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MR. GRANATO: Good morning and welcome to the Houston area panel workshop. First thing I would like to do is introduce myself. My name is Jim Granato. I direct the Center for Public Policy, the University of Houston. We have all been in contact in the last couple of months in preparation for this workshop.

I also want to thank all of you for coming. I am very grateful that you are willing to participate in this very important endeavor. This would not be possible if it wasn't for the support of the Houston Endowment. So I want to thank Anne Hamilton and George Grainger and the Houston Endowment for providing the funds for this workshop and this project.

I'd also like to thank some of the members of my staff, Renee Cross, Mike Angel, Kelly Le. They did so much work for this conference and I am really grateful.

Also, grad students that worked on this project Katherine Barillas, Rose Kowalski and Thanapan Laiprakobsup also provided extensive support. And Lisa Holdeman in the development office helped craft the grant proposal with this. I am grateful to all of them.

Now, why did we ask you to participate? It's very simple, your expertise. Your mix of expertise
will inform a report that we will use to help create a panel study or a series of panel studies for the Houston region. That's why you're here.

The conduct of the meeting is conversational. It's not a traditional academic meeting where there's a lot of structure. We want to have a conversation.

We have a PowerPoint presentation on the board. Notice the bullets. That is not a sequence. That's just a set of talking points. So we can take those out of sequence. And if there are other things you see up there you want to add, feel free to do so as we go along. This is just a guide.

Frank Scioli and I will moderate. Frank, as you all know, has been on the National Science Foundation since, I think, the Civil War. And it's my pleasure he's willing to co-mod --

(Laughter.)

MR. GRANATO: It's my pleasure to have him here since --

MR. SCIOLI: Et tu, Jim.

MR. GRANATO: -- help co-moderate. Now, remember that you're going to be miked. And both Dorothy Rull, who is going to be doing the transcribing, and Phil Booth ask that you speak up and loudly -- not loudly, but
speak clearly. In addition, Dorothy asks that since we're all -- since she's transcribing, to try and take cues from each other so you don't speak at each. So try and avoid cross-talk. I mean, we're all facing each other for the most part. So let's try and make sure that we -- one person at a time talks, but make sure you get your point in. We do want to hear what you have to say.

One other thing -- and I think this is probably the most important thing about this discussion -- as we talk to each other today and tomorrow, I want you to think about this process being guided by the principle of calculated risk; that is, as we go through and discuss designs and issues, we want to consider the benefits such that the risk of -- of -- of taking on a certain type of design is -- is outweighed by the potential benefit of the information you acquire. So keep that in mind as we go along.

So let's begin. Please, introduce yourself with your affiliation and your expertise.

I'd like to start with Chris Achen.

MR. ACHEN: I'm Chris Achen. I'm at the Princeton Politics Department.

MR. BIEMER: My name is Paul Biemer. I actually have two places I work, RTI International and University of North Carolina the Odem Institute. And I'm
a statistician, and I have expertise in surveys.

MR. BLAIS: André Blais, department of political science at University of Montreal. I've been involved in Canadian election study.


MS. CALLAGHAN: I'm Karen Callaghan from Texas Southern University right next door to University of Houston. And I am in the field of political behaviors, political psychology, and the interim director of a new survey research center at the Barbara Jordan Institute in our school of public affairs.

MR. ESCHBACH: I'm Karl Eschbach. I'm a sociologist and demographer. I was here at U of H for about six years from the mid '90s then down at Galveston at the medical school there for another six years and then this last August I inherited the directorship of the Texas State Data Center from -- from Steve Murdock, when he -- when he left the state.

MR. FRANCIS: I'm David Francis. I'm the chair of the psychology department here at the University of Houston, and I also direct an institute here called The Texas Institute For Measurement Evaluation and
Statistics. I'm a quantitative psychologist, but I started out as a clinical neuropsychologist. I do a lot of work in education.

MR. SCIOLI: I'm Frank Scioli. First, a disclaimer, anything I say does not represent the National Science Foundation. I'm here based on my training and experience, as the police would say, and I live in Washington, D.C. and I work at the National Science Foundation.

MS. HAMILTON: I'm Ann Hamilton, senior grant officer at Houston Endowment and the vice chairman of Teresa J.W. Hershey Foundation. I'm here as an observer.

MS. JASSO: I am Willie Jasso. I am a professor of sociology at New York University, and I've done work on panel surveys and also on the empirical study of immigration.

MR. JONES: I am Mark Jones, professor of department political science at Rice University.

MS. LEE: Good morning. I'm Rebecca Lee. I'm here at UH in the Department of Health and Human Performance. I'm the director of our Texas Obesity Research Center. And I do a lot of work looking at minority and underserved populations, increasing physical activity, reducing obesity, improving dietary habits.
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Colm O'Muircheartaigh. I'm at the Harris School and NORC at the University of Chicago. And I am a statistician with an interest in survey methodology -- or a survey methodologist with an interest in statistics.

MS. SIEBER: I'm Joan Sieber, psychology professor emeritus from Cal State East Bay and editor of the Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics or JERHRE.

MR. GEYEN: Good morning. I'm Dashiel Geyen. I'm on the psychology faculty at Texas Southern. And I have quite a bit of interest, particularly in clinical research associated with mental health concerns, chemical addictions, and health disparities.

MR. GRANATO: Thank you all very much. So we would like to start off the discussion now. Norman Bradburn has agreed to kick off the event.

MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. Jim asked me to do a little, I guess, introduction or sort of background to -- kind of history and some other aspects of contemporary longitudinal studies or panel studies. And I'm -- I'm going to start at the bottom, both utility and other issues, okay? I'm going to work up to them. And -- and this is kind of a broad picture sort of notion, which I think might help frame more detailed
And, first of all, let me start a little bit about terminology. I think the others can -- particularly, the political scientist people might correct me. I think the term "panel study" was -- was invented by Paul Lazarsfeld, and I think the first panel study that people pay attention to was the first election study, the Lazarsfeld and Berelson -- Berelson -- Elmira, was that --

MR. ACHEN: Yes.

MR. BRADBURN: I think the Elmira study.

And the idea was that rather than just doing the regular polling, you take a group of people before the election and follow them through during the campaign through the election and after the election. It's a prototype which various election studies, national -- the U.S. national election study and, I imagine, Canadian election studies and so forth have adopted ever since; and -- and Lazarsfeld and other colleagues did several others I think in other elections. Was that the 1940 election or '40 -- '44 election? It was quite early.

Well, any case, that's -- that's where the term "panel study" came from. And basically, though there's no codified view of these terms, I -- I would
think just the way I've noticed the terms used, the panel usually refers to interviewing the same people several times, you know, maybe -- certainly twice -- certainly twice, maybe three, maybe four like I said.

Whereas the term "longitudinal study" tends to be used nowadays anyway, where you follow a group of people or -- or households or whatever the unit is over a long period of time, many years. The -- the -- some panels -- the PSID, which is probably the panel survey of income dynamics started in the '60s, has been going continuously, I mean, every year, every -- I think probably it's every other year now since then.

So -- and -- and they're interest -- very interesting unit problems when you carry a panel that long, what happens -- and they're now, I think, doing grandchildren of the original respondents in the PSID. And we conduct -- that's one issue obviously we're going to talk about. That started in -- in the '60s during the War on Poverty.

And I just want to say one other thing about -- about terminology. There's another use of the term "panel," which confuses people at times and that's, I think, only used by commercial research firms where they impanel a group of people, usually volunteers, and -- and then they send out a -- a request for
participation in a particular study. So it's not -- I don't know quite how they analyze the data, but I think it's not so much that they are looking at responses of the same people over many different responses -- I mean, over different queries. Rather it's a panel in the sense that you impanel a jury or -- so it's -- it's a -- it's sort of a standing sample that you can query some portions of it. I don't -- don't -- and they're very large. They'd be 80,000, 100,000.

The Harris -- the current one that you hear a lot about, the Harris interactive one, which is a very large group of people who have agreed to answer questions for Harris, if they're asked. And they have -- they do get the sociodemographic characteristics of them, so they try to then draw a sample that is, in some sense, balanced or -- or representative or whatever they're trying in the instance. That is not a -- I mean, that's not the use of "panel" that, I think, we would want to be using here.

Just as a suggestion, I would suggest it would -- to distinguish panels from longitudinals, if you're thinking about something that's relatively short, that could be a year or two or three, something like that. You can call it a panel study. If it's something you're thinking of for a very long period of time, then I
think we tend to think of it as a longitudinal study. Although, again, the term "longitudinal study" is sometimes used, to my mind, incorrectly but, in any case, used to -- to apply to something that is a successive time series, across -- but a successive cross-series. Like the general socio survey which NORC does and NSF has sponsored for many years since 1972 is a -- well, up until next year, is a -- is a new sample each year. So it's a time series, same -- many of the same questions are asked every year, but it's a new sample. So you can't -- but it's representative of -- of a population. So you could look at trends in the population, but you can look at individual change.

I think beginning -- what's the next year, is it, Frank? What -- there will be a panel component, so... And -- and it has, at various times, that -- a sample of the GSS has been used in a kind of quasi-panel fashion.

So, now, let me just say a little bit about why there was so much -- has become so much enthusiasm for -- for longitudinal studies. And I think it's probably due to the -- the example of the PSID. What -- when the Panel Survey of Income Dynamics got started on the war on poverty, one of the relatively early things that they found was that, although the
poverty rate didn't change very much, when they looked at individuals in poverty over time where they're now --
they looking -- they were interviewing families every year, they found that individual families did not stay in poverty very long or, at least, many of them didn't. And it was a relatively small proportion -- I think about 20 percent or something -- that were persistently in poverty.

This completely changed the view of policy people and people who thought about poverty because rather than being an enduring characteristic of families, which you would assume would be the case if you just looked at cross-sectional data because the rate stayed pretty much the same, in fact, at the individual level, there was a lot of turnover in various sections. And that's -- that basic insight or basic sort of fact is what drives interests, I'd say, in -- in panel studies and longitudinal studies.

The fact that you may -- if you look at aggregate data, even though a good time series, you may misinterpret what's going on. And so, I guess, one principle in terms of utility to say is that where you think something like that might happen, that's a good place to put your money on thinking about -- about longitudinal studies or panel studies of various sorts.
Now, what about design -- sort of general design issues? I -- in starting to characterize the different types of panel studies and longitudinal studies, I think there are two -- two major ways that -- or two major types -- excuse me. One basically takes a group of people who have -- who share some characteristics of some kind and that are of interest and particularly if they're characteristics that change over time; for -- age, for example, or -- or children growing up, people getting older, people who are going through school, people who are going -- entering the labor force. That is you think of transitional roles or places in society where there are people who are transitioning from one to another and there's a kind of natural time dimension to it.

So there's a -- there are a number of longitudinal studies that the National Center for Educational Statistics does where the principle is to take a cohort of students, usually defined by where they are in school, starting -- the -- the basic for years, the basic principle had been to take senior class, though the senior class of 1972, and '82, '92 and then they missed out in 2002, but they're, I think -- I don't know where that is -- and they're starting a new cohort. Now, they may start in different places. So the 1972 cohort
started with people as seniors and then followed them on after graduation.

Then there was more interest in the dynamics of high school. So the next one, which is called High School and Beyond, which was to take the people who would graduate in '82, but they started with them in the 10th grade in 1980, because they were interested in -- in what happened to the people who didn't graduate so it would have followed -- would not have been in the sample of seniors.

The next one, the '92, people who were the '92 seniors, they went back even further to start with people in the 8th grade because they were even concerned with that. And there would have been others that started with a cohort of kids entering kindergarten. There's even a cohort birth cohort where -- taking kids who were born in a certain period and following them. Those -- some of those are extremely long lived, maybe 10, 20 years. And -- but the principle you could see is they take people at some common experience, but it's going to change over time.

Another one that's quite well known in NORC -- and -- and we're involved with -- is the National Longitudinal Study of Youth, which takes as its standard age rather than grade. So the first one that we're
involved in is the -- it was 1979. It was people who
were born -- who are aged 14 to 21 in 1979. And they're
still being followed. They were followed every year for
about 15 years or so, 20 years. Now they're followed
every other year. And I suppose, unless the Labor
Department gives up entirely, they will be followed until
they retire or die, but...

Then we started a new cohort in 1997 of
people child -- of people who were born -- who were aged
12 to 17 in 1997, and they have been followed every year
now for -- let's see. What is this '97 -- 10 years, I
guess. I mean, we're in the 11th or 12th round of that,
and I think they will probably do that every year until
they're about -- for about 20 years and then shift to the
every-other-year sort of mode.

The -- I -- I want to mention a few
because there are people -- experts on these. Again,
they can become farther as we go along.

The other -- this I have talked about age
and things like that. Another principle one could take
is people who are entering in some transitional phase. A
very challenging one, which Willie can tell us about it
as we along, is the new immigrant study; and that took
people who were legal immigrants to the U.S. in one
calendar year, was that?
MS. JASSO: A specific time period --

MR. BRADBURN: Time period.

MS. JASSO: -- with admission to legal permanent residence.

MR. BRADBURN: Residence. And then they are being followed yearly or -- or...

MS. JASSO: About every four to five years.

MR. BRADBURN: So they will be -- and that's looking at people who have a particular starting characteristic that they were immigrants, though heterogenic -- heterogeneous obviously immigrants, and then following their essentially assimilation or progress or whatever into the U.S. society and that's another kind of principle.

Another one, which is a somewhat shorter one that Paul tells me he's involved in, is the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being which takes a sample of children who are -- of any age, including babies and so on and so forth, who are in a --

MR. BIEMER: Investigated.

MR. BRADBURN: -- investigated for child abuse of various sorts, and -- and then they're followed as -- for two years or...

MR. BIEMER: Well, they're -- they
follow -- they interview them at 18-month intervals, but they've been following them now for about 10 years.

MR. BRADBURN: 10 years. Okay. So it's...

Just to give you a couple other examples, NSF does a study of people who receive Ph.D.s in science and engineering; and they follow them for the rest -- essentially from the time they get their Ph.D. -- or at least a sample. Not all of them -- until they retire.

Well, 75 now, I think. It used to be until they retired. But now, since you don't know when that's going to be, they -- and that's, I think, every other year.

And at the other end of the age spectrum, The Health and Retirement Survey, which take -- the National Institute of Aging does, and that's -- takes a cohort of people who are, I think, 55 to 60 at the beginning; and they have been following them, then, until they die. And that's -- covers both health, disparity -- their health as they age and their involvement with the labor force and particularly savings or retirement and how they handle that sort of thing.

Another one was a long-term -- a study of long-term disability, which took a sample of -- took a cross-section, but then was heavily oversampling for people who had disabilities, and then follow -- have been
following them until they die, but...

A new one, which Colm is involved in, is just getting started. It's called The National Study of Children, which will take not only a birth cohort, but pre -- prebirth and even an intentional --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Preconception.

MR. BRADBURN: Preconception. That's a -- a sampling challenge, to say the least. And that will be very, very large study. I think 100,000 children are expected, and they will be followed for 20 years. And that's -- one more focused on health, particularly environmental, the interplay between environments and -- and -- and health.

Now, notice that these mostly have been either defined by some common characteristic or some -- something that's intrinsic to the individual like age or something like that.

There have been -- but cross-section -- I mean, nationally. Pretty much, these are all -- well -- is -- is their specialty.

MR. BIEMER: Mine is national.

MR. BRADBURN: There -- there is another variant where in one interesting context -- I think this may be -- well, it -- something called the Chicago Neighborhood Study, which is a bit of misnomer because
it's actually a study of young people and their
involvement with the criminal justice system. I mean,
that's the focus of it. But people that the
investigators were extremely interested in the
neighborhood context within which young people were
socialized and got involved with criminal activities of
various sorts. So it's -- though -- it's a longitudinal
study, and it's a kind of quasi-cohort.

But what they did there was to take
neighborhoods, very small neighborhoods, two or three
blocks, in Chicago because they wanted to narrow the
context and, also, for practical and cost reasons and so
forth, get intensive information about the -- the
characteristics of the neighborhood. So that it's a kind
of ecological study that's different from these others,
which have just sort of taken the individual or household
as a unit.

This takes -- it sort of blends the --
the neighborhood and -- and they get all kinds of data.
It's not just data of individuals. There's data from
households in the -- in the neighborhood -- I mean, now
they just -- the focus is kids who they are looking at
and things, but other households in the neighborhood,
filming the neighborhood, getting -- characterizing the
character of the housing, the cleanliness, the graffiti,
various stuff like that, a very intense kind of data of
all kinds of different levels, which is another kind of
ting of various sorts.

MR. SCIOLI: Who funds that?

MR. BRADBURN: Well, it's the justice -- National -- NIJ put in a lot of money, but also the --
the MacArthur Foundation and several other private
foundations did that. The -- now, that's one way of --
of looking at it.

Another way they characterize -- are
selecting different -- it's almost like natural
experiments, that is, taking some event or -- real event,
elections being, you know -- except in Canada where you
don't know when it's going to happen, but. At least, in
the U.S., you know when the election is going to happen
and so you can plan out a survey before, during and
after. It's much more challenging in Canada where you've
got to be ready to go at any particular moment.

But -- but the idea here is rather than
taking people with common characteristics, you take an
event or a series of events or class of events and then
look at what -- people who are affected by these events.
As I say, the elections are probably the easiest one.

Program -- many program evaluation
things, training programs, for example, would fit into
this sort of model in which people are going into a training program or several different types training program, you know, like the facts of Job Corps versus neighborhood youth training programs or things of this sort. You can take a sample of people who are going into the training program or getting a control group is often the problem with these kinds of designs, but you want people who would have gone into the training program, but for some reason didn't go into it. Some reason, it's not relevant to the dependent variables and then follow them for some period of time. These tend to be more like adaptive panel studies because they tend to be shorter. They always give lip service to the idea that they want to look at long-term outcomes, but I don't know any that actually have. They usually get -- after a couple of years, figure that's about what they've done. We did one -- one I was involved in some years ago was looking at the effects of a TV program on conveying health information and that, I think -- I think we did that in Dallas. I don't think we did it in Houston, but I think it was in Dallas. And there we enlisted a bunch of people to watch the program, and we have a control group of people who weren't watching the program. And we had -- it's a complicated design, actually. But it was to see
whether the -- the programs which were designed to teach
people about nutrition of various sorts and cancer
screening and other things, whether it, in fact, did this
or not.

Now, one of the -- this -- now, so -- so
those things were events you think. And as I say,
they're kind of either real experiments or if you can
control the event or, in fact, one many years ago was
quite interesting -- in terms of controlling the event
was looking at the effects of sonic booms on households
in which the Air Force -- because we could schedule --
this was done for the Air Force -- schedule the -- the
sonic booms at different times and see what effect it had
on -- on the poor populous that was doing -- being
subjected to this --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Did you have an
IRB clearance for that?

MR. BRADBURN: This was before -- this
was before IRBs existed. I don't know -- I don't know
how they would have respected to that. But it's a
different sort of approach to the problem.

Now one of the -- excuse me -- the value
of either of these, also, is there's a certain ability
to -- for serendipity to do things. Because sometimes
you're involved in a -- a study and an event happens that
you hadn't expected. I was involved in one some years
ago in which we were -- it was -- looking -- trying to
look at event -- natural events on mental health or, at
least, stress of -- of ordinary population.

And while we were engaged in the pilot
study, so we had done -- we had done the first data
collection, but hadn't done the second yet -- well, we
were going to do four, and I think -- I forgot whether it
came between the first and second or second and third,
but...

In any case, the Cuban missile crisis
came along. So we had this intense event, and we were
able to quickly go back to the people that we had already
interviewed when we had a lot of data about psychological
reactions and so forth. We had predata, so you could
really see what the effect of a -- of a social trauma, so
to speak, or tension was on that. And then later on
when -- when we actually were doing the study, President
Kennedy was assassinated. And we were able, also, to go
back to an unscheduled follow-up to see what kind of -- of
effect that had on people where we had previous
information.

And that's -- those are kind of things
that you can't -- these are sort of unscheduled events,
thank goodness. But if you have a panel going or a
longitudinal study, you can go -- you can take advantage
of that of various sorts. In fact, you can sometimes
if -- even if you hadn't planned it as a panel study, you
can use -- you go back to people.

So after 9/11, we went back to -- we
had finished, just not too long out of the field for the
General Social Survey, and were able to go back to the
people who had been in that to see. And, again, because
you've got a lot of pre-measures and so it's a good chain.

So, as you can see, the kind of -- and on
the dependent variable side, one is interested in either
change, short-term or change as a result of events, or
sort of change in a transformational sense as people age
or move through some psycho -- yes.

MS. SIEBER: Norman, the General Social
Survey being a cross-sectional study --
MR. BRADBURN: Right.
MS. SIEBER: -- how did you know how --
who to go back to?
MR. BRADBURN: Because we had the names
and addresses.
MS. SIEBER: So there it's not anonymous?
MR. BRADBURN: No. Because it's -- it's
a probability sample of the population, so you have to go
to the address and do a listing of the population and --
and get the -- the thing -- we need that for verification purposes and other things. So it's -- you know, we -- you know, we have that in the -- in the sampling -- in the field records as who the respondent was.

Now, I'll just mention one other use of panel studies that -- but not analytically. And -- and I -- this is just for -- anyway for completeness. The -- where -- as I say, typically you're interested in change. And there are some measures or some surveys that are very interested in change, like the current population survey where you're interested in the unemployment rate every month and you're interested in changes in the unemployment or lack of changes in unemployment rate. And you're interested also in very small changes, you know, tenth -- several tenths of a percentage point, something like that.

So the kind of sample we need in order to do that is very large. But -- so what the Census Bureau does is to use some of the principles of panel studies, but they don't analyze them that way. That is, they enlist a new sample every month and then that -- that -- that series of households --

(Electronic feedback.)

MR. BRADBURN: Is that okay?

-- stays in the -- for four months and
then drops out for eight months and it comes back in for four months. And that's -- but -- but they don't look at the data for each household change over months. In principal, it could; but the spirals aren't set up that way and they're so doing. And that's really a sampling issue in order to simply reduce the -- the variance times that so that you can make the -- the change -- the estimates for change in the unemployment rate more accurate for smaller sample size of various sorts.

That is, however, a problem that you should be aware of. Many people -- because the analysis of longitudinal data or panel data and so forth is more complicated and it requires also the files to be set up in such a way that you can so do this. And often people don't -- they go to all the trouble to do it, but then they don't really exploit the data fully.

For example, the -- the survey of doctorate recipients, the USF study, which is a longitudinal study, isn't very often analyzed from the point of your career development, which is what you could do and so forth. And, in fact, it's treated by many people who analyze it and so forth as -- as if it were repeated cross-sections, and they don't take advantage of that. Now, that's -- anyway, those are kinds of issues that we can -- can get onto, but...
Anyway that's -- that's the kind of overview of, I think, the -- the kind of terminology, principles sort of views of why -- why one does -- does the -- does panel studies. As I say, they're the kind of thing that, you know, in terms, its change is obviously the major kind of thing and what kinds of change. And I -- I separate these two; that's change where you think there's some kind of event because those are -- are -- the design of those are somewhat different than those where you're essentially taking a cohort of individuals who are going to go through some kind of transition into the labor force or health or age or disabilities or whatever, those kinds of things of that sort, or -- or career development.

So I think I'll stop there.

MR. GRANATO: Thank you very much.

Would anybody like -- like to add something, what Norman put forth?

Go ahead, Colm.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: There's just one other example to add to Norman's categorization. There's the set of surveys that NORC is carrying out for the Annie E. Casey Foundation on their Making Connections Program. Their Making Connections Program is one in which they adopted 10 neighborhoods or neighborhoods in
10 cities across the country into which they invest foundation money, and they want to evaluate what happens to these neighborhoods.

The first -- NORC is carrying out the evaluation surveys. And the first wave was six years ago in which we selected a panel of 800 households in each of these neighborhoods and then went back a few years later to see what their characteristics were and what the characteristics of the neighborhood were. And one of the things that we hadn't realized -- and indeed the Annie e. Casey Foundation hadn't realized -- is how many people would move.

And it turns out that 50 percent of the people in the panel had moved out of the neighborhood during the three-year period. And this raises the issue of what -- what your panel is and what its function is. So, in one, we have a panel of housing units or a panel of addresses that we can follow, which tells us something about how the neighborhood is changing; but that doesn't tell us what happens to the people in the neighborhood. And from the point of view of the foundation, it's important what happens to people who leave the neighborhood.

So you could envisage, in parallel to Norman's example about PSID and poverty, it could be that
the neighborhood stays the same, but that all of the
people who leave the neighborhood go on to better things.
So the neighborhood is essentially a launching pad for
progress or it could be that the neighborhood stays the
same and -- but the people who leave all getting worst
off so that it's a -- a slippery slope to -- to -- to
depprivation -- more serious deprivation.

And the smaller the area, the more
serious this problems becomes in terms of the proportion
of people who are likely to disappear. So it's not quite
panel mortality. Having worked mainly with national
studies myself, you know, this is -- it's a relatively
small problem for national studies and the -- the outward
migration, in particular, is not such a big issue. But
for -- for a lot of small area studies, it turns out that
there's a real conflict between following people and
following addresses or following housing units.

And -- and it's caused the Foundation to
rethink its policy as to what it's trying to do. If, for
example, nobody essentially stays in the neighborhood
more than three or four years, the kind of program that
you want to implement there is going to be very different
from the kind of program you want to implement if people
stay in the neighborhood for very long periods of time.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. I'll pick up on
that. The other side of that issue, which is one of these cases where what's happening at the aggregate may mask what's happening at the individual level and that's when neighborhoods improve a lot there's gentrification in various sorts where the -- the housing values and so forth go up, but it isn't the same people who are living there, that is, the people who -- who -- the poorest neighborhood or...

And I did a study of racially integrated neighborhoods, and this is a kind of problem that is there, too, is the people -- even though some of the characteristics may stay the same, it's -- it's quite different people who are -- who are living there. And it can -- it can go up or down, depending on -- on which way it's sort of going.

But it does -- if you're trying to sort of meld it with -- with policy interventions of various sorts, then you really do need to know what's -- what's going on at the kind of -- both levels because it's not -- you may -- you may be trying to do something about the neighborhood, independent of the individual, but you may be wanting to do something for -- for that kind of person regardless of where they live.

MR. GRANATO: Paul.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Just on the -- on
the very same issue, we're -- we're going back this year shortly for the third wave of this panel. And, again, we don't know the answer to the question whether we expect 50 percent change again this time, but we don't know whether it's the same 50 percent or a different 50 percent. And these, again, are very different pictures. So that having churning where everybody moves is quite different from having an area where 50 percent stay the same all the time and the other 50 percent change every -- every couple of years.

So it's one of the reasons I think why panel studies or longitudinal studies are so valuable is that you can get a lot of information with a cross-section and two gives you a straight-line model, I guess. If you wanted to attain more complex, you need at least three observations. And if you wanted a real picture of what's going on, then you need probably more than three.

MR. GRANATO: Paul. And then Willie.

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. What Colm said reminded me of another type of panel survey, and I think you've probably covered it implicitly but this is with community intervention type of study where in the case -- RTI is doing this survey called the Community Healthy Marriage Initiative where they're going into communities
and they're offering various types of services and classes and so forth on -- you know that -- related to marriages. And they wanted to see, you know, how this might improve characteristics, such as the divorce rate or separation rate or marital happiness and things like that in the community. And so they'll do a baseline interview and they'll do the intervention; and then they'll come back and do, you know, more surveying. And -- and -- and do the surveying, it could -- I think, in this case, they're going to be surveying these people several times. At the same time, they want to be able to make cross-sectional estimates to be able to get descriptive statistics of, say, marriage rates and so forth that are going on in the community. So they're -- they're having to refresh the panel for the same reason that Colm was talking about, moving in and out.

And another issue that you run into with those kind of intervention studies is that if you're looking at -- at sort of community-level aggregate change, you -- you have to have some pretty big changes to be able to detect them because in a lot of these studies there -- there are not many communities involved. You know, you have like control group and treatment groups. They're not -- there are not that many communities that are really getting this type of funding
to do this -- this -- these marriage -- this marriage initiative.

And so in those situations, you have to be -- you have to consider maybe more sophisticated types of modeling that are having -- you know, that are operating at the individual level and measuring individuals exposure to these programs and things like that. So it brings up some real complexities in dealing with analysis.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. That's -- what's wrong with that is if you have a treatment of some sort, even if you think you -- and if it's a general sort of one. When we were doing this evaluation of the TV program, we had very careful inducements at different -- like we paid people different levels to -- to watch the program. But then it turned out not everyone watched the program, even if they got paid. But also the people who weren't paid did watch the program. So analytically it became extremely tricky to be able to separate out the people who were in the true experiment, that is, you assume you induce them to watch the program they would not have without the inducement. On the other hand, there are people who watched it without any inducement, who -- the nat -- people who naturally would have watched it.
And, of course, that's the kind -- the group that you worry about -- I mean, why you do an experiment because you worry if you just did a cross-section and said who watched the program, who didn't watch the program and how much they know about health information, you -- you know, you would worry about -- that that's, you know, the predisposition of various sorts.

So it does became extremely tricky if -- and -- and even very well designed experiments of interventions -- Jim Heckman has done a lot with the training programs where there people are -- go to various training programs and so forth. It turns out that a lot of people in the control group get training also, I mean, not in the -- not paid for by the program, but either they pay for it themselves or -- or some other kind of program. So you have to be very careful in -- in -- in the data you collect and the way you do things, if you're trying to do it -- use it as an evaluation to -- you can't just assume that your co -- your control group didn't get treated, whatever the treatment is in that sense.

MR. BIEMER: Yeah, exactly.

MR. BRADBURN: The same would, you know, go here where -- where there -- so these big
interventions, in some sense, are available to lots of people and not just the ones you necessarily are thinking of -- that are in your, quote, experiment.

MS. JASSO: I want to go back to the issue that -- that Colm raised because it's been a very important part of thinking in immigration research and, I think, will be pertinent to the planning of the Houston study.

The key thing is to distinguish whether we want to learn about a place or learn about people and people's behavior. And in -- in immigration for the 20 years that immigration researchers were developing the design that became the design for the New Immigrant Survey, this was a very key question. It's well known, for example, that there are areas in the country -- and you see this on TV all the time -- where no one speaks English. And the interpretation is always that people go there, they stay there forever, they never speak a word of English.

It turns out people pass through those areas. So the idea behind the New Immigrant Survey is to take people on their road, and they will stop off along the way and long the way live in some of these areas, but we will be able to contrast what happens to them over time versus what remained the characteristics of those
areas.

And this will be something, I think, to -- to think about very hard because in a -- in a study such as Houston, it's very important to know about geographic areas, but it's equally important to know what happens to the people who pass along the way through those geographic areas.

MR. GRANATO: Chris.

MR. ACHEN: I want to throw one other -- one other point into this conversation and, that is, that we're in an era now of computerized databases often collected for administrative purposes.

And, for example, up in my room, I have every New Jersey voter on my laptop and which elections they have turned out for as long as they've been registered in the -- in the State of New Jersey. This is 4 1/2 million records, and it's available -- it's a public document. They just burn a CD for you, and you carry it away. The name, the address, the phone number are -- are all there.

So this is, in effect, a longitudinal survey of its own kind. Every little election, they record whether you showed up or not and this information is public. So one possibility that is available to people designing a survey like -- like this one is to
take public records of that kind and take the name and
address and the phone number from the survey, match it to
the public records and add that kind of information into
the -- into the survey.

So 15 years ago, of course, this would
have been impossible. No one wants to read through
4 1/2 million records and find individuals. But with --
with computer databases now and -- and the kind of high
speed processing we've got, this is perfectly possible.
And voter records aren't the only thing. There are
commercial databases of various kinds as well.

So one thing, I think, that we might just
want to have on the table is the possibility that the
data that are in the survey that you collect might be
supplemented by relatively inexpensive public sources.
Sometimes, you know, $50 will buy you the -- will buy you
the CD, and then you just take a laptop and have it do
nothing else for a couple of weeks except find people and
match them up.

MR. SCIOLI: Carl Eschbach.

MR. ESCHBACH: Yeah. I -- I work in a
census shop. So relative to this point, I thought I'd
share some -- some facts from the American Community
Survey and from the 2000 census that the American
Community Survey has questions about residents one year
ago. And on that basis, 160,000 or about 3 percent of the Houston metro area population enumerated in 2004 in that area was living outside the area; in 2005, one year later, about half inside the state and half outside the state. And of course that does not speak to any international out-migration that occurred. About 5 percent, about 220,000 people moved into the Houston area from outside, again. And that's domestic in-migration. And we do have international in-migration, about 50,000 moved in from outside the country. So -- so, in aggregate, about 5 percent of the population in one year is different.

If we go back to the 2000 census, looking from 1995 to 2000, and forgiving niceties like circular migration and -- and mortality in the period, 11 -- about 460,000 or 11.5 percent of the 1995 -- people who were enumerated in 1995 in the Houston metro area were outside were enumerated somewhere else in 2000. I -- I didn't poll here the in-migration figures, but it'll give you some sense of the turnover that Houston experiences.

Oh, and I guess the other -- about 80 percent of Houstonians in 2005 who were living in the same house that they were living in, in other words, 20 percent had moved in a one-year period from 2004 to 2005.
MR. SCIOLI: One of the things that has struck me with this august group and for the -- the folks from -- the locals should really understand that these are the best that you could have discuss these issues in a conversational way.

I'm -- I'm reminded of D.T. Campbell's work on threats to validity. And Norman talked about that and Colm talked about that. And the classic of looking at what -- I guess he regretted ever calling quasi-experiment. It haunted him for the rest of his life. But there we are, having brought out some critical points.

And, in my mind, that the bullet at the top of the list really comes down to the power of the design. There are tricky analytic questions, but I mean you have bright people who work on these questions and they invest their time. They can do the statistical analyses. They can do the methodologic innovations. But it comes down to the tradeoff between the power of the design, again, independent of the qualifications of the people involved -- you're going to get the best people involved -- how much do you have available, what are the resources to bring to this kind of an undertaking.

I mean, unfortunately it comes down to the bottom line. The -- the dollars invested yield the
power of the design, yield the kinds of questions that can be asked and the -- whether you're looking at the --
the critical issues that so many of you have raised.

So, I mean, I guess Norman in his wisdom said "I'm not going to touch that one at the outset."

Let me lay out -- and that's kind, if you will, the NORC strategy. Let me draw you in. Let me tell you about what we can do. I mean, here's the fillet and here's the fish and, oh, over here we have a nice buffet with macaroni salad and then, hey, if you only eat one meal a day, maybe that's all you need.

Or -- so who'd like to share with us the magnitude of increasing costs relative to the power of the design?

MR. O'MUIRHEARTAIGH: I guess -- I guess the question would be, you want to compare two designs and which is more -- which is more expensive. So, I guess, the alternative -- the question is what are the alternatives that you want to consider? And I suppose the primary alternatives are to have a panel compared to having a successive cross-section. So I guess these are -- the cheapest of all is not to do any social research. So that's easy. These are a lot more expensive than that.

MR. GRANATO: Although ignorance is
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's right.

MR. BRADBURN: And the second is just use administrative records.

MR. GRANATO: Sure.

MR. BRADBURN: Although that's -- that's not necessarily cheap, depending on --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So -- so, I guess, the question in part, is that what the question -- to what extent is it -- is there -- is it more expensive to have a panel and to maintain a panel than to have successive cross-sections of the same size? Is -- is that -- because that's, at least, a question that could be answered. I'm certainly not going to be the best person to answer it.

It's not clear to me that there's an enormous difference in cost between the -- Norman, I'm sure, would be better equipped to answer this than I would. But in many ways, the second wave of a panel is lot cheaper than a single cross-section because you have much better locating information, you have much higher productivity for the cases that you field. Typically, the -- the -- the loss to a panel comes primarily in the first -- in the first wave. The -- the conditional probabilities of response -- the response rates among
those who recruit such a panel said traditionally have been very high. So -- and -- and -- NLSY, they're above 90 percent every year, even for -- for -- for 90 -- NLSY97.

For the Making Connections Project, which is not nearly as well resourced as NLSY, our response rates among people who agreed to response in the first wave are between 80 and 90 percent. And they're cheaper cost per case for these than the refresher samples that we add to the -- to the panel in these neighborhoods. So I'm -- I'm not sure that there would be any substantial --

MR. BIEMER: Well, except one -- one issue might be the sample size required for two cross-sections to get the same precision on the measure of change as you would get from two interviews of the same sample.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right.

MR. BIEMER: -- because you would need a smaller sample size with the longitudinal.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No, no. Absolutely. But I'm saying, my guess is that in comparing the costs, people will probably not think so much about that, but think if you have 3,000 observations twice, which is cheaper.
MR. BRADBURN: Well, it would also depend

a lot on -- on the number of design issues and -- and

implementation issues that can be more or less expensive.

For example, many longitudinal studies
don't go back in the second wave to the people they
didn't contact in the first wave. That is, they may go
back to the people who -- well, some don't even go back
to the people who refused them the first time. But
the -- the big expense in -- in the first wave in
cross-sectional study is the -- you know, the cases that
you have a hard time contacting because they aren't there
or it turns out it's not really a household, et cetera,
et cetera.

So if you don't go back and try to do
that again, that -- that's cheaper. I mean, that --
that's the kind of thing... And, again, as you go along,
if you -- if you -- if somebody drops out and you just
let them drop out and don't try to keep them back in,
then that's -- that's a cost saving.

I mean, the NLSY, for example, which is
quite well financed on the whole, they go back to people
that -- who are in the original sample until they
ascertain that they're dead or that they've said, "If you
call me once more, I will put my lawyer on you" or
something like that. But -- and we have found people,
you know, in the tenth wave that we hadn't interviewed
since the second wave or something like that. So you try
and fill in the -- the data to some extent. But if you
try to go back always to the original sample, that's more
expensive than -- I mean, but that's a kind of option.

The thing that really is -- that -- if --
and this gets back to the kind of motion that Willie and
Colm mentioned about what's the sampling unit. And it's
been a problem with PSID because as -- if -- if your
family is the unit, which it was in the PSID, so now the
next -- you come back, and the -- and the parents are
divorced. Now, you've got two households. Who do you --
you know, your sample potentially can grow and so forth.
And -- and so you have to have a rule about which -- what
you're going to do.

If you're -- if the house unit, the
address is the unit and you decide you're going to take
who's ever there and not follow the people who moved out,
then that's cheaper than if you say, no, I want to find
out what happened to those people who -- who moved out.
Then, two things, you might -- one your sample might grow
because now you might use both the people in the house
and the people who moved out. But if you say, well,
let's just stick with the original people, then now
you've got to track them someplace and typically, you
know, to minimize costs at least with personal interviewing, you know, you cluster households and you have area -- multilayer sampling and so forth -- well, now the person has moved -- this is -- this really drives up the cost in the NLSY. The person has moved from a place where you -- a sampling point where you have interviewers to a little town in Wyoming or something like that that's 250 miles or 500 miles from where you have the nearest interviewer. And -- so what do you do? Do you fly in an interviewer or do you switch modes and try to do it on the phone or -- or whatever, if you can get the phone numbers and things like that.

So it's -- I mean, these are all kind of issues that -- that have big cost implications, but they are design -- you know, depending on your resources of various sorts, you can -- you can take the more expensive option or the less expensive option and so forth.

