Introductions and Logistics

Frank Newport: It's pretty interesting, historically, because it hosted what Ulysses Grant or maybe President Andrew Johnson, yet it was only built in 1968 as you saw in the brochure, if you looked carefully, so, quite a time warp here. I think that should have been 1868. Our CEO, Jim Clifton used to always start talking and say, "Well, they would say Abraham Lincoln *[inaudible]* here at some point you know?" But he didn't. His anecdote always, as they've gone back in history and trying to find evidence that Abe Lincoln was in this building, but they had not, so I think that came right after he was assassinated — which, by the way, was only a block from here as you know on 10th Street where the Ford Theater is. So, this is really a very historic part. They used to call it downtown, maybe they still do, Washington D.C., the old Masonic temple.

But speaking for Gallup, it's a pleasure to welcome you here. We are privileged to be able to host this conference with Jon and Skip and the National Science Foundation individuals who are here, and we'll introduce in just a moment to talk about the areas of cross-interest and cross-pollination, and cross-improvement, I guess we could say, between the projects that have been going on, I've been told yesterday, since 1952 — the first election, the ANES.

The reason I was told that is Allen Gallup, who is the son of the founder of Gallup, claims that when he was a graduate student at Stanford in 1952 he worked on the original ANES project. I'm not sure if that's been verified or not, but that's what he was telling me yesterday. He's sorry that he couldn't be here today, but it's a great privilege for us to host it, and I hope that it's an important and very rewarding day in which those of us who are involved in more day-to-day, nitty-gritty media polling trying to understand the election in the very short-term, you've got the data out to an eagerly and pantingly awaiting public, as we do, can contribute something to the individuals who are engaged in this extremely important long-term study of election behavior and attitudes, which is available for academics in posterity. I think it would be a good idea to have us introduce ourselves. Maybe we'll pass the microphone around, how's that? I think you know Jon and Skip, but we'll start with you anyhow, and we'll go around the table, okay? Maybe, Jon, with your long Vitae, maybe 15 minutes about your background, the publications you're most proud of— *[inaudible]*

Jon A. Krosnick, Stanford University: I would like to read one of my publications aloud *[inaudible].* I will just take this opportunity to thank Frank very much, and to thank Gallup for having us here today and to thank you all for coming. We're really excited about this day and looking forward to hearing from you all on a variety of issues. We've been preparing for a long time. Dave Howell, who you all know now, has been working very hard with his staff to get this whole thing pulled together and Matt DeBell, who you will see is also on our staff, has been working as well to prepare this and with thanks and encouragement from NSF. It's great that we can all actually be in this room, so thank you for doing this. And with that, let me pass it on to Skip and we'll go around.

Arthur (Skip) Lupia: I'm Skip Lupia at the University of Michigan, and you'll hear more from me later, so why don't we pass this around.

Matthew DeBell: I'm Matt DeBell from Stanford, and I work with Jon on the American National Election Studies.

Jeff Jones: Jeff Jones from Gallup. I have a little advantage over maybe some people in this room, because I worked with ANES when I was in grad school getting my Ph.D., so I had some experience with this. So hopefully that will help move it all along today.

Jim Norman: Jim Norman from *USA Today*.

Lydia Saad: Lydia Saad from Gallup.

Susan Pinkus: Susan Pinkus from the *LA Times*.

Anthony Salvanto: Anthony Salvanto from CBS News.

Nick Allum: Nick Allum from the University of Surrey.

Evans Witt: Evans Witt from Princeton Survey Research.

Scott Keeter: I'm Scott Keeter from the Pew Research Center.

Marjorie Connelly: Marjorie Connelly from *The New York Times*.

Andy Kohut: Andy Kohut from the Pew Research Center.

Trevor Tompson: Trevor Tompson Associated Press.

Rich Morin: Rich Morin, Pew Research Center.

Jon Cohen: Jon Cohen, *The Washington Post.*

Brian Humes: Brian Humes, National Science Foundation.

Phil Paolino: Phil Paolino, National Science Foundation.

Mark Schulman: Mark Schulman, SRBI Abt.

John Curtice: John Curtice, Strathclyde University, I used to be responsible *[unintelligible]* at the British Election Studies, and I also get involved in exit polling and commercial polling as well. *[Portion unintelligible]*

David Sanders: David Sanders, University of Essex. I'm involved with *[inaudible]* the British Election Studies.

Harold Clarke: Harold Clarke, A quarter century ago I was at the Canadian National Election Study, but now the British Election Study.

Introduction to the American National Election Studies

Jon A. Krosnick: Gary "Starbucks" Langer has just arrived. *[unintelligible]* So our first discussion, we do have a lot we want to accomplish today and we've got a fairly tight schedule, and as you can see, we're now an hour behind according to that clock up there. I learned an important lesson today: don't put clocks too high on the wall where you would need some ladder and a person to change it.

So, we're going to start by bringing people up to speed on the National Election Study, and certainly there are at least half of you know a lot about the study — but probably most or all of you don't know everything that's going on with it. And, so we thought that it would be important to let you know not only about the history of it, because some of that has gotten obscured in people's memories, but also the latest stuff in the present is not all that well publicized, so we're going to do that as well, and Skip is going to take the lead on this.

Arthur Lupia: The mic helps, all right. Well, thank you very much for coming, our friends from various polling firms and our friends from the UK. It's really great that you've decided to spend the day with us. You may have varied familiarity with the American National Election Studies and it's mission, so I want to walk you through a bit of its history. *[inaudible]*

The ANES actually has a history dating back to 1948, and since then, it has run polls in every presidential election since then, and also in most of the congressional elections since then. It was founded at the University of Michigan. From the late 1940s through the late 1970s, it was known as the Michigan Election Studies, and then in the late '70s it became the National Election Studies, which also marked a funding change from a consortium of philanthropic organizations to funding by the National Science Foundation, which has funded it ever since.

The American National Election Studies is used by scholars, students, journalists and citizens around the world. It's the basis of a wide range of other studies, and it's also the basis of thousands of publications. At our count, it's 5,000 articles and books, but you know, I don't know that we really keep up with the count as well. You know, there's Google and there's the Internet, so I think that's a lower limit.

The studies have a couple targets. The main target is to explain vote choice. For elections in the presidency and Congress there's really a national focus in terms of choice. The second equal emphasis is on turnout — why do some people come and turn out to elections and others don't. The American National Election Studies are constructed in a way to allow hypothesis testing. The questionnaires usually include a large number of questions to allow for, not just explanations of voting turnout, but a lot of related social phenomena. There are questions about groups and attitudes about a wide range of things that have various associations with elections.

The main attribute of an ANES site is you want to ask a lot of questions and provide many variables, because we have a wide user base and they have a lot of different interests. We want to facilitate as wide a range of analyses as we can, while staying focused on voting and turnout. There's a real emphasis on promoting comparisons. In our studies, particularly our time series — our presidential election year time series — there's a real emphasis on continuity, on having the same questions and following the same practices to the extent that they are still, the practices are viable to allow comparability over the years, of both the general population and important subgroups. The numbers are high enough in terms of numbers of observations, in this case, that you can take important subgroups of the American population and trace their attitudes and opinions over time as well.

