56, 62, 66, Stanley, Almond-Verba	83,765
Yale University	6 D-China, 66, Russett Regionalism, Rummel Foreign Conflict, Panel Data, Rummel Raw	65,380

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

UNIVERSITY	DATA DESCRIPTION	CARD IMAGES
York University	2 A-64, 58	3,393
TOTAL:		
87 Universities	97	6,257,795

Not included in this tabulation are general administration, secretarial, supply, and data maintenance costs.

A=analysis deck, D=full data set, S=statistics, *=non-member

IV. ICPR ADMINISTRATION

ROSTER OF MEMBER INSTITUTIONS AND OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVES

Institution	Category*	Official Representative
Alabama, University of	A	Dr. Robert B. Highsaw
Alberta, University of	A	Professor J. Paul Johnston
Allegheny College	B	Professor John H. Kessel
The American University	A	Professor Jeff Fishel
		Dr. Elke Frank
Amsterdam, University of	C	Dr. Rob Mokken
Arizona, University of	A	Professor Michael Sullivan
Arizona State University	A	Professor Leo D. Vichules
Australian National University	C	Dr. R. S. Parker
Ball State University	A	Professor W. L. Gruenewald
Bowling Green State University	A	Professor James Q. Graham
Bridgeport, University of	B	Dr. Bruce Stave
British Columbia, University of	A	Professor J. A. Laponce
California, University of (Berkeley)	A	Professor William Bicker
(Davis)	A	Professor James McEvoy
(Riverside)	A	Professor Charles R. Adrain
(Santa Barbara)	A	Professor Carl Hetrick
(Los Angeles)	A	Professor Harry M. Scoble
California State College (Fullerton)	B	Professor Charles G. Bell
(Long Beach)	B	Professor Jerry L. Weaver
Carleton University	A	Professor Hyman Burshtyn
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	A	Miss Anne Winslow
Cincinnati, University of	A	Professor R. Eric Weise
City University of New York	A	Professor Kenneth Sherrill
Colorado State University	B	Dr. Jerry W. Landsdowne
Columbia University	A	Professor Robert S. Gilmour
Connecticut, University of	A	Professor Everett C. Ladd
Cornell University	A	Professor Richard Hofferbert
Dartmouth College	B	Professor Denis G. Sullivan
DATUM (Bad Godesberg, Germany)	C	Dr. Klaus Liepelt
Delaware, University of	B	Professor John Deiner
Denison University	B	Professor Roy Morey
Duke University	A	Professor Karl Braithwaite
Emory University	A	Professor Lewis Bowman
Essex, University of	C	Professor Keith Ovenden
Florida Atlantic University	B	Professor Douglas S. Gatlin
Florida, University of	A	Professor Richard L. Sutton
Florida State University	A	Professor Norman R. Luttbeg
Georgia, University of	A	Professor Keith R. Billingsley
Georgia State College	A	Dr. Charles Pyles
Georgetown University	A	Professor Cynthia Thomas
Gothenburg, University of	C	Mr. Bo Sarlvik
Harvard University	A	Professor William Schneider
Hawaii, University of	A	Professor Ira S. Rohter
Houston, University of	A	Professor Hugh W. Stephens
Illinois, University of (at Chicago Circle)	A	Professor George Balch
Illinois, University of (Urbana)	A	Professor Fred Coombs
Illinois State University	B	Dr. Joel G. Verner
Indiana University	A	Professor Charles H. McCall
Indiana State University	B	Professor John Crittenden
Iowa, University of	A	Professor George R. Boynton