MR. BIEMER: But, you know, I -- I just want to -- I just want to reiterate that, you know, you really can't -- you really can't talk about cost of two designs without fixing something like quality, you know, in terms of, at least, precision. So if we're talking about estimates of change and looking at estimates of change of a certain precision, then when you start comparing different survey designs, you might find that
one survey design, like a cross-sectional survey, becomes much more expensive because, you know, you're going to have to double the sample size to get the same precision. So you really have to think in terms of not just the sampling -- you know, how many -- what sample size, but what's the quality of the estimates that are going to be produced by each survey design that's being considered.

MR. BRADBURN: I mean, as I mentioned, the census and the CPS uses a panel not for -- for the kind of purposes that we're sort of thinking about it, but to reduce costs to get a better -- more precision for the unemployment -- change in the unemployment rates.

MS. JASSO: Let me jump in here. A couple of points. Part of the answer to the questions that -- that -- that have been raised is going to be what the Houston group decides are to be the objectives of the study and, of course, it takes time to -- to decide what those objectives are. But it's possible that you could come down to the side that you really have two objectives; one of them is a Houston-area study and other one is Houstonian study. And you could have two components, a panel and a cross-section component.

The second thing that I want to say is that a lot of what we're talking about that we know comes
from regular surveys of the native born. We are finding
in the New Immigrant Survey that foreign born behave
somewhat differently or, at least, it's a hypothesis to
entertain that may be differences, for example, in the
traditional cost savings of recontact in a longitudinal
survey. These may not apply or not apply directly to
foreign born. So it's going to be very important to --
to take into consideration the -- the -- the demographic,
the nativity composition of -- of the Houston area
population.

In relation with that, an early thing to
confront that we confronted in the New Immigrant Survey
is language. We -- we came down on the side that for
data quality and -- and for inclusiveness, we would have
the principle that every person would be interviewed in
the language of their choice. That runs costs up a lot.

MR. KLINEBERG: So not just Spanish?

MS. JASSO: Oh, no. We have 95 languages
in the New Immigrant Study. And not only that, it also
means an enormous amount of planning has to go into the
design and it also interferes with traditional notions of
mode. You've heard norm Norm say the in-person mode
versus the telephone mode. Once you get into the
language problem, it may be that there's no interpreter
available on the ground --
MR. KLINEBERG: Sure.

MS. JASSO: -- and you have to go to a --

a telephone mode. Moreover, one of the things that we
encountered with the immigrants is that many of them
preferred to be interviewed on the phone, but only after
they have met the interviewer in person. So you make the
contact, you go, you know, all the expense of going to
the household and then they say call me at 2:00 a.m.

And -- and you do that. And so you end up with this very
interesting mixed mode that is arising from the
characteristics of the population whom you want to study
and -- and every bit of it has cost implications.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Something I'm --

what Willie says, it seems to me that one of the most
desirable outcomes of this question as to which is the
better design is that it would force those of you who --
who -- who are conceptualizing the study to decide what
you want to do. So we could almost postpone the question
until you've decided what the purpose of the study is
because it really makes an enormous difference, i.e., in
terms of all of the methodology depends on what your
fundamental objective is.

And it may be that the design that Leslie
Kish itch called the split-panel design is -- I mean, the
danger with these compromise designs is they always look
good to everybody because everybody feels they're getting part of what they want. Maybe that's not a good idea for the split panel in which you have -- in which you run a panel, but also have refresher cross-sections in each wave might be -- might be the best design. And the balance between the panel part and the cross-section part would depend on the relative weight that you give to -- to the objectives that you have.

Following what Norman said, the tradition in panel studies has been never to go back to wave one failures. So, in general, nonrespondents of wave one and noncontacts of wave one are not followed up in a panel and apparently because of the notion that you need that first -- these starting conditions, these initial conditions for panel members to make it worthwhile.

So even NLSY, which does go back to everybody after the first wave, conditions it on -- on first-wave response. And we've been experimenting with going back to first-wave nonrespondents in -- in the Making Connections study and in our studies of the Chicago Housing Authority leaseholders who are being displaced by the plans for transformation and have found a very high success rate in -- in going back even to refusers at the -- at the first wave. So our current estimate is that probably 50 percent of refusers and a
higher percentage of noncontacts can be converted at the second -- at the second attempt.

And my -- and my proposal would be that the first wave, in contrast to our usual system, which the first wave is very content heavy. You know, this is like the -- the launch pad for the panel and it can -- usually a very long questionnaire with a lot of detail -- that maybe it would be much better to have a very light first wave so that the first wave is really a recruitment wave so that you don't lose cases in the first wave and that you pick up the information later. If you think about PSID where perhaps half of the total nonresponse after 20 years could be traced to the first wave nonresponse in PSID.

If they had thought back then that it would have been -- because we have strong evidence that people will continue in a panel once you have recruited them, so that the key is to get them in. If they had done a very light wave in 1966 just to get people in the panel and have their nonresponse rate down and picked up the other information over the following 40 years when they have plenty of time to pick it up, the attrition problem wouldn't have been nearly as great. So I think for panels, my new proposal is have a wave zero, which is essentially recruitment and just enough to involve
people, just enough to get it started, but minimize
response -- nonresponse so maximize the response rate at
this wave zero, don't allow all of the sponsors and
enthusiasts to get all of their questions into the first
wave where they all want to have them because they say
without that, civilization as we know it pretty much
comes to an end.

Very light first wave and then maintain
the panel carefully afterwards. And -- and my -- my
hypothesis is that the attrition level will be much lower
than it would be otherwise.

MS. SIEBER: I've -- I've been thinking
about the recruitment issues particularly as they relate
to your relationship with IRBs since that's my role here.
And I -- I want to relate to this point in that that
recruitment wave would be, I think, a very important step
for building the motivation to continue in the study,
understanding what the study's benefits are so that the
recruitment wave could be followed up with mailings that
would build a relationship with the survey. This way
when you tell people that they don't have to answer
questions or, you know, whatever you have to tell them in
the informed consent, if they already know you, that's
what the informed consent is. It's not what the IRB
insists, you know, that long thing is. I think that
could solve a lot of recruitment and retention and IRB
problems.

MS. JASSO: Let me jump in here because
I -- I think this is a wonderful idea, but it will only
work with surveys that have certain purposes. For
example, it would not work with a survey of brand new
legal immigrants because part of it is that you want to
know exactly what they're going through immediately after
getting their green card. So you can't have a wave zero
and postpone getting that terribly important, immediately
important substantive information.

The same thing with some of the election
surveys, it would be -- it would be difficult, I think.
But for other surveys, I think it's a splendid idea.

MR. KLINEBERG: Well, the other
possibility is to have a shorter gap between that first
wave and second. So you recruit them and then get back
to them fairly quickly with the longer survey.

MR. BRADBURN: Could I just pick up one
point? I mean, it's -- it's back to an earlier point
that Willie made about misestimating the costs, I mean,
the -- because you're going on some assumption of various
sorts.

A case in point that was enormous -- had
enormous cost implications: When NCS decided to go back
to eighth grade, start the panel in eighth grade, nobody
seemed to -- well, I don't think there were any data and
so forth. But nobody took an assertion that -- that
people -- kids who were in the eighth grade don't
necessarily just all go to the same high school. And it
turned out that the spread of kids going to different
high schools was much, much greater than had been
anticipated. So that instead of having a very -- most
people kind of in one place to go for the second wave
when they were sophomores, it turns out that they were
scattered all over the city -- I mean, not taking into
account, you know, the 20 percent who mover every year or
whatever, but just spread out over -- over a much bigger
geographic area. So you -- you have one or two kids in
30 schools instead of, you know, 20 or something in two
or three schools. So it just blew the budget enormously.

And you know, there's -- there's --
you -- well, unfortunately, when you get into these
studies you realize how many assumptions we make about
the -- the course of life for -- for different kinds of
things without any real data about it. And that was one
that people just assumed, you know, well, there are
feeder schools to these high schools and so all the kids
from this eight grade are going to go to that high
school, and it just wasn't the case at all.
MR. BIEMER: You know, another thing I've learned is that some things that you think might increase survey costs actually can work to reduce them. I mean, Colm's idea, for example, about having the zero wave first struck me as being, you know, sort of an expensive way to increase response rates. But -- but then again I think about some of the experiments we did at RTI looking at incentives. And you might think, you know, that incentives would increase survey costs. We found in some of these studies that they actually reduce survey costs. Giving a $50 incentive to respond to sample members, it not only increases surveys costs but it also gets them more engaged and it reduces the number of follow-up attempts that are necessary to -- to be able to convert initial nonrespondents and so forth. So it's -- it's --

MR. BRADBURN: Good point.

MR. BIEMER: -- it's something that, you know, you have to experiment with. You can't just go on intuition.

MR. GRANATO: Chris, do you want to say something?

MR. ACHEN: I'm not sure when you want to take this up. But at some point I think it might be helpful to us to have some sense of what it is you guys
want to do. And though there's this very nice panel aspect of the CPS, for instance, which I -- that -- that Norman mentioned that I became aware of about a year ago. It is completely useless to political scientists who want to use the CPS for voter turnout because that's an every two-year thing and the panels never overlap.

So the question drives what's useful about the design and vice versa. There are, of course, other aspects of the CPS for which the panel thing is just -- is just great. It just doesn't work for us.

So I think there must be an enormous number of possible things to ask about the Houston region. But at some -- at some stage, I think focusing us a little bit might be helpful.

MR. GRANATO: We will. After this overview discussion, the next discussion will be about design issues. So we're going think -- talk about studies like PSID, but there's also the potential to integrate with the Klineberg study. We link -- he has it cross-sectioned on every year he's been doing it. Is it 20?

MR. KLINEBERG: 27 years.

MR. GRANATO: 27 years. And maybe a way to integrate panels with his -- it's like a voyager spacecraft, right. He's taken a thermometer of the area
and the region and way to just use the panels and to
drill down in a specific area that seems to be flaring up
in his survey or it could also be used to validate a -- a
large omnibus panel, too. It has its cross-sections, the
integrity of the sample -- but of this large panel, given
the threat of migration, out-migration. Does it still
square with what he's finding in cross -- at the
cross-sectional level. We're going to talk about those
things in a little bit.

One thing that struck me is I have read
and studied panels, though I've never implemented one
myself. But the one thing I always viewed and I'm
starting to -- the discussion here has made me think
twice about this now -- is the sampling mortality issue.
It sounds like it's not as big a problem as I -- I mean,
I heard about refresher samples. And I assume, since
it's being used, no one thinks they compromise the
integrity of the -- the sample itself. So is that true?

Is that -- I mean, because I figure, you
know, your first wave, that's your baseline. Then you go
in successive waves. You actually bring in a refresher.
No one is concerned about the fact that that refresher is
in some way going to create or contaminate the original
baseline?

MR. BRADBURN: Well, there -- there has
been at various times a concern for what's called panel
effect, which is -- that is, our people who have been --
and -- and particularly with attitude kinds of things.
And I think an election survey is probably more so than
others. But the question is, if you're interviewing the
same people over time, then to what extent have you
taught them or have they committed themselves to one
view; and so there's -- there's a kind of dependence
that's -- that's been art -- assumed conceptually it's
been artificially introduced by the fact that you've been
asking them questions of various sorts.

And -- and many studies build in ways to
test out whether that's true or not. In -- in this
evaluation of the TV programs that I mentioned, as it
were, we had a -- an elaborate design in order to pick up
whether there were panel effects and so forth.

And my -- I guess my bottom line of that
is I'm seeing very little evidence that that's a major
problem. So there may be some cases where it is. But it
seems to me that, at least in -- certainly in the studies
I've done myself and -- and sort of -- I haven't done,
you know, an exhaustive search of literature and so
forth; but I think it's -- it's an overblown problem.
And -- and I think it was one that in the beginning -- in
the early election studies that Lazarsfeld and his
colleagues did, they worried about that a lot. But I

don't think that they, in fact, found a big -- big
effects -- small, yes. Little tiny effects and so forth.

So there's --

MR. KLINEBERG: You would think --

MR. BRADBURN: Pardon?

MR. KLINEBERG: You would think there

would be effects because --

MR. BRADBURN: Well, but it's in the same

issue that in the early days people worried about

interviewer effects. You know, there -- there's a whole

literature that -- the Hyman, et al., book on

interviewing and so forth, which was premised on the

worry that the interviewer's attitudes would affect, you

know, that they would get the -- that the respondents

would say what the interviewers wanted them to.

Well, I mean, the basic issue there is if

you train interviewers well, you know, they -- and they

behave the way they're supposed to and so forth, it isn't

an issue of various sorts. I mean, there are good

interviewers and bad interviewers and so on and so forth.

But I mean there are a few places that

worry if -- but I'll actually give you a place where --

where there a bit of a problem with longitudinal studies

that we turned up in the NLS. Now, see, this is a study
of kids, at least, in the beginning, they're kids so
they're typically interviewed in home -- at home or so on
and like that. And they're interviewed. And pretty
much, they're living in the same place. And the way the
interviewing staff is, it's pretty much the same
interviewer who comes every year. So after four or five
years they really -- there's a relationship and, in fact,
we would get places where people would say, "Well, Sally
didn't come back this year and I only want to talk to
her. I'll only give the interview if I have" and so
forth.

Well, another researcher who had studied
in -- in various other context rates of elicit drug use
in youth found that the reports in the NLSY were less
than they were getting in some successive
cross-sectioning. And what she believed -- I'm not sure
this totally was evidenced. But it -- it's certainly
plausible and feasible that over time the -- the
respondents had sort of bonded with the interviewers like
their mothers or something like that, and so they were --
they were not reporting sensitive behaviors of various
sorts that they wouldn't report to their mothers or
something like that. And so they -- it's a kind of -- a
kind of extra relationship that they have sort of built
up. But that's a very unusual kind of situation of
various sorts that -- and I don't think it -- it was --
again, if it's an effect of at all, it's kind -- kind of
a big effect.
I mean, it was -- Willie mentioned about
the -- the immigrants. I mean, there is a sense in which
the interviewer in these longitudinal studies does have a
somewhat different -- because we do try to, in general,
match this, you know, so that they can go back to -- to
the same person, and sometimes this is -- with NLSY it's
been many, many years.
MR. BIEMER: Well, the other reason why
you want -- want a refresher sample is because over time
attrition will reduce the representativeness, if I could
use that word, of the sample that you selected. And if
you try and make cross-sectional estimates, then you
don't really have -- integrating a sample. So you may
want to, you know, bring in, you know, the in-movers,
things like that that aren't represented by the original
sample.
So it depends upon your objectives again
whether, you know, you're more interested in start
looking at a fixed panel where you select a sample from a
population at some point in time and that's going to be
your reference population, you just want to look at how
that population changes or you want to, you know, update
that sample for changes in the population and do
cross-sectional estimates along the way; and that's where
you get to the rotation panel designs.

MR. EMERSON: But you're --
MR. BIEMER: Like a refreshment?
MR. EMERSON: Pardon. But it's quite
important to distinguish between the different purposes
for supplementing the sample.

MR. GRANATO: Right.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: And they really
can be quite different. They can be -- the rotating
panel is essentially an attempt to -- it replaces a piece
of the panel. So its purpose is to reconstitute the
panel in some sense.

But the split panel design is essentially
one where you have panel, which is a pure panel that you
follow. That means it's the same people. You don't add
to it, you don't subtract from it. And in parallel, you
run cross-section samples because you want to represent
the population as it is.

So one is measuring change in terms of
the -- within individual gross change, and the other is
looking at net change in the -- in the community. And I
think in Houston it looks as though they might both be
quite important objectives, but they're not the same.
MR. BIEMER: Right, no.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So we probably shouldn't use the term "refresher" for cross-sections that are running in parallel.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, you have -- the -- as you go along -- again, it depends on what you're -- what the universe you're sampling is. But they -- after the first year for many samples, there will be people who weren't eligible at the time you did the first wave or the zero wave but who are now eligible. I mean, obviously if you're doing a sample of people in Houston, the next year there will be some people who moved into Houston in the year that you -- since you started and they were not eligible the year before; so they're -- so your representatives, in that sense, decreases every year because -- and you have to -- for -- for that kind of design, you have to do refreshers because you -- they're just people that -- that had no chance. It wasn't that you didn't get them; they just had no chance to be in the sample.

MR. GRANATO: Got you.

MR. BRADBURN: But others -- for the others, it's people who dropped out -- who are replacements for people who dropped out, but who could have been in...
MR. GRANATO: Got you.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: I guess then the real refresher would be the HRS design, Health & Retirement Study, would be real refresher, a panel refreshed where every five years they recruit a new age group because the other reason people aren't eligible is they're not old enough, so if you have a couple of adults or old people or whatever. So every five years HRS recruits a new cohort essentially so that they maintain the panel by adding 50 to 55 year olds or 46 to 50 years olds or whatever the -- the current age is where they -- where they supplement the sample.

MR. GRANATO: One thing I want to bring up -- let's take a 10-minute break. But one thing I want to do is talk about this idea -- I want to keep up with this point about I'm -- the concern I have is not about a new -- a refresher where you get a new cohort in it. It's when you bring in a refresher to try and supplement a cohort you already have, and I want to know what you-all think about that.

MR. BIEMER: That would be like substitution. So you have someone who dropped out and you try and match them on the characteristics?

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. Yeah. Let's take a 10-minute break, and we'll come back and we'll start with
those design issues.

(Recess 10:48 to 11:16.)

MR. GRANATO: Okay. What we're going to do, we -- we're going to focus on design issues for quite a while now because this is very important. And there's several substantive questions to deal with, which each may require different types of design.

But before we get to that, I -- I think we should get a summary of the Klineberg survey, which has -- which has been around for almost 30 years. It's -- it's a cross-sectional survey of the Houston area. And Steve Klineberg is here --

MR. SCIOILI: A Lucky man.

MR. GRANATO: -- lucky for us. And I'd like him just to explain what -- what he's been doing and then the possibilities of linking up with panels and things of that sorts and the questions -- some of the questions he's been addressing in that time. Steve.

MR. KLINEBERG: Well, we began 27 years ago. And -- and I get unfairly credited for planning to do this in my life. I mean, I teach a research methods class to sociology majors at Rice. A friend of mine had just started a survey organization. Houston was booming. One million people had moved into Houston between 1970 and 1982. One million, we were riding the oil boom to
continued prosperity. We did that first survey. Two months later, the oil boom collapsed. I said, "My God, we better do this survey again."

And so in 27 years, we have been asking -- taking a representative random sample of Harris County residents reached by random telephone numbers -- that RDD thing, random adults in each random household.

I hope we have a chance to talk a little bit about what's happening to response rates in all of this and are there alternative ways to ensure that truly representative samples are taken. So our response rate have been going down every year, but the sample still seems to be a very good representative picture of a city undergoing just remarkable transformation.

The city went into major recession after the oil bust and then recovered into a radically restructured economy and a demographic revolution. And so for 27 years, we've been watching the city change and documenting these -- these developments. So the beauty of what we're now thinking of doing with -- with -- with this panel study is -- is we have now this -- this cross-sectional survey that is continuing.

The reason -- when I was late this morning, I was having a definitive meeting with our dean. Rice is committed to helping us raise, as a part of their
endowment, 5 to 10 million dollars that will establish an
institute on Houston-area research at public impact that
will ensure that the survey continues.

MR. BIEMER: Could I ask, what's the
sample size?

MR. KLINEBERG: Sample size of about 700,
drawn from a population of about 2 million.

MR. BIEMER: 700 completed or...

MR. KLINEBERG: Excuse me?

MR. BIEMER: 700 completed?

MR. KLINEBERG: 700 completed interviews,
yeah. So starting in our -- at the beginning, we got --
had a 75 percent response rate. Of all potential random
numbers, once you remove numbers that are not in service
and -- and business numbers, 75 percent of all those
random numbers resulted in a completed interview. Now,
it's about 38 percent. So that's a growing concern. But
still, as I say, seems to be -- you know, somehow it
still seems to be representative. People who don't want
to answer they're -- and -- and the other thing that's
happening is that we're not -- we're not getting more of
a refusal rate. The cooperation rate remains just about
what it was. The problem is finding a human being to
answer the telephone.

MR. GRANATO: Wow.
MR. BRADBURN: Do you know what proportion in this county -- have telephone.

MR. KLINEBERG: It's about 92, 93 percent. Now, I'm not sure because so many having land lines, it's hard --

MR. BRADBURN: Well, the land line, that's different from the issue. But the one -- I mean, the one population that is under covered by telephones were Hispanics, and so...

MR. KLINEBERG: And young people now.

MR. BRADBURN: And young people have phones, but not land lines. They're not...

MR. KLINEBERG: Can you -- and you can now do samples of cell phones; right? You can get those numbers. And so that's a -- certainly one possibility.

MR. BIEMER: The question is, do you want to. But, yeah, you can.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: The evidence is quite strong that response rates for these cell phone samples are extremely low. But, again, the cooperation rate is high. But that speaks -- the very small number of people who answer the telephone to numbers they don't recognize, so the overall response rate is very low.

MR. KLINEBERG: Right, right.

MR. BRADBURN: But you're not -- is that
because you don't know whether it's a real number or not?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No. But these --

these are samples of cell phone numbers.

MR. KLINEBERG: I mean, because

people don't -- people will not answer their cell
phones...

Yeah. And you leave -- we leave messages
at the end. We say, "We're calling from Rice University.
We're doing our 27th annual survey." Don't know who we
are. We are -- but "please call us back to do the
survey." No one calls back.

So, at some point today, I would love to
get help from all of you about what are some alternative
ways to get representative samples as we go forward in a
world where telephones are less and less effective in
reaching people. But the survey has continued to be a --
a very reliable ongoing feature of --

MR. BRADBURN: Do you have a core of
questions you ask each year and then topical modules? I
mean --

MR. KLINEBERG: Yes.

MR. BRADBURN: Sort of like the GSS?

MR. KLINEBERG: Right, right. And we ask
about -- 20 percent of the survey is new each year, but
then we've got these questions. Then two years later,
let's ask some of those again. So it's now getting pretty full.

MR. BRADBURN: How long is it?

MR. KLINEBERG: Survey takes about 20, 25 minutes. Once people start, almost no one breaks it off.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. You can go longer than that.

MR. KLINEBERG: So it's been -- and do -- do any of you know -- as far as we know, no other city has been tracked for this length of time in this kind of systematic way. The Detroit area study used to -- used to be around. The Los Angeles County survey is done every year, I think, but by different clinical investigators each year so there isn't that continuity.

So our sense is that this is a real -- really has turned out to be a very interesting and unique resource for Houston. No -- no city has been tracked this as far and I assure no city has undergone the kind of transformations that Houston has.

MR. SCIOLI: How much have -- pressing you a little bit on Norman's question, how much is core and, you know, I was looking at the back, your -- your corporate friends and sponsors.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yes.

MR. SCIOLI: And how much do they kind of
make suggestions and say, "Why don't you include a module
on this" and you know, therefore the original objective
may have changed and the core --

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. That's a great
question. We have been very fortunate with recognition
in the city very early on that this is enormously
valuable to business. And -- and people have -- we've
sort of made this consortium of groups -- because I get
invited all the time to give talks to managers of banks
and -- and Mattress Mack, who is this big furniture
company. "I need to know who is going to be buying my
furniture." And -- and they -- when they ask me to give
talks, I say, "Sure. But will you make a tax deductible
contribution to Rice to help support the survey?" And so
the result has been $170,000 a year from this consortium
that makes it possible for us to do that.

And they are -- they understand that this
is -- that we are open to suggestions at all times, but
the survey questions are shaped by -- by the issues that
we're -- we're exploring. And -- and, also, no question
is ever proprietary and data are always made available to
everyone. And -- and the support has come just with the
sense of -- and in some ways that's the most valuable
thing about this survey is that it is independent and --
and no one controls it.
And we do add modules. We did a module one year working with the Greater Houston Mental Health Association, did a series of questions on the perceptions of mental illness. We did a module with the Texas Transportation Institute at University -- at Texas A&M. We do on module on attitudes towards mass transit and different transportation questions. So we've done that. And then -- and then some of those become questions that we track a couple of years.

MR. MURRAY: Steve, when did you begin to add these supplemental samples of African-American samples --

MR. KLINEBERG: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: -- to your 700 continuing --

MR. KLINEBERG: Well, we had that 700 continuing. And that reaches -- and that oversamples Anglos because we take a random adult in each random household and -- and if you've got five to six adults in the household, they get one to five or six chances as opposed to one or two.

So we -- we -- early on, starting in 1991 the first time, we did additional sample surveys with the identical questionnaire. And it -- and it asks about four questions in, "Are you Anglo, black, Hispanic, Asian or some other ethnic background?" And -- and then -- and
we continued the surveys then to reach a total of 500 African-Americans, 500 Hispanics, and 500 Anglos every year. So now I have very rich data, especially on Latino immigrants and their experiences, too.

MS. JASSO: It's in Spanish, also?
MR. KLINEBERG: And it's always translated in Spanish. In two of the years, in 1996 and 2002, we added a major survey of the Asian population in Houston where we -- we did 28 percent of the interviews in Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin and Creole. It seems like every seven years. So next year, we're back. Thank god we talked about it. Can we do this?

It's a tremendous undertaking because Asians are growing faster even than Latinos, and they represent about -- about 7 percent of the population, but they live in only around 4 percent of the households. So it means -- what we did in 2002, we started with 60,000 random phone numbers, reached 26,000 households, and did -- and did a little survey with the adult in the household to then ask about ethnicity and then is everyone in the household the same ethnicity as you and found 701 of those households that contained an Asian.

And then we took a random Asian in those random, and a tremendous undertaking to get a truly -- but then it became a truly representative sample. We
really can tell you how the Philippinos differ from the
Indians in their -- in their experiences and what does it
mean to be a Vietnamese refugee as opposed to a -- to a
professional immigrant --

MR. BRADBURN: Are those oversamples in
addition to the 700 core?

MR. KLINEBERG: So we build on that --

MR. BRADBURN: So you add 2200 or --

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. We build on that
700. So -- so we reach, for example, about 420 of that
700. We then do it again until we get 500, and then we
say, "Thank you very much." And we have 120
African-Americans we keep doing until we get 500
African-Americans. So it's a big job.

MR. BIEMER: Who are the main data users
for this study effort?

MR. KLINEBERG: We -- we publish a report
like that every three years. Now, once we get this
institute going, we'll do a report every year. It -- I
give about 95 talks a year. And everybody wants it, and
that's another reason why we have got to get this
institute going so we can have other people involved
and -- and figure out more effective ways to get the
information out.

It gets used -- that's, of course, part
of the difficulty. It is such a rich survey that it covers so many different areas that all the ethnic communities are interested, all the business communities are interested, all the -- all the environmentalists, all the -- the women's groups. I mean, it's this self-conscious awareness in Houston that the 21st century is a different place and Houston's enormous success riding the oil boom of the 20th century has to all be rethought if this city is going to position itself for prosperity in the 21st century.

And then the demographic revolution has been just extraordinary because it was Anglos pouring into this city during the oil boom in the '60s and 70s until 1982. And all the growth of Houston in the last quarter century has been immigration from Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Caribbean. And this biracial southern city dominated by white men has become one of the most ethnically and culturally diverse cities in the country.

And because of that migration, there's a tremendous -- there's a nationwide relationship between ethnicity and age, of course. The aging of America is largely Anglo aging. More clear in Houston than anywhere else because the Anglos pour down here until 1982 and then all the young people who came as immigrants. So,
you know, one of the most powerful charts in my survey is
of that of everybody in Harris County age 60 and older,
72 percent are Anglos. And of everybody under the age of
30, 75 percent are non-Anglos. Here we are, this
endogenicity.

So it's a -- it's a city that is self --
that is self-consciously aware of the need for this kind
of information. It's been tremendous, I think. And I
think that's also why we feel to put forth for a panel
study that would be able to answer and ask different
kinds of questions than this cross-sectional study.

MS. HAMILTON: Can I just say that the
Houston Endowment Foundation uses this study very often,
and it's quite helpful to us to look at target where
we're going to put money. So we're very proud to be a
part of that study.

MR. SCIOLI: Could you say a little bit
more about that, Ann? What do you mean about where
you're going to put money?

MS. HAMILTON: Well, it -- it --

MR. SCIOLI: No. I -- I have no idea
what...

MS. HAMILTON: Houston Endowment does a
lot of work. We don't really care about having our name
all over everything anymore. And so we do a lot of work
looking at gaps, where the gaps are; and this study helps us see those gaps and where they -- they are with regard to health and human services and environment and planning issues --

MR. KLINEBERG: Education.

MS. HAMILTON: -- education issues. So all the -- all the groups that we give to. Arts and culture not as much, but that's...

MR. KLINEBERG: One of the interesting things that Houston is aware of now is that the strategies for economic prosperity for Houston in the 21st century are different from the ones that worked in the 20th century, above all having to do with quality of life, with making this city a more beautiful, attractive place where people who can live anywhere will say, "I want to live in Houston."

All right. And that's -- and Houston never had a way with that because we had the east Texas oil fields. So that, too, has become -- and we've been tracking just growing shifts of attitude among the general public about the importance of environmental protection, about -- about transmission issues and so forth.

MR. SCIOLI: So let me put on my fiscal administrator hat for a second and ask me, why do we need
two sheriffs in town? Why don't you do the panel study?

MR. KLINEBERG: I'm -- I'm -- don't have
time to do that. We do need -- we need many sheriffs in
town.

MS. JASSO: Marshals.

MR. KLINEBERG: Marshals. Then we
have -- the other thing that's so interesting is that
Houston is the fourth largest city in America and
probably the most understudied major city in the country.
And part of that is our history. We have not had large
numbers of great universities with strong social science
programs as Chicago, Los Angeles, New York; and so we're
playing catch-up and we need this tremendous -- this is --
this city is sociological gold mine. It's a laboratory
for understanding the American experience. And no one
appreciates that.

MR. SCIOLI: Let me press this point once
again. And I'm -- I'm sorry to do it. But it's --
again, it's based on my experience that I have to ask
this question.

So your objective -- I mean, you heard us
struggling with let's understand what the objectives of
the panel study would be. And it seems to me, without
great knowledge of it, that there's a potential
partnership here; as opposed to you using this or this
informing another study, that there's a partnership where both boats would rise and there would be a conservation of resources, a pooling of resources. I mean, is there something going on that I don't know about where Rice won't, you know?

MR. KLINEBERG: No.

MR. SCIOLI: Okay. Sorry to bring that up, but I bring those points up all the time.

MR. KLINEBERG: Oh, no.

MR. GRANATO: Actually, the -- UH's Survey Research Institute does his -- does the work for Steve's survey.

MR. KLINEBERG: We already have some who -- that do the core --

MR. SCIOLI: Oh, okay.

MR. KLINEBERG: We didn't before. It just happened that there's somebody called telesurvey Research associates that I started working with, and they went out of business and so we came over here. So we're -- it's tremendous cooperation.

And the idea would be to combine these two, because you have got a cross-sectional study that is now going to go on, we think, indefinitely. But we can't answer the kinds of questions that a panel study can. And -- and the panel study doesn't have to worry so much
about, "Are we continuing to represent the city?"
Because we now -- we have a pretty good picture of how the city is changing. We can take human beings and watch their lives unfold, you know, where it provides enormously understanding. So that's sort of what we're thinking of.

MS. JASSO: A very -- a very quick little question, Steven. How did you make the decision when you added the -- the subsamples of African-Americans and Hispanics and Asians, how did you make the decision to screen on the basis of self-reported ethnicity rather than on the basis of country of birth for Hispanics and Asians?

MR. KLINEBERG: Well, I mean, obviously, we ask everybody countries of birth and how long you've been in this country, and so we have all of that rich information. But to -- it never occurred to us to screen on basis of country of birth. We screen on the basis of ethnicity. And in reaching 500 samples every year for 15 years has meant enormous richness of information about the Latino population in Houston, how long they've been here, where they came from, where their parents were born, what language they speak at home.

MS. JASSO: See, the reason I ask is, as you know, ethnicity is a choice, whereas country of birth
is, say, a fact.

MR. KLINEBERG: I see.

MS. JASSO: And there is some evidence that Hispanics in particular, as they assimilate, may give up the Hispanic label. And so then there wouldn't be as much information as you would want on the progress of people who came from Spanish-speaking countries as opposed to the people who continue to call themselves Hispanic.

MR. KLINEBERG: Well -- yeah. The only way we can do it -- we're on the telephone, so we don't -- and we just say, "Are you Anglo, black, Hispanic, Asian or some other ethnic background?" And if they say "I don't know" or more than one, we follow it up with "Which ethnic group do you most identify with?" If they continue to say "I don't know" on either, we say, "Great. Fine."

MS. JASSO: Sure.

MR. KLINEBERG: "Thanks for your help."

(Motions.)

MS. JASSO: But it would be possible to screen on -- on country of birth?

MR. KLINEBERG: And then we ask everybody, "Where were you born and where were your parents born?"
MS. JASSO: Yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, I think a
screener question in country of birth would be a little
more intrusive and possibly inappropriate as the first --
as the first question in the survey, especially given
issues of immigration and other...

MS. JASSO: More intrusive you think than
ethnicity?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Absolutely.

Absolutely. If you have --

MS. JASSO: Boy, I don't think so.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: You probably
weren't born in Mexico and living in Houston?

MS. JASSO: No, I was not, but

nonetheless.

MR. KLINEBERG: That's interesting. And
you're right. All these ethnicity is getting more and
more complex and --

MS. JASSO: And more and more of a
choice.

MR. KLINEBERG: We -- we sociologists
like to have nice clear categories. You're in it or
you're out of it, and it's just getting more and more --

MS. JASSO: Well, you need exogenous
variables.
MR. BRADBURN: I wasn't sure what you said about the people who are -- basically self-identify as multiethnic or however you put that.

MR. KLINEBERG: We -- we classify them as "other."

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. And then what?

MR. KLINEBERG: And -- well, then, when we do the oversample to try to reach additional African-Americans, we would then at that point terminate the interview.

MR. BRADBURN: But you would include them in your core 17 [sic]?

MR. KLINEBERG: Oh, absolutely. In the first 700.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Well, just -- and in passing, you might want to consider in the future oversampling that group because that -- that may be a growing group.

MR. KLINEBERG: Font.

MR. BRADBURN: I mean, it -- the -- well, the census has introduced the multi-racial and so forth category and with much controversy and so on and so forth. But I think -- again, this sort of speaks to trend data and maybe possibly longitudinal and so forth, that that's -- it's good to have something early on when
it's not yet --

MR. KLINEBERG: That's a very good point.

MR. BRADBURN: -- an important category.

Because I think in terms of what you're -- one of the things you might be interested in -- I presume you're interest in -- in a community like Houston, how one loses one's ethnicity or one begins to identify with a tranethnic group. And for the future of Houston or areas, cities like this, that seems to be an extremely important sociological fact that you'd want to track with considerable care.

MR. KLINEBERG: It's still a very small number now.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. But that's -- I mean, that's -- you hope that that grows.

MR. KLINEBERG: Good. That's a very good...

MR. BRADBURN: Rather than -- the city could go the other way and become polarized more so and so forth. But, again, that that might be a very sensitive indicator of the degree to which it is polarized or less polarized or whatever.

MR. EMERSON: One of the -- a lot of changes happened, I think -- and I think maybe since Steve started -- with Hispanics. Houston is
overwhelmingly -- population was overwhelmingly of
Mexican origin 27 years ago. So you identify a
relatively small number of non-Mexican origin Hispanics.
Now, that's increased very substantially. We're probably
now 62 percent, 64 percent Salvadoran immigration and
some Central America, some South American. We have
almost no black Hispanics. So we have a very tiny
overlap in this community of persons who say they are
black and Hispanic, very different than New York City, of
course. But that's picking up a little bit.
We had almost no foreign-born blacks.
Virtually all blacks were born in the United States.
That's changing. Migration from West Africa.
MR. GEYEN: Yeah. And Africa, yeah.
MR. EMERSON: We probably have more Nigerians here now than --
MR. GEYEN: And the Caribbean.
MR. EMERSON: So these questions have --
you know, have changed a little bit over the 27 years
because our racial ethnic categories are getting more
diverse, more people are saying "other," not identifying
with a primary census category. So these are good
questions to consider going forward.
MR. KLINEBERG: And, again, it makes the
point that -- that Houston is a kind of mirror in the
sense that new America takes shape.

MS. CALLAGHAN: I just have a question about race of the interviewer, how -- how well do you get a match? And how do deal with multiple languages, do you -- the 700 people that you oversample, do you have information on their ethnicity by the phone numbers or --

MR. KLINEBERG: No.

MS. CALLAGHAN: -- something that you know ahead of time where you have to call another -- you still do telephone surveys?

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. We always translate the questionnaire into Spanish and there are always bilingual Spanish-speaking interviewers available at all times. And they're all -- the interviewers are trained. You know, you call and someone says, "Bueno." You say, "Oh, un momento por favor."

And then -- and then only when you do the Asians do we have these multilingual Asians interviewers helping.

MS. CALLAGHAN: And race of the interviewer match?

MR. KLINEBERG: And we always -- a core base of interviewer and gender of interviewer. And we also have not found much effects. In fact, we looked every once in a while.
MS. LEE: Okay.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. So -- so, you know, you can't -- to some degree, Houston is segregated, but -- but we're segregated in pockets all over the place. So it's -- so you really have to -- it's hard to say this is a purely African-American area and this is a purely Latin area. And so --

MR. MURRAY: The Asian population is particularly dispersed in Houston.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.

MR. MURRAY: Only about 20 percent of the Hispanics live in overwhelmingly Hispanic neighborhoods, so...

MR. KLINEBERG: And, still, there's a central corridor of Latin Americans. Even there, too, it's -- it's spread out.

MR. MURRAY: They're dispersing as well.

MS. SIEBER: As I listen to this discussion of a change in demographics as a large non-Caucasian young population, one of the things that occurs to me -- again, putting on my recruitment hat -- is that this is an excellent opportunity for self-identified emergent leaders to want to use this data in relation to the development of their own community.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Absolutely.
MS. SIEBER: And -- and it seems to me that this is an extremely selling point as you go out to each minority group and -- and point out what they can do with the data and what you will help them to do, so that essentially you can be both developing political and scientific infrastructure within that community, recruiting students to the University of Houston, recruiting research assistants, and putting the word out to diverse communities what they can gain from their involvement in these panel studies.

And they, in turn, can give you a lot of feedback on how to relate to them. And I think Rebecca will -- will be a -- being a participatory community research person --

MS. LEE: It can be worse.

MS. SIEBER: -- can play a major role in helping guide to make the best use of the input that you can get from each community and how to relate to them and how to do the things that they want. They, too, should be setting the agenda. And until you go out to them, they may not even realize that they would have that prerogative.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. That's a good point. The -- our -- the survey that I've been involved with has been just enthusiastically embraced by
the -- by the minority communities across the board.

MS. SIEBER: Yeah. And -- and I see --

MR. KLINEBERG: There's great excitement.

MS. SIEBER: -- I see Rice and University of Houston working together in -- in this public relations outreach.

MR. KLINEBERG: Uh-huh. Here, here.

Public -- public impact.

MS. SIEBER: Uh-huh.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. No, and there really is -- I mean, we're in a wonderful position, because there really isn't problems between these institutions in this. And -- and I think basically it's just this awareness there's so much more to be done here, there's so much more research to be conducted than any one outfit can handle; that we all need to work together and benefit, as you say, from working together.

MR. BLAIS: David, I'd like to know whether you have data on the conceptual level, neighborhood level. For instance, would it be possible to -- with your data set, to see what's going on in the neighbor where the crime rate is going up or down in which we act on a neighborhood level as well?

