

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY
HOUSTON AREA PANEL STUDY WORKSHOP
March 21, 2008

BE IT REMEMBERED that the aforementioned
proceedings were heard on the 21st day of March, 2008,
beginning at 9:20 a.m., at the University of Houston
Hilton, 4800 Calhoun, Waldorf Astoria Ballroom, Houston,
Texas 77004, reported by Dorothy A. Rull, a Certified
Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, as
follows, to-wit:

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 MODERATORS:

3 Frank P. Scioli, Ph.D.,
4 Jim Granato, Ph.D.

5 WORKSHOP PANELISTS:

6 Christopher H. Achen, Ph.D.
7 John J. Antel, Ph.D.
8 Paul P. Biemer, Ph.D.
9 André Blais, Ph.D.
10 Norman M. Bradburn, Ph.D.
11 Karen Callaghan, Ph.D.
12 Michael O. Emerson, Ph.D.
13 Karl Eschbach, Ph.D.
14 David J. Francis, Ph.D.
15 Dashiel J. Geyen, Ph.D.
16 Guillermina Jasso, Ph.D.
17 Mark P. Jones, Ph.D.
18 Stephen L. Klineberg, Ph.D.
19 Rebecca E. Lee, Ph.D.
20 Richard W. Murray, Ph.D.
21 Colm O'Muircheartaigh, Ph.D.
22 Elizabeth Rigby, Ph.D.
23 Joan E. Sieber, Ph.D.

24 ALSO PRESENT:

25 Ann Hamilton, Houston Endowment
Elizabeth Rigby, U of H Political Science

CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY:

Mike Angel
Renée Cross
Kelly Le

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 PROCEEDINGS

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

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

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

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

24 Now, why did we ask you to participate?
25 It's very simple, your expertise. Your mix of expertise

1 will inform a report that we will use to help create a
2 panel study or a series of panel studies for the Houston
3 region. That's why you're here.

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

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

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

18 (Laughter.)

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

21 MR. SCIOLI: Et tu, Jim.

22 MR. GRANATO: -- help co-moderate. Now,
23 remember that you're going to be miked. And both Dorothy
24 Rull, who is going to be doing the transcribing, and Phil
25 Booth ask that you speak up and loudly -- not loudly, but

1 speak clearly. In addition, Dorothy asks that since
2 we're all -- since she's transcribing, to try and take
3 cues from each other so you don't speak at each. So try
4 and avoid cross-talk. I mean, we're all facing each
5 other for the most part. So let's try and make sure that
6 we -- one person at a time talks, but make sure you get
7 your point in. We do want to hear what you have to say.

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

18 So let's begin. Please, introduce
19 yourself with your affiliation and your expertise.
20 I'd like to start with Chris Achen.

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

23 MR. BIEMER: My name is Paul Biemer. I
24 actually have two places I work, RTI International and
25 University of North Carolina the Odem Institute. And I'm

1 a statistician, and I have expertise in surveys.

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

5 MR. BRADBURN: Norman Bradburn. National
6 Opinion Research Center and University of Chicago,
7 although living in Washington at the moment. I do -- I'm
8 a survey methodologist.

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

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

22 MR. FRANCIS: I'm David Francis. I'm the
23 chair of the psychology department here at the University
24 of Houston, and I also direct an institute here called
25 The Texas Institute For Measurement Evaluation and

1 Statistics. I'm a quantitative psychologist, but I
2 started out as a clinical neuropsychologist. I do a lot
3 of work in education.

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

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

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

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

20 MS. LEE: Good morning. I'm Rebecca Lee.
21 I'm here at UH in the Department of Health and Human
22 Performance. I'm the director of our Texas Obesity
23 Research Center. And I do a lot of work looking at
24 minority and underserved populations, increasing physical
25 activity, reducing obesity, improving dietary habits.

1 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Colm
2 O'Muircheartaigh. I'm at the Harris School and NORC at
3 the University of Chicago. And I am a statistician with
4 an interest in survey methodology -- or a survey
5 methodologist with an interest in statistics.

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

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

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

18 MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. Jim asked me
19 to do a little, I guess, introduction or sort of
20 background to -- kind of history and some other aspects
21 of contemporary longitudinal studies or panel studies.
22 And I'm -- I'm going to start at the bottom, both utility
23 and other issues, okay? I'm going to work up to them.
24 And -- and this is kind of a broad picture sort of
25 notion, which I think might help frame more detailed

1 discussions.

2 And, first of all, let me start a little
3 bit about terminology. I think the others can --
4 particularly, the political scientist people might
5 correct me. I think the term "panel study" was -- was
6 invented by Paul Lazarsfeld, and I think the first panel
7 study that people pay attention to was the first election
8 study, the Lazarsfeld and Berelson -- Berelson -- Elmira,
9 was that --

10 MR. ACHEN: Yes.

11 MR. BRADBURN: I think the Elmira study.

12 And the idea was that rather than just
13 doing the regular polling, you take a group of people
14 before the election and follow them through during the
15 campaign through the election and after the election.
16 It's a prototype which various election studies,
17 national -- the U.S. national election study and, I
18 imagine, Canadian election studies and so forth have
19 adopted ever since; and -- and Lazarsfeld and other
20 colleagues did several others I think in other elections.