The other thing about the ANES is that no one has privileged access, so the way that we run the organization is that the first day that you have access to the data is also the first day that Jon and I have access to it. Now, of course, in the process of putting the data together, there are technical reports, there are things that we see, so we do look at those. But in terms of being able to use the analysis for our own research, we don't see it until you do.

And that's an important part of the sort of public mission of the ANES. In academics it's presented as a public good. It's not the property of Michigan or Stanford or principal investigators — it's the property of the user community. And you will see that a lot of the decisions we make about how to put the questionnaires together, that that spirit, that premise really is the foundation of everything we do.

Our goals in terms of the scientific community is where we want to provide the continuity, we want to allow for a wide range of analyses, but we also want to try and push the boundaries as far as we can in terms of thinking about various aspects of survey design. How can we have better measures? How can we, what can we do with question wording and the way that the responses are worded to try and make sure that the data we put out are accurately interpreted, that they mean the things that the user community hopes that they'll mean? So we do a lot of work on that.

And we're very engaged with a wide range of scientific communities in a two-way relationship. We want to learn from psychologists and sociologists, and a wide range of scholars, their ideas about how we might conceptualize things and how we might have a more effective study at how people think about electoral phenomena. But at the same time, our practices are meant to feed back to them to help them think and work more effectively.

The history of the project is maybe useful, just for its own sake, or to understand why we are where we are today. These are the founders of the National Election Studies. Here's Phil Converse, Warren Miller, and Angus Campbell from the University of Michigan, and Don Stokes who was at the University of Michigan and later at Princeton. These are the founders. Their best known work in social sciences is *The American Voter*, a book that is widely cited and widely replicated. We have these book titles that have variations of *The American Voter*, people trying to copy the idea or change it in particular ways. This was a very influential book, not just for it's topicality, but for the way that it talked about elections — for the centrality of the use of

nationally representative surveys in an attempt to come up with a general conception of how Americans vote. Really a landmark book.

This book was the result of the early National Election Studies, and the National Election Studies really became focal in political sciences and the social sciences, and had almost a monopoly data provision role throughout the 1970s. It was an era of people really couldn't, individual scholars really couldn't run their own studies, in part because of lack of expertise, and in part because the deregulation of long distance phone calling hadn't happened yet, so the economies of scale were a bit different.

So it was hard for scholars to run their own surveys. Many people depended on the NES exclusively, but times changed and people became more able to run their own studies, which that along with what happened to the economy in Michigan and the nation in the '70s led to a different funding model.

We went to the National Science Foundation, NSF became involved, because of the centrality of the study in the social sciences, but also around that time, the demands and expectations of the National Election Studies started to change. One, because of the dependence on it; some people wanted it to do more things, but also because in the 1980s the rise of alternate means of running polls, by telephone for example, led people to want the National Election Studies to do things that individual academic pollsters couldn't do or wouldn't do. That was an important part of the mission.

The inventory of studies that exist, probably the best-known studies are the presidential election studies. They actually date back every year until 1948. We go back and forth as to whether the time series really starts in 1948 or 1952. A study was run by this group in 1948, but using a set of practices that probably today we wouldn't recognize as best practices. And so if we think about the underlying assumptions— *[Technical difficulties]* we like to date the series to 1952 *[Technical difficulties]*

Typically, an hour-long interview conducted between Labor Day and Election Day before the election, and then the same people are revisited in their homes after Election Day, and I think we stop interviewing typically four or five days before Christmas. That's the nature of it. If you run large polls, you know, we try and get very good response rates, and we succeed at that but as you know we have a limited fielding period—not as limited as most of you, but within academic circles we think our fielding period is quite limited. So, but I know that you don't feel sorry for us.

We've also run a range of other studies that are widely used and well known. There are congressional election studies, which really refer to mid-term studies. Mid-term studies have been run in almost all of the election years since 1948. There was one run in 2002 — in 2006 there was a change of emphasis, which I'm happy to answer questions. The field itself has had a big debate about what kind of congressional election study we'd like to have. Some scholars would like to see a mid-term election study that had a national representative appeal — the idea that these mid-term elections are national mandates but other scholars reject that hypothesis and really would like to see a mid-term election study that focuses on the congressional district itself. So looking at the thinking that the real story here happens within congressional districts and if you had a national representative sample that had only four or five respondents per congressional district, those scholars think that wouldn't be very useful. So there's a debate going on in the field right now; there isn't a consensus about what's most useful.

So in 2006, partly because of the debate, we ran a pilot study, instead, where we carried some congressional content, but also new questions, because there isn't scholarly consensus right now on what kind of design they'd like for mid-term studies.

These are the time series studies. These are the presidential election studies. *[inaudible]* We've also run a number of panel studies. *[unintelligible]* They've had different emphases over time, as you can see. Here you have three election series where you have the same respondents, and you can track how they feel about various things. There's a new panel study that we're starting in January 2008 that I'll tell you about in a few minutes, but this is the set of panel studies that we've run.

We've run a number of pilot studies. Our practice with NES is that we don't like to put questions on the study whose properties aren't somewhat known in advance. So, we don't like to put urgent questions on a full ANES production survey, so we'll run pilot studies to try and test new ideas about question wording or how we can get at new concepts or things like that. That's a very important part of the innovation in survey design that we try to do.

And what's nice about the pilot study, particularly in recent years, it's not just a top-down affair where we're thinking about ideas. We really try and bring the user community in and a wide variety of scholars in to help us think about how can we better measure essential concepts and the electoral content. We've had a series of pilot studies, including one in 2006 that I'll talk about. There's also been a number of specialized designs over the years. Not parts of the main study, but things that we've done to capture issues of special emphasis.

So the ANES has had great success in some senses. It's very focal in the social sciences. It's something that people know about as being influential and been widely used, but there were also criticisms that go through the 1980s and into the 1990s, and the criticisms — I mean, I think some of them had to do with the success of the study, that is, people thought, well, it can measure A, B, and C, and I'm really interested in D, why aren't you doing more of D? And that was legitimate. But there are also concerns about, you know, if you're running a full-on face-to-face study like that, people wonder about the opportunity cost. So, those are the types of questions.

And so, you know, one of the questions, for example, is a lot of people become interested in campaign dynamics. Our pre-post design, we get to interview respondents twice. You can't really capture any. How many campaign effects do you capture with two interviews at two discrete periods of time. And a lot of scholars wanted us to be more intense with that. There was a problem that in part had to do with, I think, the legacy of how studyies *[unintelligible]* technology. A lot of people wanted to have input.

What's curious about Jon and I are neither of us have training in political science. Jon's trained in psychology. My training is in mathematics and economics. But one of the similar things that we had, in addition to the deep interest of voting, is that we'd sent proposals to the National Election Studies in the 1980s and the 1990s. And the thing we had in common was not only were they rejected — rejected would be too kind to say what happened to them, because we just never heard anything. We just never got a response. They went into a black hole, and that was really the modal experience of a lot of people in our generation. And so, we didn't really have a sense of how decisions were made, or sort of where the study was going, and that was general.