MR. KLINEBERG: Concern about pollution, does that occur primarily along the ship channel?
MR. BLAIS: Yeah.

MR. KLINEBERG: We have -- well, we have

700 from a representative sample of 2 million in an -- in
an -- in an area the City of Houston that covers 620
square miles. You could put inside the city limits of
Houston simultaneously the cities of Chicago,
Philadelphia, Baltimore and Detroit.

MS. SIEBER: Oh, my God.

MR. KLINEBERG: Those four cities fit
inside the geographical space of -- of the City of
Houston. So we -- we have ZIP codes and we have -- we
use the telephone numbers to identify census tracks, and
we connect the respondent -- responses to the census
information about the census tract.

MR. BLAIS: Is that built into the data
set?

MR. KLINEBERG: And we have that built
into the data set now in the last four or five years.
But we end up with 15 or 20 from a particular region, and
so that's not enough to be able to tell.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, but if you have, for
your core questions, at least, which you ask every year,
for a variable for which time is not -- at least, a year
is not necessarily things you could pool across several
years to get bigger --
MR. KLINEBERG: Right.

MR. BRADBURN: -- bigger samples of geographic samples.

MR. KLINEBERG: But attitude changes are -- get lost in that so -- but you're right.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I mean, if you look at the GSS, for example, attitudes change pretty slowly. And so I would think you would -- I mean, in a certain sense if you, let's say, you pool five years with some added -- you could test out a little bit whether the heterogeneity gets bigger or --

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. We have some --

MR. BRADBURN: -- I mean, some things about that.

MR. KLINEBERG: We ask questions about environmental concern, identical questions over all 27 years.

MR. BRADBURN: Lump them into five-year categories and -- and pool them, then you could get -- I mean -- I mean, well, people often overestimate the amount of change that occurs, you know, social change that occurs from year to year. Decades, yes. But changes probably --

MR. KLINEBERG: Well, we have --

MR. BRADBURN: Five years probably
pooling would --

MR. KLINEBERG: It depends on what issue there is.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

MR. KLINEBERG: Some issues vary.

Concerned about attitude changes --

MR. BRADBURN: But the issues for which there have been big events of various sorts. I mean, if there's a big oil spill or, you know, a gas -- something blows up or whatever and -- and there's a particular thing, that will have a short -- short-term effect.

But in the studies I've done, I've always been impressed or depressed, depending on which way you look at it, at how the half life of these particular events, you know, very dramatic events, but -- and they have -- but their -- their half life for -- for individual kind of attitude change or -- or emotional reactions and so forth is quite small.

In fact, just to give you an example, when we were doing -- I mentioned the Cuban missile crisis had occurred in the middle. When we tracked -- and we were able to re-interview everybody within a week, I mean. But if you look -- if you plotted the -- the reaction in terms of, you know, sort of anxiety-type reactions and so forth, by the day of the interview after
the -- the major -- well, you know, when the missiles were back and forth, you can see that it drops off. You know, by the end of the week, the people were much, much less worried than the people who were interviewed the day after and so on and so forth. And -- and it's -- these kind of things really have amazingly short half lives compared with the kind of attitude -- you know, sort of more general attitude.

MR. BIEMER: Have you done anything to sort of integrate the data with the American Community Survey data on Houston?

MR. KLINEBERG: Well, we -- we -- no, actually. We're still using the 2000 census data to put in. And, of course, that doesn't work with the -- but the American Community Survey is just, what, a 3 percent response, 3 percent of households responding? So you can't really do it at the level of the -- of the census tract.

MR. BIEMER: No, not at that track.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGN: Well, no. In two years' time, every track -- ACS would publish track-level data equivalent to the long form of the census. But at the moment, you don't have it. But starting from, I think it's -- it's 2010.

MR. O'MUIRCHEAR TAIGH: It will be a five-year aggregated sample for every tract. So that it'll have essentially a five-year moving average of tract-level information for every tract in the country. Cities at the moment are relatively badly treated by ACS. Since the census categorizes places rather than population aggregation; so that in the big cities, you can only get PUMAs -- PUMA-level data. You can't -- whereas in a town of 25,000, you already have ACS data. For big cities, it won't be until the tract data become available. But then after 2010, we'll have the equivalent of a long form every year.

MR. KLINEBERG: And -- so but some will be updated and others not, is that the idea?

MR. O'MUIRCHEAR TAIGH: Pretty much everything on the former census long form will be published every year for every tract on the basis of previous five years. So it's accumulated five-year data.

MR. KLINEBERG: I see.

MR. BIEMER: But some areas, it's three years, isn't it?

MR. O'MUIRCHEAR TAIGH: Yeah. But that's -- these are places of 25,000 or more.

MR. BIEMER: Right.

MR. KLINEBERG: But cities don't count.
MR. BIEMER: So at the Houston level, you could do it?

MR. O'MUIRCHEAR'TAIGH: Yeah. Every year for -- every year for the metropolitan areas.

MR. ACHEN: Could -- could I ask a question about how you manage your agenda. Partly you've got a tremendously interesting city here and even from 1500 miles away we know that. So there's a lot of descriptive things and just tracking and -- and -- that are important and must be important to your sponsors. How do you -- do you have an advisory board for that and then do you also have an advisory board for a more strictly scientific agenda where there's something particular research thing that you want to do and so you focus more in a given year or how do you manage those -- how do you manage those competing agendas?

MR. KLINEBERG: We're in this transition from being -- I've been all by myself for these 27 years. I have an undergraduate class that works with me in the spring each year to -- to think about the questions and to develop the pilot interviews and then they work on papers and stuff. But we have no graduate students now in sociology; we're moving toward a graduate program of sorts.
So it's been just building on, you know, and knowing what's happening in the city and talking to people, inviting people to talk to us about thoughts they have. But one of the things we're planning with this building of a new institute and to raise the funding is to -- is to finally do it right and have a full regular advisory committee and -- and hopefully also -- to be able to bring consultants in from outside and to help us think about various methodological issues and to have a full-time executive director that would be independent of the faculty director to do a lot of the -- but it's been a -- it's -- it's just been me and my graduate students.

MR. ACHEN: So you might get your life back?

MR. KLINEBERG: There are reports.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Although I'd like to express some concern that doing it right might be much worse than doing it the way he's been doing it for the last 27 years.

MR. KLINEBERG: Thank you.

MR. ESCHBACH: Steve, going forward, are you content with telephone survey mode as the way to conduct the survey, particularly with respect to differential nonparticipation across different ethnic groups or pop -- population growth mode?
MR. KLINEBERG: The belief that a 70 percent response rate was the minimum that you could require if you were going to, you know, apply sampling theory. I'm very upset by a 38 response rate. When I was a graduate student, you would have tossed those away; those aren't real surveys. And they're as good as you can get, you know.

So I'm very eager to hear about thoughts whether -- and we experimented one year with trying to pay people. But we don't know their names, and so we -- so -- and it's an anonymous survey. We said at the end, "If you will give us your name and address, we will send you a token of our appreciation and we'll promise you we will separate" -- and very few people want to do that. It's "all right. Glad I could help. Forget it."

MR. SCIOLI: What's the cost to do this survey?

MR. KLINEBERG: We raise about 170,000 a year. And it costs about -- what are you charging me now?

MR. MURRAY: $34 per interview.

MR. KLINEBERG: So it's still pretty good, yeah.

MR. MURRAY: So if there's 1700 times 34, $54,000 field costs roughly.
MR. KLINEBERG: And then a lot of other incidental things that are part of that, but it's -- it's in excess obviously. It costs --

MR. SCIOLI: Well, two guys are really smiling here. Is that -- is that a bargain at RTI and at NORC? Why were you smiling?

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: We couldn't afford --

MR. BIEMER: That's at bargain at RTI. It's not a bargain at USC.

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: NORC would -- it would cost a lot more to do it a NORC. It would cost a lot more just to talk to us.

(Laughter.)

MR. BIEMER: And the clock is running right now.

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: You're going to get billed for this.

MS. SIEBER: I think Stephen deserves a medal.

MS. JASSO: Yes, he does indeed.

MR. KLINEBERG: It's been great fun, very very interesting.

MS. JASSO: On this issue that everyone -- everyone in social research is worried about,
the telephone problem, the coming problem of -- of
nonresponsive, I wonder if it might be useful for us to
think about a different source for the sampling frame
than using telephone vendors or other means in order to
make the initial contact with the sampled individuals.
I -- I -- I think we're all going to have to -- to -- to
worry and think hard about this. What would be
alternative sampling frames?
Chris mentioned, for example, voter
lists. But of course that only -- yeah. I know.
Driver's license databases.
MR. KLINEBERG: There are Internet
surveys, which are -- have the same problems as NAD
surveys.
MS. JASSO: They have the same problem,
that's correct. That's correct.
MR. BRADBURN: Well, they are more
sampling problems because --
MR. MURRAY: Or tracking. We did a
survey years ago at Sam Houston High School that's
overwhelmingly blue collar Hispanics, high immigrant
community. We -- and the kids were -- we get their
records of the parents from the school, so we can call
parents, bilingual interviews.
But just in the couple of years we were
surveying, 70 percent of these working class Hispanic households had Internet connections; and that had gone up dramatically. So we're probably never going to reach the level of telephone penetration, but we are seeing even in a -- a very historically underserved community, due to computer connections and so forth, dramatic increases. And there's this good potential to weed out some of these problems as we shift -- as we will have to in the 21st century from less and less telephone-based interviewing.

MR. KLINEBERG: Latino immigrants are much -- are much less likely than others to have it. U.S. born Latinos have -- have Internet access. But coverage, that's of course a critical point.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, even if the coverage weren't a problem, it's a sampling problem because you can't -- there's no -- no analog of RDD for -- for IP addresses. So you have to have -- if you have a list sample, like apparently you do there, then you can start off pretty well. Because you -- you basically need an e-mail address to start and so forth. So you need some way to -- to screen.

So, I mean, we -- I think -- I mean, there are various experiments going on in which -- in using face-to-face interviewing to contact people to get an e-mail address and so forth and then actually doing
the -- it's sort of an analog of what Willie was talking
about, is you get the interviewer to make a contact and
sort of establish a relationship and then you do the
actual interview through the -- over the Internet or
whatever or web if you -- for -- at least, for those
people who have internet.

MR. BIEMER: You could provide it.
MR. BRADBURN: You can provide it, that's
true. You can provide it.

MR. BIEMER: It works through the TV.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I had a small
grant from NSF to test face-to-face recruitment of an
Internet panel. So this was -- I kind of remember it was
a feasibility study or a demonstration project, whatever
the lowest possible level of project is in which we used
face -- NORC face-to-face interviewers to recruit a panel
of people following the -- the model that Knowledge
Network has for their panel in which they would be
provide -- either provide them with the web TV, MSN TV 2
equipment or else if they had a computer Internet
connection of their own to use that for collecting data.

And it was relatively successful, at
least, as a demonstration project in that using three
slightly different procedures we got recruitment rates
between 60 and 70 percent of people who signed up to do
this. And then about 70 percent or a little more
actually did it. So, I mean, there's -- there's a whole
sequence of lost points in any operation like this. But
this is a very low -- relatively low cost and small scale
operation. And I think it suggests that we could do
it -- probably get recruitment rates over 70 percent.
And John Kosnik [sp] has now got money, I think, also
from NSF, from one of these center grants or --

MR. SCIOLI: To do research

instrumentation.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right. To try --

try this out on a larger scale.

MR. BIEMER: Well, you know, Craig Hill

at RTI is experimenting with these --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right.

MR. BIEMER: -- devices which -- these

handheld Internet devices which you -- basically you

approach them face to face. You recruit them into a

panel and provide them with this device as well as pay

their monthly fees and, in exchange, they agree to do so

many surveys over a period of a year, which are short

surveys. They can be conducted on this, but they occur

more frequently. So you're able to, you know, cover the

same ground as you would with a telephone survey, say,

15, 20 minutes but they're only getting it in like
five-minute doses.

MR. KLINEBERG: Do you pay them also for their --

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. Well, I think, the incentive is the device and the fee that you're paying on a monthly basis for them to use this device.

MR. GRANATO: How is the expense on that?

MR. BIEMER: Well, these devices are $100 and then, I think, it's $50 a month.

MR. GRANATO: Okay. In contrast to doing RDD or whatever you -- you --

MR. BIEMER: I think it's comparable.

MR. GRANATO: Is it?

MR. BIEMER: Depending upon how many -- how many you can -- how many surveys you can do with them over a period of time. And I think that's the key thing is, you know, you sort of amortize the initial cost over a number of surveys that you conduct with them.

MR. GRANATO: And the response is -- is fairly...

MR. BIEMER: Well, he's still looking at that. I think this experiment is still in the field.

MR. GRANATO: Okay.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Because this -- this is really the -- the example that Norman gave
earlier of essentially impaneling this group. This is --
this is not a panel in the sense of trajectories for
individuals. This is more a -- a group of people who
would then do a set of relatively unconnected surveys for
you, and the advantage is that you collect the basic
sociodemographic information only once so that each
client who buys 10 attitude questions or 15 marketing
questions, also, gets all of the sociodemographics at
relatively low cost.

So it's not an alternative to -- to a
cross-sectional survey. And this really works only if
you're planning fairly intensive use over a period of
time of the people that you've recruited. Because you
have all the costs of face-to-face recruitment, which is
a big cost and dwarfs the cost of the telephone survey,
plus the cost of -- ongoing costs of paying an Internet
collection fee or a -- in the case of an Internet panel.
So it's really quite an expensive way to do it. And so
far, it's not clear how good the real response rate can
be.

Knowledge Networks, which has been doing
this now for 10 years, I guess, has a -- a true response
rate of single-digit response rate. So if you look at
the true response rate, it's less than 10 percent. And
that's kind of not -- you know, we've gotten used to
70 percent and 50 percent and 40 percent and for RDD now, 30 to 40 percent. Market research has gotten used to 20 percent, sometimes 10 percent. But single digits still upset even the --

(Laughter.)

MR. KLINEBERG: Give us a little more time.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: -- the survey researchers. But on the sampling -- sorry.

MS. RIBGY: Oh, I was just going to ask, when you say "real response rate," you mean because of the two stage, the recruitment into the panel and the panel? And I ask this as somebody paying money to Knowledge Network.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Sure. And I guess it's -- the issue is how representative of the population is it.

MS. RIBGY: Yeah. Okay.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: So then you have to do everything. So you have to start with what proportion of people they recruit by telephone, okay. So that means anybody not in the telephone frame can't be recreated anyway, so you lose now with cell phone only being 12 1/2 half percent, right, you got a chunk on there.
MS. RIGBY: Right.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Then you have the RDD response rate, which I haven't heard reported recently, but it's certainly not more than 40 percent. You know 40 percent is now a good response rate for -- for true RDD. So even if we gave them 30, 35 percent for that; and that's of the people who agreed to do it.

And then of the people who agreed to do it, the proportion who actually install the equipment is maybe -- at the beginning, was 70 percent and that's the most it is. So let's say 60 or 70 percent. And then of the people who install it, the proportion who do one survey is perhaps 80 percent. Then of the people who do the first survey, the proportion who will do more than two surveys is perhaps 60 percent. And you don't have to multiply .6 by itself all that often with a couple of .3s thrown in before the number really gets quite small. So --

MS. RIGBY: Thank you.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: And there's attrition of another couple percentage a month or 10 percent a month of the people who are in it. So if you're getting kind of the middle of the panel -- and I think -- I don't think they would challenge these numbers. I mean I think they --
MR. BIEMER: Well, they can -- I mean, they can jump it up a little if you start with a face-to-face recruitment rather than an RDD.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, sure.

MR. BIEMER: But then the stages after that are pretty much the same.

MR. KLINEBERG: Trying to do face to face in a city like Houston is going to be just...

MR. BRADBURN: Generalization.

I -- I don't know of any probability sample longitudinal study that hasn't started out with face-to-face recruitment. And even though later on -- and maybe even the first couple of waves face to face. After that, you can mix modes.

The -- the one -- I guess, an exception to that would be where you -- if you're using cohorts that are clustered in some kind of way. Like sophomores in high school, they start off with group -- a self-administered group thing, if you have got people together kind of in a way. And then -- but then they spread. Once they graduate from high school or spread out from high school, they then have to be done individually of various sorts. But the only exception to that would be -- that I know of would be places where there are -- you can do a self-administered because
you've got a group, those kind of things.

Once you get people sort of hooked on it, kind of in a way, you then can do a lot -- you can do telephone or -- and I'm sure you could do Internet. I mean, I think once you've got people -- you've done a couple and established the kind of relationship and sort of really got them engaged in a longitudinal study, then you probably could keep them going. Although even there, you probably once in a while would need to -- to have some human -- real human contact rather than machine contact, I guess.

MS. SIEBER: You know, it occurs to me that if -- if you decide to really get a lot of input from communities within Houston, particularly minority communities, and if you decide to give training to the people who want to actually work on the survey and help you interpret it, those same people and other emergent leaders within those communities could hold town hall meetings in their communities, discuss the survey, and get people to indicate whether they would be willing to participate; and this could supplement your sample frame. That is, you could get contact information on people that you could not otherwise reach.

MR. KLINEBERG: Even though it's not a representative sample?
MR. BRADBURN: Well, you -- you do run into self-selection problems.

MS. SIEBER: Well, yeah.

MS. LEE: You always have that.

MS. SIEBER: You always have that.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I do think that --

I was interested that -- Steve, that you said that doing a face-to-face survey in Houston would be a daunting task, which of course is true. But if one were designing a face-to-face sample in Houston, it wouldn't be equivalent of an RDD sample. It wouldn't be an AREM sample. It wouldn't be a sample of individual households.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It would be a multi state sample, so...

MR. KLINEBERG: So you're stuck with -- I was going to ask you, you're stuck with --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Clusters.

MR. KLINEBERG: -- box and --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And possibly tracts. I mean, I know we use tracts as our unit in major urban areas as the -- as the clusters in our national samples. And tracts are relatively small. You can use block groups if tracts are too big.
I mean, I -- so it depends on -- but it's certainly not -- you wouldn't envisage that your sample would be spread out uniformly across the area if -- if travel costs, for example, are so large. And with all the information that we -- we have in small areas, you can stratify really quite tightly in terms of selecting areas so that you reduce the cost greatly by having adequate work loads for an interviewer in a relatively small area, so they're not driving 20 miles from one interview to another. So certainly for a face-to-face survey, I wouldn't start with the assumption in Houston, although you might in Manhattan, of a direct sample of households or housing units. And that -- you can change the cost very dramatically by changing the clustering of the -- the sample.

MR. BRADBURN: Just to go back to the -- before the break kind of question about comparative costs, when we were talking about panels or lunges [sic] and not necessarily being more costly than things, implicit in that was that the mode was the same. I mean, if you're contrasting an RDD sample with a longitudinal sample which is face to face or, at least, for several ways face to face and so forth, then you are talking about big cost differences. But that's not due to the panel versus cross-section. It's
due to the mode -- difference cost.

MR. KLINEBERG: Do you -- do you -- when you go to -- you pick your place and you send your interviewers out there, you don't know whether anybody is at home even; right?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Oh, certainly not, no. That would be too easy.

MR. BRADBURN: But, actually, there are -- if you -- you can moderate a little bit if you have a backwards phone directory. I mean, if you know phone numbers for at least some of the addresses, you can call them up and make an appointment or -- I mean you can --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Although in general we don't --

MR. BRADBURN: -- we don't do that usually, but...

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: We don't hardly because we -- we want to give -- one of the great advantages of the face-to-face is that you have a real person at the door, asking them to do something. And that's harder to turn down flat. You know, it turns out people don't -- they might do that more than we would like, but they don't -- they don't it all the time.

So you want to minimize the number of
opportunities somebody has to turn you down before your interviewer arrives. So I think our current -- at least, my current thinking is the reason for not phoning in advance is that that gives the respondent or the putative respondent an opportunity to say, "Don't bother me again" in which case we can't send an interviewer.

MR. BIEMER: Well, you know, if you have 10 households that are in the sample in the same area, then the interviewer is more productive. They go to the area, they can, you know, go to all of those households and they'll find somebody. So it's not always a wasted trip.

MR. KLINEBERG: Then you take a random adult in each household, so you do an --

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Yes. The same -- the same as -- but nowadays our samples -- it used to be that for such samples you had to do a listing of the area once you -- in order to find out where the housing units are. But our recent work suggests that that's not necessary.

I mean, now we use almost always the USPS delivery sequence file so the address frame from the postal service, which especially in urban areas tends to be quite complete in terms -- in terms of the dwellings since these are delivery points for -- for -- for the
postal service, I mean this has reduced very considerably
the cost of small area or local area face-to-face
surveys.

MR. BIEMER: That would be good for the
Houston area. I think those addresses --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Huh?

MR. BIEMER: That file would probably
have pretty good coverage in the Houston area.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah, absolutely.

I mean, it's never -- it's never as good as we hope. But
it's certainly -- well, my guess -- or our results
suggest that it is, in fact, as good as our own survey
listers would get. So that's, also, of course, not
perfect, so...

MR. BRADBURN: And you can also have
provisions for picking up an address that --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Sure, right.

MR. BRADBURN: -- appeared there that
wasn't in the delivery...

MR. SCIOLI: How long do they last? I
mean, what's the average interview time? 20 minutes for
the Klineberg survey. I mean, I know it varies for
everybody.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, most of our
face-to-face surveys would be at least an hour, but...
MR. SCIOLI: An hour?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARATIGH: Yeah.

MR. JONES: How do you deal with the security aspects with the gated apartments, gated communities?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARATIGH: That's -- that's a -- that's -- I'm glad to say I'm not an interviewer. Our interviewers are better at this than our researchers are. I mean, both gated communities and -- and apartment buildings that -- where you have to phone ahead. We can, as -- as Norman says, get telephone numbers for addresses for probably 50 percent of the addresses in the country, maybe 60 percent, depending on -- depending on the area. So the interviewers can get -- can get telephone numbers in those cases.

Gated communities, our interviewers are quite good at talking to the gatekeepers. So gatekeepers, in general. Both the gatekeepers in the gated communities and just general house -- you know, building gatekeepers and manage to convince a high proportion of them that they're not selling anything and that it's okay to -- to -- to let them in.

But it is -- it is a challenge. And there are some places, I think, where interviewer just
can't crack it and then it's nonresponse. So it's a --

it's a higher level nonresponse. So it's not at the

level of the selected person, but at some -- some larger

level. I don't think we've ever lost a whole cluster

because --

MR. BIEMER: I think you could probably

except, what, 70 to 75 percent response rates on a

face-to-face survey these days.

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: Yes. I -- I --

this has been remarkably consistent really over the last

30 years -- well, 20 years. So 70 percent is still --

our face-to-face surveys are typically -- GSS is just

over 70 percent. Bagley [ph] is around 7.

MR. BIEMER: Ours is our 70.

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: Older respondents

was 75 percent for a 2 1/2 hour interview a couple years

ago. So we still expect 70 percent -- between 70 and 80

percent, I guess, would be...

But in my -- my suspicion is -- and

Norman might be able to confirm this. We now spend a lot

more to get that is my feeling.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: So we've managed

to maintain the rate, but by greatly increased

expenditure.
MR. ACHEN: Ballpark, what would the cost be of recruiting a sample of 1,000 door to door in Houston?

MR. BLAIS: Cost per interview.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Huh?

MR. BLAIS: Cost per interview.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I don't know. I now use -- they certainly won't do it for less than $400 a case and maybe 1,000.

MR. BRADBURN: Is that the actual interviewing cost? I mean, we tend to lump in --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No. This is --

this is the total --

MR. BRADBURN: -- total costs.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- cost, that's right, would be between 400 and 1,000 a case. So between 400,000 and a million would be my guess. Would you think, Paul?

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. I think so.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. But that would include the sampling cost?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, sure.

That's included.

MR. BRADBURN: And now I'm under the question -- I mean, that's the total cost?
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's really the whole --

MR. BRADBURN: If you just pull out the interviewing costs, it may a third of that or half of it.

MR. KLINEBERG: So 1,000, that would be a minimum of $400,000.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, but actually -- and Norman is right. We think of it in terms of the cost of doing the survey, which includes all of the planning and design and the data processing and -- and take data preparation and so on, so...

MR. BRADBURN: And an unspeakable word of overhead.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Sure, yeah. Most of it is overhead. It's actually $10 a case.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And then there are executive vice presidents and all sorts of people like that.

MR. BRADBURN: My guess is that the actual, out-of-pocket interviewing expenses is maybe a third of that.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: A third to a half.

It might be a half.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I don't -- well --
and, again, it depends on your overhead structure.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: We could find out. I mean, that -- that would be certainly -- we could find out approximately.

MR. SCIOLI: The big three, General Social Survey, American National Election Study, Panel Study of Income Dynamics is anywhere now between 2 million and 4 million per year. That's gold standard. That includes training, questionnaire design, advisory board that was mentioned earlier, implementation of the instrument, cleaning of the data, archiving of the data, webinars, et cetera. And of that, 55 percent is overhead perhaps.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

MR. SCIOLI: But those are sunk costs because NORC, Michigan have been in the business and have the personnel. So if you start -- if you're talking about de novo, starting a whole operation of training face-to-face interviewers, that's a whole different thing.

MR. BLAIS: And I would submit this would be only the first wave, you know. If you think in terms of long-term and you assume that most of the interviews would be on telephone or Internet, if it's multi mode, you know, the -- the data survey will cost much, much
less on one hand.

And you can also do like the Dutch election study, which basically let people choose. So if you contact them and if they don't -- are not really ready to do an interview right on the spot, then you can offer them the possibility of doing it on the phone or Internet. So the -- it could be only the initial contact which will be at home; and that would also reduce costs.

MS. RIGBY: Although that actually raises an issue for me, as somebody who has just moved to Houston -- and I'm fascinated by the dynamics -- it's both our selling point in some ways and it's a limitation in some ways. The refreshing of the sample, I think, is a key issue. Is that a priority? If -- if it is a priority to retain the representative nature of it, we're under a much larger refreshing, you know, challenge than other cities would be.

MR. KLINEBERG: And our changes.

MS. RIGBY: And -- or -- or are we going to rely on the cross-sectional? Are we going to say, well, we have an ongoing cross-section and so this is more of, you know, the project for human development in Chicago neighborhoods or something that is about change and not about representation?

MR. BRADBURN: And actually the data --
because the data that was mentioned earlier about moving
rates is not out of line with general -- with habits
generally in the country. So, at least, in terms of
the -- of the -- I mean, maybe there are more in-migrants
than out -- I don't know about out-migrants. And so that
will depend on the economy probably.

But the -- the number of the churnings or
at least the people who didn't seem to me out -- in fact,
I was surprised that it was as low as it was compared
to -- I mean, in general in the country, I think it's
18 percent now, 19 percent, something like that. And you
said it was 20 percent?

MR. ESCHBACH: 20.

MR. BRADBURN: So that's not such a big
difference, but -- now, I don't know what your
in-migrant -- I mean, obviously after Katrina or
something, you had a big, you know, sort of influx. But
I presume each year, you don't have that much.

So I wouldn't think the -- the refreshing
from the point of view of getting in people who were not
ineligible at the initial time would need to be done more
than once every five years or something like that, you
know, unless you have a big -- you know, another Katrina
or something like that or -- or some other --

MR. MURRAY: We have a net in migration
gain of about 2 1/4 percent per year.

MR. BRADBURN: Per year.

MR. MURRAY: High for a metropolitan area.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. That's...

MR. MURRAY: And a disproportionally high of in-migration from outside the U.S.

MR. BRADBURN: From the U.S., yeah.

So, you know, in -- in five years, you've have added, what, 10 percent --

MS. RIGBY: Okay.

MR. BRADBURN: -- or 12 percent, or something like that. So, you know, you -- it's the same problem with the long form before the ACS surveys is, you know, the -- if you are only updating every five years, then -- or the fourth year you're a little bit further out than -- but you could -- if you had a handle on what it is, you could do some weighting to correct, to some extent, for that if that's a big -- a big issue. It would depend on the content -- you know, particular content as to whether that's an important issue.

MR. KLINEBERG: Or that's if we have this cross-sectional study every year, continuing.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Well, that --

MR. KLINEBERG: That answers the question
about how the city is changing, which there's concern for
the panel study to really follow along...

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: And following one
of Norman's earlier suggestions that -- which I -- which
I approve of maybe because I'm getting older -- that
human contact once in a while is not a bad --
face-to-face contact, one on one is not a bad thing.

If you were to recruit a panel face to
face and then maintain contact by some choice of methods,
phone, Internet, or whatever for four years, but then go
back every five years, that would be an opportunity to
augment the sample at that stage at a relatively low
marginal cost.

So if you built in a -- a biyearly
face-to-face contact, that's the point at which you can
relatively easily recruit replacement or supplementary or
cross-sectional cases.

MR. GRANATO: But do you see -- do you
see a drop in response so when you do the face to face
the first year -- and I mean, that's always been the
bargain with panels is that you went right to IDD after
that. But I never followed up to find out, do you see a
drop-off, then, in response?

MR. O'MUIRCEARTAIGH: Well, I don't
think anybody has -- at least, none of the panels that
I'm involved with has gone straight to or something other than face to face. But what has happened is that an increasing proportion of the data collected are not by face to face, so -- but it's usually because it's the second best. So the interviewer says, "I just can't get this person at home. Is it okay if"... So even in GSS now, there's a proportion of interviews -- and this is for the only interview -- a proportion of the interviews that are by telephone. I can't remember what it is, but it's negotiated every year by the advisory board with NORC. And in NLSY, there's always been the possibility of telephone, but it was always considered less desirable and, therefore, it wasn't done very much. So face to face is sort of attempted for almost everybody, except the -- all these people who moved to the small town of Wyoming are phoned. It's full of people who move cross-sectional survey samples.

MR. BIEMER: Well, the SIPP (Survey of Income and Program participation) actually went to telephone every other year. And, of course, nontelephone houses are still conducted by face to face, but they would go back face to face every other year.

MR. GRANATO: And did you see -- did you see any fluctuation response?

MR. KLINEBERG: The CPS is done by phone,
except for the first and the --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: First and fifth.

For CPS, almost all interviews, apart from the initial
recruitment interview and the interview after the eighth
month hiatus, are telephone. And that's been the case
for a --

MR. KLINEBERG: A long time.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- 20 years --

more than 20 years. So perhaps...

MR. BIEMER: But if you have interviewers

on the ground, if they won't -- you know, if you can't

get them by phone, then you can always send an

interviewer out there, even though it's designated as a

telephone...

MR. GRANATO: Got you. So it's the

reverse of what Colm was saying. If it had been -- you

actually use the -- the phone as initiate and then you

go with the --

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. You try to get them

as phone, but then as a last resort you have to go out.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. Which raises your

costs, but it's still just the coverage.

MR. BIEMER: Yeah, because you want to

maintain a response rate. If you only did try to do it

by phone, then your response rate is going down.
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But CPS designed it such that the -- there's a new group recruited every month in the same locations as the existing panel. So essentially it has interviewers in every location every month. So that's where the construct is entirely exactly the opposite of what it would be if you had a telephone operation, then you wanted to try to use face to face.

MR. GRANATO: Sure.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So if you can find a way to keep interviewers in the field all the time, then you have real flexibility as long as they were saying you can either collect it from them face to face or have phone or have them do it on the Internet.

MR. GRANATO: I hear stomachs growing, so why don't we take a break for lunch. And we'll come back in about hour, and we're going to come right back to these set of issues because there's some more things that we need to discuss with this.

(Recess, 12:23 to 1:41.)

MR. GRANATO: I'd like to call this meeting to order.

What I'd like to do is pursue these design issues some more. And one of the things -- I was talking to Paul Biemer. One avenue, I think it's probably, given the infrastructure we have in the City of
Houston region, is we probably want to go the route of something called -- I believe they're called design contracts.

MR. BIEMER: Design contracts.

MR. GRANATO: And let me tie it into something else that's going on here. I mean, Norman mentioned something also to me. You don't want to start with a plan and then find out three or four years later that there's critical errors in the plan that makes you have to jettison the surveyor or -- or, you know, make you realize you made -- you're not going to be able to achieve the objectives that you want and some of the information you want.

So what I want to do in the next hour and a half or so think about designing -- have a design contract that deals with some of these issues of design. The inspiration for -- for this conference initially was the PSID, trying to design a PSID-type survey for the region, but that's not the only thing we can do here obviously. I mean, a split panel survey, for example, would be another thing. There are several things we can do.

And let's set aside for -- for a while the substantive questions and deal with the design issues and the trip wires we have to go through to -- to create
a plan and design contract that would be something that we all would be comfortable with.

So if we were to do a PSID --

MR. SCIOLI: May I interject?

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. SCIOLI: Let me ask a point question, then. I don't think it's out of sequence. But in order, typically, we have to start with the objectives. I mean, in -- in the job that I have, it's always so what are the objectives of the study and then how you -- what's the main question you want to ask, and what is the design.

So I -- I really would like to get a handle from you or from Richard about two objectives and then have these brilliant minds think about the best design that would -- you know, and nuance that a bit, tease that out. Because there are so many real -- there are people who have been in the trenches.

So, Norman, what are the objectives.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I mean, that's for the Houston folks to say.

MR. SCIOLI: No. I'm teasing you.

MR. BRADBURN: And so -- but I was going to make essentially the same point that the PSID was designed with a particular objective in mind, and it's evolved, so -- you know, but you've -- you've got to
have, at least, some broad objectives to know how to -- I
mean, to even make a handle, a start on some of these
questions, the design parameters.

MR. BIEMER: One of the things I wanted
to just say sort of in support of this idea of a design
contract was I'm thinking of the survey that I'm working
on now, this National Survey on Child and Adolescent
Well-Being, which is being funded by The Agency For
Children, Youth and Families.

You know, they -- they started out really
not having -- having an idea because it was mandated by
Congress that they should survey -- do -- conduct some
kind of survey to look at the child welfare system. It
was very broadly conceived. And they really didn't have
an idea of what this survey should do or how -- you know,
they should go about -- you know, what should the
objectives be even, other than just sort of satisfying,
you know, the letter of this mandate. But there's a lot
of ways to do that.

So they came up with this idea -- and
this is not a new idea -- of doing a design contract, and
they set that out for bid. RTI bid on that. We won the
design contract. And one of the things we did was we
convened several panels of experts, just like this panel,
to come up with sort of brainstorming what are the --
what should the objectives be for a survey like this.
Now, these were people -- you know, in a situation like
you have here, would be people who would be kind of the
end users of the data, the people who would have -- who
are stakeholders, those kind of people, to kind of
brainstorm and get all that on paper.

And once you -- once you have sort of
gotten all the parties involved and started throwing out
ideas, then you can begin to say, okay, what kind of
survey design would try to meet as best as possible all
these objectives. There's going to be conflicts. You
know, there are conflicting objectives, certainly. And
you have to come up with an -- with a design that does
sort of well for a lot of them, but not best for any
particular one of them.

And it turned out, I think it was a
useful approach for them because they were starting sort
of where you are, not really knowing -- you know, having
never done this before and not really knowing exactly
what would be the most useful thing to produce for the
research community, they wanted to get feedback from the
research community and then get the experts involved in
saying how can we best address these needs.

MS. SIEBER: Jim, one of the things that
I'm wondering about is whether you are interested in
having this data shared as a publically accessible 
resource perhaps on-line or whether you would be 
providing the data to discrete groups? Because if -- if 
it's going to be publically accessible, you're going to 
have to think about not only how to document the data for 
any sort of purpose, but also how to make sure that 
there -- that it wouldn't be easy to deductively identify 
individuals.

So -- so I guess my -- you know, my basic 
question is, should this be a public use data set that 
would be available on-line to anyone or would you control 
access to it?

MR. GRANATO: It would be publically 
used. I mean, open access.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, let me question you 
on that. Is -- as panels go on, it becomes hard -- I 
mean, the guarding against de-identification is -- is 
more problematic, which means that what you can put out 
publically -- and not that you would put anything 
publically -- but it's -- you have to mask a lot of 
things, and there are various ways of doing this.

However, there are some things coming up 
in terms of data enclaves and so forth which allow you to 
get both worlds, that is, you can have a public data set 
which -- which is, you know, somewhat higher level, some
things have been changed and so on and so forth. But you
can also have, with appropriate safeguards and so forth,
allow licensed researchers essentially to sign away their
life, ends up with -- to have access to microdata. So
it's -- you can -- can do both.

MR. GRANATO: Okay.

MR. BRADBURN: But you really have to
think a lot about what -- what you put out. And -- and
it's getting harder and I -- I -- I mean, the people are
cleverer and cleverer about how to crack, you know,
public files of various sorts. So it's -- I think my
sense is that, you know, we're moving toward more data
and data enclaves and -- and less interesting -- the more
interesting data for people to be in enclaves than what's
publically available would be less -- I mean, it will
be -- for a lot of people that they don't neat a lot of
those sort of details, but -- for scientific uses and
scholarly uses and people who really want to get into
things, you know, have --

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. There's different
levels of public availability. Because you can -- you
can say there's a public use file that's out on the web,
anyone can download it. Or another way of doing it is
people have to apply to you for usages, in which case
they have to sign certain forms which guards -- sort of
guards against their elicit use of the data and
usually -- well, we do this. We don't give the data to
anyone who is not at an organization that has an IRB and
does research. But still, you know, we have very
sensitive data because this is all about children who
have been abused and neglected and so forth. It's called
a -- it's more of a protective file rather than a public
use file, but still researchers in universities can get
the file. They just have to apply for it and abide by
the rules in terms of how to keep the data secure within
their organizations, that kind of thing.

MR. GRANATO: I mean, let me give you an
example of what we've done that's very sensitive. We've
had access to HPD, Houston Police Department, data. And
it contains officers' names, suspects' names, several
things. We are not, under any circumstances, allowed to
reuse any of that; so it's all been redacted. But
information about age and gender and offense and things
of that sort, we can -- and we are required to make it
publically accessible.

So, I guess, there has to be a set of red
flags that we have to know about that under no
circumstances can we give away, you know, a name or
something like that. Now, one feature may be address.
Is that something that's usually allowed?
MR. BIEMER: No.

MR. GRANATO: Well, because it could be location of offenses.

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: I mean, one of the big problems we have -- first, I endorse everything that Paul and Norman have said.

And the term "public use data file" has almost no meaning anymore --

MR. GRANATO: Okay.

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: -- because it can be a case of downloading the GSS data file from -- from the web, in which case you get all the data. But of course, no address information, including even part of the country through to getting all the individual data, but then under IRB protection.

So data sets that we release -- and -- and the data archive in Michigan has a whole hierarchy of levels of release for data where typically if you get individual level data, you have to have essentially your own IRB approve your use of it and have a data security plan and all that's other things that we didn't know about in the old days.

The -- one of the big problems now is that we geocode everything and -- and address -- any address in the country we can geocode, and 90 percent of
the time it will be in the right place. That's close
evenough. And from that, we can add block group data.
We've had block data. We can add block group data. We
can add track data. We can -- so putting the address in
is the same pretty much -- and I -- and I have a file of
128 million addresses, and I put a name -- a name to
them, not necessarily the right name, but a name to them.
So if you -- any of you give me his or her address, I can
find out a lot more about you -- I could find out a lot
more about myself than I know if I were to bother to do
so.
So -- so address is really almost the
same as name.
MR. GRANATO: Okay.
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Address and -- and
very simple sociodemographics give you the -- identify
someone.
MR. KLINEBERG: I would think you could
release the data without addresses. These are anonymous
names. You have a -- you have a --
MR. BRADBURN: Well, you need to be
careful have you --
MR. KLINEBERG: How do you identify them?
MR. BRADBURN: I mean, geography is -- is
a give-away for lots of things these days, I mean, ZIP
code or whatever. So you have to be very careful of
geographic data attached to files, because that really
makes it -- and -- and the thing is, it's not so much --
I mean, for years, I've always thought and most people
think about deductive closure [sic] as what you do if you
cross-tab something 500 times and find the right person,
so on and so forth, but that's not the problem anymore.