Institution	Category	Official Representative
Johns Hopkins University	A	Professor Steve Stephens
Kansas, University of	A	Professor John Grumm
Kansas State University	B	Professor Frederick D. Herzon
Kent State University	A	Professor Steven R. Brown
Kentucky, University of	A	Professor Michael Baer
Lehigh University	B	Professor Charles A. McCoy
Louisiana State University	A	Dr. Fred W. Grupp, Jr.
Louisville, University of	B	Professor Louis C. Kesselman
Loyola University	B	Dr. Herman Smith
McGill University (Montreal, Canada)	A	Professor Harold M. Waller
McMaster University (Hamilton, Ontario)	B	Professor H. J. Jacek
Mannheim University (Germany)	C	Dr. Max Kaase
Maryland, University of	A	Dr. Mary M. Conway
Massachusetts, University of	A	Professor David A. Booth
Memphis State University	A	Dr. H. R. Mahood
Miami University	B	Professor Douglas W. Frisbie
Michigan, The University of (Ann Arbor)	A	Professor Bruce Bowen
Michigan State University	A	Professor Paul Conn
Minnesota, University of	A	Professor William H. Flanigan
Missouri, University of (Columbia)	A	Professor David Leuthold
(Kansas City)	A	Professor Dale A. Neuman
(St. Louis)	B	Professor Edward C. Dreyer
New Hampshire, University of	B	Professor Robert Craig
New York University	A	Professor Robert Burrowes
North Carolina, University of	A	Professor William R. Keech
North Texas State University	A	Professor Ralph Bunch
Northern Illinois University	A	Professor Kevin L. McKeough
Northwestern University	A	Mrs. Lorraine Borman
Notre Dame, University of	A	Professor Donald P. Kommers
Nuffield College (England)	C	Paul Duncan-Jones, Esq.
Oberlin College	B	Professor Paul A. Dawson
Ohio State University	A	Professor Richard Hofstetter
Oklahoma, University of	A	Professor John W. Wood
Oklahoma State University	A	Professor Charles M. Dollar
Oregon, University of	A	Professor John Orbell
Pennsylvania, University of	A	Professor Louis Seagull
Pennsylvania State University	A	Professor Edward Keynes
Pittsburgh, University of	A	Professor Michael Margolis
Princeton University	A	Professor Walter Murphy
Purdue University	A	Professor William Shaffer
Queen's University	A	Professor N. H. Chi
Rice University	B	Professor Joseph Cooper
Rochester, University of	A	Professor Richard Niemi
Rutgers University	A	Professor James N. Rosenau
San Diego State College	B	Professor Betty A. Nesvold
San Francisco State College	A	Professor George Kent
Southern California, University of	A	Professor Kenneth H. Thompson
Southern Illinois University	A	Dr. David Kenney
Stanford University	A	Professor Edward Greenberg
State University of New York (Albany)	A	Dr. Leon Cohen
(Binghamton)	B	Professor Paul A. Smith
(Buffalo)	A	Professor Brent Rutherford
(Stony Brook)	A	Professor John A. Gagnon

Institution	Category	Official Representative
Strathclyde, University of	C	Professor Richard Rose
Swarthmore College	A	Professor Ray Hopkins
Syracuse University	A	Professor Michael O'Leary
Temple University	A	Professor Stephen Whitaker
Tennessee, University of	A	Professor Charles E. Patterson, Jr.
Texas A & M University	B	Dr. Bruce W. Robeck
Texas Technological College	A	Dr. Gordon Henderson
Texas, University of	A	Professor Allen Shinn
Tulane University	A	Professor John Pierce
Vanderbilt University	A	Professor Richard Pride
Vermont, University of	B	Professor Lyman J. Gould
Virginia, University of	A	Professor Paul T. David
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	B	Professor James F. Herndon
Washington and Lee University	B	Professor William Buchanan
Washington University	A	Professor George Kraft
Washington, University of	A	Professor Wayne Francis
Washington State University	A	Professor Evan Rogers
Waterloo, University of	A	Professor Daniel Kubat
Wayne State University	A	Professor Charles Baer
Wesleyan University	B	Professor Clement E. Vose
Western Michigan University	B	Mr. Chester B. Rogers
Western Ontario, University of	B	Professor S. J. R. Noel
Wichita State University	B	Professor Richard E. Zody
Williams College	B	Professor George Marcus
Windsor, University of	B	Professor Larry LeDuc
Wisconsin, University of (Madison)	A	Professor Jack Dennis
(Milwaukee)	A	Professor Ronald Hedlund
Wisconsin State University	B	Mr. Morton Sipress
Yale University	A	Dr. Charles L. Taylor
York University	A	Professor Michael Lanphier

ICPR COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

1962-63
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
Dwaine Marvick, UCLA

1966-67
Dwaine Marvick, UCLA, Chairman
Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University
Carl Beck, University of Pittsburgh
John Meisel, Queen's University
Sidney Ulmer, University of Kentucky