And that became a problem because, you know, when time came for NSF to decide to renew this every time, the scholarly support was uneven. A lot of people depended on it, but a lot of people were deeply skeptical of whether the model was really pushing social science forward, or just relying on successes in the past, and so that was a problem we had to deal with.

Of course, the other problem that you may be familiar with is a lot of people asking questions about face-to-face. "Couldn't we just do this all by phone? It would be a lot less expensive." And things of that nature, so these were the kinds of questions that were circulating really in the late 1990s. And it led to a watershed event. There were a series of workshops held at the National Science Foundation, both about the National Election Studies, and also the other large studies — the general social surveying accounts studying dynamics. Really asking about the social value of these investments, particularly relative to other projects that they were funding.

The workshops were very big, *[inaudible]* they led to reports that are available online. At the end of the day, what was found was there was a lot of support for the study. Just to use, this is my own view, and it doesn't reflect the view of anyone else, if you take the American National Election Studies and compare it to a lot of other things that are funded by the federal research agencies in the name of political science — you know, like my own research or Jon's or things like that — if you look at citations per dollar or influence per dollar or books per dollar or things like that, a project like the American National Election Study just blows everything

else away. I mean, I love my own research agenda, but the fact is when I produce a data set, I put it on the website, I use it — a couple of other people do, but not really.

Any time a National Election Survey study is released, it's, you know, instantly viewed by tens of thousands of people around the world, used by students and things like that. And there are, the multiplier effects of something like that, the influence is pretty great. I'm not going to say that that's the reason that NSF chose to, not only continue funding, but try and reinvigorate these studies, but from my point of view it would be a valid rationale for going forward in that direction.

So now there's a new enthusiasm for our surveys at NSF, but they really want innovation. The signal that was sent by NSF was that just doing things the old way wasn't going to suffice, so they put out a call for proposal. And it was the most detailed call for proposals about the National Election Studies that the National Science Foundation had ever put out. They were willing to put a lot more money on the table, $7.6 million is about a 250 percent increase, I think that's right. The prior grants were $2 million up to $3 in the end. Which was a substantial increase over the amount of money available for the National Election Study in the previous cycle; however, there were a number of requirements about what they wanted in the next grant. And so, I'm actually going to work, I won't go through the call although I'll tell you how we answered it, because we were very focused on this call, and wanted to provide the innovation and the energy that the user community wanted while satisfying the, you know, what the workshops and things like that produced in terms of desires at the National Science Foundation.

So, our strategy was basically this: we wanted to try and — the study is already focal, we don't have to kind of sell people on the idea that it exists, or that it could be important. What we wanted to do was try and leverage the extensive expertise and energy in a wide range of communities in social sciences with our friends in other countries with folks like you trying to figure out how can we get the accumulated energy and wisdom to help make these instruments more effective for everyone? How can we leverage technology? How can we leverage social networks and things like that to try and improve the National Election Study for a broad constituency? How can we at the same time increase the number of stakeholders, the people who think, "Yes, this is relevant to me, this is something that I would do?"

So our strategy was multi-university. Michigan had always had the National Election Studies. We thought both for political and practical reasons, it was useful to now base it at multiple universities, so we're now partnered with Stanford. And, I think for a number of reasons that's a great thing to do.

We're very multidisciplinary, I'll tell you some of the statistics about our recent activity; we have, for example, we've had call for proposals recently for new questions. We've received over 1,100 questions. Over 40 percent of those questions were from outside of political science, which is just compared with the previous history of this project it's quite a remarkable change. It's really unprecedented; plus, it represents more voices at the table who are knowledgeable about how we might measure and conceptualize things. And we wanted to give people new opportunities to participate in this plan.

So we had the 2008 Time Series Study, that will continue the task. The fielding periods will be the same; the interviews will be the same. There will be a core component, which will carry the questions from the past, but there are going to be some new wrinkles in this study —

Frank Newport: Skip, just time-wise, you and Jon submitted a proposal and were officially awarded it for what time period? When were you awarded it, do you know?

Arthur Lupia: The call came out in late 2004, the deadline was May of 2005. We heard in the fall of 2005, and the grant was for the fall of 2005 through to — I don't know if it's the end of 2009 or fall of 2009, but basically it funds the cycle that allows us to run the studies for the 2008 election. And, our panel study actually runs past Election Day, and then to do all of the data processing and archiving and things like that that would be necessary to distribute the data, so that really runs us into 2009.

So we have the 2008 study, we'll have many of the same attributes as before, but with a couple of twists. One thing that's going to happen is in our post-election survey, we're going to turn the screen around and

allow respondents to self-administer. Is it OK that I'm walking away from the mic? Is that—ok? We're going to allow them to self-administer. The idea is that there are some questions that they may answer differently, if they can answer it themselves.

It also allows us to do some new things that are of interest to social scientists, so for example, there's a mechanism called "The Implicit Attitudes Test." And what that is you can go to a website, and you'll see certain images or words, and you'll be asked to match them. And what happens is that what's recorded is the speed at which you can match things; the speed at which you can match the image of let's say an African-American male with an attribute of something we might have, might be bad or good or something like that.

What psychologists are now very interested in is those time measurements — the differences between how fast someone might match an Anglo face with the word "bad" to an African-American face with the word "bad" — can tell us things about how people feel about different races. That's an Implicit Attitudes Test. By turning the screen around, that's one of the kinds of things that we can allow a respondent to self-administer. And it's, you know, it's a new thing, but it's one way to try and get a new sense of how people are feeling about things —

Frank Newport: This is still at home, though?

Arthur Lupia: It's still in their homes.

Frank Newport: Not online?

Arthur Lupia: It's not—well, we're putting the laptop around. They are actually, they're in the middle of the interview. They would, I think that they would go online —

Jon A. Krosnick: Now so the, the way this is done, the interviewers go to living rooms, they bring laptop computers with them; the questionnaire is programmed into the laptop, and then the interviewer simply turns the — so this is really ACASI, audio self-administered interviewing. So, they put the headphones on, they read and listen to instructions. And then they type stuff in, so the software will all be in the machine.

Frank Newport: What about older people, or people who are not comfortable even with somebody telling them what to do — ?

Jon A. Krosnick: Well, and you might say people who are not literate. And, this ACASI has been used in lots of huge federal surveys now, where it's really essentially just like the experience of talking to an interviewer, because the question is read through the headphones to the respondent, and then the screen highlights. It says, "If you want to answer this, then click this," and then highlights. So you have to sort of teach them how to use the mouse at that moment, so anybody who doesn't know a mouse will have a problem, but other than that, it's worked quite well. And, you know, I'm sure tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of interviews already.

Arthur Lupia: And one of the interesting things is that *[unintelligible]* inferences you'd want to draw from something like that are within the person, right? So if you could have an older person and they do two of these, that's the key comparison, right? So, you can kind of normalize for time *[inaudible]*. It's the kind of innovative thing that you can't know, it's not a device whose properties are completely known, but it is a device in which many people are interested. The properties are being devised. And to put it in the context of a study like this might really *[Technical difficulties]*

—various things. The other thing that turning the screen around does is it allows us to administer images during the interview. Right, so, Markus Prior at Princeton, for example, has run studies where it asks identification questions. You know, who's the holder of this office? And what he's found is he would say, you know, "What is the office of this person?" Or I'm sorry, *[inaudible]* what's the exact wording of the question?