Far more, because there are lots of
publically available data sets that have names and
addresses on them that you can -- you can match in the
ways. And you can -- so you take things independent --
each independently is -- doesn't tell you anything. But
when you put them together, they tell you things that you
don't want to have publically known anyway.

And it's that -- that aspect of what
computers have done, and the problem that make the public
use data sets much more difficult to think -- and -- and
when you've got, you know, the same person over time,
then it becomes even more -- because there's more -- more
 chances that something is going to be in there that's
going to be in -- in -- in files.

I mean, I've seen some demonstrations of
this that are just, you know, hair raising in terms of
what people can find, you know, with cancer registries
and other things in terms that you would think you
wouldn't -- you know, like the person has ZIP code and a
diagnosis or something like that and, you know, they --
within a -- and the state maybe or something like that
and, you know, within a couple of hours, they can find
the individual.

MS. SIEBER: Now that data -- some data
are geocoded, you can overlay the geocoding on other data
and you can tell exactly where the person lives.

MR. BRADBURN: Right, yeah.

MR. GRANATO: Right.

MR. BRADBURN: So it's -- that's a
complicated issue. But it -- but they're -- you know,
it's not an intractable issue. It's one that -- and the
technology for understanding the dangers and ways of
doing things are -- are improving all the time.

So it's -- and NSF is putting a lot of
money into solving these problems for us. We're having
funding people who will solve them for us. So it's
not -- that's the least -- it's not a trivial problem,
but it's the least of the problems, so...

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And the good thing
about it is it's a big problem for everybody, so you're
not going to have to solve it.

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It's not going to
be one of the problems that you need to deal with.

Somebody is going to have dealt with that by the time we've dealt with the other trivial problems that you have on the list. That will be taken care of.

MR. GRANATO: We do -- since we do want to serve the community with the work we're doing, there will have to be some aspect of public access, whether it's some hybrid scheme that we have that's -- you know, hierarchical or something like that, but there has to be some level of access so that people can actually start to use it. And particularly policymakers who may find that -- especially the panels are really going to help the policymakers, that's the big payoff for these folks, perception and attitude.

MS. SIEBER: However, Jim, the policymakers are probably going to want to turn to you or some other methodologists to get them the data that they want; and there will also be a great opportunity to train people from the community.

MR. GRANATO: Right.

MS. SIEBER: So it's not like you're just sending the data out there.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

MS. SIEBER: Also, for those who want to hack in or -- that's not the right word. Those who want
to snoop and find out things they shouldn't find out,
there's a lot of costs connected with that for them. So
the question always is, is there something so valuable
that someone would to that cost.

MR. KLINEBERG: And that's what I wonder, too. I mean, it's conceivable that you could identify
the person, but would it be the effort to anybody to try
to do that.

MR. BIEMER: I think one of the issues --

MS. RIGBY: Advertisers, advertising.

MR. BIEMER: Well, one of the issues
there is what's the public perception of how secure the
data are. Because even though we say -- you know, we can
convince ourselves that there's probably no one
interested in these data, the public thinks that, you
know, hey, the data are not being kept secure; that they
may not respond.

MR. KLINEBERG: Right.

MS. JASSO: Let me just underscore a
couple of things. There is a -- a well known and growing
body of knowledge about how to handle this. And
basically you fit -- you match a set of disclosure
standards to a set of release -- a hierarchal release
schedule.

So, for example, for the New Immigrant
Survey, we have three different releases. One of them anybody can get and in -- in a matter of hours. And for that one, we disguise a lot of things. So, for example, country of origin, we don't reveal country of origin until there's more than 100 cases, et cetera, et cetera.

Some things -- in the immigrant study some things are excruciatingly sensitive. For example, if you know a person's age, country and Visa and they happen to be a former ambassador, that's -- that's it. You have given the whole thing away.

And I understand that there is really a lot of interest in -- in the information. There are a lot of people who work hard to get -- to get information they shouldn't get. And this includes divorce lawyers, this includes fundraisers in other countries, et cetera, et cetera. So -- so the -- the stricter you are in -- in -- in honoring confidentiality, the better.

MR. ACHEN: I would -- I would even say that in some instances data that are publically available, for example -- again I know the -- the voter registration files very well -- name, address, telephone number, and party registration are all on there. And actually with our public use files, those that are available to students, I've actually stripped the name and the address and the phone number out of there just
because I don't want to be on television explaining that
this is public information, because a lot of people don't
know that it is. And so, I think, bending over backwards
and letting the abuser be someone who found your files
not that helpful is -- is probably just sound caution.

MR. GRANATO: What's interesting about
some of this, too, is it's -- there's some surveys --
panel surveys, they ask you about drug use, but you get
in trouble if you ask them about their -- who they voted
for.

MR. ACHEN: Yeah.

MR. GRANATO: I mean, which seems a
little...

MR. ACHEN: Either -- either way, you
don't want to be in the newspapers explaining it.

MR. GRANATO: That's right.

MR. KLINEBERG: Okay. So the plan is to
start with 1,000 or 1,500 randomly selected Houstonians
and then follow them up with a series of questions for
over -- once every two years or something --

MR. GRANATO: Right.

MR. KLINEBERG: -- to document
experiences?

MR. GRANATO: And if someone twists my
arm a little bit more, I would say let's pick a sub --
let's pick -- I don't want to use the word PSID. But
let's just say income, let's just track -- and income
mobility. Let's track just that. We ask some questions
related to your economic resiliency, just that, a battery
of questions on that.

So maybe part -- maybe partially related
to what PSID is doing, but it has its own unique Houston
flavor. So we've got 1500 people -- are P -- are you
comfortable with that size of a panel for that type of a
design?

MR. ACHEN: For how --

MS. JASSO: Let's come back to the size,
Jim, I think, in a few minutes after we talk more about
content.

MR. GRANATO: Okay.

MR. ACHEN: And for how long.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEOARTAIGH: Okay. I just
now -- I think that Paul is -- not to -- not to preempt
our discussion here or to render it useless, but if -- or
as you go ahead with this, I think the notion of devoting
a fair amount of effort in the early stages to planning
the design is very good one. Panels are enormously
expensive in terms of what you're going to do over the
long run, and an investment beforehand could save a lot
of expenditure later and more likely would just make the
same expenditure much more valuable.

So I think there a lot of these issues
that we can touch on, but you really do want, one way or
other, to -- to make sure that you thrash these issues
out before you go in the field the first time. Because
knowing what you intend to do down the road has a lot of
impact on what you should do in the early stages in the
panel; and that's -- it's very difficult to retrieve that
information later if you haven't gotten it at the
beginning.

I mean, merely knowing you're doing a
panel changes how you end the interview with the
respondent the first time.

MR. KLINEBERG: That's right.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So when -- when we
have a panel, before we leave the household, the
interviewer will collect from the respondent -- first of
all, we tell them and also collect from the respondent
typically the names and telephone numbers and addresses
of three close friends who would know where they have
moved to should they have moved and we wanted to come
back. So we always say, "Would you mind letting us know
if you moved" but more likely we say, "We know -- we know
it would be hard for you to remember to let us know if
you move. So in case you move, could you give us the
names of some close friends or neighbors who would be
likely to know where you were so that we could get in
touch with you?" And that reduces greatly the cost of
follow-up, tracking people who have moved.

And it does two things. One it also --
one, it makes it cheaper to follow people and, secondly,
it tells them that they're in a panel, which makes it
easier when you go back to them -- and people don't mind
usually the notion that you come back in a year's time or
two year's time. That's way beyond the point at which
you think of this as a burden. And often by then, people
actually like the idea. The interview is over. You have
listened to them for longer than anybody else has
listened to them give their opinion.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTRAIGH: You seem to be
interested. You may even have given them money. And
they kind of feel like "Yeah, this is really something I
wouldn't mind doing again." So -- but all -- and then
you have a plan for keeping in touch with them. Even if
you don't go back for two years, you may send them a
report after six months or a -- a Christmas card -- not a
Christmas. I forgot I'm in the United States -- a
seasonal greetings card to -- just to remind them who you
are or give them a pen, although the danger with pens is
it makes the probability of identification much higher if
they have a ballpoint pen in their house that says "A
member of the Houston area panel," then you can find them
a lot easier. And if you don't know their--so many of
surveys, we can't give people anything where--that
carries the name of the survey because it increases
disclosure risk.

MR. BIEMER: Another--another issue is, you know, more than just figuring out what you want to
ask on the questionnaire, it's what groups within Houston
are you interested in focusing on in case you want to
oversample certain groups.

In--in this panel survey that I'm on, you know, the sample size is around 5500. But if you--
if you look at the precision that we're getting from
that, it's--it's more like 1,000 and that's because
that 5500 involves a lot of oversampling of special
groups of individuals that we wanted to make estimates
for. And--and so when you aggregate it all up,
you get--you get this design effect because of the
oversampling that's involved there.

But it took--it took a lot of experts a
long time to try to figure out--because you don't--
you don't have the luxury of oversampling every group that
you're interested in. You have to kind of decide on what
are the key groups that you want to oversample -- and
there's probably always going to be some oversampling of
Hispanics or some other group -- and try to figure out
what -- you know, whatever those groups are and how much
precision you need in the estimates and -- and so forth
is a really critical issue.

MR. GRANATO: So you were part of this
planning group leading into all this; is that right?

MR. BIEMER: Right, yeah.

MR. GRANATO: How long did it take from
start to finish?

MR. BIEMER: A year.

MR. GRANATO: A yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: In the British
Household Panel Survey 15 years or so ago we had a set of
methodology panels that met for two years before the
survey was launched to talk about these kinds of issues.

MR. GRANATO: Wow.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And one of the key
issues that came to mind, as Paul was speaking, was a
design in Houston that was interested in neighborhood
context would be different from a design that wasn't. So
if your plan was to -- to look at impact on
neighborhoods, including neighborhood observation or the
kind of video'ing that PHTCN [sic] did or -- or some
other -- talking to other informants in the community,
church leaders or community leaders, then you'd select a
sample of fewer clusters with more respondents in each of
these clusters. So you might say what we need is 20
places in Houston and this will be -- the panel will be
based on these 20 places rather than dispersing them so
that -- but that just -- that depends on whether that's
what you want to do.

MR. GRANATO: Right.
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But if you do want
to do that, then you will change the overall design of
the sample, which will have implications for the
precision of individual level estimates, but will give
you great richness in terms of community-level
information and will bring into play issues like using
the community to help recruitment. Let's say, if it is
community-based, then you can use local people. NORC
typically won't use anything like that because our -- the
density of sampling is so low in a community that it kind
of doesn't make sense to say, "We are here and we'll be
interviewing 40 people in Chicago in the next six weeks."
Sort of, it doesn't have -- have a lot of impact, but...
So these are the kinds of design issues
that really take time and expertise from different kinds
of people. So it's not just one group of people that will look at this. There will be different groups with some overlap that would look at different aspects of the design.

MR. BRADBURN: Let me just give you an example just from a simple question that you sort of say -- you say, well, the object is to follow the income distribution and so forth -- not distribution, but dynamics of income. So as a -- somebody advising on design, I'd say, "Are you interested in that for people who are living in Houston in 2009 or '10 or '08 or whatever? Are you interested in the income of people who are in these houses in Houston? Are you interested in the individuals within the houses? Are you interested in the family in the houses?"

Each one of those answer to the questions will yield a somewhat different design and have different implication for who stays in the panel as you go along, how you do the field work, the costs, and so on and so on. So even the very big, you know, sort of general obstacle -- goal like that will have all kinds of details that you have to work out when you -- when you get to the -- to the design.

So that's why there's this intimate relationship between what you're trying to accomplish
over time and -- and how you do the design. And as, I think, Paul or somebody said earlier, you know, it will be an optimizing issue. Because, you know, your first -- the first answer is "We want all of those." And -- you know, and that will be true for lots of other things.

And then pretty soon -- you know, and then as Colm was saying, "Do" you want to be able to look at Hispanics separately from African-Americans from Anglos from others, you know, from -- from who -- or people who lived here more than five years or less than five years" or...

You know, there are just large number of variables that you could think about which will affect, particularly for a given sample size, how you would draw the sample at various site, but also how big the sample size would need to be in order to, even under reasonable stratifications, give you the kind of -- of -- you know, an analytic file that would be worth and interesting to -- to analyze, so...

MR. BLAIS: I would be extremely surprised if you decided that 1500 is enough. If you expect many of the impact of this on public policy and so on to be conditional on, you know -- you must state at time one that only certain kind of groups are going to be a focus. And if you're interested in changes, my
assumption is that you would need at least 3,000.

MR. KLINEBERG: 3,000 to start with in the first survey?

MR. BLAIS: That would be my assumption.

MR. KLINEBERG: And -- and somebody else said earlier that to do this you have to start with a face-to-face interview?

MR. BIEMER: Contact.

MR. KLINEBERG: Face-to-face contact?

MR. GRANATO: I would think so.

MR. BIEMER: Otherwise -- otherwise you don't really get them committed --

MR. GRANATO: Right.

MR. BIEMER: -- if you just call them up --

MR. KLINEBERG: Can you do it by telephone?

MR. BIEMER: I mean you can, but you won't get the response rate you want.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARAIGH: I think your response rate -- your 38 percent is at the high end of regular RDD surveys. I would think that for standard RDD now, if you've got 40 percent, which is the latest one that I was involved in Chicago, we were pleased with 40 percent, not ecstatic, but we wouldn't have been
surprised by 35. So I don't think you can do much
better. And that -- you know, you are making unlimited
numbers of calls pretty much, you know, and ignore
refusals pretty much, you know, unless they're couched
in -- in litigation terms. So I don't know that -- and
starting -- starting at a level of one-third really
undermines the ability of the panel very substantially.

MR. KLINEBERG: And then do you also give
them some kind of compensation?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: This varies a lot.
I mean, we -- this, in my experience, varies depending on
the burden of the -- of the activity itself. So in
the -- in the -- IN NSHAP, which is an NIA sponsored sort
of National, Social, Life, Health and Aging Project,
which is a two and a half hour in-home experience
involving interview and collection of biotmeasures, we did
give all the respondents $100 incentive as a BASE -- our
basic incentive was $100. But that's a pretty -- that's
a pretty heavy burden. I mean, that's not -- that's not
exp -- and I kind of remembered, does GSS have any
initial incentive now?

MR. BRADBURN: No.

MR. BIEMER: We have an incentive in our
survey. I think it's 65.

MR. SCIOLI: But with the Houston study,
wouldn't be there compelling reason for the citizenry to cooperate. I mean, it depends, you know, what the purely academics study or certainly with a marketing survey, you know, why would anyone participate unless they were being remunerated. But if it were couched in terms of or framed in terms of "This is part of the Houston consortium of -- to find out blank, blank, blank. Your views are kept confidential. Your participation is essential?" I mean what -- what's the experience with the --

MR. BIEMER: I think you're right --

MR. SCIOLI: -- appealing to citizenry?

MR. BIEMER: I think you're right there.

I know that there's some literature that suggests that -- for example, the University of Michigan does surveys within the State of Michigan and they get great cooperation. They go outside Michigan, and they get less cooperation. And I think a lot of it has to do with, you know, people in -- within the state. And I think it would be the same here for the local community, the Houston community, it's a local survey, Houston -- University of Houston is sponsoring the survey. You'll probably get better corporation. How much better, I don't know that we can say.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. And the key is --
in our surveys, we get very good cooperation. And we
tell them we're coming from Rice University and people
have a vague sense, oh, there's that Rice survey. Our
problem is getting the person to answer the telephone.
That I'm talking about.

MR. BRADBURN: In a conference that ONB
sponsored some years ago, we sort of developed a rule of
thumb that you could sort of appeal to patriotism, I
think, or civic responsibility for about an hour or an
hour and a half interview which -- of -- of a fairly
interesting and not too tedious content.

If you wanted to do beyond that in the
sense if you wanted somebody to come in -- instead of you
going to them, to have them come into you or you wanted
them to give a blood sample or some other tissue samples
or whatever and so forth or take a test or do something
beyond that sort of thing, then you -- you compensate
them.

And in addition, we have -- in the GSS,
we do and, I think, some other things, too -- and this --
people worry about this. I don't know whether IRBs worry
about this. But you essentially bribe the really
hard-core refusals. And we used to -- I don't know what
we're doing now, but we give the interviewers a sum of
money that they could use flexibly.
Because it turns out, actually, that it
isn't the money itself. Sometimes the interviewers would
say, well, if I had some money to hire -- so I could hire
a baby-sitter for the respondent who has a small child
and has -- I can't interview the person because they
don't -- they can't -- the child is always sort of there
of various sorts. But if I could -- you know, if I had
$10 that we could hire a baby-sitter for an hour, hour
and a half so the mother could be free, that sort of
thing or sometimes, you know, just a gift -- some flowers
or something. You know, it depends.
So you're giving flexibility to the
interviewer to -- to do something which in that
particular case -- I mean, the -- the most famous case
was the -- you probably know about this on the -- when we
were doing the national deliberative poll, we had to hire
somebody to take care of the cows of one respondent
because she couldn't leave her cows to come. And
there we were -- I mean, there we did pay people, but...
But you know, it's -- everybody has a
particular problem. And sometimes it's just -- you know,
money will do it. But sometimes it's cheaper in a way to
do something that solves the particular problem about why
a person who would be otherwise willing to do it can't --
can't do it.
MS. SIEBER: Norman, do you typically
give cash? I -- I think checks are problematic for some
people who don't have bank accounts.

MR. BRADBURN: We give cash, yeah.

MS. SIEBER: And how about the
accounting, do you have to account to the IRS for who you
gave the money to?

MR. BRADBURN: Not at -- not at the
levels that we do. We have -- they get them -- we have
to have a receipt. I mean, they have to sign a receipt.
And that's for our internal accounting and other kinds of
things and so on and so forth. But I think we've got a
determination that we don't have to report sums of that
amount to -- to the IRS.

MS. SIEBER: What is the cutoff point? I
mean, that's been a problem for a lot of drug addiction
research where people, A, don't have bank accounts; B,
don't want to give a Social Security number --

MR. BRADBURN: Right, right.

MS. SIEBER: -- for -- for IRS
accounting.

MR. BRADBURN: Right, yeah.

MR. FRANCIS: 1099 is 1,000 bucks.

MR. BRADBURN: 1,000, yeah.

And there are -- with drug studies, there
are some legal shield law things and so forth, which
allow things that would not be permissible in other kinds
of things because --

MR. BIEMER: I just wanted to add, I
mean, André had a good point about the sample size. I
think the thing you have to think about is that, well,
when you -- if you're going to cluster a sample, which
you would if it was face to face within Houston, then
you're going to get less precision than you would if you
were just doing a -- you know, a complete sample within
the area. And so -- and then you have that within
household selection, which on top of that cuts down on
the precision.

So you could well be talking about, you
know, a design effect of two, indicating that 3,000 might
only be equivalent to 1500 selected completely at random.

MS. JASSO: To build on that and, also,
on some things that both Norm and -- and André and
Stephen have been saying, one way to think about it might
be let's begin with the objectives, progress, proceed to
what we want to know -- and Jim already has a terrific
list here, health, education, income, et cetera,
et cetera, that from which we may add or from which we
may subtract -- and, three, from whom or about whom.

And it's this about whom that -- that
Norm discussed that has enormous implications for sample size. And so an exercise that we might do could be suppose we only wanted to know income, education and health about -- and -- and just arbitrarily say, you know, some group of people who -- who are X age or they're in the labor force, et cetera, et cetera, what kind of a sample size would one need in order to make the -- the -- the estimates that everybody wants to have and as well to estimate multivariant models? What -- what sample size are we talking about? And -- and then we go from there.

MR. SCIOLI: Is this best done with an advisory committee at the outset so that the objectives are really tightly linked to the needs of the community and you involve the potential -- well, the stakeholders, those who have the -- the need? I mean, that's -- that's risky because you don't know where it's going to go. I mean, it could go into areas that are too expansive and, you know, when you start talking about the cost of the instrument and the cost of doing a study, it could scare away some of the potential contributors.

But for a study of this importance, it seems to me that you'd want to get the stakeholders involved at the early stage. So antecedent to, you know, the Center spelling out the objectives, it would be the
Center with the Endowment with the -- whoever, you know, as Willie said, there's some great topics.

Well, you know, maybe that's too many topics to start with and the objectives would just be so broad based that you'd never get anything done.

What was -- Norm, what was the original framing for PSID? I mean, when it was framed?

MR. BRADBURN: Well, it was in the context of the War on Poverty.

MR. SCIOLI: Okay.

MR. BRADBURN: And they were starting a lot of programs to abolish poverty. So, in some sense, it was to look at the kind of -- the way in which programs would operate to get people out of poverty.

But, of course, the first thing they found was that people are going in and out of poverty all the time without any programs going on and understand -- you know, understanding that dynamic much more.

The -- and then -- now, if -- if you're thinking of programatic approach, so you say, "We're going to try to accomplish these goals" -- I mean a not uncommon one among political actors of various sorts is, you know, we're going to -- we have some objective; we want to abolish poverty or we want to have everybody, you know, health insured or we want to have everybody have
access to some kind of services or so on and so forth.
And then you use the -- the surveys to try to, not just see whether that's happening, because that you can do on cross-sectional basis, but to understand what -- since these programs hardly ever work, what it is that -- or at least work in the way you think they're going to do to understand what it is that people -- the barriers that people are having or how they work or it turns out it wasn't the people you thought it was that -- that you were helping. You're helping some other group or whatever. I mean, there's lots of difference things.

But I would say if you -- I would second the idea of, you know, starting with some stakeholders of various sorts or the principal ones, and then -- and also the people who are obviously going to use it. And they sort of work in two different ways, but bring essentially doing all this together with people who know about design issues because what -- as you can just see from that little thing that I -- having people raise the questions, well, do you mean the individuals, do you mean the family, do you mean the people -- you know, people who live in these houses or whatever helps clarify for people what -- what they really are after kind of in a way.

So it's -- sort of having that kind of back and forth is very important, I think, to get people
thinking about what it is that they really want to know
and -- and -- and priorities. Because, I mean, in every
experience IS people want to know more than they can
afford. But, you know, even if they put the entire GDP
to work on it, you know, they still wouldn't get the kind
of information they really -- they think they want to
various degrees. But -- so you have to kind of work back
and forth in these kind of ways to come up with
something.

The other thing is to sort of, starting
off, I think, in some other things I've done like this,
is asking people rather than what their objectives are
and so forth, is to say, "What kinds of questions do you
want to have answered?" And -- and you can go -- and
those usually come in -- in ways that then lead to -- to
certain kind of questions about, you know, well, does that
mean -- do you mean this aspect of it or that aspect of
it or how important it that it be answered at this level
rather than that level.

MR. KLINEBERG: I have a question that
you should ask. One of the central issues in -- in
attitudes in politics today is this anti-immigrant
feelings that come from the belief that Latino immigrants
are not progressing like other immigrants have. They're
not learning English, they're not being successful,
they're not becoming American.

Our survey is we have a large enough number of Latino immigrants that we are able to compare those that have been in the United States for 9 years or less, 10 to 19 years, 20 years or longer, and it all shows a progression; but it's not following people. It's a cross-section.

I think one of the -- one of the goals ought to be to get a large enough number of recently arrived immigrants and to be able to follow them for 20 years would be a tremendously valuable and unique kind of conclusions, so... And I think we need to start thinking about those kinds of questions that Houston is especially prepared to provide a context for.

MR. BIEMER: Well, now, you're talking about a national survey because when they start here, they could go almost anywhere.

MR. KLINEBERG: That's right. And then -- and I think you would commit to following them wherever they go. And one of the things that might be interesting is what happens to people who leave Houston and do they -- compared to those that have stayed and stuff. So I think that's right. I think you would want to -- this should not be a survey that is focused on understanding Houston in quite the same way that the
Houston area survey is that does this annual study of the
year, but instead to understand the unfolding of lives
that began in Houston, most of them will stay in Houston,
but not all.

MS. JASSO: Let me just mention that --
that I think we already have part of that in the New
Immigrant Survey. And that would be fabulous because one
could -- one could compare the national group and the
Houston group.

Now, our sample in the New Immigrant
Survey, if memory serves, I think we've got about 1100
cases born in Mexico, and so a lot of them are -- are
divided between the Los Angeles area and the -- and the
Houston area, so...

MR. KLINEBERG: And these are panel
studies that you're following them?

MS. JASSO: Yes.

MR. KLINEBERG: Okay.

MS. JASSO: Yes, yes.

MR. KLINEBERG: Oh, great.

MS. JASSO: Yes. It's -- it's a panel
study, and it is indeed yielding a lot -- precisely
the -- the kind of information --

MR. KLINEBERG: And showing the same
evidence of --
MS. JASSO: Well, it's too soon here.

Except that one can already trace, for those who have been in the country several years before they become green-carders, one can already see the progression. And moreover with the children, it's astounding. The -- the -- the children tend to be perfectly fluent in English. They prefer to speak English. And the most remarkable finding is that the children of immigrants who have had illegal experience are more fluent in English than the children of parents who have not had illegal experience.

MR. KLINEBERG: How do you explain that?

MS. JASSO: Well, there -- we can tell several stories. We were talking about it last night. One of them is that they've had practice translating for their parents. The -- another is they have seen the hardships that their parents endure, and so they want to make sure that -- that they won't be in that situation.

MR. GRANATO: Could I follow-up with you, Willie, on this? You had a set of stakeholders in your survey; correct? You have -- you know, you have -- most of them are public, not private. And did you engage them early on or...

MS. JASSO: Well, see, our case was different because for 20 years there were all these
groups, both academics and policymakers, getting together at meetings and conferences and saying, "We need to know this. We need to know that. We need to answer this question or that question and we can't with the data that's available." So what would the right data look like?

So, by the time we submitted that first proposal, we already knew what the -- what that design was -- had to be, what the features had to be. It had to be longitudinal. It had to be based on a cohort because if you don't have a cohort, then you're going to get different survivorships from different -- with different mechanisms from -- from different cohorts.

We already knew that we had to interview not only the main sample respondent, but also spouse and children and, by the way, give cognitive assessments to the children and for that we're using the PSID battery, et cetera, et cetera. So we already knew all that.

By the time we got to the pilot stage, the question was, "Can it be done? And if it can be done, how can it be done cost effectively?" And then we had fabulous peer reviews, including the old fashioned that hardly happens anymore where Ray brought, you know, 20 people to Washington to interrogate the PIs and all of that honed the research design.
And so by that point, it was -- the --

the one remaining thing that we've not been able to do

because the sampling frame doesn't yet exist -- and this

echos something that came up earlier today. I forget who

brought it up -- about trying to get people as early in

the process as possible. We would like and we would like

to be able to have a cohort of people who have their

first visitor's Visa to the U.S. and then see who among

them decide to stay and do they overstay, do they become

illegal, do they transition to legal, et cetera,

et cetera. But getting that sampling frame of first-time

visitors is -- is -- remains a challenge, but I think now

it may be around the corner in the sense of three or four

years from now.

MR. ACHEN: I think it's worth thinking

another set of stakeholders, too, who may be a little bit

more invisible at the early stage and that's the

University of Houston and its stake in your having some

real academic success here. I don't know that there will

be any single identifiable person who will be the key

representatives of that, but I'm listening to people here

and I -- I think it's not as visible to the outside world

as it might be that after Texas and Texas A&M, both of

which are pretty well known, that the number three

institution is -- is the University of Houston.
And if -- if the survey works in the way that everyone here hopes it will, it will move on to topics nobody has thought of yet and that's for the future. But it might be worth thinking about some particular aspect of Houston in the way that Steve was talking about here a minute ago. You've got obviously a big advantage on racial -- racial and ethnic diversity. That's one place to exploit it. There might be others as well.

And if you have the kind of money you're hoping for, you're going to be in a pretty special situation. And a targeted attack on some bottleneck a lot of people would like to know the answer to and you -- you get it and you get prominent publications and they say "University of Houston," then subsequent rounds and subsequent applications will have, not just community support that's horribly important, but also academic credibility. And it seems to me that's an important piece of the puzzle for you, too.

MR. MURRAY: Could I pitch a little bit on the objective side from the local perspective? I think, if this survey is to go forward, we do have to keep in mind the unique aspects of this metropolitan area. Steve mentioned high growth, increasing racial ethnic diversity. There are a number of other
characteristics of the metropolitan area that pose important challenges.

We have a very unusual system of delivering local governmental services here in that we have a -- a fast growing large segment of our population that does not live in a municipality and they're effectively blocked from forming their own cities. In fact, that's the second largest segment of our population. The largest segment lives in the City of Houston, 2.2 million people. The next largest segment lives outside the city and not in any other city and generally cannot incorporate themselves. That's very important in Texas because municipalities in Texas are probably the strongest they are anywhere in the country. And counties are very weak and not able, like say Los Angeles County, to pick up the slack. So it's a unique problem. Even in Texas, no other metropolitan area has this delivery of local governmental services problem.

The old way, the city would just annex people in -- but, for various reasons, the Voting Rights Act, resistance from suburban voters, that doesn't work. And people from the City of Houston don't want to annex anybody anymore. The City is relatively prosperous. Why bring in a bunch of losers from outside?
But it's a growing problem, and it's one that would be very worthwhile over time to see this increasingly not working local governmental services and how that's impacting people's lives.

MR. KLINEBERG: So depending on the counties, Harris County takes care of them?

MR. MURRAY: Yeah. Counties in Texas can only do what they're explicitly authorized to do by the legislature. So any time they wanted to expand any kind of service delivery, they have to go to the legislature in Austin, which only meets 140 days every two years. Cities have very broad expansive power. They can pretty much do anything the State doesn't prohibit them from doing. Just almost a total reversal.

We have some unique issues like Florida, susceptibility to hurricanes. And we had a near miss here that produced a major policy disaster. Over 100 people were killed fleeing a storm that didn't hit. 60 percent, 70 percent of the population was displaced. One of the things that we need to be able to do to improve the quality of life here is convince people, "you-all can't leave the city when a hurricane approaches. That's just not possible."

And so we have some unique factors here that I think would be very worthwhile to explore over
time. Of course, this list is a great list. It's the
major issues people confront everywhere in America;
income, health, education.

But I think to really make a project like
this work for a lot of folks -- we have -- the second
largest number of Fortune 500 companies in America are in
Houston. So a lot of big business is here.

You have these big governments, the City
of Houston and others, small but interested active
community and 5 1/2 million citizens. We really need to
blend this national set of urban concerns with the unique
features in this community, I think, in part to generate
the support needed to carry out a first-rate study.

And I think there is a richness here that
we can put together good practices from other cities and
good techniques with our unique set of local problems
here that you could produce a -- a very interesting,
going project that hopefully will have legs like the
27-year project now. And, obviously, we can -- we can
play off some of the work that he's done. There's a lot
of stuff that his survey work suggests needs to be looked
at more intensively. But we have some other
characteristics of the special area that, I think, will
make it exciting to try to develop a -- a design that
will be of interest to national scholars, but
particularly of value to decision makers and citizens in this community.

MR. BIEMER: Well, does that, then, argue for, you know, selecting -- selecting the sample in Houston, if they leave the Houston, then not following them?

MR. MURRAY: I think we need a metropolitan-area sample.

MR. BIEMER: Right.

MR. MURRAY: The City of Houston, which is basically now -- boundaries have been frozen for -- well, we had one annex in 1996. But the City's boundaries are largely what they were 30 years ago, and the population has moved around. We have very high mobility here, a lot of land, a lot of new housing being constructed, no zoning in many areas; so people could easily move. And you don't have stable ethnic neighborhoods, excepting a minority of the population, the black population is increasingly moving around a lot more. So I think that that reality means we want to cast our -- our geographic unit very broadly to encompass the 5 1/2 million people who live in this -- this --

MR. BIEMER: So it would be Harris County?

MR. KLINEBERG: So the ten-county area?
MR. BIEMER: Well, no. More than Harris.

More counties.

MS. LEE: No, no, no. Parts of Houston are outside of Harris County.

MR. MURRAY: Yeah. Probably eight-county.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, is that --

MR. MURRAY: Adding a couple more that don't make much sense, but --

MR. BRADBURN: MR. BRADBURN: Well, is that the MSA?

MR. MURRAY: But effectively you need to get the large suburban counties of Montgomery and Fort Bend and Brazoria and Galveston.

MR. BRADBURN: That would be the unit.

MR. KLINEBERG: And the eight-county covers a geographical space larger than the State of Massachusetts.

MR. MURRAY: Or bigger than New Jersey, let's say. But people move around in this metropolitan area very quickly. We don't want them to move in and out of our -- if they're stay in the Houston area, in the Houston economy, we want to keep interviewing them.

MR. BRADBURN: It -- I mean, this will be a -- like apple pie, I suppose. It sounds like what you
need is some large question or -- and vision, which then
ecompasses several important next-level kinds of
question and -- but are sufficient -- is sufficiently
broad that allow you -- first of all, allow you to design
it in a way that you're comfortable with. But then as it
goes forward -- and this is what's happened to most of
the -- of the long-term longitudinal studies, they have a
core and then other -- each year or every other year or
however long you do them, you begin to explore some
topics of various sorts.

And let me, at the risk of being, you
know, a total outsider to this, suggest that, you know --
just responding to what has recently been said,
understanding which -- and at -- at the broadest level
says, what -- what is going to make Houston successful in
the next decades, the next half decade or something like
that. And then drawing kind of on our social science
knowledge, you say, "Well, what are the elements that
make a metropolitan area successful?" Well, human
capital is one; and that -- that has all kinds of -- you
know, you can define that -- define that very broadly so
it encompasses, not only education and all those sort of
things, but health issues and well-being issues and so on
and so forth, the political structure, governance,
stability of the thing and that allows you to go off in
that sort of direction and -- and a vibrant economy,
so...

And then you can look at what the kind of
economic things and that plays in with, you know, the
human capital issues and the governance issue, too. So
that gives you a kind of very broad structure that would
allow you to, I think, then to go to the next stage and
get people to -- you know, at some level, that's
probably -- you know, for many kind of people, that's --
that's -- you know, a few questions there are sufficient
to get them excited about it and then the hard work is
going to the next level and sort of saying, well, what --
you know, what are we going to do -- at what level do we
want to say about it, you know, if we're talking -- if
the unit is the -- the -- I mean, the Census Bureau has
sort of given you the unit and -- and that allows, you
know, a lot of data that you get from ACS and other
things.

And then you say things, well, in terms
of what we want to do, how discrete do we want to be
within the MSA? You know, is it geographic? Is it, you
know, political boundaries? Is it ethnic groups, You
know, whatever the big -- the big analytic blocks are
going to be.

And then within that, then you begin to
think about these -- the topics that are next in line. But those can -- don't have to be done -- I mean, some
you might want to cover every time, but then different
years you might want to go deeper into different ones,
depending on what's -- what's topical at the time, you
know, or the -- the policymakers are dealing with most --
most --

MR. BIEMER: Well, the core then would --
would -- the core then should have the longitudinal
objectives. Because if you're going to be changing
topics every year, then you lose the longitudinal -- the
ability to look at things longitudinally.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, except the topics
are not that independent so that material from the
previous years or -- or things may -- you know, some of
them would be relevant to the particular topic. I
mean -- I know I used to say --

MS. JASSO: Let me ask a question --

MR. BRADBURN: Could I just -- it reminds
me. I just realized a little while ago with something
Stephen said. He and I come to this from quite different
presumptions, because he is talking about attitude
surveys and what I keep talking about are behavioral
surveys in which there's relatively little attitudinal
component and so that's another cross way of cutting it.
Most of the examples of the things that I've talked about and so forth have been largely behavioral data of various sorts and very little attitudinal. And I think that -- you could do -- on the behavioral side, you can do more perhaps combining cross -- time may be less important for some of these than -- than if you're thinking about attitudinal issues, although even there I don't think they change that much.

MS. JASSO: All right. That's excellent.

Let me try a little twist that can fit exactly into everything that Norman just said, and the twist arises from the fact that there's budget constraints and so any -- anybody, any advisory body that's going to be thinking about this is going to have to be asking themselves "Which of these questions can be answered by a cross-section and which require a longitudinal survey?" --

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MS. JASSO: -- and then reserve for the long -- so in that spirit of how would we ask this question, I wonder if it would be useful to go back to the -- to the -- the classical idea of the purpose of a longitudinal survey and to add to what the -- the beautiful PSID example that Norm already talked about, which was that even though the fraction poor may be the
same, it's different people who are poor.

To add to that, from the perspective of
the data user, the reason we love longitudinal data is
that one of the biggest problems in learning about human
behavior is that when we try to set up and estimate an
equation, there's usually a correlation between our
explanatory variables and the unobservable errors. This
biases everything. We can't have confidence in -- in --
in the results.

And so statisticians figured out that one
way -- one way to get around this is if you had
longitudinal data, then you essentially could control for
the time and variant components of the unobservables.
It's another way of saying that respondents are their own
controls. So for any -- to answer any question in which
the equation would have this type of error regressor
correlation or any kind of simultaneity, then for such
time we would clearly want longitudinal data.

We would also want longitudinal data any
time that we want to distinguish between age period and
cohort effects. So if people are getting healthier or if
people are earning more or less or whatever they are, is
it because of how old they are or how long they've been
in the labor force or because they were born during the
Depression or during World War II, et cetera. So for any
question like that, longitudinal data.

And so by -- by meshing the big questions, as Norm had outlined them, with when do we need longitudinal data, then we can -- I think we can conserve sources and leave for the cross-section anything that can be answered by cross-section.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I'm a little more concerned, though -- I -- I was very interested in both the points that Richard -- both Richard and Stephen made about interesting questions for Houston, but unfortunately they implied entirely different designs for the panel.

And I think this is -- one had to do with the trajectories of individuals in which case we know that you want a panel of individuals over time, and the other had to do with the trajectories of neighborhoods or -- to take the specific question of delivery of services to the unincorporated parts of Houston. There you don't really care about individuals. You care about the neighborhood and that's the point that Norman made at the beginning that we talked about before, is it a panel -- is it place panel or is it person panel, not just a person panel or a family panel?

So I think it's really important to define it in terms of the kinds of things that our
colleagues have mentioned. In other words, it should be a Houston study and not -- and it should be interesting to Houston and take advantage of the -- in a -- in a nonbenevolent way of the -- of the problems that Houston has or the -- the challenges that Houston has to tackle.

But there really is a fundamental difference between the place and -- and the person or the family. And there's a difference even between the person and the family, but that's sort of more manageable in a way than the difference between the place panel and the -- and the person panel. And it may be that, once you have outline the problems, it will turn out that it isn't -- that a panel is not the answer or it's a particular kind of panel that's the answer; and that, I think, is a much more important question than -- than the sample size question, which is purely technical question.

I have undertaken a lot of sample size estimation problems in my -- in my life and taught other people to do the same thing in the tradition of perpetuating pointless activity. And I have never yet had a problem of that kind where the answer wasn't as big as you can afford, if not bigger. You know, there just is no -- there is no -- I don't know what anybody else has had. But I've never had -- never -- answers never come out smaller than we could afford.
So essentially, once you have the design right, if you get more money, you can do more of that better. I mean, you can have more subclasses, for example. So instead of just having an estimate for all of Houston, you can have a separate estimate for different sociodemographic and ethnic groups in the city.