1967-68
Sidney Ulmer, University of Kentucky, Chairman
Christian Bay, University of Alberta
Charles Cnudde, University of California
Heinz Eulau, Stanford University
Richard I. Hofferbert, Cornell University
John H. Kessel, Allegheny College
David Leege, University of Missouri
John Meisel, Queen's University
Stephen Whitaker, Temple University

1968-69 Heinz Eulau, Stanford University, Chairman
Christian Bay, University of Alberta
Charles Cnudde, University of Wisconsin, Madison
William H. Flanigan, University of Minnesota
Richard I. Hofferbert, Cornell University
Joseph LaPalombara, Yale University
David Leege, State University of New York at Buffalo
Donald Matthews, University of North Carolina
Stephen Whitaker, Temple University

1969-70 Heinz Eulau, Stanford University, Chairman
Charles Cnudde, University of Wisconsin
Fred Greenstein, Wesleyan University
William H. Flanigan, University of Minnesota
Jean A. Laponce, University of British Columbia
David Leege, State University of New York at Buffalo
Donald Matthews, University of North Carolina
James Rosenau, Rutgers University
Charles Tilly, University of Michigan

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ICPR COUNCIL

Data Acquisition and Repository Activity

Professor Heinz Eulau, Organizational Data
Professor Jean Laponce, Comparative Politics
Professor Donald Matthews, American Politics
Professor James Rosenau, International Relations
Professor Charles Tilly, Historical Data

Decentralization of Summer Training

Professor Heinz Eulau
Professor William Flanigan
Professor Donald Matthews

Membership Committee

Professor David Leege
Professor Charles Cnudde
Professor William Flanigan

Summer Admissions

Professor Charles Cnudde
Professor William Flanigan
Professor Fred Greenstein

ICPR STAFF

Administrative

Executive Director - Dr. Warren E. Miller
Associate Director - Dr. Philip E. Converse
Associate Director - Dr. Donald E. Stokes
Assistant Director - Mr. Gregory A. Marks
Assistant to the Director - Mr. Raburn L. Howland
Senior Administrative Assistant - Miss Ann Robinson
Administrative Assistant - Miss Evelyn R. Kromer
Secretary - Miss Christine Fiore
Secretary - Mrs. Oksana Solchanyk

Curricular Development

Acting Director - Dr. Gudmund Iversen
Research Associate - Mr. Lutz Erbring
Research Associate - Mr. Michael Fried
Research Associate - Mr. David Karns
Assistant Study Director - Mr. Paul Beck
Assistant Study Director - Mr. Larry Boyd
Assistant Study Director - Mr. John Deegan
Assistant Study Director - Mr. Helmut Norpoth
Assistant Study Director - Mr. George Rabinowitz
Secretary - Mrs. Stella Moyser

Historical Archive

Director - Dr. Jerome M. Clubb
Assistant Director - Mr. Michael Traugott
Assistant Study Director - Mr. Erik Austin
Assistant Study Director - Miss Charlotte Goodman
Assistant Study Director - Mrs. Janice Plotkin
Assistant Study Director - Mrs. Santa Traugott
Supervisor, Servicing Section - Miss Janet Vavra
Assistant in Research - Mr. Michael McCrory
Assistant in Research - Mrs. Noriko Williams
Keypunch Supervisor - Mrs. Arlyn Champagne
Keypunch Operator - Mrs. Scarlett Bennett
Keypunch Operator - Mrs. Bok Soon Hoag
Keypunch Operator - Miss Patricia Tigue
Secretary - Miss Joan Getsinger
Secretary - Mrs. Maureen Kozumplik

International Relations Archive

Director - Dr. Raymond Tanter
Acting Assistant Director - Miss Carolyn Geda
Acting Assistant Director - Mr. Michael Traugott
Assistant Study Director - Mr. Erik Austin
Supervisor, Servicing Section - Miss Janet Vavra
Technical Supervisor - Miss Susanne Marshall
Assistant in Research - Mr. Thad Brown
Assistant in Research - Miss Cheryl Olsen
Assistant in Research - Mrs. Kathleen Sabrosky

Programming Staff

Supervisor - Mr. Stewart Robinovitz
Research Associate - Mr. David Beckles
Programmer Analyst - Mrs. Tina Bixby
Programmer Analyst - Mrs. Carol Cassidy
Programmer Analyst - Mrs. Donna Rocheleau
Systems Analyst - Miss Sylvia Barge
Programmer - Mrs. Jennifer Campbell
Programmer - Mrs. Carol Damroze
Secretary - Mrs. Magdelena Eureste