21 Was that the 1940 election or '40 -- '44
22 election? It was quite early.

23 Well, any case, that's -- that's where
24 the term "panel study" came from. And basically, though
25 there's no codified view of these terms, I -- I would

1 think just the way I've noticed the terms used, the panel
2 usually refers to interviewing the same people several
3 times, you know, maybe -- certainly twice -- certainly
4 twice, maybe three, maybe four like I said.

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

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

20 And I just want to say one other thing
21 about -- about terminology. There's another use of the
22 term "panel," which confuses people at times and that's,
23 I think, only used by commercial research firms where
24 they impanel a group of people, usually volunteers,
25 and -- and then they send out a -- a request for

1 participation in a particular study. So it's not -- I
2 don't know quite how they analyze the data, but I think
3 it's not so much that they are looking at responses of
4 the same people over many different responses -- I mean,
5 over different queries. Rather it's a panel in the sense
6 that you impanel a jury or -- so it's -- it's a -- it's
7 sort of a standing sample that you can query some
8 portions of it. I don't -- don't -- and they're very
9 large. They'd be 80,000, 100,000.

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

20 Just as a suggestion, I would suggest it
21 would -- to distinguish panels from longitudinals, if
22 you're thinking about something that's relatively short,
23 that could be a year or two or three, something like
24 that. You can call it a panel study. If it's something
25 you're thinking of for a very long period of time, then I

1 think we tend to think of it as a longitudinal study.
2 Although, again, the term "longitudinal study" is
3 sometimes used, to my mind, incorrectly but, in any case,
4 used to -- to apply to something that is a successive
5 time series, across -- but a successive cross-series.

6 Like the general socio survey which NORC
7 does and NSF has sponsored for many years since 1972 is
8 a -- well, up until next year, is a -- is a new sample
9 each year. So it's a time series, same -- many of the
10 same questions are asked every year, but it's a new
11 sample. So you can't -- but it's representative of -- of
12 a population. So you could look at trends in the
13 population, but you can look at individual change.

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

19 So, now, let me just say a little bit
20 about why there was so much -- has become so much
21 enthusiasm for -- for longitudinal studies. And I think
22 it's probably due to the -- the example of the PSID.
23 What -- when the Panel Survey of Income Dynamics got
24 started on the war on poverty, one of the relatively
25 early things that they found was that, although the

1 poverty rate didn't change very much, when they looked at
2 individuals in poverty over time where they're now --
3 they looking -- they were interviewing families every
4 year, they found that individual families did not stay in
5 poverty very long or, at least, many of them didn't. And
6 it was a relatively small proportion -- I think about
7 20 percent or something -- that were persistently in
8 poverty.

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

19 The fact that you may -- if you look at
20 aggregate data, even though a good time series, you may
21 misinterpret what's going on. And so, I guess, one
22 principle in terms of utility to say is that where you
23 think something like that might happen, that's a good
24 place to put your money on thinking about -- about
25 longitudinal studies or panel studies of various sorts.

1 Now, what about design -- sort of general
2 design issues? I -- in starting to characterize the
3 different types of panel studies and longitudinal
4 studies, I think there are two -- two major ways that --
5 or two major types -- excuse me. One basically takes a
6 group of people who have -- who share some
7 characteristics of some kind and that are of interest and
8 particularly if they're characteristics that change over
9 time; for -- age, for example, or -- or children growing
10 up, people getting older, people who are going through
11 school, people who are going -- entering the labor force.
12 That is you think of transitional roles or places in
13 society where there are people who are transitioning from
14 one to another and there's a kind of natural time
15 dimension to it.

16 So there's a -- there are a number of
17 longitudinal studies that the National Center for
18 Educational Statistics does where the principle is to
19 take a cohort of students, usually defined by where they
20 are in school, starting -- the -- the basic for years,
21 the basic principle had been to take senior class, though
22 the senior class of 1972, and '82, '92 and then they
23 missed out in 2002, but they're, I think -- I don't know
24 where that is -- and they're starting a new cohort. Now,
25 they may start in different places. So the 1972 cohort

1 started with people as seniors and then followed them
2 on after graduation.

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

11 The next one, the '92, people who were
12 the '92 seniors, they went back even further to start
13 with people in the 8th grade because they were even
14 concerned with that. And there would have been others
15 that started with a cohort of kids entering kindergarten.
16 There's even a cohort birth cohort where -- taking kids
17 who were born in a certain period and following them.
18 Those -- some of those are extremely long lived, maybe
19 10, 20 years. And -- but the principle you could see is
20 they take people at some common experience, but it's
21 going to change over time.

22 Another one that's quite well known in
23 NORC -- and -- and we're involved with -- is the National
24 Longitudinal Study of Youth, which takes as its standard
25 age rather than grade. So the first one that we're

1 involved in is the -- it was 1979. It was people who
2 were born -- who are aged 14 to 21 in 1979. And they're
3 still being followed. They were followed every year for
4 about 15 years or so, 20 years. Now they're followed
5 every other year. And I suppose, unless the Labor
6 Department gives up entirely, they will be followed until
7 they retire or die, but...