So I think the key question really is the design question as to whether your target is the city, the place, or the people; and that's what's going to determine whether you really do want the panel of people or a panel of housing units or a panel of tracts or a panel of parcels. I mean, there's -- a perfectly respectable panel survey would be -- well, maybe there are no land parcels in Houston since there's no zoning, maybe. But many places have identified parcels of land and maybe you just want to see what happens to these parcels of land over time. That gives you a dynamic picture of the community that's different from and, in some ways, more useful than any other kind of panel.

MS. RIGBY: May I ask a question about that? Is there a -- I mean, is there a compromise there where you could have an individual panel, but it could be stratified by people living in Houston, people living in unincorporated areas?

MR. O'MUIRCHEAR'TAIGH: Absolutely.
MS. RIGBY: And then you could weight it back up if you wanted to average Houston and you could compare those three.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That is, I think, the point that Paul was making earlier. So stratified, of course, but disproportionately stratified --

MS. RIGBY: Yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- so that -- so that you really do focus on having 200 Asians, for example, which you'd never get in an equal probability sample without having an enormous sample, or 700 or whatever the number is and an equally disproportionately sample the nonmunicipality areas of Houston. So that certainly does do that.

But -- but then the panel issues arises that if they leave there -- so you have oversampled people currently living in these areas. And if they happen to be disproportionately mobile, then you have a very small sample of people living in these areas a bit down the road. And the reason you've oversampled them was because they were in these areas, so there's this conflict between -- in the design between which of these two you really want to target.

MS. JASSO: And then from the point of view of analysis, there's the difficulty that that's been
a choice and so there's endogeneity. And -- and you're very limited in what you can say when you -- when you analyze the data. So it's -- there are pitfalls all around.

MR. BLAIS: I assume that what you're interested in is the impact of changes in public policy on changes in individual behavior.

MR. GRANATO: Intervention, right.

MR. BLAIS: If that is the case, I -- I would assume -- and that successful, you know, parallel is extremely essential for this kind of analysis. So if that is the purpose, I -- I would assume that you would want to look at policies where would you expect changes and also policies in which there are different changes within Houston so that -- so that's -- I think that's where you completely get real leverage.

If you expect changes in policies -- different changes in policies within the same community and you would see how, you know, individuals in these settings react differently because, you know, you have the control group, if you like, no change in policy, and people who can observe the status quo when it comes to behavior and you can compare with the other group or even people moving from one place to the other. I mean, that's the kind of scenario where, I think, you can get
greatest leverage. So if you have any indication about the kind of policies you where you expect changes and differential changes within the community, that's where I would go.

MR. GRANATO: And let me confuse things more because I'm an expert at confusing things. Apparently, the discussion right now, in my mind, has been mostly about an omnibus survey, a large panel and you focus on a few things.

What you're talking about, André, is -- is more linking up with Steve's survey where he has this -- he's got a cross-section of the area and over time you see something flaring up, whether it's an environmental quality issue or -- or crime or something. That's when this intervention that the panel can be targeted just for that specific type of -- it could be geographically centered, for example. It could be dealing just with crime. So a focused panel that links with him is a different breed, than -- I think it would be more difficult to do interventions in this omnibus thing. So if we were to do that, I think the -- I think you called a split panel design.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Uh-huh.

MR. GRANATO: I think that's what you do for those type of things.
MR. ACHEN: And short-term rather than longitudinal?

MR. GRANATO: Right. And, again -- and, in fact, that was -- when we first started talking about this last fall, the concern about the PSID -- I'm just using PSID as an example.

I mean, that type of long, long-term design was, in this area, of course, is sample attrition. So what people thought an alternative was exactly that, link up with Steve's study, keep and target the interventions and keep them much shorter in duration so you guard against the attrition issue. And it's much less risky in that sense. It's not as grandiose as the big, big thing we'd be doing; but it gives you something very, very targeted and it runs less risk and it's going to be cheaper. So that --

MR. BRADBURN: I don't know that it'd be cheaper if -- if -- because if the biggest cost is starting it and if I understand this sort of thing, you'd be starting one every five years or four years, I mean, so you'd have more startup costs than you would in the longer term panel of various sorts.

MR. GRANATO: Oh. I was thinking just strictly on crime, so it's just for five years and it stops.
MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. But -- so then
after that you do something else, and so you've got to
start. So in 10 years you've done two startups rather
than one.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It's actually even
worst. In 10 years, you'd have done one because you
won't get money for the second one, you know. And I
think -- it's really an issue. How often can you
generate the local stakeholder enthusiasm to fund a
Houston area panel; right?

Now, you won't be able to do that every
year. You know, you might be able to do it now and set
up a process that can then continue. It's much easier
with a successful panel to get continuing funding than it
is to say, "We did it with crime in 2008 and now we have
a great idea. We want to do it with housing in 2011,"
right? That's a whole new sale you've got to make, you
know.

So if you really want to track what
happens to the Houston area over the long-term, you want
to set up a robust instrument that all you have to do is
maintain rather than something for which you have to
generate all of the entrepreneurial and political
goodwill to get it started, so...

MR. GRANATO: Is there sufficient
flexibility in that type of design to allow for the interventions?

MR. O'MUIRCHEAIRTHAIGH: Sure.

MR. GRANATO: Okay.

MR. O'MUIRCHEAIRTHAIGH: I mean, if you want it to be flexible, then that's -- it's a trade-off. You're going to have to lose something else. But you can, for example, make it a place panel in which you are willing to switch your attention from one place to another at different times, and so you can -- you could design a panel which is over the whole Houston area and then only go to certain places at certain times.

So some people you go back to in any case. A core you go back to every two years. But every so often, you intensify what you're doing in particular parts of it because of some specific topic. So it's kind of a hybrid.

MR. KLINEBERG: But these would still be people who were in the panel?

MR. O'MUIRCHEAIRTHAIGH: Right. They were, at least, initially recruited in your grand panel or their -- at least, their places were. This is easier if you take -- make it a housing unit panel because then that's what you're going back to. You don't have to keep in touch with the people, who 10 years down the road if
you haven't been in touch with them, are going to be
gone. But at least you have set your basic design, and
you have it and nobody has it. So the marginal costs of
doing these short-term panels is much lower for you than
it would be if you were trying to start it up again.

MS. JASSO: That's a wonderful idea for a
sit-com, by the way. So that could generate funds. Go
back to these -- I have this address. Long before you
lived here, somebody was here.

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: And I think -- you
know, I mean, you could spice it up, of course, by having
short segments on sampling and nonresponse and...

MS. JASSO: Sure.

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: I'm sure it would
be a big success.

MR. SCIOLI: Did you mention late night
TV?

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: Maybe for sweeps
month, you could have waiting.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

MR. SCIOLI: Question order, how about
that one?

MS. JASSO: Well, the possibilities are
endless.

MR. ACHEN: There are some interesting
questions, it seems to me, that a longer term panel would really be extremely useful for. One of them is this question of Latino immigration and -- and long-term assimilation and so forth. And there's just, you know, as Willie's been saying, no substitute for following people over time.

The other one that occurs to me because of my being a political scientist is whether the Latino vote -- one of the things that's worrying Republicans and some of my students is what's going to happen to the -- to the Latino vote if -- if it goes the way the African-American vote has gone, Republicans will have to get two-thirds of the white vote to win elections and they're never going to do that. So they're very concerned about this. And, of course, the Democrats are, too.

And Houston is actually kind of a cockpit for this, because unlike the rest of Texas which has gone from being reliably Democratic to reliably Republican in national studies, Houston has got some -- been bouncing back in some ways, and the Democratic party is a little stronger than anybody thought it was going to be 20 years ago. So, again, following we -- we just don't have any long -- any longitudinal surveys of -- of voters anywhere.
Now, you'd have to face the fact that 10 years from now, the people you'd be talking to would just be the people who had been in Houston 10 years and that's not a random sample of the population. And so you'd want to supplement with people who have gotten here more recently and so on. You can't do, you know -- the point is obvious.

But to be able to talk about the pattern of, you know, people who may have voted twice for George Bush and then drifted or not drifted and over time that -- there is, you know -- there is no data set, to my knowledge, anywhere on the face of the earth that has the same respondents for three national elections in any country, and that is a hole. And so I'm sure there are lots of other examples of this kind of people in other subfields can think of.

But it still seems to me especially where we have -- where you have Steve already doing the -- the cross-section stuff that there's a -- this might not be the only thing you did, but a longitudinal survey that ran a while some bloody place that was interesting is, it seems to me, a huge opportunity.

MR. FRANCIS: Well, I don't see why you couldn't ask those questions in the cross-sectional survey. I mean, people could usually generate who they
voted for in the last two elections.

MR. ACHEN: They can generate it --
MR. BRADBURN: Not very accurately.
MR. ACHEN: -- but not accurately.
MR. KLINEBERG: The classic, after

Kennedy's election.

MR. FRANCIS: Everybody voted for him?
MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.
MR. BRADBURN: After -- after the Regan

election, the post-election, Michigan voter election
study wouldn't have thought he got elected. Because
all -- all the Regan Democrats then refused to -- or
didn't admit that they voted for him.

MR. MURRAY: You get pretty good data if
we ask people -- you know, the standard party ID question
and then say, "Within some time frame, did you always
think of yourself as an Independent or Republican?"

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.
MR. MURRAY: They're pretty good at that.

They're not so good at telling who they voted for.

MR. BRADBURN: No. I mean, the GSS asks
who you voted for in the last three elections. And if
you use that then to go against -- compare that with what
the election was, it's way off.

MR. MURRAY: McGovern actually tied
Nixon. We just didn't realize it.

MR. BRADBURN: I think Nixon lost.

But -- but another selling point for a long-term one potentially -- and then, again, if you're clever about your content is -- you might well pick up trends that aren't apparent and are on a -- but if continued would cause problems. They may be trends that -- that don't at the moment rise to the level that is -- are seen as -- need to be on the political agenda or something like that, but you can see that they're going in the way that if they continue are going to be problematic. And though our political system's ability to deal with things before they become a crisis is pretty small, you know, you just hope it's -- a turn on that -- that data are going to -- you're going to help inform public policy. Anyway.

MR. MURRAY: Another good aspect of a longitudinal study here would be to get in the Robert Putnam mode of social connectedness. Houston probably is going to score low on that because so many people moved here and they don't have a traditional church, they don't have family. So how are people over time, are they becoming socially connected and does that seem to have any significant behavioral consequences? But it seems to me, there again, you really need longitudinal data that's
following specific individuals over a long time frame
because we would almost certainly start very low on a
metropolitan comparison of people at any given point in
time having a significant level of social connection
here. So what happens to them as they are here longer.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. Because 20 percent
are first-generation immigrants.

MR. MURRAY: And our biggest industry
remains energy. We're not as dependent, but...

That means that a lot of our very upscale
workers, of course, didn't grow up here. Interviewing
some people at big companies a few years ago and they
said, "Hell, we don't care about how fragmented the
community is. If you want to work in our industry, you
have to come to Houston because we're it." So we can get
the best graduate from the University of Michigan if
they're a petroleum engineer or -- or whatever. So, you
know, pure economic incentives are so powerful. But
those people, just like the new immigrants, don't have
any social connections when they arrive here. They came
here because they can make $175,000 a year. And so we
have got a lot of these socially, not well connected
people top to bottom.

MR. BRADBURN: But as the -- I mean,
again, you can get this survey in terms of time. As the
economic base of Houston changes and maybe moves -- you
had mentioned biotech-type technology and other things,
that's going to change the -- the kinds of people who
come and that may then change the things like, you know,
other amenities of the city which -- because there you
may have more competition for other centers for -- for
those industries, not the kind of drawing power that
energy or the oil industry has here. Or even as the
energy industry changes, that you may get more
competition for -- in different types of -- of companies,
which would require a different kind of mix of people and
there may be more competition there, so...

But, you know, again, if you were
thinking in these sort of larger terms about the dynamics
of a -- of the economy and the social connectedness and
the whole human capital and that sort of thing, then --
then you could have a -- the study could contribute to
those -- understanding those interconnections and trends.

MR. BIEMER: Jim, I have a question. You
mentioned this morning the Detroit area survey, and then
you said the Los Angeles County has a survey?

MR. BRADBURN: Metropolitan area.

MR. BIEMER: Metropolitan area. What --
are they longitudinal? I know the Detroit wasn't
longitudinal.
MR. BRADBURN: I don't think Lamas' was.

MR. GRANATO: Actually, when I first proposed this idea to Norman, I think you told me you had not heard of one that had been done; right?

MR. BRADBURN: No. I don't -- No, I don't know any --

MR. GRANATO: Metropolitan.

MR. BRADBURN: -- metropolitan area study that's a longitudinal study.

MR. GRANATO: Right.

MR. BIEMER: I guess -- and a question in my mind is why is that? I mean, has no one found the need for longitudinal data at the -- at the --

MS. JASSO: Because people move a lot.

MR. GRANATO: That was -- that was the -- when we talked about this last fall, we initially thought about -- you know, the inspiration for all of this was a longitudinal survey, and -- and then there was questions, "Why not anywhere else?" And the answer was exactly what Willie said, the out-migration, the -- the sample mortality because you're -- we talked about earlier this morning, geographical area constraint, not -- so you lose folks.

But it sounds like what I'm hearing earlier today, we may -- that's not as devastating a
threat as it might be the case.

MR. BRADBURN: Now, I -- I think that's partially true, but I -- I suggest another reason. If you -- I mean, just if you look empirically at the -- all the -- the longitudinal studies that I mentioned of various sorts, they are -- their focus is around two different -- either a group that has a natural process of change, that is, aging, education, moving from education into the work force, and aging of various sort of things, deteriorating health or something like that; that it is a trans -- they're studying a phenomena that is inherently transitional.

The other type were event driven and, in a way, PSID is sort of event driven. None of them are place based. The nearest place based one, I think, is the Chicago Neighborhood Study and that's only -- that's not -- it's only accidentally placed based because it's really focused on -- on criminal -- you know, on socialization into criminality is what it was really about. But because they thought the -- the neighborhood context was determinate -- or, at least, largely determinate if all that happened, it got -- but it's -- even though there's a lot of neighborhood connections and so forth, I don't think people are studying the change in neighborhoods. It's -- it's the synthetic cohort of kids
who are raised in these neighborhoods or moved to other
neighborhoods, and their -- their involvement with the
legal system. That's the focus of the attention of
various sorts. So.

I don't know any study that takes the
gEO -- or an MSA or a geographical unit and so forth
and -- and the change that goes on in it, so to speak, as
the focus of attention.

MR. O'MUIRHEARTAIGH: Isn't it also the
case that it's clear who would have funded such a study.
Now, national studies are funded by national agencies.

If a -- if a city comes forward with a
plan, I'm sure that NSF would say, "Well, why -- if we do
it in Houston, we're going to have to do it in at least
the three bigger and the three smallers. That'll be
seven of them. Maybe, you know, 723 of them. So there's
no -- you know, this is just not a possibility for a
national organization to say "We're going to take one
city and devote all this."

And I think the academic world has been
generally more disrespectful of place than it is of
national so that, you know, you have data only from
Chicago or only from Houston whereas somebody else has
data from the country that -- that seems to have much
more heft as social science evidence. This may be quite
wrong, and I might arguing that this is quite wrong.

MR. BIEMER: Unless there's something unique about Houston that attracts researchers outside of Texas.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But even that statement just betrays this national orientation. There's just -- unless there's something -- of course there's something unique about Houston. I mean, there's also something unique about Chicago.

But, I mean, there may -- there may not even be anything unique about the United States apart from the fact that it contains Houston and Chicago. So these artificial states are seen as much more relevant both for funding, and we've had very little spatial analysis in the social sciences. I mean, we've really been very backward in linking space to data.

So we're happy are individual-level data because we know how to deal with that, linking -- multilevel modeling is really quite knew in terms of incorporating measurement of different levels. And, I mean, you're one of the few people I know, Paul, who's had any interest in spatial analysis and in using context for -- for data. Geography has not been an -- an equal partner in social research, and -- and I think that's why people haven't had the idea because they're not looking
at it. But it seems to me in many ways to be much more
fruitful as a -- as a basis for social science research
than -- than artificial countries.

The United States is an article official
country. It's a -- you know, it's not clear that that's
a good sociological unit. Houston seems to be a much
more interesting and defensible unit than the whole
United States.

MR. GRANATO: General Santa Ana might
disagree with you.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I'm hoping he will
disagree with me, otherwise I wouldn't be making a
contribution and will probably be wrong.

MS. LEE: And, you know, I like the point
of Houston being unique in some ways. But I think if we
can think of Houston as a lab, sort of the unique
opportunity then to inform the rest of the country.

We do a lot of map restudies in my lab,
and Houston is incredibly diverse, if you consider, you
know, the larger Houston, not just the City of Houston.
Even just Harris County in terms of its mix of urban
designs, its mix of socioeconomic status, its
neighborhood level, and then the mix within those two, if
you plot those against each other. So I don't know. I
like that idea a lot, including the geography, but then
thinking of this unique opportunity as Houston is sort of the lab that's been generalized to the rest of the...

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: World. I mean, it shouldn't stop at ordinary --

(Laughter.)

MS. LEE: It's all here.

MR. ACHEN: It's worth remembering that the very first study Norm mentioned this morning was the Elmira study.

MS. LEE: Right.

MR. ACHEN: And there's probably something unique about Elmira, but maybe none of us knows what it is. It was quite a small town. What has made that book so important over the years is partly the tremendous talent of the people who did the study. But in addition, I think, of reading that, you get a real sense of what the labor unions were there, how strong they are, how the communications patterns worked.

The people who worked on that actually knew the town, and the same thing will happen here is; that people who will work on this really, really know Houston, and it -- it gives that study a richness that -- that the big random national samples just valuable as they are lack.

So I don't see the restricting it to
Houston as a -- I see it as an opportunity, and the fact that other people aren't doing it isn't necessarily a reason to not pick up the benefit of doing it.

MS. LEE: I would agree with that, and I would also hazard to guess that the way things are going in Houston may be a snapshot of what is going to happen in the future in the United States. You know, the demographic -- dramatic demographic shift is not just in Houston. It's happening all over the United States. And if we can get a handle of it here, maybe that then can inform what will happen, you know, wherever -- wherever it is wherever things play first. Now it's happening in Houston.

MR. BIEMER: I think what Colm says is true, though, that making that argument to a Federal funding organization is going to be a tough sell.

MS. LEE: It's a silver pen. It's right here. Anything is possible.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But the first time it's easier, you know. So, I mean, so at least if you're the first entity to make this argument, then it can be argued this is worth funding because it may -- it points the way. But the fifth will have the hard time, but the first can really have a -- a shot at it, it seems to me.

MR. BIEMER: But are you saying then --
I -- are you saying that -- I picked up some -- something that in what you said that indicates that this maybe should be a place study; that we should be tying -- tying the -- the unit to geography rather than individuals who could move anywhere.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. I think -- I think that one of the things you have to do is to decide when you're going to let people go, you know. So I don't think you can afford to follow people into the whole country and the world. You know, I think that's just not practical. You can do some tracking, so you can follow with phone interviews just to find out approximately what -- are they in jail, have they become CEO of JP Morgan or whatever. So what's their trajectory.

MR. ACHEN: Bear Stearns.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It's a sequence really. Usually you become CEO first. It's possible that you might go the other way.

MS. LEE: Yeah. And Houston seems to have this sort of this -- this sort of strange situation where you have more people coming in than going out, right, so that's maybe less of a concern than following them. And also within, there's a lot of mobility.
People are moving around in their neighborhoods.

MR. KLINEBERG: Within the -- within the Houston area.

MS. LEE: Right. And from a -- you know, I do a lot of this disparity work. And if it is true that people sort of go in and go back out again of poverty, maybe that's part of it, is they are sort of moving to where they have to be. You know, the immigrants move into their initial neighborhood of same language, and then move to another neighborhood when they are able to do so because they've acquired the resources in terms of language and skills and citizenship or whatever it is, you know, that you need. And so I think, you know, in that sense, it's a great dynamic opportunity.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: And Karl will be able to tell us how far people are likely to move further -- you know, if you take the whole eight-county area or 13-county Chicago metropolitan area, whether that encompasses most of the movement. Most movement is relatively small -- short and eventually you catch almost all of it without going -- it may be that in Houston that eight-county area really does cover most of the movement people would have, apart from, I guess, going to college. There are certain lifetime transitions when presumably
we've got bigger moves.

MR. BIEMER: Let me ask the question a little differently. But what -- what -- what about the idea of just tying it to a housing unit, so that the housing -- whoever lives in that housing unit is in the sample. When they leave that housing unit, the next people who move in, the next family that moves in is the -- is now in the sample. Sort of what the CPS does. And that way --

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: And that's what we do in -- in the Making Connections Study is a sample of housing units.

MR. BIEMER: Right.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: We also follow families, but the panel is a panel of housing units with -- and then a refresher of new housing units. And I guess in Houston would be --

MR. BIEMER: There's no following of anyone.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: But we do always follow -- interview whoever is in that housing unit at each of the time periods that we go there.

MR. BIEMER: Right. Now, why -- why wouldn't that work for the objectives that are being contemplated for this?
MR. KLINEBERG: Because you're not following the same people. You're not able to obtain --

MR. BIEMER: Well, I know. But you're still getting information about communities change over time.

MR. KLINEBERG: The question is, is your unit of analysis a neighborhood and that's what you want to track.

MR. BIEMER: That's the question.

MR. KLINEBERG: And that's a lot like tracking the city by -- by cross-sectional thing or do you want to take advantage of this opportunity to follow the lives of people over time?

MS. LEE: And, I think, that Houston is too dynamic. Now, if we think back to when you started your survey, my block that I live on here in Houston was comprised of single-family homes, freestanding homes, you know, detached, I guess, is what they call that. And now my block that I live on is all these town homes, shared homes -- like shared sort of building space attached, I guess, is the word. And it's totally different units, different structuring.

You know, the map from 20 years ago, if you look at the aerial view, it's very different looking than the one you look at now. And I think that that is a
real challenge to the linking to the households, I mean, depending upon how long we want to go, but I think there's -- it's a much more temporal sort of housing structure, not always. I mean --

MR. KLINEBERG: It's interesting. It's just a different kind of study, so we've got to think about it.

MS. LEE: Yeah, it is.

MR. BIEMER: I guess that's the question I'm trying to raise.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean, you can follow most of the people without traveling very far in our experience, you know. But there are data on this course elsewhere. But you can follow most households with the same field force because they're close enough. A lot of people move just a block or two, and they move within the neighborhood. Most people stay in the same city within county attire and then after that I don't know what happens.

MR. BRADBURN: I -- I don't want to keep picking up the differences between the Stephen's approach and mine, but his last remark did suggest one of the differences. Because if you are thinking about attitudes is what you're dependent variable is, then having the same individuals is very important because they're the
ones that carry the attitude.

But if you're thinking about what the behavior of a system is and how things are distributed and the dynamics of it, it's more -- it's not the same people necessarily. It's the characteristics of the people who happen to be in the places that you are studying and their relationships to one another or to the economy or to whatever and so forth. But that's a different, you know, set of research questions really.

MR. KLINEBERG: Both very interesting.

MR. BRADBURN: And it means -- but they lead to different designs and different kinds of issues.

Let me, I just -- in thinking about the lack of this anyplace else, which is one of its perhaps greatest attractions is the uniqueness of it. If you think about the uniqueness of it, but why it's particularly valuable that it's unique and why other people haven't gotten onto it before, I think one -- a little bit I know about Lamas and the Detroit-area study and an effort in Chicago, which came and went, for -- for a successful longitudinal study, you need a commitment of funds for a longer period of time typically. So it's easier if you don't know -- you know, if you only have funding for a couple of years or something, it's easier to do cross-sections because if -- if you -- you don't
have a big investment in it, I mean.

And you alluded -- it sounded as if the
funding for your study is problematic from year to year.
At least, probably some -- from some years it's been
worse than others and so on and so forth. But if you
don't have a long-term commitment in a way, then to put
the investment -- because it's the up-front investment
that's the -- you know, the planning, the recruitment,
that's the big expense in a way.

And then carrying it on is less expensive
than all the other up-front things. And if you don't
think you're going to have -- be able to carry it for,
you know, a sufficient length of time, it really is
not -- it's not worth the -- I mean, it's hard to
motivate people to put all that effort into it.

MS. SIEBER: As we talk about long-term
financing of this, one of the issues that comes up for me
is what ideas can you most easily sell to businesses
and -- and to other local organizations that will
contribute. And it seems to me, in part, it's going to
be an effort to sell the survey if there is an
interest -- I mean, creating an interest in the life
stories of individuals may be a little harder to sell
than creating an interest in what is happening with
communities.
MR. KLINEBERG: Very good point.

MS. SIEBER: But if we -- if we really want to do individuals, maybe we can be very creative on how to sell that idea.

MS. JASSO: Well, I think the approach is you use the longitudinal data in order to get a reliable answer to the question. Then you tell the story as it fits about -- about the -- the -- whatever it is that that suitor will most like.

MR. KLINEBERG: But it is true that it's easier for me to fund my survey every year in Houston because that's telling us what's happening in the city. These are issue that much more of interest to sociologists and psychologists and political scientists watching this process unfold in people's lives, and that's where we would need some national -- national support, I think. And we'd have to figure out how to -- how to make that happen even if our focus is on Houston. But I think -- I think that --

MS. JASSO: For example, the question, "How are immigrants doing," you really can't answer it without longitudinal data.

MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. No, I said you can get some -- some of that.

MS. JASSO: Yeah.
MR. GRANATO: One thing, we have an organization called The Greater Houston Partnership, which a big concern is work force training in this area of human capital, so it fits like what you were talking about before. And we've not approached them about all about this. We haven't talked to anybody about this yet, but it's possible to do something along those lines. They're also concerned about energy conservation and some other things which again fits into a pan -- you know, there's a way to do that as well, especially if one of the things that's being discussed is having certain instrumentation put in certain households in certain areas and not in others. And so you can do -- again, you know, the spatial issue, you could actually see if there's a change in consumption patterns in one area and not another over time. But there are some -- that entity, GHP would be, I think, interested once we had a plan.

MS. SIEBER: There's a topic that I'm going to talk about a bit more when we get to human subjects issues and that is that there is a distinct disadvantage to taking Federal money. If you can persuade your IRB to uncheck the box that says that Federal -- that any study will be supervised like a Federally funded study, if they'll uncheck that box on
their assurance then you have much more freedom to do things without the IRB hovering over you. So there's a disadvantage to Federal money.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARBAIGH: I've always welcomed it personally, Federal money.

MR. GRANATO: Green.

André, you want...

MR. BLAIS: I just want to mention one, I guess, kind of question -- research question that I think is quite important for us, I guess, as social scientists and I think would be very trusting, I think, to the business community for instance; and that's the formation of expectations about where the city is going. And this is -- this is a huge question, I guess, you know, at this point, how do people form expectations.

And a longitudinal study is crucial in trying to determine exactly how to form these expectations and how these expectations change over time, and I suppose that the kind of questions that the business community will be very eager to understand because they have to think about investments in the future and, you know, expectation -- you know, citizens expectations about where the city is going.

MR. GRANATO: Well, I mean, that's a -- as a basic research question, it's huge because it's
definitely -- my expectations take hold in economics and
they've -- they've done wonderful things with that. But
in the other, social sciences hasn't taken effect yet.
So this type of design may feed into political and social
modeling that actually starts to create analogs for
expectations, and now you've got the data to test it.

MR. BLAIS: And the business community is
also interested in these kinds of questions.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

MR. ACHEN: Just learning in general, I
think, is something that is -- I would guess would be
quite important here locally whether you want to call it
that or not is another question. But you've got this
huge number of immigrants and many from other countries
and how they're getting attached to the political system,
how they're getting attached to different religious
denominations. There's been this recent discussion about
how immigrants become more religious after they get here,
for example. Again, a longitudinal study would allow you
to look at all of those.

MR. GRANATO: Why don't we take one last
break. We'll come back. Take a break for about 10
minutes and we'll finish up at 4:30. But come back in
about 10 minutes.

(Recess 3:27 to 3:49.)
MR. GRANATO: Okay. We're in the final stretch. Secretariat is in the lead again.

David Francis, wants to lead off.

MR. FRANCIS: So just listening to the conversation so far to this point, it seems clear to me from our previous conversations as group that there are questions that we will want to answer from this panel study that will focus on individuals and that there will be questions that will focus on places. And that both of these -- inferences about both levels are actually of interest to us.

And so my question is, aren't there ways to design the sampling that would allow us sufficiently to get at, you know, for instance, at both levels?

MR. BRADBURN: Well, it depends on what you want to say about individuals and how -- and how you conceptualize the individual. Paul and I were talking about this, even if you -- if your sample unit is the dwelling unit, the data you're getting is from individuals. I mean, pretty much all this is your -- you're always getting -- so you can be saying something about individuals. It's -- it's -- but they're -- but they're -- they're the individuals who live in those houses and that's different from individuals, per se, so to speak.
Now, you can -- you know, again, it depends on your resources. Obviously, you can follow, at least, for some limited amount of time or if you've got large resources for long periods of time, the -- both. That is you can stay with the people who are living in the units, and you can follow the people who are out of the units, but it becomes much more expensive relatively quickly.

At lunch I think we were talking about one way of compromising that is -- and when people move out, you do one like exit interview with them to follow, to see why -- why they left, where they went, you know, things like that. So that becomes a -- a kind of thing. And that makes sense if what you're studying is a place -- you know, what we are calling place based. That is, if you want to understand the dynamics of a particular metropolitan area or city, that -- that makes sense.

If you want to study the people who -- like immigrants or you want to study people who grew up in Houston, let's say, or some -- some other characteristic such that they carry it around with them, but over time they will spread out, then you're going to -- you want to follow the individuals.

But if you want to say something about
the area and the people who live in it, then it seems to
me you stay more focused on the -- on the dwelling units
as the stable element.

Rebecca just mentioned something. A
study I had completely forgotten about, which is a -- it
actually is a longitudinal study, and it's placed based.
It's the Almeida County study in the Bay area, but
that -- that just focuses on health issues. And I don't
know the design of that. As I suspect, they stay with
people who are in -- living in the county because they
want to relate it to the supply of -- of healthcare and
things in the county and other kind of things that go on
in the county. But that is one that is both kind of
place based, but it's -- it is -- has a focus on only one
of the -- the areas that one -- that we've been talking
about. But it would be worth looking more at design
issues about that one just to see how they handle some of
these issues.

MR. FRANCIS: Well, can -- so we -- can
I -- so if we were interested in both kinds of things,
would it be more efficient to just augment the Houston
area survey to get at neighborhood information and just
do that cross-sectionally or do you -- would you be
missing something in looking at the neighborhood
information cross-sectionally as opposed to
longitudinally?

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I...

Again, it sort of depends on whether you think -- it's like poverty in a way. I mean, I -- my guess is that this is an area where what goes on at the individual level and what goes on if you're looking at rates or characteristics of neighborhoods that you will get a quite different story if you just look cross-sectionally than if you look longitudinally because people are moving in and out of the neighborhoods.

Like we were talking about, for example, if -- if you looked cross-sectionally and the neighborhood seems to stay the same and it's an area -- you know, it's like a poor area and you -- you think you're trying to do something to improve the area. But then if you look at the individual level, it turns out that people are continually moving in and out because they're -- in a positive way, there's people who move there and then they -- their -- their life improves and so they move out. And some other people who are living in even worse move in and so forth. So it looks like it's staying the same but, in fact, you may be having a social process which is -- you're trying to bring about, is trying to move people up in a way.

On the other hand, I've seen many places
where people have -- in urban renewal kinds of things,
where people have done -- maybe -- I don't know what your
neighborhood was before it got changed to things that
suggest that --

MS. LEE: That neighborhood disintegrated
after the bottom of oil boom fell out.

MR. BRADBURN: That sounds like a
neighborhood that was -- that had deteriorated and then
they came in and so on and so forth. But if you look at
that cross-sectionally, you may find that, oh, it's --
you know, gee, the neighborhood has improved and so forth
so the people there must be a lot better off. But it
isn't the same people or the people who were there got --
in Chicago we say urban renewed out -- or -- and -- and
all of a sudden new people came in. Well, that's a
different story, so to speak, or different meaning about
the effect of the change than people often take away from
studies about urban renewal, which say, oh, isn't it
wonderful this neighborhood went from a very poor
neighborhood to -- to middle class or upper middle class
neighborhood. But it isn't that the individuals who live
there got -- got -- and I've -- I've seen that in other
studies where it was some aspects of urban change where
you've had new schools or new things like that, new --
new housing, et cetera; but it -- it's not -- I mean,
it's one of the ironies of many -- of many things is that
the people who you're trying to help, it turns out,
aren't the ones who get helped. Somebody else gets
the -- the benefits of the -- of what you're doing and
that's -- and that, I think, is one of the things that
longitudinal studies allow you to see vividly in ways
that you -- you might be able to tease it out of
successive cross-sections, but you are less likely to see
it I think.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But I think that
we shouldn't overemphasize the difference between those
two designs. A lot of the elements in the -- in the
panel will be the same, whether you do it for people or
for -- or for place. So -- and I guess this is
something -- there's reasonably good information on this
as to how many people -- if 80 -- if 80 percent of the
people are in the same place five years later, for
example, that means that there's an 80 percent overlap
between the place based, the housing -- the housing unit
based and the person based.

MR. GRANATO: Sure.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So it's not as if
it's all of one or -- or all of the other. A lot of the
design is going to be similar, and it's at the edge
really that you're making a decision. And it may be that
you want to say -- you know, it's a cost issue. So you can keep the location, keep the housing units and follow half of the people who move or follow all of the people who move or follow a tenth of the people who move or follow them only once, or follow them once and then again five years later.

So I don't think it's as fundamental a contrast as we've been making it. I mean, it's good to think about which is your priority because that's where you're going to focus the efforts. But a lot of what you're going to do is going to be similar under the two designs.

Jim mentioned earlier that the energy folks might be interest -- well, energy studies are all place base -- they're all building based. So the national energy studies are studies of buildings. So they'd like -- that's what they focus on. They don't care really who's in them. I mean, they just want to see what's being used by the buildings, and so that's an area where there would be an overwhelming priority given to keeping the same units, the same housing units, or the same structures rather than the same people.

Attitudes, as Norman pointed out, is somewhere where you really do want to have individuals because you -- you want to track what happens to
individual's attitudes, not so much the house attitudes, although a politician might be more interested in the house-based attitude. If it's in your -- if it's in your district, you want to know what the people in that house think. You don't care that the people that used to be there are now somewhere else voting. So it really does depend.

But my guess is that for a period of high proportion of what you're doing, you're going to have the same thing. So it's not -- you don't have to discard one entirely, and you can recover from other.

MR. BIEMER: I think the thing -- the thing to worry about if you, for example, select a sample of housing units and you keep that as your fixed panel and anyone who lives in those housing units, you know, even if it's 80 percent overlap from interview to interview, the people who move may have different characteristics than the people who don't move on those things that you're interested in, and you will only be able to do the longitudinal analysis on the people who stayed -- stayed there. So if that's going to be a problem -- if you think about, you know, what you want to do with the data and you think, well, most of our objectives have to do with the way people change, although we do have some objectives that have to do with,
you know, what's happening in their neighborhoods in the context where they're living, you know, it's really a trade off. You have to think -- and then -- and then you're into sort of what Colm was talking about and having to do something about those people who moved out to follow them if you think that they're -- you know, it's important that you try to represent movers.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But, remember, you do, of course, represent movers in a place, in a housing unit.

MR. BRADBURN: In-movers.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So you get the in-movers.

MR. BIEMER: In-movers, right.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So there is an issue as to what the modeling is.

MR. BIEMER: But it's not the -- it's not -- I mean, you're not getting a longitudinal record.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No, no. Absolutely. You're absolutely right. But you do get information about movers, so it's not --

MR. BIEMER: On a cross-sectional, yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And depending on what your model is of movers, you may or may not be happy with these. And if you have a fixed housing stock, then
you are, of course, getting a representative sample of
movers simply by having a representative sample of
housing units that people move from.

MR. BIEMER: Right. It's just the change
estimates will be biased.

MR. BLAIS: What about those who move
within the region, I assume you want to follow them?

MR. BIEMER: Well, not necessarily.

MR. BLAIS: Not necessarily.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARIAIGH: But it's cheaper
to follow them. So it's more realistic to follow people
within the region because --

MR. BIEMER: Rather than outside the
region.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARIAIGH: Yeah. Because
your data collection is geared toward the region, so...

MR. BRADBURN: But the question is
whether you let the sample grow or not. I mean, it's the
same issue about the family, if the family breaks up, you
now have two -- two families. So your sample can
potentially grow if you follow everybody if you don't
have a rule for --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARIAIGH: The PSID, I think,
got the perfect balance by the growth being
counterbalanced by attrition. Not quite. They had to
subsample, but it was a considerable part of the sample
growth that was accommodated by the attrition in the
original sample?

MR. GRANATO: Is the PSD about 8,000
right now?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. But it
started at 5.

MS. JASSO: 5,000.

MR. GRANATO: And the British Household
Survey, what's that up to?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It's going 100,000
for the new one.

MR. GRANATO: Oh, okay.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The Millennium
study is going to be 100,000 people. It may -- it may
be -- it may be only 25,000 housing units. Everybody --
everybody in the household is included, so -- but I think
it's 100,000 people.

MR. GRANATO: Okay. So we're -- I
just --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's one of
these European Millennium initiatives. You know, that's
kind of like -- a bit like Roznik -- what's that --
what's that thing called? His major research.

MR. SCIOLI: MRI?
MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: MRI, yeah. So that's one of the mega things.

MR. FRANCIS: So there was another point that came up that seemed to be sort of two alternatives out and it was kind of an either/or case and that was random digit dialing versus face-to-face interviews for the first interviews. And the concern about the RDD was that low response rate leads to not -- potentially nonrepresentativeness.

And what I wondered about is actually designing an experiment into the survey such that you randomize people to either get their first contact as face to face versus telephone and can you then use that to judge the -- both judge the degree of nonrepresentativeness of the random digit dialing, but also sort of then weight it back up to get it to where it's representative, maybe save some money in the process.

MR. BIEMER: It's more than just the initial response rate because there's some evidence that suggests if you do a telephone recruitment, they won't stay in the panel as long as if you did face to face. So you'd have to run it -- you'd have to run it longer than just the first interview to be able to see what effect that's going to have on future attrition.
MR. FRANCIS: Okay.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean -- I mean, and there's -- an additional issue, which is telephone samples, especially if they commence with RDD have very poor context information. You know, so even though -- I think Steve was saying that he links telephone numbers to tracts, that's kind of guesswork.

You know, telephone numbers cannot be link to tracts. They can be linked with a higher probability to some tracts than to others, but unless you use an address matching system, you can't mix those tracts. And we can do that for maybe 40 percent, maybe 50 percent of telephone numbers. So you lose all the context information, unless you get addresses from people, which is a little difficult. Not impossible. And that -- that also means that certain kinds of analysis that you might want to do with -- with the panel can't be done.