Survey Archive

Director - Dr. M. Kent Jennings
Assistant Director - Miss Carolyn Geda
Substantive Coordinator - Mrs. Maria E. M. Sanchez
Technical Supervisor - Miss Susanne Marshall
Supervisor, Servicing Section - Mrs. Maxene Perlmutter
Data Librarian - Mrs. Sylvia C. Turner
Assistant in Research - Mrs. Bobbe Jean Ellis
Assistant in Research - Mrs. Rosemary Grimes
Assistant in Research - Mr. John Petrocik
Assistant in Research - Mr. Edward J. Schneider
Assistant in Research - Miss Karen Sidney
Assistant in Research - Mrs. Mary Starkweather
Assistant in Research - Mrs. Suzy Weisman
Secretary - Mrs. June Stuart

Summer Training Program, 1969

P.S. 687, Research Design, P.S. 787, Data Analysis, P.S. 788, Statistics

Professor Philip E. Converse
Professor Warren E. Miller
Professor Donald E. Stokes
Professor Gudmund R. Iversen
Dr. Jerrold Rusk
Professor Edward Tufte
Mr. Herbert Asher
Mr. Paul Beck
Mr. Lawrence Boyd
Mr. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita
Mr. Bruce Campbell
Mr. Steven Coombs
Mr. John Deegan
Mr. Milan Dluhy
Mr. Lutz Erbring
Mr. Michael Fried
Mr. Bruce Greenberg
Mr. Peter Joftis
Mr. David Karns
Mr. Richard Katz
Mr. George Levenson
Mr. Thomas Mann
Miss Stuart Macdonald
Mr. Arthur Miller
Mr. Helmut Norpoth
Mr. Norman Ornstein
Mr. Rick Piltz
Mr. George Rabinowitz
Mrs. Joanne Stelzer
Mr. Leigh Stelzer
Mr. Carl Stone
Mr. John Stucker

Guest Lecturers: Professor Hayward R. Alker, Jr.
Professor Hubert M. Blalock

History 799. Quantitative Methods in Historical Data Analysis

Professor Jerome M. Clubb
Mr. Michael Traugott

P.S. 763. Methods of Field Research in International Organization

Professor Harold K. Jacobson
Guest Lecturers: Professor Hayward R. Alker, Jr.,
Professor Hubert M. Blalock
Professor Charles F. Cannell
Professor Leslie Kish
Professor Philip Stone

BUDGETS

	Final Budget 1968-69	Projected Budget 1969-70
I. TECHNICAL SERVICES TO MEMBERS		
A. Historical Archives Servicing		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$ 12,000	$ 20,800
Supplies, postage and communications	2,800	3,000
Computer time and machine rental	12,000	18,100
SUBTOTAL	$ 26,800	$ 39,900
B. Survey Archives Servicing		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$ 40,000	$ 48,200
Supplies, postage and communications	4,500	5,600
Computer time and machine rental	12,000	21,100
SUBTOTAL	$ 56,500	$ 76,900
C. System Distribution		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$ 15,000	$ 18,100
Supplies, postage and communications	500	1,600
Computer time and machine rental	1,500	3,500
SUBTOTAL	$ 17,000	$ 23,200
Overhead	7,500	14,000
TOTAL	$107 800	$154,000
FUNDING:		
ICPR Operating Budget	$ 78,800	$134,000
NSF (Computer funds)	25,000	---
Miscellaneous income from non-members/members	4,000	5,000
System distribution cost sharing	---	15,000
	$107,800	$154,000