Jon A. Krosnick: What job or office do they hold?

Arthur Lupia: "What job or office does this person hold?" You say Dick Cheney, some people get it right. You show Dick Cheney and just show the picture and give them no other information, a lot more people get the question right, okay? So you can do things like this, showing images and so forth. I'll tell you how we will take this opportunity and put it in the survey, because part of what we're doing is telling people that this is available and having them propose ideas to us about how to make the best use of this opportunity. So, that's the main study.

We've also run a number of other studies. In 2006 we ran a pilot study. It was a post-election study in November of 2006, where we fielded a hundred brand new questions. These questions were proposed by scholars from across the social sciences. And this was a test bed for thinking about how to measure new concepts, or how to better measure old concepts on a nationally representative survey. So, the pilot study *[inaudible]* it's online, and you know, we have people not only evaluating the questions, but all of the data is available for you. And, so now people who didn't write the questions are writing their own studies and sending them in to us kind of giving us a sense of how these new ways of measuring things are actually working.

One of the more exciting things that we're involved in, and actually that's been keeping us up this week, is we're running a panel study. The panel study is going to start in January 2008, and run through the middle of 2009. A panel is being drawn exclusively for our use, so we'll have the same respondents for 21 months. They will be, within a month they'll be randomly chosen for a week, and then they'll be asked to complete the interview. So, there will be one interview a month — only interviews that are controlled by us, and so we'll have over 2,000 cases to start.

In a panel study like this, we're very concerned about attrition. And we're building into the instrument a lot of ways to try to deal with attrition. One of the main ways we're trying to deal with this is we're not recruiting people into a political survey. They're being recruited into an omnibus survey, so in fact only seven of the waves will be about politics. The other waves will be about things about like public health or pop culture, or maybe games that they like to play or things of that nature. The idea is to keep people interested in the survey, so that they'll want to answer it every month. So that when we get to the political waves, they'll stay with us there too. We have a lot of design elements trying to minimize attrition as a whole, but particularly focusing on attrition due to the fact that "I don't like politics, so I don't want to answer questions about politics every month." These folks are being — what do we call it? Should I say what we call it?

Jon A. Krosnick: Well, a monthly special topics study.

Arthur Lupia: Yes, monthly special topics study, that's what people are being recruited to, but really it's our time to field this type of study.

Frank Newport: You may get to this, are you recruiting it by mail initially?

Arthur Lupia: No, it's random. It's RDD.

Jon A. Krosnick: So, they get a letter in advance, and then we call them, and it's just a regular RDD recruit, and we provide—

Unidentified Speaker: Is everybody — are there only six months in which you are running politically— or are the political questions being administered to different respondents in different months?

Arthur Lupia: There are seven political months, and then however many waves we run, minus seven non-political months. So if you get political questions in February, everyone else does, okay? But you may get them in different weeks within the month. We're randomly controlling which group *[inaudible]*.

Jon A. Krosnick: And, one little feature is, so we're setting up this panel, and they'll be doing Internet monthly surveys, but some people will not join the panel. And we're going to get data from them by telephone for those months that we need it, so we'll have that supplemented.

Susan Pinkus: On the political surveys, are they going to be asked match-ups, or *[unintelligible]* questions, or just generic kinds of political questions? Because I would imagine, you said that it's going to be perhaps in February different weeks of the month that you'll be asking these questions — I would imagine some events may alter some of your answers, and so how would you, you know, work with that?

Jon A. Krosnick: Well, the design is for that purpose, so we want to randomly spread these interviews throughout the month. And, a bunch of people on our board are very interested in studying exactly what you've just said, and yes, there will be horserace questions in the first wave and other waves as well. And, as the candidate field narrows, we can ask more about the candidates about who are really contenders, and—

> *unidentified Speaker: When are you recording the results of these surveys? After the election — ?*

Jon A. Krosnick: Long after the election.

Arthur Lupia: We're funded by Congress, and we release all of the data on the same day. We never release things before the election. Because, you know, we don't want to be reported as having affected anything in the election. Any day that we're in the news with that story, that's a bad day for us. When senators sort of talk about our project as, you know, "Well, we should cut the social sciences and here's some big ones we should cut." That's a bad day for us.

Jon A. Krosnick: There was a day like that! [Laughter]

Arthur Lupia: There was, yes, there was a day like that, yes. So, we release them after the election.

John Curtice: So, Skip, this is a mixed merge of Internet and telephone, is that right?

Arthur Lupia: Yes, what I should say about the questionnaires themselves is the questions we're using and the way we're wording them, they're all built to leverage the temporal aspect of this design. So, the questions that we're asking about the candidates, the questions we're asking about comparisons between candidates are things that we could ask now, and then we could ask at a future date to try and change things.

So, for example, you know, we're asking a lot of questions about all the candidates right now. And you might say, one question is, "Why are you wasting time on, you know, Kucinich or Gravel?" One of the things scholars might want to know is what's the difference between, you know, what's Kucinich's person going to be doing in eight months? Right, are they going to be different than an Obama person in eight months, right or a Richardson person in eight months? What's their trajectory going to be, and then are there going to be some systematic differences based on where they started out? So, all of the questionnaires are really being developed with the temporal aspect in mind.

The other key thing about this is we're going to stay in the field after Election Day. Because another key thing is how are things that happened in 2008, how do they affect the first couple months of the new president or of the new administration? Was anything that was said in 2008 constraining? You know, did the public not buy it, or the public thinking about some of the things that happened during the election and in mid-2009 still basing their judgments on it, still basing how they think about it? So, we want to stay in the field after all of the cameras are off to try and give scholars and all of you a sense of, you know, how did the election affect things after the lights went off.

We also have engaged in a number of other activities to try and support the main studies. We now have a partnership with the National Longitudinal Study.   The National Longitudinal Study has been in existence for,

you know, 30 years. It has a panel of people who it's been interviewing since 1979, a second panel of their children who it's been interviewing since 1997.

We have been working with them, and with the funding of NSF, have been able to put questions of relevance to elections on there. So, you can ask people about, you know, how they feel about participation, how they feel about candidates and things like that. These are people on whom a 30-year data record exists — about their employment history, about their education, about when they got married, their military service and things of that nature. So, there's a real possibility there, if you were to think about, you know, how people make certain political transitions in their mind, whether they come to accept certain ideas or not.

We're going to be buying time on two of the studies that have been running since '97, so we'll have a 2006 observation and a 2008 observation, and then one in '79. There is the ability to look at this political data in light of a comprehensive 30-year data history on what these people have been thinking about a range of other social topics, so that's another opportunity for the NES user community.

Also, we're working with the Department of Homeland Security. We've extended the length of the post-election interview, and also there's going to be a special wave on the panel study where we have questions that are of interest that are of relevance to the electoral context, but also of interest to the dual mission of Homeland Security, which is terrorism and domestic preparedness. In fact, on Monday, we'll probably have—David, is Monday reasonable for the DHS call? Yeah, so we'll probably make the call to the public on that day of what kinds of questions we want for that *[unintelligible]*. And, I'll tell you in a second how we'll do that, because that's a key part of how we operate now *[unintelligible]*.