MS. SIEBER: It sounds like that essentially destroys the community part of the study, which we have decided is very important.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. I mean, we can now -- sometimes we can get as many as 60 percent -- we can locate as many as 60 percent of telephone numbers. And it may be eventually we could be able to link them
all. I mean, I'm horrified personally by how much we can
link, and the issue about databases out there. If you
ever ordered a pizza, we can probably -- we probably
know your -- we can probably link your telephone number
to your address, at least, if you have your pizza
delivered to your home address. If you haven't, we could
also let you know about that. But if you're -- if you're
not governor of New York, I guess it's not important,
so...

But you certainly --

MR. BRADBURN: A lot of commercial
databases are based on telephone. I mean I --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARÁIGH: Yes. But most of
them link --

MR. BRADBURN: And link the telephone to
the address.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARÁIGH: Most of them are
based on marketing lists of some kind.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARÁIGH: So -- and some
things that we've done and we do sometimes in surveys
where they're -- particularly not so much in NORC
surveys, but surveys that we do at the survey lab at
University of Chicago, which is much leaner and less
expensive version of doing surveys -- is to use dual
frames where you use a telephone -- a listed telephone
number frame and an address frame and match them and,
therefore, maybe get 50 or 60 percent coverage -- these
are for small area surveys, so for neighborhood
surveys -- and maybe get a frame that would contain
60 percent of the addresses in the -- in the neighborhood
and use that as our frame and just write off the other
40 percent, you know, so there...
You can -- you can certainly approach it
both ways. You can telephone frames and link them to
addresses. You get address frames and try to get
telephone numbers for them. And the commercial marketer
Donnelly and the other commercial marketers will sell you
lists that will probably contain between 40 and
60 percent of any urban community in the country together
with a lot of information you don't want, you know, the
financial information, there's stuff that we don't use
for our sampling generally.
But -- but they're all separate from a
very -- for serious academic or -- or government surveys,
the undercoverage is such that we wouldn't use them as
the frame because 40 percent undercoverage to start with
is kind of too much to carry on top of the nonresponsive
that you have in the survey. So we just don't use them
for that.
But they may be better than RDD. RDD is very -- you know, pure RDD we never use anymore, but which I mean just generating telephone numbers and calling. We would always try to abide by lists and nonlists. So we will identify all listed numbers, all listed telephone numbers and select a sample from these and then generate a sample of -- of random numbers from nonlisted numbers because it's more efficient in terms of resources than a straight RDD.

So I'm not sure what -- so we don't ever do just a straight RDD telephone number generation anymore.

MR. BIEMER: Do you usually use advanced prenotice letter for the enlisted numbers?

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, I mean, this depends on the survey. Yes. I mean, whenever -- I mean the general answer would be yes. There have been times when they haven't been used. But -- and as Paul says, for those, you will always send an advanced postcard perhaps just saying someone will call and there's very strong evidence this will increase your response rate, but probably not by more than a couple of -- 2 to 5 --

MR. BIEMER: Well, if you send a letter with -- with some money in it to the household.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That we don't do
typically.

MR. BIEMER: Well, we do that and it seems to have a positive effect. Even though you don't have a name, they seem to report that they received it more reliably. At least, they know that they received it and that helps in -- in terms of a -- versus a cold introduction where you're just calling a number and they've never heard of you.

MR. GRANATO: I'd like to -- I'm going to bring it up, sample size. I have to ask about this. When I -- when we were recompeting the ANES, and I proposed to Roger Toronjo, what would it take we just did a bona fide longitudinal panel study for the American National Election Study, how many people would we need? He said 8,000.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: All right.

MR. GRANATO: Does that sound...

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The number?

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. I mean...

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean, it's a good number. It's not the only number.

MR. GRANATO: Right. But it seems like there's a floor --

MR. BRADBURN: Probably 16.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I could do 4.
MR. GRANATO: Where's the auctioneer?

MR. O'MUIRChARTAIGH: We can thank you at dinner with that. Before we leave, we'll give you a number in a sealed envelope and you can open it up.

MR. GRANATO: And the winner is...

MR. SCIOLI: What is it, Chris, the number now for ANES?

MR. ACHEN: I don't know what their target is for this year. They've been up and down depending on funding, as you know better than I. It's been close to 2,000 some years and it's been about 1,000 in others.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. The number I remember was 1200 when I was doing...

MR. BRADFORD: That's kind of standard.

MR. O'MUIRChARTAIGH: What question did you ask about, Jim? What question did you ask?

MR. GRANATO: I just asked what we were talking about, there was the idea of trying to get ANES to become a panel. I mean, they had been -- they had a panel for, what, the '70s.

MR. BRADBURN: One funder.

MR. GRANATO: I think they had three panels, I believe, and two panels in the '70s I believe.

MR. ACHEN: Yeah. It's never gone longer
than four -- no panel has ever gone longer than four years.

MR. GRANATO: Exactly. Because that gets you your three national and...

MR. ACHEN: Exactly.

MR. GRANATO: And so I just -- we had a conference, and I asked them about this and what would it take. He said 8,000 and then -- which is the PSID number that -- that we know about now. And NOVO SR [sic] out is 5,000, I mean...

MR. BIEMER: Well, you know, in deciding of the sample size for the child abuse study, you know we did a lot of power analysis, you know, to find out, you know, what -- what people -- what people -- first of all, what -- what are they trying to measure, what kinds of change estimates do they want to make, what -- how much of a change would be important enough that you'd want to be able to declare it significant. I mean, there's lots of questions that one has to ask about, you know, what -- what precision you need in the estimates to be able to answer that question.

And then -- and then if you're doing subgroup analysis and there's domains of analysis that you're interested in, that's going to increase the sample size. So it's really one of those things that's very
hard to answer in that -- that type of question. I don't
know how he did it, but he's an amazing guy.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The key -- the key
issue is the one Paul raised as to how many domains do
you want estimates for. So what drives it is the
smallest domain, I mean, the domain group for which you
need an estimate of a given precision.

If you want it for one overall sample
estimate, which is never what you want, but if you only
wanted the national mean or whatever it is, then the
sample size might be 800. But if you want to do it for
10 different groups in the country, it's going to be
8,000, you know, because you need that many for each of
the domains for which you want the same precision.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. It seems to me if
we're looking at neighbor effects or things like that,
that's really going to push it up.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean...

MR. GRANATO: Because you have the
cluster issue, birds of a feather, I mean, you've got all
that.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: For
neighborhood -- psychologists are the best people to
answer this question. They spend their lives doing
effect size and sample size analyses, right? I mean, you
wake up in the middle night and do them?

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So it's kind of a -- so it -- so it all depends on how big the effect -- if it's a big effect, you don't need a big sample to find it. But a small effect, you need a big sample to find it. So it's one -- it's a great secular argument where if something has a major impact, small samples will pick it up.

If it's a very fine difference, then you need bigger samples to identify it. So you -- you have to start by saying if there were a difference of 10 percent in something between two parts of the city and we wanted to pick that up, how big a sample size would you need; and you can answer that question.

But if it's a 30 percent difference that you want to plot, then you need a smaller sample size. And if it's really very refined analysis, you say there's a 2 percent difference between the two, then the sample size will increase exponentially, so...

But there is a calculation that can be done for every one of these, and survey researchers generally don't do that, you know. But -- but in psychology, in particular, and in medicine, I guess, in the biological sciences, there's a much stronger
tradition of writing down your hypothesis in advance and
specifying the effect size that you're looking for and
the alpha value and the beta value and then the number
comes out the other end. You know, it's kind of -- and
it's strange enough, it always comes out to the number
that you first thought of, so...

Because there are three unknowns and you
can fix any of them, so... it's all of them, I guess,
and you can get the right answer.

MS. LEE: Well, PSID was a -- is a
national -- national representative study, right, and I
it's done throughout the United States. So because
Houston is somewhat smaller from the United States, not
much but somewhat, perhaps there is less representing
that needs to be done.

MR. BIEMER: Well, one thing it helps you
with is that -- and if you're talking about a national
survey and you're talking about clustering the sample,
you need more clusters across the United States because
you have a lot more variation across the clusters.

But within Houston maybe it's more
homogeneous. You can get by with fewer clusters, which
means that you can concentrate the sample more in fewer
places. But, you know, when we were doing this work
for the -- for -- well, all the studies that I know of
when you're thinking about cluster size, you also have to weigh into that what's the size of an interviewer workload. Because you don't want to -- you don't have a cluster size that's too big for one interviewer but too small for two. Or it's -- it's -- you know, it's not balanced properly in terms of efficiency, in terms of how you're actually going to do the interviews there. So that's another thing that has to be considered.

But, you know, in a place like Houston, I would imagine that it's more homogenous compared to the United States. You need fewer clusters, depending upon the size of those clusters, like block groups of -- or tracts or something like that. So that would help your cost, if you can -- if you're doing a face-to-face survey then have fewer clusters rather than more.

MS. SIEBER: Now, this is probably a very unorthodox maybe unworkable idea, but you -- you want, of course, to also help students in this university take advantage of the kinds of entre you can offer. If there are particular cohorts where you would like to really hone in and learn more about lifestyle, why not have some psychology and sociology and anthropology graduate students go and do a study within your study of those particular cohorts. Is -- is that a reasonable thing to do? I don't know.
Dead silence.

MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

MR. ESCHBACH: I don't know if we've --

I'm thinking about the discussion before the break and the -- and the assertion and question about why would a national funder fund a local study. As I've been thinking, I think I can think of about 70 or 80 examples where they have. It's not that big a deal, but the trick is, is that it's not by selling a study as being about a particular place. A lot -- I mean, and what -- how can I get to 60 or 70? I'm thinking of all the various programs. But nobody said that East Boston, you know, the -- you know, was representative of the country and we had to study East Boston for that reason.

It's -- I mean, a lot of these studies are funded by NIH, and it's because I think there's an assumption that the processes, the physiological processes, work the same anywhere. So what -- the reason you're doing it in the local area is because it's feasible. Because if you want to track a longitudinal population, it's more feasible to do that with a local sample than a national sample at a given sample size.

Similarly, when I'm thinking of studies like the Chicago Human Development Study or the LA FAMs or I'm thinking of the -- also, Portez and Rumbaut, the
Chicago -- and they're not -- Miami and San Diego looking at immigrant incorporation. I don't think they were sold as being -- the research design is, is we've got to study this because they're so distinctive.

They're sold as we've got a strong intellectual reason to study something, and it's feasible to do it here. And it seems to me that that could be a way of thinking about justifying such a study. I mean, you have to have a strong intellectual reason. I mean, it helps to have that, you know.

But it seems to me that place effect studies are one reason -- place effect studies almost have to be smaller area, all right. Because to have -- to have it be feasible to be -- you know, to be describing characteristics of neighborhoods and of individuals in neighborhoods, it's not really very feasible to do that in a larger area.

I think immigrant incorporation -- I mean, there are a lot of health studies that look at -- I mean, the new Hispanic cohorts that NH -- NHLBI is establishing of, like, four cohorts of 8,000 going to local areas. I mean, the national Timberland study is implicitly -- it samples areas. I mean, it's national but it's also strongly clustered.

It seems to me like there's -- one way to
think about this is not how do we sell the importance of funders studying Houston, but what good idea do we have that we can do here where maybe subparagraph 3 in the significant section is, yeah, and we've seen neighborhoods in Chicago and we've seen them in LA, but Houston might be different. That's not the main purpose, right. Because if you make that the main purpose, it seems to me you fail the research design requirement to have comparison from get-go and you don't even get scored, right.

But you say, okay, well, there's a process that's interesting and important and we can study it here because of the characteristics of this place, so -- so let's do it.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I think that's very heavily -- very different among disciplines. So I think that social scientists, especially sociology related sciences and statisticians tend to -- social statisticians think about representation and, therefore, do think about national studies.

The National Children's Study is a wonderful example because there was a sustained battle over a period of three or four years between the medical epi wing and the social science wing in terms of whether it should be a probability sample of the country
or not. And it was only after prolonged resistance on
the part of the NIH that it became a probability sample,
and now partly for their own -- for their own peace of
mind, they're reinterpreting it as a set of places even
those these places are a set of probability sample
conduits in the country and the locations within these
are also a probability sample of the places.

So I think there's no cred -- no
additional credibility in these medical studies of having
a national sample because they don't think about
representation. I mean, representation is not --
representation of the population is not their interest.
It's the process. So they believe the underlying process
is what's being examined.

But I think if we were to go through
to -- to a group of social science reviewers, there would
be more -- that would be a real issue. It's not that it
can't be done, but it would certainly be an issue as to
what the representation -- nature of the representation
was.

MR. BIEMER: And another way of saying
that is just what you find in Houston can be inferred to
any other part of the country.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right.

Absolutely. Well, I think it's entirely defensive -- not
just defensible. It's a very strong case for -- for social science to do something like this, but it's not -- but it mustn't be -- you could do 73 of them and you'd have to fund all of them. Is that this really a place where there's the energy and the -- and the commitment by the stakeholders, so it can be done and it wouldn't be done anywhere else and that's why -- that's why it's here. And it's really interesting, because it's a microcosm -- either microcosm of the country is a good shot.

If that doesn't work, it's a -- it's a leading -- it's a vanguard site where things are happening and are going to happen elsewhere later, so you can get them here. But, I mean, there's always a conceptualization that will make it look like the right one.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I think, it would -- it would also depend on the particular type of funder, that is, someone -- a funder that's interested in Houston would be responsive to arguments that this is something that would benefit Houston or particularly segments.

A group that's interested in, you know, developing social science or might be interested in it as -- you know, a new way to look at social processes or social systems or something. I mean, it would have been
if the human social dynamics program was not coming to an
end, it sounds like there would be something that could
be well positioned to -- to be in the competition like
that at NSF.

MR. SCIOLI: Like policy, statistics?
MR. BRADBURN: Right, yeah.
MR. SCIOLI: Are there groups involved,
like, core cadre?
MR. BRADBURN: Economic.
MR. SCIOLI: Yes.
MR. BRADBURN: And environmental issues,
yes.
MR. SCIOLI: -- scholars working around
the topic. That would have been an excellent place.
MR. BRADBURN: And, similarly, I think
the other, the place that might -- places that are more
likely to be -- it'd be attractive to if it's -- I don't
think you have to pitch it, depending on what it is,
but -- and that's some of the large private foundations.
MR. SCIOLI: I'm just going to raise
that.
MR. BRADBURN: Because they are moving
to -- back into the research, but -- but more
policy-related type research kind of thing, so...
And they are -- well, first of all,
there's some foundations that are place based, I mean, like -- and you know ones that are place based with
regards to Houston. But there are others, I think, that would be sufficient -- you know, whose interest in, you
know, sort of urban development or something like that would could see it as a -- you know as a kind of new way
of looking at some of the -- some of the perineal issues that they have on -- or -- or one that's interested in --
in intergroup relations, the assimilation of Hispanics and immigrants and so forth into an economy. Or -- or
one -- maybe the -- I don't know what the Sloan Foundation is going to be doing these days.
But, you know, the sort of changing economy from how does an area move from being dependent
on energy so on and so forth and you characterize that to a more diversified economy where you try to balance out
biotech and other things or develop -- I mean...
So there are different foundations that have different missions of various sorts. But this is sufficiently broad kind of in a way that it could be -- parts of it could, at least, be supported by different foundations and...
MR. SCIOLI:  I think Colm's points were excellent ones; that it's the crafting of the question in a way that the appeal is targeted and, you know, your
sentences -- heaven knows I've seen things that are very
successful because of the way they are crafted in terms
of the importance.

And while Houston is a single site, as
Norman just mentioned, the human social dynamics program
at the National Science Foundation would have -- you
know, agents of change within a metropolitan area within
a standard, yeah, that would have been certainly on the
table.

Good night and good luck.

MR. GRANATO: Well, let's -- let's wrap
this up for today. Tomorrow we'll meet again at -- well,
start time will be 9:00 but feel free to come here by
8:00 and mingle and have your breakfast.

We'll focus on aspects of IRBs and
budgeting. Also, I want to go back to this issue of
design contracts and have like kind of a greater focus on
an action plan that we would want to put into a report
that we're going to do when we get to that, which will be
over the summer and the fall.

Thank you very much for coming. There
will be a van, I think, to pick you up at -- is it going
to be 5:45 again? I don't know. Does the itinerary say
that?

MR. SCIOLI: 5:45, Michael?
MR. ANGEL: 5:45.

MR. BRADBURN: Tomorrow, there's a -- is a break scheduled in the morning in terms of checking out we can do it then rather than...

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. There will be a break at 10:30.

MR. BRADBURN: Okay. So we can check out then rather than...

MR. GRANATO: Yeah. I would say the last -- we'll adjourn at noon tomorrow, so I would say the last half hour is really going to be sober second thoughts and thinking about what we should take from this.

MR. FRANCIS: I was going to say, you can probably get late checkout.

MR. BRADBURN: So that we can come here. Rapid checkout time.

MR. GRANATO: Thank you very much and see you tonight.

(Off the record, 4:29 p.m.)
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MR. SCIOLI: Well, good morning everybody. I guess we should begin. A couple of housekeeping things. Jim has assured me that we will be finished by noon. Apparently, box lunches are coming in to take with you as you see fit.

The transcript that's been developed will be circulated to you to redact untoward things that you may have said during the course of the meeting. Things said last night at the restaurant will forever be indelibly imprinted in my mind. But since Dick Murray was not there, he doesn't have to worry about the reputation of the institution. See, I will redact that, for example.

So two ways of looking at this, the hard work is done or the hard work begins now. I tend to think that tremendous advice was provided yesterday by everyone in attendance. In my view, attending these kinds of meetings over the years, this is the best I've been to in terms of the openness of the discussion, the willingness to provide advice.

My experience has been that you bring in good people, and they don't -- they're not always as forthcoming as this group was. I don't know. Maybe it's something about the environment in which I work, the
city, the intimidation --

MR. BRADBURN: It's because they always
think you're going to give them money.

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah. It's delighted -- I'm
delighted to not be loved to death at this meeting.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCIOLI: In any event --

MR. BIEMER: You can redact that, too.

MR. SCIOLI: But I mean that. I think
some nominal advice was -- some thoughts -- as Jim
started yesterday, he wanted this to be a conversation;
and I was quite impressed with the tone, that it was
conversational. It was not pedantic, but it was
certainly erudite and it was instructive. It was -- if I
were in his shoes, Ann Hamilton, Richard Murray,
Dr. Francis and Klineberg, I'd be very hopeful about the
direction this might take as time goes on.

I think there were considerable
conclusions reached or, at least, preliminary
conclusions. Design mode still has to be talked about a
bit today. But I think that the sense, unless someone
wants to speak against it, was that at least at this
stage it's important to think about a well-planned,
well-developed, top-drawer study.

So let's use that as the kickoff point.
Would anyone like to comment on that?

I -- and -- and accompanying that is, it may well be that it's going to be an expensive study to do it the way this group would like to see it done. So thoughts? Why don't we use that as a kickoff point.

Norman.

MR. BRADBURN: Just to add for the -- for the record what I said off the record last night is that just remember Daniel Burn's injunction, make no small plans. So that's how Chicago grew to be what it is. And if Houston wants to aspire to be what -- replace Chicago as the number two city, at least -- and I guess Chicago has fallen to three now, so it's on the downward slope.

But any case, if you start off thinking what's the best thing to do, the right thing to do and then if you can't fund that, it's always -- you can scale back. But it's harder to go the other way. If you start with a plan that's too small and then realize that you've got to do more, it's much more difficult to -- to go up.

So that would be my major advice.

MR. BIEMER: I guess I would say also that -- and I agree with that. But you could also think in terms of phases, you know, so that you don't have to hit the ground on day one with, you know, the full plan, but rather build on it as time goes on. So you could
think about -- you know, well, sample size, for example, is something you can adjust moving forward. And I think it might work if you can sort of build a base of -- of people who are interested in the data and, you know, you're being very responsive in the survey to their needs for data; and that base begins to build and more and more interest, you know, accumulates. Sort of what we were hearing yesterday from Steven, you know, that now he has a base of -- of users who, you know, they don't want to see the survey go away. Now, it's going to be sort of going on in perpetuity. But to get there, you have to kind of build that base.

And so initial funding might -- might only fund a fraction of what you want the thing to be, but you can think big but maybe also think in terms of phases. And a phase one would be a smaller version of the survey.

MS. SIEBER: The other thing on Paul's point, the corporations who may be some of your sponsors will want the data yesterday. And -- and I think that it would be useful to think about what kinds of useful preliminary data you can spin out very quickly before you go into fancy modeling with your full data set. This can be very tantalizing to your sponsors and would be sponsors, and it shows that you're not just an academic
who will say, "Well, we'll get the full report out in
three years, but we haven't finished our survey, but
here's -- here are a few means and cross-taps of
interest -- that might be of interest to you."

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I'm inclined to
think that Norman's approach is likely to be more
successful in this case, which is to sell the vision
rather than the data.

I mean, do you really want to go out
there and say, "We can put Houston on the map with a
study that would be a beacon in the -- in the darkness to
areas that just haven't thought about these things. It
lights the way for the future that takes an exciting
metropolitan area and follows it in a systematic way to
reveal things we couldn't do otherwise."

For a lot of things, in my work, it's
better to start the way Paul says, you know, to get a
demonstration project and build up from there. But
you're not -- you know, you have an idea, which is, I
think, possibly easier to sell a big idea than a small
one. In some sorts of circumstances, it's easier to get
big money than little money. You know, you get sponsors.
You bring them on board. The University buys into it.
The area buys into it. And you do all that before you
present any data, which makes you realize the difference
between the vision and the realities.

MR. MURRAY: I think there's several key constituencies or players that we have to get support for if this is going to have a good chance of moving forward.

One, might be the new administration at this university. We have a new president, 52-years old, at the very impressive arc of her career; and it happens to be a political scientist with a background in public administration but has been mostly an administrator. But she's looking for some good ways of convincing the community to become more supportive.

The university is about to launch a pretty large public drive. So I think we've got some possibility if we can develop a very good big plan of getting our president's support because she's at a particular juncture where she's looking for new ideas. And this would have, I think, pretty high visibility in the community.

A second key player is the mayor of Houston. It's a very, very strong mayor system here, similar to New York. We have a very popular who's term limit -- he's only got another couple years in office, but he's almost certainly going to run for governor of Texas; so he's interested in big projects, big ideas. A very smart guy, very data oriented. I think we would
have a pretty good possibility of getting his backing and support, which would help us with the business community here that's been generally supportive of Bill White.

And so I -- I think I would echo the comment, "Let's think big at this" because I think if we -- if we start out with a major proposal with teeth in it, we've got a better opportunity of selling it and getting key supporters who help us deal with this very important issue of getting significant funding.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: And I think to pick up Paul's point, Steve Klineberg's survey in a way provides that smaller scale demonstration of the value of data. And it's almost ideal in that it's been long running, it's Houston, but you can show what it doesn't do, you know. So you're saying, now, this is a great -- this is what happens if you do it on a shoestring. You can get this. You can get it every year, but it doesn't answer the fundamental questions about what's happening to the community, what's happening to people in the city so that it's almost like having some somebody else do this demonstrate that that's not the way to do it -- I mean, not that that's not a thing to do it, but that's not the way to do what you want to do, which is much broader and more policy relevant than behavioral -- measuring behavior as well as attitudes, but more
importantly tracking trajectories rather than just getting snapshots because I think that's something the policy people would like to have and that's what -- that's what's interesting in a way.

And that would give you a contrast with a good product already -- that's there; but that's why you don't need another 250,000 a year; that's why you need to talk to people who have -- who are thinking in millions and not in hundreds and thousands.

MR. MURRAY: Something I did not hear -- and maybe I just wasn't present when we discussed this -- the length of time. What would be the optimal initial plan here? And I'm thinking -- I would think minimally 10 years, but longer? What -- what's the sense about what we should start out projecting?

MS. JASSO: Let me answer that first and then I'd like to make some other comments. Let me just tell you our vision in The New Immigrant Survey and then you can take it from there. Our vision is that that survey will still be going on when all of us are dead because it will be the only way to know what happens to third generation, the fourth generation, the quest for roots, et cetera, et cetera.

But coming back to -- to some of the larger issues, nothing that has been said is mutually
exclusive; and I agree with everything. I think Norm is absolutely correct that it's essential to have the large vision of the ideal. There will be plenty of time to scale back. We'll to scale back. For example, if the -- if it turns out that the questionnaire is so long that you have to keep the respondent there for eight hours, obviously, you will have to cut. And it also will be natural in the implementation to think of things as phases, exactly as Paul said. If nothing else, a little pilot to -- to begin with.

Now, I want to go back to Joan's point because I think it's very important. If it is possible to identify one thing, just one thing that could be quickly answered, just with an average or in proportion but that is really important and that nobody knows, that -- that would be the catalyst for enormous extra funding and support.

And I will give you the example from The New Immigrant Survey, which is that before the pilot of The New Immigrant Survey nobody knew one thing that everybody -- and certainly everybody in Congress wanted to know, which is the schooling of a legal permanent -- new legal permanent residents. All that was available was the schooling of foreign born in the census, and everybody knew that was no good; that was distorted. And
so we were able to come up immediately with this number, which shows that the average is two years larger than the average for the -- for the regular foreign born. And that just -- if -- if you can find one thing that people want to know and that -- that -- that only you can uniquely get, that will be dynamite.

MS. SIEBER: It's a lot of publicity, too.

MS. JASSO: Yeah.

MR. BIEMER: Let me give you an example of what I was talking about phases. In the survey I'm working on currently, this child abuse study, the first cohort that was fielded, there was only funding for three waves. Once we did the data for -- data collection for the first two waves and published a report looking at changes, there was a groundswell of interest that wasn't there initially. And people began to realize what these data could do, only after they saw some of the data come out and see what longitudinal analysis really meant.

And if you think that you're going to start out with all the interest that you're ever going to get, I think, you know, you're -- you're -- you're deceiving yourself. I think what -- you may get some initial interest, but that's probably nothing compared to the interest you're going to get once you start
publishing this data and you'll see that more people will want to contribute. And that's why I'm saying that this will build, and you need to think in terms of how you're going to build.

MR. BRADBURN: Let me go back to Dick's question. The -- in Chicago, there's a group called The Civic Committee, which is a group of business CEOs and top professionals that has been around, I mean, in various guises since the famous Vernom [ph] plan in 1893 or '5 or whatever it was. And they periodically undertake a major plan -- vision for a plan for Chicago. And right now, it's Chicago 2020.

But -- but they use a 20-year planning horizon. And I think this -- that sort of developed over the last hundred years or something like that, and I think that's probably a good time period. It's long enough that you can think about changes, major changes of various sorts, but it's not so long that it's -- you know, you -- you have no chance of really know what's going to go on. So something on that order of magnitude. And obviously, it would be more detailed in five -- for five years and 10 years than it is in -- for the 20. But still, if you're going to think about particular dynamics of Houston and both where you want to be and where you think you'll be, you need something like
that, that length of time, I think.

MR. BIEMER: Does that mean, though, that
you'll have to get sponsors on board to commit for
funding this thing for 20 years?

MR. BRADBURN: Not necessarily. But I
think that you -- it -- you're fooling them if you
think -- and probably not in good faith if you think this
is something, you know, that can be accomplished in -- in
five years or something like that. I mean, it's --
because it's not only --

MR. BIEMER: Would you turn down money if
they said, "Well, you know, I'll support it for a couple
of years and see what" -- you know.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: No, I don't think
so. But I think -- I think one of the things that's
different between -- perhaps between this and the project
you were working on, Paul, is having an infrastructure,
you know. So at NORC or RTI or University of Chicago,
there's a big infrastructure that can support development
of things; and it's going on all the time. Some with no
funding, some of it with a lot of funding.

But if you want to set up an operation
where you don't have that infrastructure, then core
funding, I think, is kind of critical. But, see, you can
set up something like this with just the money to do the
bits that you described in the sense of saying, so much
for questionnaire design, so much for sample design, so
much for field work. You really need to have some sort
of institution or some entity that does it, whether it's
the Center For Public Policy or the separate Houston 2050
plan or whatever it is.

You don't need to have money for all the
field work for 20 years, but you need to have at least
enough money -- money for long enough that people can
commit to it and know that this isn't something that's
going to be gone by the time they get started. So you
think about getting good people to commit to working on
this, you have to have a place for them to be that has
some existence.

And the university might provide that in
some places and not in others. I mean, it's not here at
the moment. You know, if you were in Michigan, ISR in a
way would provide that sort of base for you. Maybe NORC
would do it in Chicago. Because that's why I think you
have to have this big plan, and certainly getting money
for the field work doesn't have to be locked in for 20
years.

Five years funding seems to me to be a
perfectly reasonable period of time for data collection
money. It's long enough so that you have at least -- you
know, you can fit it better than the linear model data
with three or four or five waves of data, but not so long
that people feel they're signing for something they have
no idea what it is. So there, I think, you do build up
by saying --

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. That's what I'm
saying.

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: -- getting
underway. But I think getting the whole thing in place
is really critical and that's where I think Dick's point,
that the university president and the city would welcome
this. And this is the kind of thing Chicago welcomes as
well --

MR. BRADBURY: Yeah. That's right.

MR. O'MUIRCHÉARTAIGH: -- a big idea,
it's worth putting money into because it's not just what
I'm interested in or you're interested in. It's a thing
the whole city feels that it's represented well. That, I
think, is the vision that you'd be selling; and that I
think, you want to put in place and then you can devote
people -- people would devote sort of part of their
career to it. It's like something they -- it's worth
getting involved in rather than just getting five hours
of somebody's time a month or...
analogy, I -- in looking at the sort of brochure we got
about the university -- and this is true -- I mean, this
idea that you -- you have a master plan for the campus.
And that says, oh, the next 20 years or something, this
is what we'd like to build. This is where they're going
to go. You look at nice architectural pictures of
things, which never like that, but, you know and that's
what you -- but you're not going to build it all in one
year.

You know, you -- you get the money for
this building or that building or -- and you build
this -- you build up this college or you build up that
college or whatever. But it's all in the -- within a
framework that you can show people, this is -- you know,
this is where we're going and we'd like to be and -- and,
you know, help us get there and this is --

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. A phased approach.
MR. BRADBURN: -- the steps, and the
steps to get there.

MR. BIEMER: That's actually my
experience.

MR. BRADBURN: At the risk of
complicating things, a possible way of -- of moving
there, which is -- which I think would have several
advantages. And that's to -- to think about a kind of
indicator system for Houston or the Houston area.

There's a lot -- there's a great revival of interest in particularly social indicators and environmental indicators as well as economic indicators. And there's a group actually at Brookings called the NIC -- what does it stand for? Anyway it's something about small area indicator systems of various sorts.

And if you -- that's something which essentially starts with existing data and what it does -- if you start to build the kind of system, it does two -- or it could potentially for this project do two things.

First of all, you can get started right away. It's cheap -- fairly cheap to do, something students can do and you can get -- your center could take the lead in it. And it forces you, then, to ask the kind of questions we were asking yesterday, what do you really want to know and how much do we know already from -- from census and other -- other -- from Stephen's surveys or other -- other data around or things -- or rearranging census data or whatever, the -- the state center could help on that sort of thing.

But then it also points up what you don't have. And now, granted, what you have is all cross-sectional time series, if -- if that. But it -- it does begin to fill in an otherwise vague picture of what
systematic data about an area means. So people can -- it
gives some more flesh to -- to what -- what it means.

But also it points out what's -- what's
not there and that becomes, then, part of what feeds into
what you're going to want to put into the -- into the
panel study and in two different ways. First of all,
some of it's even -- even stuff that might -- could --
could be done cross-sectionally, but -- but still it
didn't -- it doesn't have any dynamics of it and so
forth.

So it's -- it's a kind of relatively -- I
would say it's a kind of supplementary, but things which
could -- could well help people who aren't very data
oriented to begin with understand what the power of
something like this could be. And it's certainly a
great -- now, if you have a mayor who's data oriented,
you know, he probably has something like this kind of in
an informal sort of way. But formalizing it, taking on
some responsibility for the -- the -- the -- the
University of Houston indicator series or whatever, you
know, the -- would be a kind of first step in that, so...

MR. BLAIS: I'd like to support this
view. I think this is -- the social indicators approach
seems to me extremely attractive. I suppose you could
make the case that there's never been sort of a
longitudinal study of using social indicators as such.

So this would be sort of a -- you know, indicating -- showing on one end that what a longitudinal study usually can do and using -- you know, showing a lot of changes, much more than we -- we usually think.

MR. BIEMER: Could you give me an example of what you're talking about with the social indicator? I'm not -- what would we be measuring? What -- what kind of a characteristic are you talking about that would capture the imagination of city leaders?

MR. BLAIS: Well, putting --

MR. FRANCIS: Quality of life.

MR. BIEMER: What?

MR. FRANCIS: Quality of life, which we'd combine maybe a variety of indices that are used in some of the publications that talk about quality of life, but actually get at behavioral indicators and how they change over time.

MR. BLAIS: And -- and satisfaction, I guess, with public services, for instance, and...

MS. SIEBER: If I could toss -- toss another idea in the hopper, there has been a lot of interest nationally and internationally on measures of happiness, which don't necessarily correlate with the other quality of life variables that we think influence
happiness. And I would think that politicians would be
very interested in knowing how generally happy their
people feel they are with their life, not with the
government, but with their life.

MR. BIEMER: Is that something we want to
monitor longitudinally?

MS. SIEBER: I have never seen it
monitored longitudinally --

MR. BRADBURN: Oh, yeah.

MS. SIEBER: -- but I think that would be
fascinating.

MR. BRADBURN: The GSS does it.

MS. SIEBER: Oh, does it?

MR. BRADBURN: In '72.

MS. JASSO: No.

MR. BLAIS: But that's not series, no.

MR. BIEMER: It's a cross-section.

MR. BRADBURN: Cross -- you mean
longitudinally?

MR. BIEMER: I meant longitudinally, you
know, looking at changes --

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Well, I mean, the
first long --

MR. BIEMER: -- individual level.

MR. BRADBURN: The first longitudinal
study I did that, but for two years. Not for longitudinal.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: But I think one of the problems of measuring happiness, of these kinds of measures, is that they're not -- that people adjust to whatever --

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: So that they're not useful in the long-term because --

MS. SIEBER: No.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: -- they -- they -- they -- they move a little, but there isn't a fundamental change over time. People --

MR. BIEMER: Well, is quality of life more objective?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I think -- I think --

MS. SIEBER: Oh, yes.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: -- there's a lot of social indicators and economic indicators. I mean, all you have to do is read the -- and it's easier to get a student to do this -- is to go through the last two years of Houston Chronicle and see what are the headlines that relate to data that are published. You know, there's crime data, there's police report, there's
housing, there's all these things come out all the time
and people look at them and say, "My God is that true?"
And because they don't remember -- they never remember
what it was before.

But if you track these things in a
systematic way, in other words, if you have a plan that
says here's a battery of indicators and maybe get an
index or two, people are always enthusiastic about the
Houston quality -- you know, the Houston index or
whatever it is.

But I think Norman's point is very
important in that if you do this first, it means that
when people ask questions about what the panel would do,
you know already what -- you know what's already there so
you don't sell it by saying, "It would tell us this," and
they say, "But we already have this" from -- from the
city or we have this from the state or we have this from
EPA or whatever. So in a way it's like preparation for
putting meat on the plan is that you know what's there
and you can say, "Here are these things, but they don't
tell us this." As Norman suggested, they identify the
gaps in the information and tell you what you might need
to do and maybe it'll turn out you don't want the panel
because the data are already there. I don't think that's
true, but...
MR. BIEMER: Well, I mean, I think you're right, though, I mean, the American Community Survey, for example, is going to be providing data on Houston.

MR. BRADBURN: Yes, now -- that's right -- now --

MR. BIEMER: You need to -- you need to say how you're going to distinguish -- you know, what -- what you're collecting you can't get from that?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: But -- I mean, but the key as always there would be individual-level panel data.

MR. BRADBURN: Yes.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So ACS will never produce --

MR. BIEMER: No, it won't.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- longitudinal data.

MR. BIEMER: That's why it has to be, you know, focused on that kind of --

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Sure.

MR. BIEMER: -- longitudinal analysis.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: That's why, I think, a panel is where I think the real added value is.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, and that -- you know, to go back to the original PSID issue, that's -- I
mean, that's where you can discover things which in the ACSR aren't changing but, in fact, giving you a false picture of the dynamics of what's going on and so forth. Or -- or things are --

MS. SIEBER: My understanding of the happiness index is that it's usually how people perceive their life relative to somebody else's life. So that if a country is quite poor and everyone is poor, they may adjust to that and be quite hope. But I think that in a longitudinal study, you will see what group has rising expectations and a lot of anger about not meeting those expectations. So from the point of view of any kind of political turbulence of some subpopulation, I would think you would have a useful measure of a hot spot that's emerging.

MS. JASSO: If I could jump in here and just -- I -- I think it's very useful to think about concrete things, and so let me just say that building on the foundation of the classical literature and social indicators, it would be nice to add some new indicators based in part, as Colm was -- was talking about, the issues that are gripping people right now and also the issues that -- that -- that scholars are starting to talk about.

So I -- I just made a little list and --
and let me throw it out. I think happiness is essential. I -- I would not throw out happiness simply because it's subjective.

In Europe, there's a growing tradition, I think, of including in the surveys perceptions of the fairness of own something or other, either own pension, own earnings, own grades is asked of children, for example. I -- I think there's a big future in asking what you -- are you being fairly treated. Are you over-rewarded or under-rewarded, et cetera. Big battery of new questions, for example, in the German service.

Excuse me.

Now, with respect to foreign born -- and I don't know how much you want to go into that. After all, you -- you can't overload the instrument with -- with -- with questions for the foreign born, but here's a list of some new ones. Excuse me.

Remember the old idea that when someone dies there's a set sequence in which physical systems shut down? Well, some of us are thinking that when people assimilate, there may be a set sequence in the way they do things. And so some of the things that would be really interesting to -- to get at are, if they start giving up religion, in what sequence do they do it? What aspects do they give up first, et cetera? What -- if
they embrace a religion, say they come from a country that had no religion as we're finding in The New Immigrant Survey, in what sequence do they do it, what are the steps?

The same thing with language, in what sequence do they start using English. And then for people who don't use English at a really important indicator of egalitarianism is in what sequence do they stop using the old distinction between formal and familiar that marks practically every language of the world except English and Hebrew.

And these are dynamite things for becoming American. We can also think as -- I mean, these are minor things but they turn out to be very important.

When do people stop using "kilos" and start using "pounds" or stop using "kilometers" and start using "miles"?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: When will the U.S. start using the right one?

MR. BRADBURN: When we assimilate.

MS. JASSO: Good question. In the New Immigrant Survey, we didn't -- I mean, it would have been fabulous to ask about do you use pounds or... However, we do ask height and weight and we said just whatever unit -- whatever measure you want. So we have this
wonderful indirect way of knowing who is using pounds and
who is using kilograms, for example.

MR. BIEMER: Well, Willie, is it -- is it
important to sort of tie that to Houston? I mean, the
things that you're mentioning there, wouldn't they be
more, you know, for generic populations, but are -- is it
more important to try -- since the Houston area is going
to be funding this, is there some -- something from what
you just said that could be, you know, specific for
Houston that Houston needs to know, apart from sort of --
the general -- the general theory of, you know, of social
sequencing or whatever you want to call that.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I'll give you an
example. I -- if -- if -- out of your research, let's
say you -- you developed an index of assimilation and
then you've measured that in Houston because one of the
things you would want to know is how are the new people
moving into Houston assimilating? I mean, are they
integrating or not? And where are pockets of places
where assimilation is going very rapidly and where is --
are pockets of places where it's not going on?