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

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

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

1 MS. JASSO: A specific time period --

2 MR. BRADBURN: Time period.

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

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

7 MS. JASSO: About every four to five
8 years.

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

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

21 MR. BIEMER: Investigated.

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

25 MR. BIEMER: Well, they're -- they

1 follow -- they interview them at 18-month intervals, but
2 they've been following them now for about 10 years.

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

5 Just to give you a couple other examples,
6 NSF does a study of people who receive Ph.D.s in science
7 and engineering; and they follow them for the rest --
8 essentially from the time they get their Ph.D. -- or at
9 least a sample. Not all of them -- until they retire.
10 Well, 75 now, I think. It used to be until they retired.
11 But now, since you don't know when that's going to be,
12 they -- and that's, I think, every other year.

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

22 Another one was a long-term -- a study of
23 long-term disability, which took a sample of -- took a
24 cross-section, but then was heavily oversampling for
25 people who had disabilities, and then follow -- have been

1 following them until they die, but...

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

6 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Preconception.

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

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

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

21 MR. BIEMER: Mine is national.

22 MR. BRADBURN: There -- there is another
23 variant where in one interesting context -- I think this
24 may be -- well, it -- something called the Chicago
25 Neighborhood Study, which is a bit of misnomer because

1 it's actually a study of young people and their
2 involvement with the criminal justice system. I mean,
3 that's the focus of it. But people that the
4 investigators were extremely interested in the
5 neighborhood context within which young people were
6 socialized and got involved with criminal activities of
7 various sorts. So it's -- though -- it's a longitudinal
8 study, and it's a kind of quasi-cohort.

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

18 This takes -- it sort of blends the --
19 the neighborhood and -- and they get all kinds of data.
20 It's not just data of individuals. There's data from
21 households in the -- in the neighborhood -- I mean, now
22 they just -- the focus is kids who they are looking at
23 and things, but other households in the neighborhood,
24 filming the neighborhood, getting -- characterizing the
25 character of the housing, the cleanliness, the graffiti,

1 various stuff like that, a very intense kind of data of
2 all kinds of different levels, which is another kind of
3 thing of various sorts.

4 MR. SCIOLI: : Who funds that?

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

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

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

24 Program -- many program evaluation
25 things, training programs, for example, would fit into

1 this sort of model in which people are going into a
2 training program or several different types training
3 program, you know, like the facts of Job Corps versus
4 neighborhood youth training programs or things of this
5 sort. You can take a sample of people who are going into
6 the training program or getting a control group is often
7 the problem with these kinds of designs, but you want
8 people who would have gone into the training program, but
9 for some reason didn't go into it. Some reason, it's not
10 relevant to the dependent variables and then follow them
11 for some period of time. These tend to be more like
12 adaptive panel studies because they tend to be shorter.

13 They always give lip service to the idea
14 that they want to look at long-term outcomes, but I don't
15 know any that actually have. They usually get -- after a
16 couple of years, figure that's about what they've done.

17 We did one -- one I was involved in some
18 years ago was looking at the effects of a TV program on
19 conveying health information and that, I think -- I think
20 we did that in Dallas. I don't think we did it in
21 Houston, but I think it was in Dallas.

22 And there we enlisted a bunch of people
23 to watch the program, and we have a control group of
24 people who weren't watching the program. And we had --
25 it's a complicated design, actually. But it was to see

1 whether the -- the programs which were designed to teach
2 people about nutrition of various sorts and cancer
3 screening and other things, whether it, in fact, did this
4 or not.

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

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

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

22 Now one of the -- excuse me -- the value
23 of either of these, also, is there's a certain ability
24 to -- for serendipity to do things. Because sometimes
25 you're involved in a -- a study and an event happens that

1 you hadn't expected. I was involved in one some years
2 ago in which we were -- it was -- looking -- trying to
3 look at event -- natural events on mental health or, at
4 least, stress of -- of ordinary population.

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

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

23 And that's -- those are kind of things
24 that you can't -- these are sort of unscheduled events,
25 thank goodness. But if you have a panel going or a

1 longitudinal study, you can go -- you can take advantage
2 of that of various sorts. In fact, you can sometimes
3 if -- even if you hadn't planned it as a panel study, you
4 can use -- you go back to people.

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

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

15 MS. SIEBER: Norman, the General Social
16 Survey being a cross-sectional study --

17 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

18 MS. SIEBER: -- how did you know how --
19 who to go back to?

20 MR. BRADBURN: Because we had the names
21 and addresses.

22 MS. SIEBER: So there it's not anonymous?

23 MR. BRADBURN: No. Because it's -- it's
24 a probability sample of the population, so you have to go
25 to the address and do a listing of the population and --

1 and get the -- the thing -- we need that for verification
2 purposes and other things. So it's -- you know, we --
3 you know, we have that in the -- in the sampling -- in
4 the field records as who the respondent was.

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

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

23 (Electronic feedback.)