So this is it, one of the big innovations, *[inaudible]* procedurally, is, you're all familiar with the concept of Open Source. And so, I know myself, when I run surveys, one of the big frustrations that you have is that you'll be in front of people presenting it, and then someone will ask a question. "Well, why didn't you ask this, or why didn't you do that?" You can respond however you want, but internally you might be having this V8 moment— why didn't I ask that? And a lot of times it's because, at least in academic surveys, there is a small group of people putting it together; and they have great intentions and great ideas, but they just don't have a way to communicate with a wide range of other experts at the moment of putting the survey together.

And, so for NES, the consequence was, you know, there was a small group of people, relatively small, putting it together, and then the questionnaire would come out. And there would be all of these kind of great ideas about, "Well, why aren't you asking this? Why did you ask this that way?" But of course, at that point, it's too late for the National Election Studies to do anything about it.

So, we try to figure out how can we leverage communication technologies to change that dynamic and to have that conversation before we field the survey. And, so the product of those ideas is the ANES Online Commons. It's Open Source. We open it up. We say, "Today, for the next six months, eight months, two months — we will now take proposals for the following study." We have requirements for the proposal. You have to list the question; you have to give a rationale for the question. If you want it to be run in one of our production studies, you need to provide evidence that it's actually performed well in other credible surveys, right? But you can make an argument.

And, what we do, not only to boost the legitimacy of the process, but to try and sort of distribute the effects of these expertise. Everything goes online. None of this happens behind closed doors, so when you post a proposal, we put it up on the online, you send us a proposal, we put it on the Online Commons, and there are places for people to comment on it. In response to the comments, you may revise your proposal, right, and so this is open, anyone can do it.

And so we've now completed this twice. We've ran an Online Commons for the pilot study, and for the panel study. Both times we had over 1,100 questions proposed. The number of scholars who signed up to be part of this is over 600, and the number of them that are from outside of political science is over 40 percent. So it's this sort of broad community of consultation. This network has been built, where not only are they helping us, but now they're talking to each other.

There's a focal place for people to look for ideas about and debates about how should we ask this, how should we measure that. It's going to help the study. It has helped the study, but moreover it provides a common meeting place for people who really want to think about how can we measure things more effectively. So the Online Commons is something we have run it twice. It is open now for the 2008 study.

As we talk about the 2008 study, if there are questions that you would like to have included and ideas, you can just post them. It's not that hard to do. We limit proposals to five pages, and the reason is not because we're not interested in a longer explanation; just we want people to read them. And if they come on the Online Commons, and they know that they're going to be short, there's a chance that they'll open them up and read them. You can always link to other things that you've written. You can always talk about other things, but this is the way the Online Commons works

John Curtice: Skip, the real challenge here is can you get enough comments? In the end, somebody has got to make a decision. Are you then providing a rationale for the decisions that you make about the Online Commons?

Arthur Lupia: Well, I'll tell you the conceptual answer and the true answer. The conceptual answer is that we want to do that. I mean, we really want to leverage all the input we get. And for the first couple studies, we actually did respond to everybody individually. Right now we're at our limit, you know? We've invited everyone to the party and a lot of people showed up, and so we're kind of at capacity right now, and maybe a little more so. So, we're trying to think of how to deal with that. That's an issue.

What we've done with the panel study, for example, is that we had a first round of cuts. And we wrote to people and said that we don't know any circumstances where we'd be able to use them. We have a board of overseers that looks at this; we look at it, and in every letter we write, we try to provide constructive feedback about, "These are great questions, they just don't fit here," or "this is a really great idea, but you know, none of us can kind of see how to really implement." *[inaudible]* We're trying to build this community.

On the panel study, we're sort of going real time. So, we're talking, you know, we're going to put this on Wave 2, but the communication isn't as wide. We're trying to figure out how to do that, we're at capacity. I'm being told I'm done. *[unintelligible]*— leverage and the transparency benefit. We'll talk about that later, we'll talk a little about that later, too.

So this is really what we're trying to get at, I mean, we're trying to leverage the expertise of broad groups to try and prove this instrument. But for us, it's really not just about the instrument, because we have a public focus. So, all of the development that we're trying to do are things that, in principle, anyone interested can study elections and benefit from — you guys, people in other countries. So that's what we're trying to do.

And so, if through the process of today you can see ways, either whether they're questions or procedural or conceptual, that we can do those things better, we want to hear them. That's why we're thrilled to have you here. So, I think I'm going to end here, and I'm handing it over to someone. I'm handing it over to these guys. Are we taking a break or are we— All right, so thank you very much, and now we're going to *[inaudible]*

The British Election Studies and Their Relationship to the ANES

David Sanders: We're very grateful to be here, thank you for asking us. The British Election Study has been running since the early 1960s. And almost all the things that Skip has said about the American National Election Study, I would like to be true for the British Election Study. I think it's probably fair to say some of them are true, but not all of them. At the moment, it's being run out of the University of Essex, and the University of Texas at Dallas.

And as you can see there, we've had several funding sources, but our main funding source is something called the ESRC, Economic and Social Research Council, which is the U.K. social science group within NSF. We've also got some money from the Electoral Commission, which is a kind of official government body for

making sure elections work in the U.K.   And we also had funding from BBC, the Newsline program, which is their kind of flagship news program in the evenings.

We've got a number of related projects that we'll mention that we've kind of plugged into the British Election Study, *[inaudible]*. It's been running since 1964. It was inspired by one of the four people that you saw earlier, Don Stokes, who came to England, got together with a guy at Nuffield College, Oxford, called David Butler. They began the first study in 1964, that's then being carried through variously by John and other people in the field, John being at Strathclyde, but a very strong connection with *[inaudible]*.   and it's oscillated between Oxford and Essex since 1964 through to 2005.

The core survey is always a face-to-face post-election survey, national probability samples. We try to make those as large as possible. As you can see there, in 2005, we got it up to 4,700. There have also been panel surveys. Again, you can see there '64 to '70; '74 to '79; '92 to '97 — then another one that we've got running now — 2005 through to 2009. We tried to make it rather like ANES does, a resource not just for political scientists, but lots of other analysts use it as well. And we obviously try to provide the best possible data that we can.

In 2001, when we took it over, or in 2005 when we carried on with it, we introduced a number of innovations. You can see them listed there. And some standard ones were again an idea that Skip was mentioning, the idea of rival models, and making sure that *[inaudible]* different hypotheses.

With variables we did quite a lot more on what's sometimes called "valence politics," the politics of performance — an idea that originated with Don Stokes. A lot more on turnout, than had been done in previous British Election Studies, because until this century turnout's not really a problem in the U.K. It's only really started to become a problem relatively recently. And then we also added some batteries related to people's orientation towards the democratic process, so we've kind of broadened this study out, again, in the hope of making it rather more useful to a wider user community.