So you -- the idea would be, is to build
from general research, national research and so forth to
indicators or to measures that have policy relevance
in -- in Houston. So -- not that you're building the
indicator out of Houston, but you're applying it --

MS. JASSO: As Colm said about paying attention --

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MS. JASSO: -- to what's in the headline.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. And, again, just --

this is something for homework for -- for one of your students. There is a big -- enormous effort going on in -- in Washington. It's something which used to be called the Key National Indicators Initiative. It's now called State of the USA, which is a -- now a separate public/private corporation that is going to develop indicator system, economic, environmental and social, for the United States as a whole. And these are -- there's going to be an attempt to harmonize these with some world indicators. The OCD was working on the upside.

And on the downside, on the smaller side is they're very interested in developing local indicators, versions of these indicators. And the -- basically they're -- they're -- they're starting with a very, in some sense, simple -- maybe simplistic is the word. They -- they have big areas, and they want essentially one or two indicators in each of these areas and -- and to monitor and to go...

Now, again, they're hampered -- as you
move away from the more traditional indicators, hampered by the fact that there aren't very good indicators for things like well-being or happiness or whatever the particular concept. Because they -- they -- I've been urge -- I've been on the planning committee, and I've been urging them to use some of these things. Social connectedness, for example, is one of the one's that we're trying to do. Religious behavior is -- is another one.

So it's a -- it's a -- it's -- and if you could, in some sense, tie the development of the ones for Houston into that and you could feedback to -- onto them because the problem -- I mean, I think this -- is as it gets going, assuming it gets off the ground but it's got an enormous amount of money behind it at the moment, that they -- they're facing the issue about where new or better measures of the indicators can be developed. It's particularly true in the environmental area. It turns out the environmental area is much harder -- I mean, hardest, the social is, the environmental are even harder because there's not a tradition of -- of environmental statistics the way there is about demographic and social statistics and economic statistics. But I can give you the references.

MR. GRANATO: Okay.
MR. ACHEN: One quick suggestion I have here is that you might ask for seed money for a geographic information system for Houston, geographic information system. And the nice feature of those is that you can have data at different units. So census data will come in one set of units and political data will come in another set. You might want to use voter turnout rates as an indication of people's attachment to the system and that sort of thing. Air quality data will -- may come in at various locations.

When you see people who are skillful at this do the presentations -- some of you may have seen the networks now on primary nights, they can just use their fingers on a screen and drill down to particular areas. And a presentation like that, as Norm and others were suggesting, might get going really quite early with data that already exists. And people will see the potential of it, see how the different neighborhoods are doing, and then you can then say, "It would be great to have this. It would be great to have that. It'd be great to have the third thing, but we don't have the money to do that." So it's a way of putting, you know, kind of a promise in a very visual form that often works well for -- for people who don't do -- don't do statistics for a living.
MR. BIEMER: Try to highlight the gaps in
the information --

MR. ACHEN: Yeah.

MR. BIEMER: -- is what you're talking
about now.

MR. ACHEN: -- in a very visual way that
will make a good presentation. So the problem with this
is doing something like Arc View is hard work. It's not
something you pick up on a weekend. So you probably need
a -- probably need somebody to do this, somebody who --
you know, student's feed in the data, but then this
person runs it.

MR. GRANATO: We can do it right now.

Actually, we have the capability -- so, I mean, what
you're saying, you're preaching to the choir. We're
working with folks at the Johnson Space Center and for
The Texas Lottery Commission Survey and for The Study For
Conductive Energy Devices, we did exactly that.

And now we're starting to do some
population projections. And I'm learning about something
called Tiger Data for the first time. That's what we're
starting to overlay, so -- and we're making it dynamic.
And we've got different ways to make certain parts of the
city -- you know, we're thinking about experimenting, one
part rise and another part stay the same so can actually
get differentiation.

Or right now, what we've done initially is bar graphs to see one. So if you have Harris County and you compare it to Bexar County, you can actually see the difference in terms of who plays a lottery. You may have a -- some type of demographic indicator like gender.

And so what's the difference between male and female?

And you click on that, and you actually see the bar graphs start to change. So it's that kind of thing that we -- we can do right now. But I'm -- I'm glad I could say there's something we can do quickly, which I think you're right.

I mean, what we've learned is -- for sure is people are titling at bar graphs and cross-tabs and graphs that just show things over time. They glaze over.

Once you put a geographic picture that's colorized that moves over time and they could overlay --

MR. BIEMER: It's the animation that probably gets them.

MR. GRANATO: -- it is. They learn instantly because you're getting space and time tied together, and it's just -- it just -- it wins people over quickly. They're asking questions, things of that sort.

MR. BRADBURN: You can have a great demonstration some data like -- I don't know -- like
TARL [sic] data or something like that in which you show -- who this and so forth. And then you want some other thing about social involvement or social connectedness and so forth, and you could sort of have it there. And then you push in, nothing happens, and you say, "Ahh. That's beaus we don't have the data." So...

MR. BLAIS: Question mark.

MR. BRADBURN: Question mark.

MR. GRANATO: I mean --

MR. BIEMER: With a price tag on it.

MR. BRADBURN: Answer this question.

MR. GRANATO: And we want to move beyond that. We want to move beyond that. So right now it's at the display stage, and then we've got all these nice little features there. But we want to make it smart now. The next step is to tie in property and statistics so it can show how these things are changing that's related to power laws and things of that sort.

MR. ACHEN: Well, I think this is also an answer to a question that I'm expecting you're going to get, which is that we already have Steve Klineberg's survey. What is it exactly that you're adding to this? And Steve was enormously generous and helpful this -- this weekend, and that was a classy thing for him to do; but I think you're going to want to think about how the
two of you can -- you know, you want the town to be big
enough for both of you and -- and that you're doing
different things and you're -- you're clear about that,
you're clear about the value of what he's doing, but that
you're doing something different.

So that working on -- working on --
working that out with him and working it out with your
donors and having some kind of classy way to show that
you're not in his way, you're doing something new and
interesting is, I think, also an important part of this
whole packet.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Following
Willie's point about foreign born, it seemed to me that
one of the characteristics of Houston that people have
talked about is its diversity in terms of racial and
ethnic mix and that might well be an important aspect of
this.

But one of the things that's always
struck me as a -- as a foreign born person -- I don't
think of myself as foreign born. I think of myself as
Irish born.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And it reminds me,
often people -- people occasionally ask me -- it seems a
little intrusive -- whether I'm a citizen or not. And I
say, "Of course I am." And they say, "When did you become a citizen?" I say, "When I was born."

MR. GRANATO: I always trace it to when he became a white --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: They don't ask me whether I'm a U.S. -- don't ask me whether I'm a U.S. citizen or not, which is of course a different question. So this whole notion of foreign born is an interesting to me as is ethnicity in general which applies to certain groups, it turns out. So most people are not ethnic in the United States strangely. But one of the things that --

MS. JASSO: They are, but they don't know it.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: One of the things that's interesting to find out in Houston is whether, in fact, assimilation means moving toward the Anglo or assimilating. These are not the same thing. So the question as to whether you give up your religion and your language and then your bad habits and take up good Anglo habits is not the same as saying whether there's assimilation.

So one of the questions is Houston would be is developing a different model of being an American or being U.S. Is the Houstonian now no longer trying to
be like the 75 percent over 65 who are Anglo? Are they
more trying to be like the 75 percent of non-Anglo who
are under 30 or 25 or whatever the number was yesterday.

Norman Tebbett, who was one of Margaret
Thatcher's fairly extreme right -- but by British
standards, extreme right ministers, was very much
exercised by the presence of nonassimilated foreign-type
people in Britain. And his key question for citizenship
was if England -- this is for a particular group. If
England plays Pakistan in cricket, which team do you
support? Because every time any king visited England,
all of the people of that nationality or ethnicity
supported England's opponents.

But one of the things that was striking
of that was there were no people of Pakistani descent on
the English cricket team. And as the team became more
diverse over a period of time, then this also changed.
So I think you have to be very careful in asking the
questions as to what you mean by "assimilating." If
you -- if you live in a Latino, is assimilation learning
Spanish or is it having everybody else learn English? It
does seem to me that -- I don't have an answer of course
to these questions. And I'm not hopeful that all of my
neighborhoods in High Park will learn Gaelic anytime
soon.
But it does seem to me that it's a distinctive feature of Houston that you can look to it as a different -- it's a different balance in terms of race and ethnicity and language and whether, in fact, what you're looking it at is a different model or a model where the questions take on a different flavor. And this might be something that, even in social science terms, to go back to the general question of, you know, is this -- why not national? I may be, why not national? Because Houston is really the only place -- or one of a few places that you're going to get this particular kind of mix and, therefore, it's important to study it here because this is a model that might apply elsewhere if you get that kind of change in the -- in the mixture in neighborhoods.

So I -- I certainly, if I were a Houstonian supporting this, would be more impressed if it had that flavor of saying, not how would it apply elsewhere, but here we have a very different situation and what is it -- what's happening here and how should we define what things mean because, I suspect, it might mean something different.

MS. CALLAGHAN: On that note, I'd like to say I'd like to see assimilation of negative racial attitudes, that is, people coming from other countries
that don't hold negative views of African Americans and
countries that are black African that have an in-group
notion of -- that's not prejudicial. But do they come
here and they adopt the prejudice as well.

MS. SIEBER: Coming from the Bay Area,
which is very much like Houston in many regards, I think
what Colm was saying is something that's imperceptible to
the people there, that is, the culture changes and the
only way you know it is when your relatives from
elsewhere come to visit and say, "Huh?" When you go in a
restaurant and nobody there is acting Anglo. When you go
to Chinatown and that's just how it is.

And capturing that is really good at
capturing what's going to be happening to America. It
may not be a popular message to put out. I'd be careful
how I'd put it out, but it's a dynamic which we don't
notice because it's happening all around us.

MR. BIEMER: You know it -- it just
strikes me that -- because I think we have a lot of
social sciences in the room, we tend to -- we tend to
suggest indicators that are more social indicators. But
I -- you know, this is, I think, the value of gathering
experts from different fields of economics, education,
you know, even you know looking at child care issues,
whatever and -- and, you know, trying to brainstorm about
what kinds of things this survey should measure. And I think when you're going to do that is what we found, with just a narrow field like child abuse, you're going to have so much information that this survey could collect that you're going to have to then, you know, take the next hard step, which is to try to prioritize things and -- and decide, you know, there's only about maybe 10 percent of all these things that we can actually do in the survey because otherwise the survey would last all day and we've only got one hour in the household or something like that.

But you know, this is why I think you really need to take some time. And a year is not a lot of time to really meet with various, you know, people in academe and people who are city leaders and so forth and -- and try to identify all sorts of indicators that this thing could measure and what are the main ones. And those might even -- you know, as we were talking yesterday with these topical modules, could change over time.

MS. JASSO: And by the way, in an actual questionnaire, you never ask are you assimilating, have you, et cetera. I mean, all you do is get objective information. You know, "Do go to church? Did you go to church before you came? What language are the services
conducted in" da, da, da, da, da. You just get facts, and then it's the analyst who then puts them together into a picture about who is doing what, going in which direction, toward or away from whatever may be the -- the --

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Although the definition of the -- of the factors or the indexes is heavily culturally related. So what do you consider assimilation is really -- is not value. So I agree that the -- and to some extent, even the questions you ask are -- are -- imply that. So if you don't ask the same questions of the nonforeign born population.

So, I mean, it always strikes me when I come down to this part of the country where, you know, the definition of food is really now Mexican American food or Tex-Mex food or whatever. You know, this is very different from Chicago and the northeast. And it's -- it's seen as American here, and it wasn't seen as American, I'm sure 20 or 30 years ago, Paul. I don't know, but my guess is good Americans didn't eat that kind of food.

MR. BIEMER: It was hot dogs and hamburgers.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: You know, so that's a change. And that's -- but people don't think of
that as -- they think the foreigners are assimilating, but in fact, you know, the culture has changed. The whole meaning of what it is you're moving toward is changing and that's -- and that's very significant in terms of even -- and how you think about it and what you measure because we don't think of both groups moving toward a new position. They're still at this feeling that people come in, and they're -- and are assimilated into something that's there by becoming more like that, instead of having the whole thing change so it's no longer...

        MS. SIEBER: A great example of that is what acceptable child care and elder care. It's very culturally laden, but the whole culture is changing in regard to that.

        MR. BRADBURN: There is truth --

        MS. SIEBER: It has tremendous implication for social services.

        MR. FRANCIS: Yeah. I actually have a question I want to raise, and it gets back to this point about the length of the survey. One of the things that was on the -- one of the bullets yesterday that we didn't talk about is the period of data collection should be quarterly, semiannual, you know, annual, every two years? And what I wondered is, is there any --
how would you -- how do you react to the idea of having shorter surveys, but higher frequency where certain things are collected maybe in a spring way, then other things are collected in a fall way. So you're making contact every six months, but you're not getting contact on every data point each time?

MR. BRADBURN: Well, it obviously depends on -- on the -- the total size. But in an ideal world, continuous collection would be best, that is, you having a small but a sample every month or two months. And -- and then you have a dedicated staff and you sort of do things around.

You have -- one of the great advantages that you can always take advantage of unexpected events because you don't have to -- because you're always sort of in the field. That's the way it sort of was with the CPS -- I mean, the ACS model.

But you need -- in fact, in -- and the predecessor to the general social survey was something Frank -- only Frank and I are old enough to remember, a continuous national survey which NSF sponsored initially; and that was a small sample every week actually. The questionnaire could change once a month. I mean, so you -- and if you wanted a bigger sample, you just left the same question in for -- for several cycles or many
cycles or the whole year if you wanted to build up a
big -- big enough.

If you were interested in rapid response,
then you'd -- you know, you could change it in a month.
And that turned out to be extremely beneficial during the
energy crisis because we -- that happened to be going on
at that time. So for this emergency energy office at the
White House, we could put in a question, you know, this
month about, you know, gas rationing -- you know, what
sort of gas -- if you had to ration gas, what method
would you, you know, want to use and one on going to year
daylight savings time, which we did briefly in that
period.

So that -- that's, in a way, the -- the
best way to do it, but it has -- you know, you've got
to -- and you can, you know, keep a status. So -- but
that's -- well, it depends on how big -- but even that, I
guess, we were doing that -- I think we had -- the weekly
sample was 150 or something like that and so, you know,
it built up over the years to what it had to be --

MR. SCIOLI: Well, but what about in a
less than ideal world?

MR. BRADBURN: Well --

MR. SCIOLI: I mean, what about

practical...
MR. BRADBURN: I guess it's -- it's, you know, in some sense, the principle that Colm and the GSA, that the more the better. You know, the bigger the sample, the better. So the more frequent you can do it the better. And that's -- but again, it sort of depends on what you think what variables are subject to rapid change of various sorts.

I -- most things aren't. The major advantage of -- so from that point of view, doing it once a year or every other year or something like that, is -- is not too much different, aside from the kind of logistical advantages of keeping track of people if you're doing it more frequent and so forth.

But if you -- if -- in terms of the -- of the, not only the general change of various sorts, you do want to think about it as a potential instrument for short-term things. Is there policy tests or taking advantage of -- of unexpected events, then -- then something that's close to continuous as possible is the better strategy.

I think you would basically need to look at cost differences of various sorts. I'm not sure that they're -- I mean, there are certain economies of doing it continuously. You've got to train staff, you know, the training. When you have to gear up once every year
or two years, I mean, that involves training costs for interviewers and all that sort of stuff. And if you -- if we're using a strategy that we're talking about yesterday of -- sort of initial impanelling people through personal visits and so forth, but a large -- at least lots of them after that, doing it on the phone or doing it on the web, then the continuous nature is easier. I mean, you wouldn't want to do everybody every week or every month and so forth, but doing you know subsamples on a monthly basis or basis or something would be practical, which would allow you then to -- to put in something if there's something -- you know, an emergency came up and so forth and so on.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I agree with Norman. And there are two separate issues. One is in what way do you -- in purely operations terms, what way do you want to structure the field work. So do we want continuous field work or field work every so often?

And the second is how often do you want to measure each individual. So how often do you want to go back to each individual.

And then the third point, which crosses both of these, what mode are you going to use? And for face to face really, it's not practical to go back frequently to the same household unless you have
continuous data collection. So to launch a new data
college every three months is really not practical, even
if you only want to go back some people. And my guess is
you might not want to go back to everybody for every
topic. So, I mean, you don't have to -- even if you want
quarterly data on some things, you may not want it from
everybody.

And that certainly suggests that this
recruitment by face to face and then data capture by
other modes is really probably what you want to think
about. And the time is probably right for this, you
know, in terms of movement toward Internet in particular.
So Internet data capture. As the proportion of people
with computers of their own, which I guess we now reckon
70 percent of the population probably has the Internet
access at home, this is a high proportion.

And Internet is also particularly good in
terms of the kinds of stimulus you can give to people.
So you can present people with visual stimulus as well as
with words or with video clips or with pictures of their
neighborhood or pictures of the new construction downtown
or pictures of people streaming across the border or
whatever -- whatever topic it is that you want to present
them with.

You could even consider impanelling the
Houston panel by providing them with Internet access. So making it an Internet-based data collection. So either you pay their Internet connection fee or you give them one of these lower grade web TV, MSN TV2 terminals that they can use. And then I think you -- you -- it's reasonable that they might well respond to you briefly on a number of occasions during the year. It wouldn't be -- that would be in keeping with the fact that you're paying some regular subscription for them that once a quarter, they would do some survey for you. And if you do it more frequently, the burden is less each time. So there's the additional advantage that you keep in touch with them so they haven't forgotten you by the time you come back at the end of the next year.

MS. SIEBER: Are these gadgets that their kids can use for educational purposes and so forth or --

MR. O'MUIRACHEARThAIGH: No.

MS. SIEBER: -- are they just dedicated?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARThAIGH: Just barely. Just bare. But they're so much less sophisticated than most --

MS. SIEBER: Ah-hah.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARThAIGH: -- PC or Mac-based Internet that their children would probably have much better access to it at school than these. But, yes, you
can. I mean, you can use them but they're very clunky really for -- and it might even be that you give them a computer and Internet access. These costs are now relatively low, but that's a -- but that's a big -- that's a capital investment.

MR. BRADBURN: Get one of your Texas computer companies to donate machines.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No. Sure.

MS. JASSO: That would be great.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: You can get a sponsor or two sponsors, so that the Internet connection and the computers are provided by different sponsors --

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: -- who become gold sponsors or --

MS. JASSO: The Dell survey.

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Let's save platinum for the people who are paying your salaries.

MR. BIEMER: I got overexcited.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Just losing perspective here.

MS. JASSO: I'd like to build -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I think it's wise because I could have gone on indefinitely.
MS. JASSO: Which would have been fun.

I'd like to build on something that born Norm and Colm, and that is that periodicity to answer data may differ by different topic. This is a question that -- that immigration researchers have talked about and thought about for about 30 years.

There's a point of view that says all we care about is outcomes. If you give people the green card, look at them 20 years later, look at their -- look at their kids 20 years later and compare them to the ones who didn't get the green card and see what happened.

There's another point of view that says, the process is really important. The trajectory of how these changes occurred. And some -- some will occur really fast and -- and others very slow. They're going to have different growth curves with different concavity, et cetera.

And so one needs to think a lot about the particular substantive area before deciding what's the optimal periodicity for that set of questions.

MR. BIEMER: But, you know, I think what we found though is there's a balance if you -- let's suppose that you're worried about the burden on the respondent and --

MS. JASSO: We're always worried about
that.

MR. BIEMER: -- and interviewing them too often. But if you go, say, on a yearly basis, you do have the opportunity to collect retrospective data. And, you know, to the extent that the events can be recalled with some accuracy, you know, you can actually place events that way with some new techniques that are available in surveys. So you can think of in terms of -- you know you might -- you might not have to, you know, set the periodicity of the survey to catch these events. You might be able to do it with recall.

The other -- the other thing I wanted to mention is this idea of what's called matrix sampling or have different subsamples where the two -- where two subsamples would be fielded simultaneously, but they would have different -- maybe different field periods. There would be -- they would be offset in terms of when you would actually visit these households in order to be able to, you know, flatten the -- flatten out the interviewer workload. But they could have a common core but maybe different questions in a module, you know, so you could actually have like two series going on. Now, that would cut down on the sample size for those topical modules, but you would have, you know, the full sample size for the core. So things that you needed, you know,
high precision on could be in the core and then other
things that could maybe -- precision could accumulate
over time could be in these modules. You can -- it's
very sophisticated in those designs.

MR. SCIOLI: These are issues, I think,
that are going to be extremely important as Jim develops
this further with whatever group he establishes and
perhaps some or many of you will be involved in -- in
that level of detail of design, et cetera.

But it segues nicely into a topic that
I'm interested in which I've had almost no experience,
save for long ago when I was involved with research
applied to national needs and we had users involved in
all of our advisory panels. We had firefighters, we
policemen, we had trash collectors, we had health service
deliverers mixed with academicians and that was extremely
interesting and important part of -- the academicians won
out at the National Science Foundation, as you probably
know. We decided that it was -- it was important to have
the science first.

Now, in terms of best practices, have any
of you had experience with involving community in terms
of the antecedent discussions for the sophisticated kinds
of topics that we're talking about right now? And is it
best to establish exclusively community groups, have some
scientists involved or have -- have just -- or make it equally balanced? Has anybody had experience with this?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I thought --

MR. SCIOLI: The users, if you will.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I've had some in The Making Connections Project that I mentioned yesterday, which is the Annie E. Casey Foundation project. We do have -- the evaluation is carried out on behalf of the foundation, but the operating group in each neighborhood is the local learning partnership, which is a consortium of local community leaders and local community residents.

And there's been a -- what I think Hollywood calls "creative tension" between the parties in developing what goes on. The foundation largely determines the questions that have to be asked. So this is -- because they determine that these will be evaluation questions, but the community also has input in terms of the questionnaire. And the community also wants to have input in terms of hiring interviewers, for example.

In the first wave, we more or less neglected to do this and ran into a lot of trouble in some communities where they felt that -- you know, the foundation, the whole process was failing the residents
and that they weren't being given an opportunity to be interviewers in the survey. So, though, in the first four communities I think we failed to do this and then we took it on board for the next six community, and it was another lesson in how everybody thinks something is going to happen that isn't going to happen.

So we launched a local recruitment and asked all of the local community leaders to propose people who -- who could become interviewers. One of the things, I think, people don't realize is how little we pay interviewers. I think that -- I think people think interviewers get paid a lot, and interviewers get paid very little. Sadly, that's the fact of the matter so there wasn't nearly as much demand for it as -- as had been anticipated and very few people, in fact, were generated. And -- and as is my experience in many of these cases, the people who complain most loudly and wanted most vociferously to be engaged were the people who produces fewest candidates for recruitment, but that's politics. And that's the way life is often.

But it was still very important to do it, so it's not -- and we also had a -- we had an opportunity for communities to propose additional questions to the core questionnaire that could be included only for their community. Technically, they had to pay for these, but
they were going -- essentially they were going to get the money from the foundation. But they were able to come up with additional questions that they felt were relevant, and we have incorporated questions from different communities into the questionnaire as additions to the core questionnaire.

MR. BIEMER: Was there a spokesperson for the community? Was there like a community leader?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Well, there was already this entity, the local learning partnership, which was a consortium of community organizations that were already actively involved in the kinds of activities the foundation supported. So there were literacy groups or community groups, community action groups, neighborhood watch groups, beautification groups, all the kinds of people who -- who tended to work with the community had representation on the -- on the local learning partnership.

And it certainly meant that in terms of accept -- these are quite small neighborhoods we were going into with quite a lot of interviewers. So their having local acceptability was important in terms of doing the survey. It's not like, you know, you're doing 40 interviews in Chicago. You know, you don't need -- Chicago doesn't know this, but you're doing 800
interviews in Denver in a particular neighborhood in Denver and then it really is noticeable. In one locality, we were going to every other household. So there you do -- you're fairly visible to the community. So that -- that, I think -- I mean, it's a lot of work, you know, for everybody, not just the survey people but the community people as well. And it doesn't generate, I guess, input in proportion to the amount of work. But I still think in terms of acceptability -- and sometimes I must say in terms of input, it generates things that you wouldn't have thought of, you know.

So there are a couple of cases where the questions that were proposed by one community were adopted by others, that were then offered to all the other neighborhoods as possible add-on questions. And in some questions, they generated topics that more people were interested in that weren't generated by the foundation or by the NORC group.

MS. JASSO: And you -- go ahead.

MR. MURRAY: There are a couple entities here that are -- would be very important, I think to get on board. One is the -- we call The Center for Houston's Future. It's a spinoff of The Greater Houston Partnership, the -- the sort of the leading corporate
entity. But they will be very interested in this project if it goes forward. I mean, that's -- it's a 20-year initial time frame. That's about what they're thinking about is, you know, their task with how do you grow from 5 1/2 million people to 8 million in 20 years with half of those people coming in from the United States and other issues like the major human capital challenges we have here with a higher birth rate than most parts of the country, but a lot of young people seem to be lagging in getting the formal educational credentials and skills. But I think their support would be very, very important. The good news is they've been around for a while. They've got a -- they're an organized structure.

There's one called Leadership Houston that's been around for around 20 years. And they -- they would be very important, I think, to -- to, first, let them know what we're thinking about and seek their input. Then we -- of course, we've got multiple subsections. We have a very large African-American population here that's relatively cohesive politically and closely tied to Texas Southern University and, you know, getting -- getting their -- some of the key leaders there involved early. The Hispanic community is even larger, but -- but more fragmented, more dispersed, less politically sophisticated, but becoming a really vital
force in our community.

So it is a lot of work in this -- but we do have some structural connections that are existing that we can plug into that'll -- that will be of some benefit, I think, if we can convince them that this is a good thing.

MS. LEE: That's really true. You have to pick your partners strategically. And I think broader participation is even vital.

It seems that in a lot of these kinds of -- you know, research studies, we the scientists come. We do the research, and we go away.

So the advantage of the partnership then is both in terms of advancing improvement -- and I know someone over on that side of the table brought up, when you do that, then you get sort of this bias sample, but you're going to get a sample of volunteers anyway. So, to the extent that you can make it known that this is coming and it's an important thing with your partners, that's -- that's really important.

Informing, as both of you have discussed, what are the issues of the community, what are the issues of the partners and then translation of your findings to the community, not just to the policymakers, but also to community because the community is the constituency for
the policymakers. That's really an important thing.

MR. FRANCIS: What do you guys think about the inclusion of groups representing say public education, you know K-12 education, the Texas Medical Center, energy sector, or would you just focus on greater Houston partnership and the subsets?

MS. LEE: Well, I think it's really important to get all of those people at the table. And I think you will get some representation of those groups that you mention that -- but I think specific targeting is also important. And you will know you have reached everybody when you start realizing that you're seeing the same people -- same people's names coming up, you know, when you have your snowball strategy like that.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I have some concern about representation on these things, partly because you don't want to set up a situation where people feel they're delegates and their responsibility is to get their topic on the questionnaire. You know, this is really not what you want. And some kinds of organizational structure like this lead to somebody arriving from public education saying, you know, "your job is to get public education on the agenda" or else "your job to make public education doesn't go on the agenda."
So these -- these are not -- so that's not -- so it's very important to distinguish between a political representative structure -- and I'd make these a board of some kind, you know. Give them a fancy title --

MS. LEE: Well, how many people --

MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- and have them meet and give them dinner.

MS. LEE: -- ground work, you know, sort of the formative work to determine what kind of issues we want to focus on in the survey, you know, and once those -- and perhaps all those partners can be a part of that formative piece that comes before, before you actually design the survey and decide it's going to -- you know, the specific questions that are going to be on it.

MS. CALLAGHAN: I -- I would just caution. I think there's a disadvantage. It depends on how much inclusion we want to have because as Colm mentioned, the political side, I think that we want to draw the line at the topic and the groups are not involved in question wording because there you'll see some anger over --

MR. BIEMER: No, don't do that.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Right. And so
MR. BIEMER: The bottom line is just --
is to create something that's salable, right, so people
will support it and, you know, that should be the goal.
You -- you want to -- you want to get monetary support.
You want to get people who have the money. I guess,
they -- they need to be involved in improving...

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: The thing about
it, I think you want people to be involved in improving
the general vision, but not any of the operations, so...

MR. BIEMER: No. That's right.

MR. O'MUIRCHERTAIGH: Because there,
again, I've -- we've have all been to many meetings,
inappropriate groups, you know, groups that aren't
really -- dysfunctional groups because they're trying to
do something they're not supposed to be doing. And I
think that's -- so perhaps Rebecca's point of getting
involved first as putting them on some high-level group
where, like a board, they don't get to see any detail.
They just get to the decide, you know, is this a
direction in which you're going, but certainly not as
"how many questions are there going to be" or "what are
they sort of questions," that's not their business.

MS. LEE: There's certainly levels of involvement in this kind of community participatory sort of strategy. But I think it is very common -- I think you mentioned this earlier, also, that you know, you have the agenda. We have the agenda. We are setting the agenda. You know, we are trying to get information. Whether the agenda will play, whether this agenda's even a possibility in the current context and whether, you know, we're on target and then support, you know, adoptability and that kind of stuff. So, you know, I think there's ways that are acceptable to all groups. But I think it is really important to have community involved at the beginning, if for no other reason than just to kind of keep them informed this is coming down the pike eventually.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. The -- it's -- I mean, you want to be sure that what you end up doing is relevant to the people who -- who are going to be users and supporters and so forth.

Just to draw out a distinction that's been sort of been made, but not made precisely; and that's the different levels at which you -- the word "question" is used. The -- the -- there's the -- the general question that -- that -- that people are trying
to answer and then there's the specific -- as I say, the
question that you ask real people. And that's
different -- that's the embodiment maybe of the
measurement of the some of the big kind of questions.

And you want to be sure when you're
talking -- well, there are different techniques for
involving people at both levels. But at the top level,
when you're trying to figure out what the big questions
are that people really want to have answered, doing
that -- I mean, I -- I quite agree that it's very
important that people do not see -- are not recruited or
see themselves as delegates from some political position
or -- or some group or something like that. You want to
draw on their -- you know, in some sense, expertise, but
not -- you don't want them there as a representative.
You want them there as a person.

But I've been in those kind of meetings
of various sorts and run some and so forth, and it's very
hard -- you have got to be very careful how you do it
because the major thing that I find is that at top levels
people -- and particularly people who are in Houston
running companies and things and so forth, they don't
distinguish very closely between what they want to know
and how they want to know it. And so they -- they --
they lap over from what you are trying to get out of
them, which is what's the big question that really concerns them, by -- by telling you how to do it.

And it's -- it's a very difficult -- I mean, touchy sort of thing to run meetings like that in which you can sort of separate out the -- what -- what it is that they're -- they're really concerned about and -- and get out their conception of how you -- or what the answer is. I think it's both how you do it and what the answer is. And, you know, you can get irritated at various times because it looks like they're, in one level, saying, "We don't need research because we know what the answer is," but at the same time they -- other things, they really want to know what the answer is and so on and so forth. And so it's -- that irritates me.

So at the level of how to ask the question of real people there, you know, we -- we use a number of techniques. But one that, again, is a bit different than the way many people use focus groups, but I -- I like to work with people that are like the people we're going to be -- respondents, real respondents because you -- and to see what -- how they frame -- what language they use to talk about a particular problem.

Let me give you an example. We were developing -- we developed the methodology for the U.S. News and World Report ratings of hospitals. And when we
were doing that, we -- we would have groups of nurses and
doctors and medical technicians and -- and patients and
so forth and sort of asked them, "Well, if you think
about -- you know, what do you think of as a good
hospital? You know, what do you think of -- you know,
what do you think about? What -- how do you think about
it? What words do you use?" So we gave them -- we
generated things and get them back and so on and so
forth.

And that's very important to get at this
issue of how the questions come across to the respondents
as whether you really understand them, you know, some
kind of way. And, of course, when you've got a
heterogeneous respondent population, it's hard to get
language that's -- because we want standardized language.
I -- we did play around at various times with for -- of
tailoring the question -- the -- the words that we used
for certain concepts and things like, you know, "illicit
drug user" or "getting high" or whatever and so forth,
but it doesn't add much, although it does a little bit.
But it -- that's really, I think, beyond what you -- one
generally can do. But you've got to work at both levels.
And in the beginning, you want to work at the -- sort of
the high level, too.

What we -- in the KNNI thing, what we've
been doing was asking people what -- what they wanted to
know. You know, sort of say, okay, you know, you're
sponsor you're involved in the environment of your town
and so on and so forth, what do you want to know about?
What questions do you have that you would like to have
answered? You know, not -- not what the answer is or --
and sort of putting it in that framework and then trying
to think about how you operationalize things that might
answer those big-level questions. But it's -- it's not
as timely and difficult.

MS. JASSO: To build on a couple of
points that Norm raised, for some of the questionnaire
items on some topics, there will already be a large
volume of work using focus groups, et cetera, how best to
ask this. And so for comparability, it might be useful
to -- to have the exact modules and -- and keep track --
always keep track what module came from where because
then when questions are raised of you and, "Where did you
get these questionnaire items," et cetera, you can say,
"Well these have a long history," et cetera.

A problem that may arise will be when you
go to other languages where there may not be a similar
body of work. And -- and if it comes to that, then talk
to the people at the Census Bureau who -- who translate
to other languages, talk to us because we have 10
languages for a lot of these modules on health,
retirement, assets, earnings, et cetera.

And finally, one last point -- and I --
today is probably not the day to discuss it, but since
Colm brought it up, I am deeply uneasy with using
interviewers from within a community to interview people
there. And there's lots and lots of reasons and things,
et cetera. It's probably a topic for another day, but I
don't think it should be done lightly.

MR. SCIOLI: Let me, at the risk of
putting David on the spot -- and I'm sorry Stephen is not
here this morning, but Richard may also have had
experience. Is it fairly easy to meet -- I mean, I would
imagine that Stephen has generated a lot of goodwill in
the community.

MR. MURRAY: Absolutely.

MR. SCIOLI: And he's interacted with
folks and he said 95 presentations a year. So he's out
doing what Rebecca said, translating the social science
into lay persons and saying, "This is what we do at this
tower, the weirdoes that we are" -- strike that -- "and
here's what it means to you. Here are the broader
impacts." So have you --

MR. FRANCIS: Well, yeah. We're very
involved in K-12 education in the state and certainly
local here in the city and down in Brownsville. So
we're -- the work that I've been doing is largely either
in educational or in health. So we're connected with
folks in the Medical Center, but mostly in K-12
education.

MR. SCIOLI: And, Richard, have you
gotten on speak out in communities?

MR. FRANCIS: He's a household name in
this city.

MR. SCIOLI: Oh, okay. Well, you guys
then have to be allied with this newbie. And, you know,
you don't want to bring the new gun into town and all of
a sudden going to be telling the people what's important.
I mean, Norman's point about it, be very very delicate,
the balance, so that you don't come off -- I mean, you
come off as wanting to enlist their support, listen to
them, certainly not be patronizing, but at the same time
not having them change the agenda.

MS. LEE: It's delicate, but it can be
done.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, there are people on
campus. Good. That's -- that's --

MR. FRANCIS: Well, the president -- the
chancellor of the university sits on the executive board
of The Greater Houston Partnership. I don't know if the
Rice president also sits on there or not. But I know that U of H does. I believe TSU is on that board as well. So the universities are connected to this business partnership within the city.

MR. SCIOLI: So Jim is going to need the allies in that room. And I -- probably premature to have the -- the other gun, so to speak, with the sophistication.

If I might, Jim, can we have a 10-minute break.

MR. GRANATO: Absolutely.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Just -- just one small topic I just wanted to cover probably before we finished in case we lose sight of it. Translation is a -- is a really important issue for the questionnaires. And the -- the conventional wisdom on translation was that, you know, translation and back translation pretty much took care of things. This is no longer the accepted view.

MR. SCIOLI: What's the issue? I'm sorry. I'm trying...

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Translation of questionnaires.

MR. SCIOLI: Oh, different language. I'm sorry. Okay.
MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: And the university-accepted view by people who know, which should convince you, I'm sure, without any evidence of any kind, is that questionnaires should now be developed if they're going to be used in multiple languages -- and here they will be certainly in, at least, two languages -- by committee structure rather than by individuals translating. So that you start with a questionnaire committee that forms the question. The previous version was Anglo, make it in English, then get a good translation. Bad idea.

MR. SCIOLI: Okay.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: You have to have people involved right from the beginning in the languages in which the questionnaire is going to be used, and they develop the questionnaire together. So that it's not a question of -- you can never start with an English questionnaire and translate it properly into Spanish, nor with a Spanish and translate it properly into English. You have to decide on what you're trying to find out and then develop the question simultaneously in the two languages. And for this, you need people in the community who speak the version of the language in the community.

The Census Bureau has now produced a set
of guidelines on translation. They have an accepted standards for translation, which are really quite strict. And the reason the Census Bureau did this was that it's such an appalling record on translation until they did it, you know. So the fact they've done it is partly a condemnation of their previous practices where they found with important questionnaires -- I think the original Spanish version of the ACS questionnaire had unforgivable errors of syntax in -- in the published form. I mean, even though the translation was done in good faith.

And my guess is -- so one of the things, for example, is that in many cases asking questions about public services, you can't translate the term. It may well be that in the Spanish-speaking community, they use the English language for the whatever office of -- in the city is where the translator will find a formal language translation of the employment office is and put it in; but that's not what anybody calls it.

So trans -- and especially if you're going to sell this as a -- you know, a multicultural, cross-cultural instrument, that has to be built in right from the beginning. And there should never be a meeting about the questionnaire, certainly at the point of developing the questions, that doesn't have people who are going to be writing it in the languages that you're
going to use. And I would make that both a selling point
and also a resourcing point. I mean, that means you have
to have people on board who can do this.

And it's -- clearly, Spanish is going to
be a critical language, so you have to have Spanish and I
don't know what else you have to have, but it may be that
you have to have other things as well.

And, actually, I should have referred to
Andre. Canada has, I assume, struggled with this issue
and overcome it?

MR. BLAIS: The -- the Canadian National
study, we build two questionnaires simultaneously, at the
very same time. And you have to be quite experienced
because in a ways, you know, someone is talking English,
but they try to move to French into English. You know,
we amend the initial English question because of the
problems we have translating it. And sometimes I've been
accused of vetoing some questions because, you know, I
couldn't find the French equivalent.

But it's really enriching at the same
time, so it has to be the research community on your
board, people who create the questions, have to try to
build the two questionnaires at the very same time. And
there is a -- sometimes you might decide that some
questions cannot be asked the same way, and then you sort
of agree that there will be some differences. You have
to live with them and to check the -- the result at the
end. But I think it's extremely important in your case
that you build, at least, two -- two questionnaires at
the same time.

MR. FRANCIS: Are there some guidelines
about the specific numbers of representatives of each
language?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: No. Well, I
think that the Census Bureau report -- it's the statistic
research division which produced this report, which is
available on-line. If you can't get it, ask me. I find
it -- I don't know how to do it either, but I know the
people who did it so we can get it easily.

And Janet Harkness, who is at -- in
Nebraska now was at ZUMA, was involved in this whole
translation business.

And there's quite an interesting
conference that's going to be held in Berlin in June --
you might want to go -- on multicultrual multi --
multi-country multi-cultural surveys in which this is one
of the topics on the -- on the agenda and will be --
that's one there will be a monograph eventually with the
main kind of the featured papers of this conference that
will be published. So Janet Harkness at University of
Nebraska survey department, survey program are...