24 MR. BRADBURN: Is that okay?

25 -- stays in the -- for four months and

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

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

17 For example, the -- the survey of
18 doctorate recipients, the USF study, which is a
19 longitudinal study, isn't very often analyzed from the
20 point of your career development, which is what you could
21 do and so forth. And, in fact, it's treated by many
22 people who analyze it and so forth as -- as if it were
23 repeated cross-sections, and they don't take advantage of
24 that. Now, that's -- anyway, those are kinds of issues
25 that we can -- can get onto, but...

1 Anyway that's -- that's the kind of
2 overview of, I think, the -- the kind of terminology,
3 principles sort of views of why -- why one does -- does
4 the -- does panel studies. As I say, they're the kind of
5 thing that, you know, in terms, its change is obviously
6 the major kind of thing and what kinds of change.

7 And I -- I separate these two; that's
8 change where you think there's some kind of event because
9 those are -- are -- the design of those are somewhat
10 different than those where you're essentially taking a
11 cohort of individuals who are going to go through some
12 kind of transition into the labor force or health or age
13 or disabilities or whatever, those kinds of things of
14 that sort, or -- or career development.

15 So I think I'll stop there.

16 MR. GRANATO: Thank you very much.

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

19 Go ahead, Colm.

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: There's just one
21 other example to add to Norman's categorization. There's
22 the set of surveys that NORC is carrying out for the
23 Annie E. Casey Foundation on their Making Connections
24 Program. Their Making Connections Program is one in
25 which they adopted 10 neighborhoods or neighborhoods in

1 10 cities across the country into which they invest
2 foundation money, and they want to evaluate what happens
3 to these neighborhoods.

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

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

24 So you could envisage, in parallel to
25 Norman's example about PSID and poverty, it could be that

1 the very same issue, we're -- we're going back this year
2 shortly for the third wave of this panel. And, again, we
3 don't know the answer to the question whether we expect
4 50 percent change again this time, but we don't know
5 whether it's the same 50 percent or a different 50
6 percent. And these, again, are very different pictures.
7 So that having churning where everybody moves is quite
8 different from having an area where 50 percent stay the
9 same all the time and the other 50 percent change
10 every -- every couple of years.

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

19 MR. GRANATO: Paul. And then Willie.

20 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. What Colm said
21 reminded me of another type of panel survey, and I think
22 you've probably covered it implicitly but this is with
23 community intervention type of study where in the case --
24 RTI is doing this survey called the Community Healthy
25 Marriage Initiative where they're going into communities

1 and they're offering various types of services and
2 classes and so forth on -- you know that -- related to
3 marriages. And they wanted to see, you know, how this
4 might improve characteristics, such as the divorce rate
5 or separation rate or marital happiness and things like
6 that in the community. And so they'll do a baseline
7 interview and they'll do the intervention; and then
8 they'll come back and do, you know, more surveying.
9 And -- and -- and do the surveying, it could -- I think,
10 in this case, they're going to be surveying these people
11 several times. At the same time, they want to be able to
12 make cross-sectional estimates to be able to get
13 descriptive statistics of, say, marriage rates and so
14 forth that are going on in the community. So they're --
15 they're having to refresh the panel for the same reason
16 that Colm was talking about, moving in and out.

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

1 to do this -- this -- these marriage -- this marriage
2 initiative.

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

10 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. That's -- what's
11 wrong with that is if you have a treatment of some sort,
12 even if you think you -- and if it's a general sort of
13 one. When we were doing this evaluation of the TV
14 program, we had very careful inducements at different --
15 like we paid people different levels to -- to watch the
16 program. But then it turned out not everyone watched the
17 program, even if they got paid. But also the people who
18 weren't paid did watch the program. So analytically it
19 became extremely tricky to be able to separate out the
20 people who were in the true experiment, that is, you
21 assume you induce them to watch the program they would
22 not have without the inducement. On the other hand,
23 there are people who watched it without any inducement,
24 who -- the nat -- people who naturally would have watched
25 it.

1 And, of course, that's the kind -- the
2 group that you worry about -- I mean, why you do an
3 experiment because you worry if you just did a
4 cross-section and said who watched the program, who
5 didn't watch the program and how much they know about
6 health information, you -- you know, you would worry
7 about -- that that's, you know, the predisposition of
8 various sorts.

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

23 MR. BIEMER: Yeah, exactly.

24 MR. BRADBURN: The same would, you know,
25 go here where -- where there -- so these big

1 interventions, in some sense, are available to lots of
2 people and not just the ones you necessarily are thinking
3 of -- that are in your, quote, experiment.

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

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

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

1 areas.

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

8 MR. GRANATO: Chris.

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

13 And, for example, up in my room, I have
14 every New Jersey voter on my laptop and which elections
15 they have turned out for as long as they've been
16 registered in the -- in the State of New Jersey. This is
17 4 1/2 million records, and it's available -- it's a
18 public document. They just burn a CD for you, and you
19 carry it away. The name, the address, the phone number
20 are -- are all there.

21 So this is, in effect, a longitudinal
22 survey of its own kind. Every little election, they
23 record whether you showed up or not and this information
24 is public. So one possibility that is available to
25 people designing a survey like -- like this one is to

1 take public records of that kind and take the name and
2 address and the phone number from the survey, match it to
3 the public records and add that kind of information into
4 the -- into the survey.