We had a number of methodological innovations, not least the use of Internet surveys, which we began in a very primitive way in 2001, but did fairly seriously, as you'll see in a moment, in 2005. We tried providing feedback to respondent experiments with those Internet surveys, and we particularly were interested, rather like the NES is in campaign dynamics, and we have a number of ways of trying to get at that.

One of the key features has been this increase in outreach to user communities. There have always been consultation exercises for the BES, but we were mandated by the funding audience to be far more active in the consultation exercises. We had to do a number of presentations all around the U.K. to collections not dissimilar to this one, where the object was to get politicians, people from the media, people from funding agencies as well as ordinary academics, *[inaudible]* to these consultation exercises.

And one of the key things that we did, that we've really been able to do with the changing technologies of the survey instruments was very rapid data delivery. That was especially important with our Internet surveys. We were putting them out into the public domain just as soon as we worked the data from them. *[inaudible]* there's always this danger that Skip was alluding to, that people might say, "Well, you're putting these things out, does it affect the outcomes?" That's an argument that we've not had. Nobody has complained in the U.K. about our putting the data out very rapidly. Maybe it's a problem that we'll *[inaudible]* in due course.

This is a horribly messy picture, but it's really just to try and encapsulate what the current instrument is about. We call it the "wire diagram." There's two main strands that you can see there. The top strand is the face-to-face probability sample, maintaining the study on that
face-to-face, probability sample basis that it's been since '64.

We begin, as you can see, with Wave 1, the pre-election probability sample, face-to-face interview— fairly large end. We then go to Wave 2, which is the immediate post-election study survey, which is exactly the same. That part of the study is very similar to the ANES design on the probability sample, though, we're doing both ways face-to-face rather than anything by telephone. And then in Wave 3, we then went really as an experiment, we went to those respondents that we could get who were Internet-connected from that

probability sample, to interview them really as a methodological experiment, to compare things with the bottom way. The bottom line, *[inaudible]* see where it says, "PST 2005 Internet campaign panel survey?" That's where we went to an Internet panel. We used a company called YouGov, which are the *[inaudible]* in the U.K. and it's an Internet sample, which we can debate if need be at a later date.

One of the things that we were concerned to establish was what were the similarities and differences between the different modes of recruitment of these different surveys and the different modes of application. And so we've done a series of experiments that you see there in the vertical lines, comparing the results of the face-to-face probability sample with what we believe is a representative sample from the Internet panel, and all of the comparisons that we've made have suggested that these two samples are very similar indeed.

Harold will be talking about some of those similarities, but the key feature is that marginal distributions are pretty similar on most variables. But more importantly, as far as we're concerned, the Internet connections among variables — if you run models — then you get virtually identical estimates across the different survey modes. That to us is very important.

So you can see how we've kind of filled out the Internet mode. The panel attrition on the Internet sample is very small. We do have some top hops, but it's not really necessary. As you can see from the ends there on that Internet line, the panel retention is pretty good. And we have funding to take that panel through to 2010, should the British Prime Minister decide that he will delay holding the election until 2010. So we'll have a lot of data on those same individuals starting in the early part of 2005, carrying through to 2010. Obviously, the number of interviews will be dependent upon when the election is actually held.

And then the third component of this picture you see in red at bottom, where it says "monthly tracking surveys." Now, this is work that we've done kind of outside the official financial envelope of the British Election Study — work that initially Harold Clarke and Marianne Stewart began in 1992, doing monthly surveys in the U.K. asking a range of election-related questions. And that's been carried through with some NSF funding, and also with some further ESRC funding, which we will be able to continue until 2008.

Now, what that's enabled us to do is to look at the evolution of opinion month by month, because as you probably realize, an awful lot of opinion change occurs in periods before elections. We're very interested in campaign dynamic, of course. That's why we have all of these campaign polling components built into the two main sets of surveys at the individual level where we've got the same individuals. But, nonetheless, a lot of the action does take place in inter-election periods.

And, what these tracking surveys are allowing us to do is to observe the evolution of opinion across a broad range of activities, and in particular, to look at the impact of events. That's really the crucial angle that these tracking surveys give to us as a reference there. That's all for me. *[inaudible]*—turn it off which I didn't mean to do. *[inaudible]* Any questions?

Unidentified Speaker: I have a question. Is the YouGov Internet survey recruited by personal interview or telephone interview or is it — ?

David Sanders: No, it's recruited online. That's why the experiment was so important. I have a panel of 225,000 people that they recruit in all kinds of ways — on a continuous basis and spend a lot of time trying to obtain from. We then sample from that panel. Now, you know, we have lots of discussion about this when we met on previous occasions, and the key feature for us is whether or not the panels that we get from —the samples that we get from their panels — are representative. Clearly, it's not a traditional random sample probability sample, but that second strand that you saw is a very cheap way of getting a lot of data.

The question is, "Is that data that we're getting of any use?" And all of the work that we've done suggests that "Yes, indeed it is worth having, it is pretty good data, and the comparisons that we've made really do suggest that there's not a lot of difference between the two modes." So, you know, it's not a traditional probability sample. The traditional probability sample will remain at the heart of the British Election Study, but what we can do by experimenting with these internet panels in these different ways of using the Internet both to recruit and to conduct interviews is we can establish whether it's worthwhile supplementing that

traditional probability approach with other approaches that give us a lot more information about what's going on. And in terms of bang for the buck, there's a lot to be said for those kinds of Internet-based approaches.

Frank Newport: What percent of Britain is online compared to the U.S.? Do you know?

David Sanders: Well, it's about 60 percent —

Harold Clarke: It's a little higher now; it's closer to 70 [percent], yes.

David Sanders: Yes, it's pretty high. Obviously, you have to wait for those groups that are relatively underrepresented. But what you need to recognize is that you need to compare the Internet surveys not with face-to-face probability surveys where you've gone back to the individuals using all of the traditional, orthodox and well established methods. But you need to compare it with Random Digit Dialing telephone methods, which in Britain, you know there's no callback on those methods, on the cheap, random-digit dialing surveys. And in those circumstances, you know, there's quite a low level of response on a lot of RDD surveys in the U.K., and so you have problems with the samples anyway. And so the question is, "Is the sample representative?" rather than have you properly followed all the rules of running probability samples but I'm sure we can have this— *[inaudible].*

Harold Clarke: Hi, my name's Harold Clarke, David has covered a number of the features of the BES. I will talk fairly quickly about a few particulars. One of the things, that if you think the BES is a series, some of you are familiar with it, a number of you may not be. It goes back to the early 1960s, as David said.

One of the really interesting and important features with a lot of theoretical leverage is the existence of multi-wave panel surveys, going right from the 1960s, the work by Butler and Stokes initiated this design feature. It was carried forward by *[unintelligible]* who installed it in University of Essex in the 1970s, and then massively so during the '80s and then the '90s by John Curtice and his colleagues at Nuffield with their related project, particularly the British Election Panel Surveys, and has been a feature of our work as well with 2001 and now the 2005 and 2009 BES.

Related projects, the so-called "Continuous Monitoring Projects" David talked about, mode comparisons as well. Our basic approach to this, and we're very agnostic; we want to get high quality data and do so in an efficient and economical way, so the way in which we can go forward then to us is very much dictated by these practical considerations.