MR. GRANATO: She works with Alan Kutchin?

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Yes.

MR. GRANATO: Okay. I know him.

MR. MURRAY: We'll have to make a decision as this goes forward. Of course, Spanish is essential here. But the third one is Vietnamese and to have the Vietnamese component. 90 percent of our metropolitan area should be able to communicate fully in Spanish or English.

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I do think André's point is really important. I know this idea that -- the vetoing something because you can't have a question in French. So if you're multicultural in your view, you say that's disgraceful. If you're multicultural in your view, it wouldn't be wise to pose a question that couldn't be asked in both languages. Even though, the notion that this vetoing process betrays a monocultural approach.

I'm very sensitive to this. My native language is not English and, therefore, I have always been aware of the difficulties of translation and the difficulty of expressing the same thought in two languages, which is why I frequently struggle with
MR. SCIOLI: What do you mean?

MS. JASSO: To add to that very briefly.

The New Immigrant Survey went over this, and we designed by the New York staff committee approach. And, in fact, as Norm said, put on the committee were the people who were going to be like the respondents, et cetera, et cetera. And we developed a glossary, a list of words and phrases that will always be said in English. And all that is in a paper on the web that you can get. And of course, if you want further detail, any of us on the survey would be delighted to give you the further detail.

MR. GRANATO: Thank you.

MS. JASSO: Janet Harkness is superb, and -- and I talk to her a lot. I also talk to Ilysue Schulebare [sp], yeah --

MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: USC.

MS. JASSO: -- who is absolutely tops.

MS. SIEBER: Since this is a panel study and you're going to be going back to the same people again and again, it seems to me that version of the principles has to be built into what you disseminate to the different language groups because you can really make a nice report into a nightmare by making -- doing the wrong nuance. It's not quite as critical as in the
survey design, but still very important.

MR. SCIOLI: Okay. I was serious about the break. And I've never -- I've never had a meeting in my other life where people have resisted going onto a break. This is a tribute to this group.

(Recess, 10:50 to 11:08.)

MR. SCIOLI: Okay. Let's resume. Chris will be here in a second. This is the denouement, and we've already lost one of our participants, but --

MR. GRANATO: I must -- I like --

MR. SCIOLI: Jim, should -- actually, I thought he told us we had the accent.

MS. JASSO: We are the unassimilated.

MR. SCIOLI: Exactly.

Jim, why don't you do with us what you wish before we leave and you're free to take full advantage of us. We'll just lay back, as it will.

MR. GRANATO: I'd like to ask Joan to make a few comments about IRBs and human subject pool because since this is going to be a panel study of some sort, that's going to be a big issue. So Joan.

MS. SIEBER: Okay. I want to -- I want to talk about three sorts of interrelated things. One is IRBs and regulations and the disconnect between them. The second is perceived risk
and benefit. You know, you're not talking about operating on someone's liver. You're talking about asking them questions, which you may not think are risky, but perceptions differ and the same for benefit. And then the final is creating a relationship and/or versus informed consent.

I think that probably what we've all had experience at recognizing that IRBs are very inconsistent from one to another based upon their level of expertise with the kind of project that you're presenting and this has really to do with whether they're doing a worst-case analysis because they don't understand the situation very well or whether they understand it well and can really help you to do very good science.

The regulations are actually quite reasonable and flexible, and so the problem as with any regulation is in interpretation. And I think it's -- it's important to -- well, I don't know what the IRB structure is here. How many IRBs does the University of Houston have?

MR. FRANCIS: We have two. We have a social science IRB and then a basic sciences IRB.

MS. SIEBER: Okay. So the social science IRB would be the obvious one.

MR. FRANCIS: Sure. Uh-huh.
MS. SIEBER: And I think it's really
vital, as you get geared up, that -- that the project
makes sure you have at least one person on the IRB who
has expertise in cattle research, but who is not part of
this project. So there would be no conflict of interest,
but someone who could -- could educate -- educate the
panel.

I think that beyond that, you're probably
going to ask some sensitive questions about health, about
criminal activity. You may be doing some research about
children or even have some children that you survey. And
I think on all of these kinds of things, as you -- as you
develop the questions, you really need to, I would say --
I would recommend communicate with members of this panel
who have had that kind of experience, with Paul about
interviewing kids.

MR. BRADBURN: Could I just --

MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

MR. BRADBURN: One of the -- the problems
you certainly will face is that at some point or other
your respondents will be in jail when you're -- when
their time comes around.

MR. GRANATO: Hopefully no one on the
advisory board.

MR. BRADBURN: I hope not.
And -- and as you probably know that there are special restrictions and so on and so forth with regard to people in prison.

And actually there would be two problems. One is what the IRB thinks about it, although they shouldn't really be particularly concerned because this is not prison research in the -- since they were in the panel before they were in prison, it's not technically prison research.

The other problem that we've encountered in panels where our respondents are in jail. First of all, they're extremely cooperative because they don't have anything else to do and they love to be interviewed because it takes their mind off the other things they're doing.

Some prisons won't let you bring computers in -- into the prison or to do things. So you may -- I mean, there's some -- some problems that come with that. But it's -- the IRBs sometimes end up giving unnecessary trouble, I mean, from my point of view, I say trouble, but that's where you're probably hit problem.

MS. SIEBER: So that really would be another problem to anticipate, I suppose, as...

MR. BIEMER: May I just comment. You know, RTI is doing a prison rape study. And the person
to talk to, if you'd like some information on that, would be Rachel Casper who is leading that project there. I'd be happy to put you in touch with her about some of the issues that she's run into in that study. There -- you know, this is for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and they're interviewing prisoners in -- I don't know -- hundreds of prisons across the United States, using -- well, using computer technology, in fact.

MS. SIEBER: You know, what --

MR. BRADBURN: We just recently started having trouble getting that.

MR. BIEMER: Oh, really?

MS. SIEBER: You know, I think one of the advantages that you have in that you're going to have a considerable startup period developing your questions is that that's also a time to be creating a relationship with the IRB and letting them know what you're going to do and bringing in consultants who can say, "Well, here is how this has been handled at another institution."

Give them a chance to digest all of that instead of thrusting it upon them at the last minute when they're -- when they don't have a chance to make a judgment.

I'd be interested to hear Paul's and Norman's and Willie's experience of how really you start talking to your IRB and how -- how you work that process
of educating them and having them educate you.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, I mean, I think for Paul and me, it's different because we -- our organizations have their own IRBs. And since surveys are what we do, the -- the IRB is -- is very, you know, understanding of all the ins and outs and so forth.

MS. SIEBER: Sure.

MR. BRADBURN: The difficulty sometimes, although this is -- I don't know how RTI does it. But one -- the IRBs have to have a community member. You've got to be sure that you -- the community member is somebody who doesn't just react and say, "Oh, I -- I hate surveys and so on" and use their own experience as a respondent in a market research or a poll or something and to -- to decide what's intrusive or what's -- those kinds of things.

MS. SIEBER: Get some very odd-ball responses. I think one -- one of the difficulties that IRBs have is finding good community members who are willing to give their time to be on the IRB. And you might even be able to help them by finding people who will volunteer.

MR. BRADBURN: Actually, Houston doesn't have a medical school does it, does it?

MR. FRANCIS: University of Houston does
not. Houston, the city has two.

MR. BRADBURN: In my experience is the universities that do not have medical schools have less IRB problems in the social sciences than universities that have medical schools.

MR. BIEMER: What we've run into problems with IRBs on, you know, we're interviewing children or the caregivers as well as the children who have been investigated for child abuse and neglect. You know, you can imagine the sensitivity of this information, child custody battles and all that kind of thing. It's the release of data, and you know the IR -- where the IR -- where we really ran into difficulty was, you know, what data are you going to be releasing -- well, that and informed consent.

Of course, you know, telling respondents exactly what we're going to be doing in a survey and letting them decide whether they're going to proceed with it and what's going to happen with the data after they give it to us and then what are we going to do with the data once we get it in terms of releasing it to the public or what kinds of restricted release options would there be for researchers.

And -- and so we actually -- it took a long time, I would say a year roughly, to get through all
of those issues because it was -- you know, the IRBs,
they don't work very quickly. They kind of have a lot of
other things to do in addition to what they're doing on
that board, and -- and there's really no advantage to you
to try to rush into a decision. Some of these things
take a lot of time to think about.

    MS. JASSO: Uh -- oh, sorry.
    MS. SIEBER: No. Go ahead. Because I
wanted to hear what you experienced.

    MS. JASSO: Okay. In -- in our case,
four points. The first one is exactly as Joan said, the
sooner you let them know that something is coming, the
better. So I think what each of us PIs did was e-mail
our respective contact person in the human subjects
committee staff and just say, "We're in the process of
developing this proposal. You can expect it. You know,
we have to submit it to NIH at such as such a date and it
will be coming to you."

    The second thing is that in our case,
which probably, but maybe you'll see, won't be the --
the -- the case here. There were five IRBs involved
because there were four PIs, each in a different
institution, plus NORC which was doing the field work.
And what had happened over the years is that the IRBs
have educated each other. So, for example, a question
will come up from some member of one IRB and -- and --
and then I'll get an e-mail that says, Well, has this
come up with the other IRBs? What do they have to say?"
And it has now come -- it has formalized such that
whenever any one of us comes up in the cycle for renewal,
we are requested to submit the current approvals for all
the other -- from all the other IRBs, and so they're
continuously educating each other.

The third thing is the only problem we
encountered -- and it was one that -- that makes us cry
to this day. I don't know if Norm -- Norm, if you ever
heard about this. People who have their green cards as
the spouses of U.S. citizens are sometimes under age 18.
And we wanted to interview every -- you know, sample from
among everyone who got a green card who had attained the
age of majority, which we defined as 18 or married. And
certainly we wanted the ones married to -- to a U.S.
citizen.

And it turned out that we couldn't do it
because in some of the states where we would be
interviewing, the age of majority is not defined
according to marriage. It's defined only according to
age, and so then we ended up having to drop from the
sampling frame all these spouses of U.S. citizens who
were under 18. And -- and -- and that was something
that -- that we all regret, and -- but -- but there was no other way.

MR. BRADBURN: Couldn't you invoke the permission of the spouse as the -- as the...

MS. JASSO: No. In fact --

MR. BRADBURN: But you could interview kids with somebody's permission?

MS. JASSO: Yes. That's right. We -- we -- that's right.

MR. BRADBURN: I wouldn't think you'd have to throw them out. You'd find some imaginative way to get permission.

MS. JASSO: It was complicated and, in fact, it was -- it was NORC which finally said to us --

MR. BRADBURN: Too much.

MS. JASSO: -- we can't just -- and part of it had to do with operational things like you -- you -- you can't spawn the spouse -- "spawn" being the field word organization term -- until you get the respondent. But you can't get the respondent because they're not 18.

MR. BRADBURN: It's a catch 22.

MS. JASSO: Yeah.

And then finally the fourth thing, the IRBs are extremely useful when it comes time for the data
reviews, as -- as Paul was saying. And -- and here
everybody closes ranks and everybody has the same
objective, which is to protect the confidentiality of the
respondents.

MS. SIEBER: There is -- there is one
thing that is often violated by IRBs where you can really
help them. IRBs are required by Federal law to have on
their board the competency to review whatever comes to
them or to bring in a consultant. And I think that one
can very gingerly and politely suggest that this is a
specialized area where risk and benefit differ from other
types of social research; and that -- that you would pay
the freight for the consultant and suggest some
consultants that wouldn't have a conflict of interest.
I was wondering, have any of you ever
done that?

MS. LEE: I didn't know you were allowed
to do that, and that is an excellent idea.

MS. SIEBER: Well, they're violating
Federal law when they don't have the competence to
review.

MS. LEE: I'm sure they don't know that.

MS. SIEBER: No, they don't.

MR. BIEMER: Like you say, it's very
delicate.
MS. SIEBER: It is very delicate.

MS. JASSO: My impression is that -- is that many of the IRBs actually do have -- because the universities are so large, do have -- can draw in members who have experience or expertise in practically everything.

MS. SIEBER: And they can certainly draw in faculty who are not regular IRBs members --

MS. JASSO: That's right.

MS. SIEBER: -- and wouldn't want to be.

MS. JASSO: That's right.

MS. SIEBER: You know, one of the reasons that many people with special competency don't want to be on the IRB is because the work load so huge and the reward so little. It would be suicide to a young faculty member to serve, but they would probably be very happy to be a consultant to the IRB on a given project.

MR. BIEMER: You know, my experience at UNC with IRBs, which is limited, but is very different from my experience at RTI and it sort of follows on Norman's point about having a medical center.

MS. SIEBER: Uh-huh.

MR. BIEMER: But there it was very difficult to get across to one IRB that follow-up of nonresponse is a normal part of survey practice. They
saw it --

MS. SIEBER: As coercion.

MR. BIEMER: -- as coercion, as harassing people and so forth. You know, for example, you send them a -- you send a questionnaire. And if you don't get it back undeliverable, that means -- and if you don't get it back at all, that means that they don't want to do it. You don't send another questionnaire, you know --

MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

MR. BIEMER: -- which just flies in the face of what we know about the survey practices. So that's one of the things that can happen if you don't have an educated IRB.

MR. FRANCIS: We have someone in our department in IO psychology who actually does research on survey nonresponse and has -- we've been involved in educating our IRB to those issues. And so her polls are now going through without any -- any problems, but that was an issue when we first got started.

MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

MR. ACHEN: Maybe I can pick the IRB on the journal whose reviews I'm late for.

MS. JASSO: That's great.

MS. SIEBER: I wanted to -- to revisit the issue of unchecking the box, the little box on the
IRBs assurance that says that anything that they review, whether federally funded or not, will be treated as though it's Federally funded in terms of adherence. And initially, IRBs thought they would really curry favor with the Feds by checking the box.

Now they realize this is the kiss of death because they can be caught doing things with unfunded research and not treating it as though they were funded if they checked the box. So there's a whole movement now to uncheck the box, and I could get you some workshops on that. It would be good to find out if your IRB has unchecked the box, and I'll get you some literature on reasons to do so.

MR. FRANCIS: I can assure you that, at least as of six months ago, they had not.

MS. SIEBER: Well --

MS. LEE: I didn't even know there was a box to uncheck.

MS. SIEBER: Well, I'll -- I'll send you some of the workshop literature on that.

MR. FRANCIS: Okay.

MS. JASSO: Good.

MS. SIEBER: And -- you know, in the event that you don't get federal funding, it would be tremendously advantageous.
MS. CALLAGHAN: We had talked at one point about having bioswabs to correlate with our environmental study. And I think Willie had made mentioned the use of legal advice in addition to the IRB that you had sought so that we covered all the bases.

Is that something we should consider and are we still considering that medical assessment as well?

MR. GRANATO: It's -- I would keep everything open at this point, so... We haven't limited ourselves in anything we're going to investigate.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Would that change the IRB that you would go to since you have two? It would still be a social science study?

MR. FRANCIS: Good question. I'm not exactly sure if that would kick it over. It might have to go -- there might be portions that go to both because the medical -- the natural sciences IRB would not have the capacity to review the survey side. So it may end up with a little chunk going to each group. I'm not sure.

But there's certainly some psychologists that serve on the IRB -- in the social sciences IRB that have expertise in medical studies. So it may be that they would feel competent to review it, but they may want to kick it over.

MS. SIEBER: Well, one of the things I'm
quite curious about -- I talked to Colm a bit, but he deferred to Norman on this. If you're going to ask quite sensitive questions -- and I think some of your questions will be in the areas of health and criminal behavior and so forth -- you may need signed consent. And I'm wondering, if you have an initial face-to-face recruiting intake contact as Colm had suggested, if you can get an omnibus consent form signature that would carry forth to subsequent parts of the panel, because you -- you don't want to have people signing -- having to sign something and mail it back to you if you're going to phone them. And I'd be very interested --

MR. BIER: I know, in our study, we have signed consent. Of course it's face to face. And I don't know -- I think in studies that we've done where we're on the phone and, say, we need release of medical records, we can have the interviewer sign on their behalf.

MR. BRADBURN: Usually on things like that, you can get the -- the interviewer attests that she did, you know, ask them and they said yes or something. That, for most IRBs is, as -- we, I think we're kind of past that. I'm -- I mean, my view is that we should avoid signed consent for surveys because it's so easy for people to refuse. I mean, it's really --
MS. SIEBER: Yes.

MR. BRADBURN: -- gilding the lily a bit.

MR. BIEMER: It's kind of an IRB issue.

MR. BRADBURN: I know. I know. But I keep -- we should all fight it.

The -- the -- the other problem that you need visit is partially an IRB problem, but it's really a more general problem; and that is making sure your -- your respond -- your interviewers are not liable if they have information about illegal activity. And with immigration, that's, you know, sensitive I'm sure here.

Now, there's -- well, if it's -- if it's federally funded, you can get shield from a -- from and IA. Even if it's not a public health service blanket one, you can upon application get a shield that -- that shields you from things like that. The child abuse is the one area that -- that's -- that they've tended not to give any.

MS. SIEBER: You don't have to be federally funded to get a certificate of confidentiality.

MR. BRADBURN: Oh, really?

MS. SIEBER: No, you don't.

MR. BRADBURN: But it's -- it's something -- now, you can look -- there, I think, it's worth consulting the lawyer because laws in different
states are different on these sort of things. With regard to child abuse, in some states only if you are directly a service provider and -- like a social worker or something like that and working on a case and you know about child abuse is it reportable. If you are incidentally learn about it as in an interview or you're neighbors, you're not required to. But in some states, you are. So you have to -- and it would be -- you know, you have to find out like if you -- what applicable Texas law or maybe U.S. law -- I don't know this one -- if you know somebody who is an illegal immigrant, do you have to report it? I mean, are you legally obligated to report it or are you possibly liable to -- the interviewer itself is liable? And, if so, if you're going to get into -- that would, I think, be the one -- the obvious one where you need to make sure that your -- your interviewers are protected.

MR. BIEMER: Yeah. We have a mandatory reporting in our child abuse where if we -- if we through interviewing get evidence that the child is currently being abused, that the abuse is current or there is some suicidal tendencies on the part of the child, we have to report that. And the IRB requires that. And of course, we comply with that.

And also there are -- there are states
that, you know, we requested their participation and they will not participate because they needed the consent of the caregiver to release any information at all that would allow us to then sample. So we couldn't even draw a sample until they -- they would have to draw the sample. They would have to go and get, you know, the consent up front before they would even release the information for us -- to us. We tried that and we got like a 2 percent response rate. So we just had to exclude those states. There were about maybe four or five states.

MS. SIEBER: Well, if you're going to be asking any questions where it's likely that you would get evidence of child abuse, that's -- that's rough because then you have to say in the informed consent --

MR. BIEMER: We did, yes.

MS. SIEBER: -- that you would be mandated to report that.

MR. BIEMER: But, you know, it's interesting, even after we say that and they sign it and they understand that, we still get evidence that they're being abused, so...

MS. SIEBER: Well, often -- often what goes on in families --

MR. FRANCIS: And you report it?
MR. BIEMER: And we report it. We've had reports.

MS. SIEBER: -- what goes on in families is that they are -- they don't even perceive what they're doing. I mean, there was a case at my own institution where a faculty member and some interns were going around to homes doing counseling and the -- the five-year-old girl was wearing a tutu with no underpants and went and sat on one of the men's laps in the living room, and he was fondling her. Now, of course, the faculty member and the student just about dropped their eyeballs. The family didn't see anything strange about that.

So one can walk into some rather strange situations. But, of course, they -- although they were mandated reporters, that wasn't something that they got consent -- and that was not included in the consent because they had no notion they were going to see that.

Are there any more comments on the -- the characteristics of IRBs and how to get on with them?

MR. FRANCIS: I have -- I have one question and, that is, have you ever encountered or is it -- in your experience, is it required that you reconsent the subjects at each wave of a longitudinal study?

MS. JASSO: Yes. I think we do.
MR. FRANCIS: You reconsent?

MS. JASSO: I think so.

MS. LEE: So we do a lot of follow-up contacting with the same people, and we try to always make sure in our informed consent we state that we may be calling you in the future. And does that cover that adequately?

MS. SIEBER: I -- I think --

MS. LEE: Or do you really have to do informed consent?

MS. SIEBER: -- I think that it does. I think it varies with study. You know, if -- if you were doing something that was terribly invasive, I think it would be treated differently and I think that the consent can be -- it doesn't have to be signed. I'd be very interested to hear Norman's and Paul's experience.

MR. BIEMER: You mean about what we say in terms of our repeat visits --

MS. SIEBER: Yes.

MR. BIEMER: -- in the future?

We disclose that we'll be back over -- you know, right now, for example, with this new cohort, all we know is we're going to be doing two new waves -- I mean, two waves on each one. So all we can say is that, you know, we're going to be two interviews with your.
We'll do one now and we'll do another one in 18 months.

Now, what happened the last time is we got funding for additional waves, and so we went back and -- you know, they weren't expecting us because at the second wave we didn't tell them we'd be back. So we -- but we did go back to the -- to this -- in the first cohort when we had additional funding and did more interviews. We were allowed to do that. But you have to -- I think, in our case, we found it necessary to state what they were agreeing to.

MR. BRADBURN: Right. No, I think you have -- when you're enlisting in the panel, you have to be up front that this is something you're going to do. You're going to be back to them every year or whatever it is, every other year or so on and so forth.

I would argue that once you've done that and they've consented to that, you don't need to, quote, consent them every time you do it. So, you know, I mean I'd just argue, in general, consent in the -- in an interview situation is so different from when you're going into the hospital or having your tonsils removed or something like that. I mean, it's so easy to -- to refuse. It's just absurd to be talking about written consent and things like that.

MS. SIEBER: I think it will be really
important to educate your IRB to that point ahead of time because people -- I mean, and of one, I get so sick and tired of having to listen to an informed consent on a phone interview. Let's get on with it.

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MS. SIEBER: And that's how most people feel.

MR. BIEMER: I think it depends on the topic. I mean, in the case of this abuse study, it's very very sensitive. And so --

MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

MR. BIEMER: -- they didn't want to make mistakes on that one. But, you know, you're not planning to do anything quite like that. So I agree with Norman, getting a -- you know, what we do -- you know, one thing we do is we have an audio recorder on our laptop computers and we actually can tape -- we can actually record the interviewer asking the respondent if they'll consent, and then the respondent will -- response will be recorded and so that's kind of documentation right there. So that, you know, we don't really need any external microphone or anything. It's all built into the laptop computer and that suffices for that some of our surveys, just that kind of response. Can we proceed? The respondent says "yes." When that yes is entered, then
the interview proceeds.

            MS. SIEBER: And I think that if you go through a slow process of educating your IRB, you're in a very good position to remind them that a very unethical thing to do is something that will interfere with the validity of the study; and that to be two onerous about informed consent to do a survey when they can just hang up is -- is really not ethical. It makes for a bad risk benefit ratio.

            MS. JASSO: Let me jump in here. I -- I have to look at the exact wording of -- of the new letters for the old respondents, and I'll -- I'll get back to you. But in our case -- and it may also to turn out to be the case with you -- we also have new people in the household, and so they get consented for the first time. And we have different letters for them.

            MR. GRANATO: Interesting.

            MS. SIEBER: Okay. Well, let me move on to perceived risk benefit. An awful lot of what you should be concerned with and that IRBs are concerned with, even when you have removed all the objective risks, there's a perception by subjects of risk. And this is important because IRBs don't want people to be upset. But it's also important because if people are upset about a study, they either won't participate or they may lie to
you. They may not provide the information. The polite thing to do is just smile and lie.

So it's important to know in given communities what they perceive as risk and what they would perceive as a solution to that problem. And this is also an important way to get acquainted with the community, to create a relationship ahead of time, and to provide information -- you know, we've been talking about all the sorts of input that you need both to advertise the study, get good PR, and -- and help you design the study.

So I think that focus groups in communities about their perception of the risks of participating and their perception of what benefits there would be or what benefits they would like to be are very useful, and this information should be gathered somewhat formally so you can present it to the IRB. And it's also information that you can publish because it's -- it's a useful model of how to know a particular context.

And often what investigators think would be a useful benefit, useful feedback isn't what they want. They -- they may have some good ideas of what they would like to get out of it and how.

So, you know, just think of those focus groups as providing -- serving a lot of different
purposes; educating the IRB, educating you, educating the
community. And, you know, Colm's idea of recruitment
face-to-face interview will provide a little further
feedback early on in the -- in the study that can be
useful. I'm sure that there's ideas from those of you
who've worked with audiences.

MS. JASSO: Well, let me jump in here. Because this is something that keeps coming over and over
again. I am really uneasy with going to -- quote
unquote -- "community" and treating them as valid
gatekeepers. I actually think it may interference with
the science.

It seems to me the -- the model we want
is that of treating each potential respondent as an
independent observation. I obviously realize that --
that there may be response rate implications, et cetera,
et cetera. But I -- I think this is something that needs
to be thought about more deeply.

MR. BIEMER: What do you mean by going to
community? I don't understand.

MS. JASSO: Well, for example -- and --
and, Joan, correct me if I'm wrong. But I understood
what Joan was saying, let's suppose you're going to be
interviewing some people in an area that you know is
heavily Muslim, okay. Going to a community, I interpret
as meaning that you go to a community organization,
whatever it is, and -- and say to them, "We're going to
be interviewing here. This is a very important study.
It's going to have benefits for you," blah, blah, blah,
blah, blah. Am I right, Joan? Is this...

MS. SIEBER: I have to confess that I
have not thought that through. And I think who you
select to get information about communities you're
pointing out is very critical. And how would -- how
would you do that? Obviously you want to have feelers
out there. You want feedback. How would you recommend
going that?

MS. JASSO: Well, see, this is a very
good question. I -- I tend -- I tend to prefer -- I can
be persuaded otherwise, but I tend to prefer the
unobtrusive quiet things like reading blogs, keeping your
ear to the ground.

When we were doing -- maybe I think it
was the pilot to The New Immigrant Survey, some quote
unquote community elders heard that we had interviewers
in a particular neighborhood. And these elders called
field staff and said -- this wasn't NORC. This was in
the pilot. Rand was doing it -- you know, and said,
"Well, you need to talk to us because we're the ones who
decides who comes in and"...
And we had a long, long, long discussion among the PIs and field staff, et cetera. And we finally came down on the side of "no." We do not go through gatekeepers. We -- we go to individual persons at the community level.

Now, there are still -- there's a further problem, which is gate -- gatekeepers in the household, usually husbands of fundamentalist religions. A -- and, again, our -- we -- we are to talk to the named respondent -- remember, in our case, we have a list of names -- and we want that person to agree. That person can, of course, say, "Give me a few minutes. Let me think about it. Let me talk it over with my family."

They -- they can do anything they want. But we officially do not get permission from someone else to speak to the respondent.

MR. BIEMER: I guess --

MS. JASSO: And -- and we have very good luck.

MR. BIEMER: There are other ways of getting the community involved. For example, I'm thinking about my years at the Census Bureau where the Census Bureau spent a lot of effort getting community leaders to get their members to respond to the census and then -- and, you know, trying to emphasize to them and
stress how important it is that they be counted and so forth.

And although the Census Bureau didn't get their permission to go in, they used the community leaders to help support it. Now, the community leaders say, "No. I don't want to do that." But in a lot of cases, they did and it made a big difference having the community leader saying, "This is what you ought to do."

MS. JASSO: Yeah. We decided not to do that. And -- and we certainly talked with the -- with people from the Census Bureau, and one can certainly make a case for doing it. So all I'm doing is raising the idea that there's more to it than may meet the eye.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, this is, I think, another instance of what we were talking about earlier about whether people are participating as individuals or as representatives of some group.

MS. JASSO: Yes.

MR. BRADBURN: And what -- the census is a special case, I think, I mean, because there people do have vested interests in having the census report accurately or overaccurate.

And -- but in -- in most studies, you run a risk because it isn't all that clear what the benefit to the -- to the people who are seeing themselves as the
elders in the community or whatever and so forth. So I sort of agree and disagree. I mean, I think what Willie is saying about it is very important. In -- in the '60s when there was -- the government was supporting, I mean, a lot of community organizations and there was whole kind of community development kind of ethic was going on. There -- we ran into that a lot because we were doing evaluations of neighborhood action programs, in other words. And you know, you can effectively be barred from a community by the -- the community organization leaders, you know, wanting to be bribed in a way, I mean, sometimes -- I mean, it's just various things. But I think that you want to generally think about this as individual participants, and I would -- I would interpret the word about community is that you want -- again, like other things, you want to know what the local -- insofar as you can, what the local concerns are, interests are and so on and so forth, but not organized by some gatekeepers person.

MS. SIEBER: Would you -- sort of taking off on Willie's great point of having your ear to the ground, would an ethnographic approach be a better way to learn what's going on in the community and how -- what their feelings are?
MR. BRADBURN: Well, if you can afford it and...

I mean, that -- that takes a long time and effort and so forth. I don't think -- what we're talking about on a whole, I don't think, is -- is that big a deal that it requires -- I mean, you'll pick up a lot of it if you're doing just focus groups and, you know, if you're doing cognitive interviewing to help questions and so on and so forth.

MR. BIEMER: Especially -- I mean, it depends on how you cluster the sample, you know, and how much you may be in a neighbor. You may -- you may not be -- your presence may not even be noticed for some designs.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. These -- these problems come up typically when you're doing a lot of interviews in a very small area, so that there's...

MR. BIEMER: Like any census.

MR. BRADBURN: Right.

MS. JASSO: We know we ended up with cases where -- where the person agreed to be interviewed, but -- but said, "I will call you or you call me on the phone" and probably our inference was that person then told the neighbors they -- they were not going to be interviewed, but they were interviewed and...
Now the only -- the only real -- there was one -- only one incident and it does not involve community gatekeepers. But we had a respondent who was a husband. And when the interviewer started with the consent, et cetera, the wife who was there, got very upset and said, "You can't do it. You can't do it." And he said, "But there's no harm. And -- and it's an interesting thing. And we do something for science," which is part of what was in the letter. To make a long story short, he ended up doing it against the wishes of his wife. And the interviewer -- these were NORC interviewers -- told us that for the length of the interview, they kept hearing dishes breaking in the kitchen.

MR. BIEMER: You know, there's another interesting story. You know, the Census Bureau used to in the current population survey -- I don't know if this is true. It sounds true -- but they used to use compact clusters of four -- you know, segments of four households on a street. Well, that meant that if you were in the sample and you knew the design, you were pretty sure that your neighbor was in the sample, you know, the one next to you.

And so at a meeting, Steve Fineberg got up at a meeting -- this is what I -- I didn't hear this,
but he heard the story -- and -- and told -- the Census
Bureau was present at this meeting and said, you know, he
was in CPS and that told him that his neighbor was
also -- one of his neighbors on either side of him was
also -- probably both of them, if he was in the middle of
segment. He didn't know. And -- and so that was a
breach of confidentiality because you shouldn't know if
your neighbor is in this survey. That prompted the
Census Bureau to actually change the design. So they're
no longer selecting four consecutive households on a
street. They're breaking it up. So the neighbors have
less -- you know, first of all, the neighbors don't know
who is in a sample. But in your case, they wouldn't
necessarily have that much impact on the respondent --
whether the other neighbors respond, if they don't -- you
know, have no idea if the other neighbors are getting to
participate.

MS. JASSO: Right. And -- and this was
not an area sample. This was a list of names.

MR. BIEMER: I see. So that didn't
effect you.

MS. JASSO: So there might not have been
anybody nearby.

MR. BIEMER: Well, that's a good argument
now to have consecutive households on the street.
MS. JASSO: That's right.

MS. SIEBER: Let me run another flag up the flagpole on how to sense what's going on. In -- in my limited experience of doing surveys, I found that it was extremely useful to have very frequent meetings of the surveyors to bring back information about what was going on, what was working.

MR. BIEMER: Like debriefings?

MS. SIEBER: Debriefings. And, of course, it helps the surveyors do a better job because they'll have some experiences that they've gotten in.

You know, what this means, this is not something you can tell the IRB or that you want to put in your informed consent, but it is risk benefit information that you're bringing in, that you're feeding into the project and can use. I'd be interested to hear people's experience with this.

MR. BIEMER: Oh, it's absolutely -- I mean, we do that in our pretesting stage a lot. Of course, during the survey, supervisors are talking with the interviewers, you know, at least once a week about their experiences. I mean, one of the purpose -- one of the jobs of the supervisor is to help the interviewer complete their assignments and try to, you know, discuss strategies for converting nonresponses and things like
that, gatekeepers, whatever.

So, no. But -- I mean, but during the
pretesting stages -- and I think this comes back to a
point, I think, Willie made earlier about having a pilot
study. You know, there are different ways of pretesting.
You know, you definitely need to do something to pretest
your methodology, pretest the questionnaire, pretest your
interview methodology, bring these interviewers in for
debriefing interviews, maybe even convene focus groups
that -- focus groups of respondents and have them comment
on the process and their experience and so forth as part
of the pretesting stage.

But then during the -- the interviewing
when the actual data collection is going on -- we don't
do it that often, but it sounds like it might be a good
idea also to convene meetings -- you know, maybe
telephone meetings of the interviewers and discuss their
experiences.

MS. SIEBER: Now, given that they're very
ill paid people, you have to give them some kind of perk
to keep them focused and -- and help them to deal with
the problems that come up.

MR. BIEMER: Well, in one of our surveys,
I know for sure The National Survey of Drug Use and
Health, we give the interviewer incentives based upon
achieved goals. So they -- you know, these goals tend to change over time just to keep it interesting. But, you know, it may be some goals set to improving the response rate in their area; the way that they fill out their paperwork is, you know -- the number of errors are found in that, conversions of refusals, various types of ways in which they can achieve these rewards. And that seemed to work pretty well because that's a long-standing, long-term survey. And you can imagine that over time, they kind of get beaten down by rising refusal -- reluctance to participate, refusal rates and so forth.

And it can actually be an attitude that is given to the interviewers from their supervisors. What we found is sometimes when the supervisors are sort of beaten down by the process, the interviewers kind of reflect that. And what -- you know, one way to counteract that is through some incentive program.

MS. SIEBER: That's neat. That's marvelous.

One of the key risks is breach of confidentiality or perceived breach. And I think figuring out a plan of data security and confidentiality on the part of interviewers is extremely important. And I would be interested to hear, especially given the juicy information that you have interviewers obtain, how do --
how do you train interviewers on confidentiality?

   MR. BIEMER: You mean in terms of keeping
information confidential?

   MS. SIEBER: Uh-huh.

   MR. BIEMER: I don't know that we do
anything more, but just to stress the importance of that
in our training. Certainly, they sign confidentiality
agreements that -- that they will keep it confidential.
But I don't know that -- I don't know that there are any
other -- anything else you can do. I mean, we've had --
we have had breaches of confidentiality.

   MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. The -- the most
likely place you get it -- well, there are two.
Deliberate ones are where an interviewer just takes it
upon him or herself because they feel sorry for some
respondent to want to publicize that respondent's case
to -- to the press or something like that. I mean --

   MS. SIEBER: Wow.

   MR. BRADBURN: It's a complete mistake in
the purpose of what they're doing and so on and so forth
but it's usually -- when they're deliberate ones, it's
usually from some misguided positive motive because they
think they're -- they're doing something that helps the
respondent, but in fact doesn't of course.

   The one which is -- is more likely -- I
mean, that happens very rarely. I think in my career,
I've only heard of one -- one case that I know of that we
had an interviewer do that.

The more likely case is that you have
data in a laptop and the laptop gets stolen or lost in
some kind of way. So there it's very important that all
the data be encrypted and pretty difficult to -- not that
most of the people who steal laptops really care what's
in them, you know. So it's not that. It's the
perception problem and -- I mean the Census Bureau is up
in arms because they lost 100 or 200 laptops --

MR. BIEMER: It was a big number.
MR. BRADBURN: -- and something -- a big
number in Kansas City. We had --

MR. BIEMER: Over a long period.
MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. We had -- in NLSY,
I think we had one interviewer's laptop was stolen. And
there were, you know, two or three respondents' data in
there that -- that was a problem.

The only other -- actually, there is one
other problem that -- again, this is so rare. I think
this happened once in my career and so forth. It's --
it's a different one from the one that Willie mentioned
about the spouse that didn't want.

This was the spouse of an interviewer.
We were doing a sex study, and so the interviewer had been interviewing a lot of people about sexual practices and so on and so forth. And the husband of the interviewer who knew she was interviewing but didn't know what it was about somehow or other saw a questionnaire, which of course that was a bad -- she should not have ever let him see the questionnaire. So -- but anyway he was so horrified at what she was doing that he grabbed all the questionnaires that she had been -- and -- and wouldn't let them go. So we had -- and you know -- we had --

(Laughter.)

MR. BIEMER: Sensitive data.

MR. BRADBURN: I mean, these were the raw questions. This was before computers and so forth. So, you know, where we transmitted raw questionnaires from the field to the home office and so forth. But anyway, we had to negotiate with him a long time. Finally, we ended up agreeing -- mutually agreeing that he would -- that a third party would destroy the questionnaires. And so, you know, the supervisor, he knew they were destroyed. We knew they were destroyed. And -- but that's...

MR. BIEMER: You know, that's -- that reminds me of -- you know, following on the heels of this
incident in the Census Bureau where they had all these laptops stolen, we had a rash -- I don't know. It was sort of this unusual rash of lost laptops on one of our studies, The Early Child Longitudinal Survey, and which -- which really, you can imagine, upset everybody, including the client.

After that -- following that, we were required to put in some very, very stringent rules about how laptops would be handled in the future including, you know, of course, all the encryption software we could possibly put on it, but also when the interviewer -- how the interviewer actually handled the laptop at home. And it had to be in a locked cabinet or a locked case. It couldn't be just left out, you know, in a study or a den. And so -- but there were a lot of things that were also put into place to monitor and to check to see whether or not these data were being handled properly. Some of the forms that they were carrying in their files, you know, that they use to help with the field work were automated and put on the laptop so they could be secured because there was confidential information that was on this -- on these paper documents that they were using.

So we really went through extreme measures as a result of this because it just brought up
to the client the possibility that this information, not
intentionally, but there could be breaches of
confidentiality accidentally.

MR. GRANATO: It's now noon and I
promised we would end the -- the workshop at noon. I
just want to say a few things. First, thank you very
much for coming. I really mean it, especially these two
weekends. I mean, I very much appreciate that and for
your participation in all of this. I also want to Renee
Cross and Mike Angel and Kelly Le, what they did to set
this up was amazing.

(Applause.)

MR. GRANATO: And we're at the concept
exploration stage right now. What you did here is going
to help enormously as we go forward.

And I will say this, I've been through
enough of these where we've started from the ground up
and you -- you don't know what's going to happen, but I
think -- I'm confident over time we'll have something
very significant come out of this initial effort, and I
am very grateful to all of you. Thank you very much.

MS. SIEBER: Thank you, Jim.

MS. JASSO: May I say something, I just
want to thank Jim enormously and also Frank for
moderating and then one other thing. Probably everyone
feels like I do, I learned an enormous amount in this day and a half. And I want to say one particular thing, how grateful I am that Norm came. I -- I -- to me, this was like a master class. A lot of what Norm said, in his characteristically modest way, is stuff that he invented, the words that he invented, the protocols that he invented, what's become the foundation of -- of survey research. And we don't often get a chance to be in a master class, and I think we did. Thank you, Norm.

MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. You're embarrassing me.

(Off the record, 12:01 p.m.)
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