5 So 15 years ago, of course, this would
6 have been impossible. No one wants to read through
7 4 1/2 million records and find individuals. But with --
8 with computer databases now and -- and the kind of high
9 speed processing we've got, this is perfectly possible.
10 And voter records aren't the only thing. There are
11 commercial databases of various kinds as well.

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

20 MR. SCIOLI: Carl Eschbach.

21 MR. ESCHBACH: Yeah. I -- I work in a
22 census shop. So relative to this point, I thought I'd
23 share some -- some facts from the American Community
24 Survey and from the 2000 census that the American
25 Community Survey has questions about residents one year

1 ago. And on that basis, 160,000 or about 3 percent of
2 the Houston metro area population enumerated in 2004 in
3 that area was living outside the area; in 2005, one year
4 later, about half inside the state and half outside the
5 state. And of course that does not speak to any
6 international out-migration that occurred. About
7 5 percent, about 220,000 people moved into the Houston
8 area from outside, again. And that's domestic
9 in-migration. And we do have international in-migration,
10 about 50,000 moved in from outside the country. So --
11 so, in aggregate, about 5 percent of the population in
12 one year is different.

13 If we go back to the 2000 census, looking
14 from 1995 to 2000, and forgiving niceties like circular
15 migration and -- and mortality in the period, 11 -- about
16 460,000 or 11.5 percent of the 1995 -- people who were
17 enumerated in 1995 in the Houston metro area were outside
18 were enumerated somewhere else in 2000. I -- I didn't
19 poll here the in-migration figures, but it'll give you
20 some sense of the turnover that Houston experiences.

21 Oh, and I guess the other -- about
22 80 percent of Houstonians in 2005 who were living in the
23 same house that they were living in, in other words,
24 20 percent had moved in a one-year period from 2004 to
25 2005.

1 MR. SCIOLI: One of the things that has
2 struck me with this august group and for the -- the folks
3 from -- the locals should really understand that these
4 are the best that you could have discuss these issues in
5 a conversational way.

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

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

24 I mean, unfortunately it comes down to
25 the bottom line. The -- the dollars invested yield the

1 power of the design, yield the kinds of questions that
2 can be asked and the -- whether you're looking at the --
3 the critical issues that so many of you have raised.

4 So, I mean, I guess Norman in his wisdom
5 said "I'm not going to touch that one at the outset."
6 Let me lay out -- and that's kind, if you will, the NORC
7 strategy. Let me draw you in. Let me tell you about
8 what we can do. I mean, here's the fillet and here's the
9 fish and, oh, over here we have a nice buffet with
10 macaroni salad and then, hey, if you only eat one meal a
11 day, maybe that's all you need.

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

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

25 MR. GRANATO: Although ignorance is

1 expensive.

2 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's right.

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

5 MR. GRANATO: Sure.

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

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

16 It's not clear to me that there's an
17 enormous difference in cost between the -- Norman, I'm
18 sure, would be better equipped to answer this than I
19 would. But in many ways, the second wave of a panel is
20 lot cheaper than a single cross-section because you have
21 much better locating information, you have much higher
22 productivity for the cases that you field. Typically,
23 the -- the -- the loss to a panel comes primarily in the
24 first -- in the first wave. The -- the conditional
25 probabilities of response -- the response rates among

1 those who recruit such a panel said traditionally have
2 been very high. So -- and -- and -- NLSY, they're above
3 90 percent every year, even for -- for -- for 90 --
4 NLSY97.

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

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

18 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right.

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

21 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No, no.
22 Absolutely. But I'm saying, my guess is that in
23 comparing the costs, people will probably not think so
24 much about that, but think if you have 3,000 observations
25 twice, which is cheaper.

1 MR. BRADBURN: Well, it would also depend
2 a lot on -- on the number of design issues and -- and
3 implementation issues that can be more or less expensive.

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

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

20 I mean, the NLSY, for example, which is
21 quite well financed on the whole, they go back to people
22 that -- who are in the original sample until they
23 ascertain that they're dead or that they've said, "If you
24 call me once more, I will put my lawyer on you" or
25 something like that. But -- and we have found people,

1 you know, in the tenth wave that we hadn't interviewed
2 since the second wave or something like that. So you try
3 and fill in the -- the data to some extent. But if you
4 try to go back always to the original sample, that's more
5 expensive than -- I mean, but that's a kind of option.

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

16 If you're -- if the house unit, the
17 address is the unit and you decide you're going to take
18 who's ever there and not follow the people who moved out,
19 then that's cheaper than if you say, no, I want to find
20 out what happened to those people who -- who moved out.
21 Then, two things, you might -- one your sample might grow
22 because now you might use both the people in the house
23 and the people who moved out. But if you say, well,
24 let's just stick with the original people, then now
25 you've got to track them someplace and typically, you

1 know, to minimize costs at least with personal
2 interviewing, you know, you cluster households and you
3 have area -- multilayer sampling and so forth -- well,
4 now the person has moved -- this is -- this really drives
5 up the cost in the NLSY. The person has moved from a
6 place where you -- a sampling point where you have
7 interviewers to a little town in Wyoming or something
8 like that that's 250 miles or 500 miles from where you
9 have the nearest interviewer. And -- so what do you do?
10 Do you fly in an interviewer or do you switch modes and
11 try to do it on the phone or -- or whatever, if you can
12 get the phone numbers and things like that.