We also have a number of experiments. Some of them are very similar to what Skip and Jon were talking about in terms of designs, so-called feedback and respondent experiments where we have been testing some core propositions in theories of voting, things such as the endogeneity of ideal points in spatial models and so forth. We can really do a lot in here. Some kind of computer-assisted approach, whether it be through the Internet or turning the computer around in an ACAPI setting, seems to be fundamental to that.

Rapid data release, and David has talked about this, we release power data every day during the election *[unintelligible]* campaign with the rolling campaign panel surveys. Next time around we do the BES, we might actually try to take the entire thing live so every time somebody answers an interview, you'll potentially see that line wiggle a little tiny bit, and it will automatically be *[unintelligible]* re-waved and the thing will move in real time

Frank Newport: You don't run into the same political — *[Garbled]*

Harold Clarke: No, it's really interesting, Frank. It's a very different environment having had a little bit of a relationship with the National Science Foundation, as a number of you have. You're familiar with these problems and some horror stories. That is not a situation that obtains in Britain, and so we see no reason that if we can do it every day, why can't we do it every summer?

John Curtice: But Harold, presumably, you do not mention the words Economic and Social Research Council very much—

Harold Clarke: Oh, no. Absolutely not.

John Curtice: Because the Economic and Social Research Council cannot put out press material during the course of an election. *[inaudible]* So you do have to constrain to the *[inaudible]* it is on your head, as opposed *[inaudible]*.

Harold Clarke: Absolutely, absolutely.

Frank Newport: Even though it's funded by the British government, you kind of hide that fact when you release it.

Harold Clarke: We do, it's just simply at the University of Essex website. We're really interested in reaching out to the user community as much as this group is doing today with various people from the media and so forth. We really want those people to know about this, and so we make all sorts of efforts in venues quite a bit like this. And we go around the country it's been very nice. Our meetings at the Scottish Royal Society building in Edinburgh and so forth is doing these kinds of outreaches to make sure people know about our work in a timely way, so that they can actually use the data for the kinds of *[inaudible]* they're doing during the campaign period.

Another feature of the BES, various studies, is vote validation exercises. You can actually do this with the Internet as well, and we did that in 2005. You'll see why that's important in just a second. A quick thing on vote comparisons; I want to spend a lot of time on this, and it's something that we may want to talk about in this group later today. Here is reported vote; we have in-person, Internet surveys, the experiment David was talking about, along with the actual vote shares. It's very, very close across the votes; however, we don't do well on turnout. Nobody does well on turnout. Not just us; here's a whole bunch of surveys done at ANES, NAES, Canadian National Election Studies, CES, BES — and we all more or less get it wrong, often horribly wrong, in terms of reported turnout. And people overreport like mad, as we know. When I first started this, I thought years ago people might actually underreport as a way of concealing their vote, but that's not what they do, as we know. Party ID shares, very similar across the modes, cross-validation in terms of *[inaudible]*.

Some of the topics just quickly, I'm told I've got two minutes, probably a minute and a half now, things that we are interested in, I think it's very important for our project as Skip again mentioned earlier, this is the funded project we've really got to try to bring in a diversity of theoretical perspectives into our work — either a variety of important rival models, electoral choice, turnout, electoral participation and so forth. It's our responsibility to make sure that those various approaches are in our data set, and people who are interested in testing these models can do so and we've made an effort to do that.

We're also interested, though, in using the project to study dynamics of public opinion on important topics. Here the continuous monitoring feature of the project is very important. A lot of the things that happen, not just for elections, but for public opinion generally — of course, we know election studies as traditionally set up are very poorly designed to deal with it, because they are looking at one particular point every four or five years on average, and that is not a lot of reaction. *[inaudible]* I'm right at the end here. All sorts of stuff we could talk about. One of the big things we've found, one of the aspects, *[inaudible]*, immigrants, very important *[inaudible]* voting in Britain and elsewhere.

In summary, core topics as described. Multiple modes of data collection, we're very agnostic about this. We want the best data, biggest bang for the buck, very rapid data release, easy-to-use SPSS, that could be Stata, and even the *[inaudible]* files. Grade school students sometimes emailing me and asking me if they could get partial distributions, they don't call them that, and we actually try to do some of that. Dynamics, rival models. Collaboration — you bet. We're very interested if you'd like to talk to us. Please get in touch with us. There is our contact information, and we look forward to talking with you throughout the day. Thank you very much.

Susan Pinkus: On the multiple models that you talk about Internet and self-completion mail-back, are those within a random selection of voters or adults?

David Sanders: The self-completion mailback comes off the probability sample face-to-face, so it's left with the respondent, and the interviewer then goes back and collects it. That's the device that *[inaudible]*.

Susan Pinkus: Oh, like a self-administered questionnaire?

John Curtice: It gets you another 20 minutes of questionnaire time. Basically, because the point is that you can run a 60-minute face-to-face interview, and then *[inaudible]* to the respondent — the idea is that you get the interviewer to edit the copy of the questionnaire while the respondent sits there and does the extra 20 minutes. The point is that if you did an hour-and-20-minute interview, you'd lose people, but switching back between self-completion and mailback you can get a better response rate.

Susan Pinkus: So what's the percentage of them sending it back?

David Sanders: Well, it depends on how you do it. The aim is to get 90 percent of it. If you get 90 percent, you're doing well, and 85 to 90 [percent] should *[inaudible]*.

Susan Pinkus: So do you send out cards, or do you call to remind them? *[inaudible]* If they haven't returned them, do you remind them *[inaudible]*?

Harold Clarke: Yes, we do. We have all of the sort of normal things that you do with a mailback questionnaire, you know, the tried and true sorts of methods. And in the end, as Jon said, you will typically *[technical difficulties]* a track record of, say, usually about 80 to 90 percent, I think, over time. It varies a little bit, but one of the nice things is that we have so much information about people who don't respond as well if you want to do so, you can do some fancy selection bias modeling and so forth. It's a nice way of getting a fairly radical extension, you know, with the amount of data you get at very, very low cost. Yes?

Unidentified Speaker: From the YouGov Internet sample, do you just pull a random sample from that database, or do you model that database?

Harold Clarke: As I'm sure a number of you are familiar, you know, the Internet methodology, the design of the surveys in terms of collecting a so-called "Internet panel," and then moving from that to a field sample and so it varies across from one — you know, there are several sort of competing models of how you'd do this. I won't stop right now to talk about YouGov, because of time constraints, but basically what they're going to do is they've got a huge so-called "panel." About 250,000 people right now, and they have a grid of 48 cells and they select stratified sample, random *[inaudible]* sample out of this group, and then they do some other things from there. *[inaudible]*

Unidentified Speaker: Harold, one of the questions that I had, you're interested in turnout, do you do voter validation among your respondents to see if they actually voted or not?

Harold Clarke: We sure do, and we do that both in 2005 with both the face-to-face probability sample done by the National Center, and with a subsample, a random sample of our Internet people as well.