	Final Budget 1968-69	Projected Budget 1969-70
II. SURVEY ARCHIVE DEVELOPMENT		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$103,000	$ 69,000
Supplies, postage and communications	5,000	8,000
Printing and duplicating	10,000	12,000
Computer time and machine rental	57,000	56,000
Overhead	14,500	14,500
TOTAL	$189,500	$159,500
FUNDING:		
ICPR Operating Budget	$159,300	$159,500
NSF (Computer funds)	30,200	---
	$189,500	$159,500
III. HISTORICAL ARCHIVES DEVELOPMENT		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$171,000	$133,600
Administrative costs and supplies	18,000	18,800
Computer time and machine rental	82,000	63,500
Overhead	37,000	39,000
TOTAL	$308,000	$255,300
FUNDING:		
Ford Foundation Project #45509	$162,000	$150,300
NSF Project #45487	90,000	---
NSF (Computer funds)	56,000	---
NSF Project #45550	---	105,000
TOTAL	$308,000	$255,300
IV. SUMMER PROGRAM		
Participant support	$ 87,200	$ 66,000
Teaching and staff salaries	87,000	83,000
Duplicating and supplies	23,000	8,000
Data processing and computer time	37,000	27,000
Overhead	4,700	5,300
TOTAL	$238,900	$189,300

	Final Budget 1968-69	Projected Budget 1969-70
IV. SUMMER PROGRAM (continued)		
FUNDING:		
NSF Summer Seminar Project	$ 94,300	$ 93,000
NSF Social Sciences Division	9,100	---
IBM	16,000	---
Mathematical Social Science Board	15,000	---
University of Michigan	63,000	73,000
ICPR Operating Budget	18,500	23,300
NSF Curricular Development Grant	23,000	---
TOTAL	$238,900	$189,300
V. CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$ 43,300	$ 60,000
Computer time and machine rental	5,500	15,000
Administrative costs and supplies	500	1,500
Overhead	6,600	9,600
TOTAL	$ 55,900	$ 86,100
FUNDING:		
NSF Grant for Curricular Development	$ 55,900	$ 86,100
VI. IR/IO ARCHIVE DEVELOPMENT		
Professional and technical staff salaries and fringe benefits	$ 4,500	$115,200
Computer time and machine rental	1,500	48,000
Supplies and administrative costs	300	22,000
Overhead	---	54,200
	$ 6,300	$239,400
FUNDING:		
Ford International Data Bank Grant	5,500	---
NDEA Counterpart	800	---
Contract with Center for Research on Conflict Resolution		$257,500
TOTAL	$ 6,300	$257,500

	Final Budget 1968-69	Projected Budget 1969-70
VII. CONSORTIUM ADMINISTRATION		
Salaries and fringe benefits	$ 73,000	$ 48,100
Supplies, postage and communications	8,000	10,800
Travel costs for Annual Meeting and Council meetings	14,500	18,000
Annual Report preparation	1,700	2,000
Overhead	9,700	7,900
Overrun payment*	6,000	15,000
TOTAL	$112,900	$101,800

*ICPR currently is paying off an overrun generated during fiscal years 1966-67 and 1967-68. As of July 1, 1969 it will be $27,000

FUNDING:		
ICPR Operating Budget	$112,900	$ 83,700
CRCR Contract		$ 18,100
TOTAL	$112,900	$101,800

VIII. SUMMARY FISCAL YEAR 68-69.

A. Income Sources

1. Operating Budget	
(a) 85 Class "A" @ $3,500	$297,500
(b) 36 Class "B" @ $2,000	72,000
	$369,500
2. National Science Foundation	
(a) Project Grant	$272,000
(b) Computer Allocation Fund	111,200
	$383,500
3. Ford Foundation	$162,000
4. University of Michigan	$ 63,000
5. Miscellaneous Income -	
(a) IBM	$ 16,000
(b) MSSB	15,000
(c) Department of Political Science	6,300
(d) Miscellaneous Servicing Requests	4,000
	$ 41,000
TOTAL	$1,019,300

B. Total Expense

Expenditures	$1,019,300
Remaining Deficit	27,000
GRAND TOTAL	$1,046,300

IX. SUMMARY - FISCAL YEAR 69-70

A. Income Sources Fiscal Year 69-70:

1. Operating Budget	
(a) 91 Class "A" @ $3,500	$318,500
(b) 41 Class "B" @ $2,000	82,000
	$400,500
2. National Science Foundation	
(a) Project Grants	$284,100
3. Ford Foundation	$150,300
4. University of Michigan	$ 73,000
5. Center for Research in Conflict Resolution	$257,300
6. Miscellaneous Income	
(a) Miscellaneous Services Requests	$ 5,000
(b) System Restribution Cost Reimbursement	15,000
	$ 20,000
TOTAL	$1,185,400

B. Total Cost

Expenditures	$1,185,400
Remaining Deficit	12,000
GRAND TOTAL	$1,207,400