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

18 MR. BIEMER: But, you know, I -- I just
19 want to -- I just want to reiterate that, you know, you
20 really can't -- you really can't talk about cost of two
21 designs without fixing something like quality, you know,
22 in terms of, at least, precision. So if we're talking
23 about estimates of change and looking at estimates of
24 change of a certain precision, then when you start
25 comparing different survey designs, you might find that

1 one survey design, like a cross-sectional survey, becomes
2 much more expensive because, you know, you're going to
3 have to double the sample size to get the same precision.

4 So you really have to think in terms of
5 not just the sampling -- you know, how many -- what
6 sample size, but what's the quality of the estimates that
7 are going to be produced by each survey design that's
8 being considered.

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

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

24 The second thing that I want to say is
25 that a lot of what we're talking about that we know comes

1 from regular surveys of the native born. We are finding
2 in the New Immigrant Survey that foreign born behave
3 somewhat differently or, at least, it's a hypothesis to
4 entertain that may be differences, for example, in the
5 traditional cost savings of recontact in a longitudinal
6 survey. These may not apply or not apply directly to
7 foreign born. So it's going to be very important to --
8 to take into consideration the -- the -- the demographic,
9 the nativity composition of -- of the Houston area
10 population.

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

17 MR. KLINEBERG: So not just Spanish?

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

1 MR. KLINEBERG: Sure.

2 MS. JASSO: -- and you have to go to a --
3 a telephone mode. Moreover, one of the things that we
4 encountered with the immigrants is that many of them
5 preferred to be interviewed on the phone, but only after
6 they have met the interviewer in person. So you make the
7 contact, you go, you know, all the expense of going to
8 the household and then they say call me at 2:00 a.m.
9 And -- and you do that. And so you end up with this very
10 interesting mixed mode that is arising from the
11 characteristics of the population whom you want to study
12 and -- and every bit of it has cost implications.

13 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Something I'm --
14 what Willie says, it seems to me that one of the most
15 desirable outcomes of this question as to which is the
16 better design is that it would force those of you who --
17 who -- who are conceptualizing the study to decide what
18 you want to do. So we could almost postpone the question
19 until you've decided what the purpose of the study is
20 because it really makes an enormous difference, i.e., in
21 terms of all of the methodology depends on what your
22 fundamental objective is.

23 And it may be that the design that Leslie
24 Kish itch called the split-panel design is -- I mean, the
25 danger with these compromise designs is they always look

1 good to everybody because everybody feels they're getting
2 part of what they want. Maybe that's not a good idea for
3 the split panel in which you have -- in which you run a
4 panel, but also have refresher cross-sections in each
5 wave might be -- might be the best design. And the
6 balance between the panel part and the cross-section part
7 would depend on the relative weight that you give to --
8 to the objectives that you have.

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

16 So even NLSY, which does go back to
17 everybody after the first wave, conditions it on -- on
18 first-wave response. And we've been experimenting with
19 going back to first-wave nonrespondents in -- in the
20 Making Connections study and in our studies of the
21 Chicago Housing Authority leaseholders who are being
22 displaced by the plans for transformation and have found
23 a very high success rate in -- in going back even to
24 refusers at the -- at the first wave. So our current
25 estimate is that probably 50 percent of refusers and a

1 higher percentage of noncontacts can be converted at the
2 second -- at the second attempt.

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

15 If they had thought back then that it
16 would have been -- because we have strong evidence that
17 people will continue in a panel once you have recruited
18 them, so that the key is to get them in. If they had
19 done a very light wave in 1966 just to get people in the
20 panel and have their nonresponse rate down and picked up
21 the other information over the following 40 years when
22 they have plenty of time to pick it up, the attrition
23 problem wouldn't have been nearly as great. So I think
24 for panels, my new proposal is have a wave zero, which is
25 essentially recruitment and just enough to involve

1 people, just enough to get it started, but minimize
2 response -- nonresponse so maximize the response rate at
3 this wave zero, don't allow all of the sponsors and
4 enthusiasts to get all of their questions into the first
5 wave where they all want to have them because they say
6 without that, civilization as we know it pretty much
7 comes to an end.

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

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

1 could solve a lot of recruitment and retention and IRB
2 problems.

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

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

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

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

24 A case in point that was enormous -- had
25 enormous cost implications: When NCS decided to go back

1 to eighth grade, start the panel in eighth grade, nobody
2 seemed to -- well, I don't think there were any data and
3 so forth. But nobody took an assertion that -- that
4 people -- kids who were in the eighth grade don't
5 necessarily just all go to the same high school. And it
6 turned out that the spread of kids going to different
7 high schools was much, much greater than had been
8 anticipated. So that instead of having a very -- most
9 people kind of in one place to go for the second wave
10 when they were sophomores, it turns out that they were
11 scattered all over the city -- I mean, not taking into
12 account, you know, the 20 percent who mover every year or
13 whatever, but just spread out over -- over a much bigger
14 geographic area. So you -- you have one or two kids in
15 30 schools instead of, you know, 20 or something in two
16 or three schools. So it just blew the budget enormously.