David Sanders: If I may be permitted to bash my government briefly. The U.K. government has privatized the process by which the electoral returns are now collected. This used to be a function of the Lord Chancellor's department, and with privatization the quality of collection of election returns has really gone down enormously. And so, although we managed to do it in 2005, I am concerned that next time it may not even be possible at all, because the companies that they're hiring to do this just are not doing it efficiently. It's very annoying.

Arthur Lupia: I think we're going to have another minute or two because of the technical situation, so if you'd like to ask another question or if you want to address—

John Curtice: Can I ask a question of you guys, just given the topic of the conference, what is your position, how much, did you say you had finding from *[inaudible]*

David Sanders: Well in terms of the *[inaudible]*, media age effects, or people—

John Curtice: Well, I'm only interrupting on the basis of, hey guys, can we ask the same questions, or parenting agencies to ask the questions—*[inaudible]*

David Sanders: Oh, absolutely, absolutely, we certainly did that. And I mean, although we haven't devised a consultation system, or we didn't employ a consultation system as sophisticated as the ANES is now using. Obviously, we're clear that the model *[unintelligible]*. "Ah-hah! That's something that we need to do as well." Because although we have these consultation exercises and we have a website that we want to be sensitive to, but we didn't hang it on the website. We didn't leave stuff there, but I think that's a very good idea.

Unidentified Speaker: Skip, is the ANES prepared to lend its credibility to this online stuff?

Arthur Lupia: Well, our panel is RDD-recruited and then run on the Internet, but no, we're not ready to do opt-in at this time.

Jon A. Krosnick: I think things are pretty different in the U.S. I mean you won't be surprised to know that the 90 something percent of response rates we've been hearing about would be essentially unachievable here, and the idea of retaining a volunteer Internet panel over a period of months, and then all the U.S. companies that do volunteer internet surveys say they need to recruit, you know, five times as many people at Wave 1 in order to get the number they need at Wave 2, and a Wave 3 sample is unimaginable. So, things are clearly different [unintelligible].

Harold Clarke: That's a really important point; that the data-gathering methodology, which is effective, useful, cost-effective and so forth, in one milieu may not work elsewhere. And, so as we've said, we're very agnostic about this. In Britain we've had very encouraging results with our Internet work, and so we want to do some more on that while maintaining the core time series of face-to-face surveys over time.

Frank Newport: Lessons learned. Why are the people in Britain, you're saying that they're so much more cooperative?

John Curtice: Well, hang on, the response rates to the original survey, you're now doing a 60 percent response rate, with the face-to-face probability sample, and the 90 percent refers to the 90 percent of those people who have already responded to the original probability sample. All right, OK, I mean, the response rates in the U.K. in the face-to-face surveys have fallen. *[Portion unintelligible]* GSS. Whereas at one time, we got 70 percent as our normal target, we're now struggling to get 60 [percent].

David Sanders: This is an absolutely crucial point, Harry, if you're feeling critical of Internet surveys. The problem that we have in the U.K. is very low response rates to all modes. We had to use very significant incentives for our probability sample in order to drive our response rate up from 52 percent in 2001 to 61 percent in 2005. And that was with expending a lot of money. [*inaudible*]

Unidentified Speaker: I don't see how they justify throwing the concept of probability sampling out the window — ?

David Sanders: Well, okay, but let me finish. The second point then moves to telephone polls. Now, with telephone polls in the U.K. the response rates are anything between 5 percent and 20 percent. And my experience is that they are nearer 5 percent, and I invite anyone who is skeptical of that proposition to write themselves a script and go and do some RDD dialing in the U.K. I've sat in observing random-digit dialing telephone calls where I've had to wait two hours before a team of ten interviewers could get me a single interview to listen to in order to check that it was okay. *[Portion garbled]* But it is the relevant point of comparison for this part of the election study, John. It's not the relevant comparison — you're right — in terms of the probability sample.

We are not suggesting, by any stretch of the imagination, that we should move from probability sampling. Of course, you shouldn't, but what you need to do over time is you need to establish what the properties of different survey instruments are. And if we've got a problem with response rates, which we have—it's much bigger here in the U.K. than you've got here—then you've got to try and contrive ways of getting around that. And Internet samples, we know that they're not random probability samples, but then neither are most RDD telephone samples — and that's the comparison that needs to be made.

For RDD in the U.K., if you're getting a 5 percent response rate, there is no sensible sampling distribution that you can arrive at for any of the estimates that you've got with that kind of response rate, so all you're left with is empirical representatives and that's the crucial thing that you should be asking.

Unidentified Speaker: With low response rates that low, you're absolutely correct, but there's something inherently different about a recruited sample versus a volunteered sample.

David Sanders: Well, of course. Now, how do you know — ?

Unidentified Speaker: You know by doing empirical studies

David Sanders: Exactly, and that's what we're doing.

Unidentified Speaker: I mean, look at the research that we've done on comparisons between low completion rate phone surveys and high completion rate phone surveys. One thing. The low completion rate phone surveys hold up pretty well. A low completion rate here is not 5 percent. So, I take your point, but our concern is, [inaudible] certainly my concern and many of my colleagues, is that recruited samples — volunteered samples are a tricky road to go down to.

Unidentified Speaker: Well going beyond that, these are professional poll-taking clubs in which individuals sign up to fill out surveys in exchange for points, redeemable for cash and gifts. And Individuals sign up multiple times under multiple assumed identities to increase their opportunities to take surveys and win prizes and money. Express your opinion and get paid for it. What validation is that? [Unintelligible] The identity of the panel members, and we have 250,000 members of YouGov, or do we have 25,000 members signed up multiple times? We don't know. And the validation [inaudible] is not done because YouGov doesn't want us to do it.

Harold Clarke: I think, you know, one of the key sort of things, *[unintelligible]*, in fact having a list doesn't mean that you are able to get people to do your survey. And, right now, the situation in Britain at least, is that if you do the traditional probability route you have large masses, depending upon circumstances, of people opting out and recruiting themselves out. And if you go the other route, of course, you don't have a list to begin with. People recruit in.

John Curtice Yeah, but Harold, see if you take *[inaudible]*, if you're saying, oh I'm not sure I believe probability samples anymore, why are you comparing the Internet with the probability sample, because you're using as your criterion of the probability sample —*[inaudible]*?

Harold Clarke: I haven't finished yet.

John Curtice: YouGov would argue that when they get different results from face-to-face surveys, their data is better.

Harold Clarke: No, I haven't finished that, though. What I'm saying is, given that, I mean, there's a lot of work to be done. Our perspective of this is very much a pragmatic one. And, we said, "Okay, look, this is the situation." The ideal thing, of course, will be to have a probability basis. We know why, and to be able to get very high response rates, and to be able to get the scientific advantages in terms of speed of response and experimentation possibilities in some survey instruments. I think that's what we're all working towards at this stage in the game. We're a long way from that. And what we've been doing, though, given the

deficiencies and problems with various modes, is that we've been doing a series of empirical investigations —

[inaudible] Let's suppose that we never have. Let's suppose we don't know. I give you the survey. I give you a data set. Can you figure out where it came from? The answer right now in Britain is, "No, you can't."

Arthur Lupia: We'll probably have time to revisit this topic later.