17 And you know, there's -- there's --
18 you -- well, unfortunately, when you get into these
19 studies you realize how many assumptions we make about
20 the -- the course of life for -- for different kinds of
21 things without any real data about it. And that was one
22 that people just assumed, you know, well, there are
23 feeder schools to these high schools and so all the kids
24 from this eighth grade are going to go to that high
25 school, and it just wasn't the case at all.

1 MR. BIEMER: You know, another thing I've
2 learned is that some things that you think might increase
3 survey costs actually can work to reduce them. I mean,
4 Colm's idea, for example, about having the zero wave
5 first struck me as being, you know, sort of an expensive
6 way to increase response rates. But -- but then again I
7 think about some of the experiments we did at RTI looking
8 at incentives. And you might think, you know, that
9 incentives would increase survey costs. We found in some
10 of these studies that they actually reduce survey costs.

11 Giving a \$50 incentive to respond to
12 sample members, it not only increases surveys costs but
13 it also gets them more engaged and it reduces the number
14 of follow-up attempts that are necessary to -- to be able
15 to convert initial nonrespondents and so forth. So
16 it's -- it's --

17 MR. BRADBURN: Good point.

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

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

23 MR. ACHEN: I'm not sure when you want to
24 take this up. But at some point I think it might be
25 helpful to us to have some sense of what it is you guys

1 want to do. And though there's this very nice panel
2 aspect of the CPS, for instance, which I -- that -- that
3 Norman mentioned that I became aware of about a year ago.
4 It is completely useless to political scientists who want
5 to use the CPS for voter turnout because that's an every
6 two-year thing and the panels never overlap.

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

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

15 MR. GRANATO: We will. After this
16 overview discussion, the next discussion will be about
17 design issues. So we're going think -- talk about
18 studies like PSID, but there's also the potential to
19 integrate with the Klineberg study. We link -- he has it
20 cross-sectioned on every year he's been doing it. Is it
21 20?

22 MR. KLINEBERG: 27 years.

23 MR. GRANATO: 27 years. And maybe a way
24 to integrate panels with his -- it's like a voyager
25 spacecraft, right. He's taken a thermometer of the area

1 and the region and way to just use the panels and to
2 drill down in a specific area that seems to be flaring up
3 in his survey or it could also be used to validate a -- a
4 large omnibus panel, too. It has its cross-sections, the
5 integrity of the sample -- but of this large panel, given
6 the threat of migration, out-migration. Does it still
7 square with what he's finding in cross -- at the
8 cross-sectional level. We're going to talk about those
9 things in a little bit.

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

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

25 MR. BRADBURN: Well, there -- there has

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

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

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

1 colleagues did, they worried about that a lot. But I
2 don't think that they, in fact, found a big -- big
3 effects -- small, yes. Little tiny effects and so forth.
4 So there's --

5 MR. KLINEBERG: You would think --

6 MR. BRADBURN: Pardon?

7 MR. KLINEBERG: You would think there
8 would be effects because --

9 MR. BRADBURN: Well, but it's in the same
10 issue that in the early days people worried about
11 interviewer effects. You know, there -- there's a whole
12 literature that -- the Hyman, et al., book on
13 interviewing and so forth, which was premised on the
14 worry that the interviewer's attitudes would affect, you
15 know, that they would get the -- that the respondents
16 would say what the interviewers wanted them to.

17 Well, I mean, the basic issue there is if
18 you train interviewers well, you know, they -- and they
19 behave the way they're supposed to and so forth, it isn't
20 an issue of various sorts. I mean, there are good
21 interviewers and bad interviewers and so on and so forth.

22 But I mean there are a few places that
23 worry if -- but I'll actually give you a place where --
24 where there a bit of a problem with longitudinal studies
25 that we turned up in the NLS. Now, see, this is a study

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

12 Well, another researcher who had studied
13 in -- in various other context rates of elicited drug use
14 in youth found that the reports in the NLSY were less
15 than they were getting in some successive
16 cross-sectioning. And what she believed -- I'm not sure
17 this totally was evidenced. But it -- it's certainly
18 plausible and feasible that over time the -- the
19 respondents had sort of bonded with the interviewers like
20 their mothers or something like that, and so they were --
21 they were not reporting sensitive behaviors of various
22 sorts that they wouldn't report to their mothers or
23 something like that. And so they -- it's a kind of -- a
24 kind of extra relationship that they have sort of built
25 up. But that's a very unusual kind of situation of

1 various sorts that -- and I don't think it -- it was --
2 again, if it's an effect of at all, it's kind -- kind of
3 a big effect.

4 I mean, it was -- Willie mentioned about
5 the -- the immigrants. I mean, there is a sense in which
6 the interviewer in these longitudinal studies does have a
7 somewhat different -- because we do try to, in general,
8 match this, you know, so that they can go back to -- to
9 the same person, and sometimes this is -- with NLSY it's
10 been many, many years.

11 MR. BIEMER: Well, the other reason why
12 you want -- want a refresher sample is because over time
13 attrition will reduce the representativeness, if I could
14 use that word, of the sample that you selected. And if
15 you try and make cross-sectional estimates, then you
16 don't really have -- integrating a sample. So you may
17 want to, you know, bring in, you know, the in-movers,
18 things like that that aren't represented by the original
19 sample.

20 So it depends upon your objectives again
21 whether, you know, you're more interested in start
22 looking at a fixed panel where you select a sample from a
23 population at some point in time and that's going to be
24 your reference population, you just want to look at how
25 that population changes or you want to, you know, update

1 that sample for changes in the population and do
2 cross-sectional estimates along the way; and that's where
3 you get to the rotation panel designs.

4 MR. EMERSON: But you're --

5 MR. BIEMER: Like a refreshment?

6 MR. EMERSON: Pardon. But it's quite
7 important to distinguish between the different purposes
8 for supplementing the sample.

9 MR. GRANATO: Right.

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

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

21 So one is measuring change in terms of
22 the -- within individual gross change, and the other is
23 looking at net change in the -- in the community. And I
24 think in Houston it looks as though they might both be
25 quite important objectives, but they're not the same.

1 MR. BIEMER: Right, no.

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

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

21 MR. GRANATO: Got you.

22 MR. BRADBURN: But others -- for the
23 others, it's people who dropped out -- who are
24 replacements for people who dropped out, but who could
25 have been in...

1 MR. GRANATO: Got you.

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

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

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

24 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. Yeah. Let's take a
25 10-minute break, and we'll come back and we'll start with

1 those design issues.

2 (Recess 10:48 to 11:16.)

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

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

13 MR. SCIOLI: A Lucky man.

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

19 MR. KLINEBERG: Well, we began 27 years
20 ago. And -- and I get unfairly credited for planning to
21 do this in my life. I mean, I teach a research methods
22 class to sociology majors at Rice. A friend of mine had
23 just started a survey organization. Houston was booming.
24 One million people had moved into Houston between 1970
25 and 1982. One million, we were riding the oil boom to

1 continued prosperity. We did that first survey. Two
2 months later, the oil boom collapsed. I said, "My God,
3 we better do this survey again."

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

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

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

23 The reason -- when I was late this
24 morning, I was having a definitive meeting with our dean.
25 Rice is committed to helping us raise, as a part of their

1 endowment, 5 to 10 million dollars that will establish an
2 institute on Houston-area research at public impact that
3 will ensure that the survey continues.

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

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

8 MR. BIEMER: 700 completed or...

9 MR. KLINEBERG: Excuse me?

10 MR. BIEMER: 700 completed?

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

25 MR. GRANATO: Wow.

1 MR. BRADBURN: Do you know what
2 proportion in this county -- have telephone.

3 MR. KLINEBERG: It's about 92,
4 93 percent. Now, I'm not sure because so many having
5 land lines, it's hard --

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

10 MR. KLINEBERG: And young people now.

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

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

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

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

24 MR. KLINEBERG: Right, right.

25 MR. BRADBURN: But you're not -- is that

1 because you don't know whether it's a real number or not?

2 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No. But these --
3 these are samples of cell phone numbers.

4 MR. KLINEBERG: I mean, because
5 people don't -- people will not answer their cell
6 phones...

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

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

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

21 MR. KLINEBERG: Yes.

22 MR. BRADBURN: Sort of like the GSS?

23 MR. KLINEBERG: Right, right. And we ask
24 about -- 20 percent of the survey is new each year, but
25 then we've got these questions. Then two years later,

1 let's ask some of those again. So it's now getting
2 pretty full.

3 MR. BRADBURN: How long is it?

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

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

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

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

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

24 MR. KLINEBERG: Yes.

25 MR. SCIOLI: And how much do they kind of

1 make suggestions and say, "Why don't you include a module
2 on this" and you know, therefore the original objective
3 may have changed and the core --

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

17 And they are -- they understand that this
18 is -- that we are open to suggestions at all times, but
19 the survey questions are shaped by -- by the issues that
20 we're -- we're exploring. And -- and, also, no question
21 is ever proprietary and data are always made available to
22 everyone. And -- and the support has come just with the
23 sense of -- and in some ways that's the most valuable
24 thing about this survey is that it is independent and --
25 and no one controls it.

1 And we do add modules. We did a module
2 one year working with the Greater Houston Mental Health
3 Association, did a series of questions on the perceptions
4 of mental illness. We did a module with the Texas
5 Transportation Institute at University -- at Texas A&M.
6 We do on module on attitudes towards mass transit and
7 different transportation questions. So we've done that.
8 And then -- and then some of those become questions that
9 we track a couple of years.

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

13 MR. KLINEBERG: Thank you.

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

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

21 So we -- we -- early on, starting in 1991
22 the first time, we did additional sample surveys with the
23 identical questionnaire. And it -- and it asks about
24 four questions in, "Are you Anglo, black, Hispanic, Asian
25 or some other ethnic background?" And -- and then -- and

1 we continued the surveys then to reach a total of 500
2 African-Americans, 500 Hispanics, and 500 Anglos every
3 year. So now I have very rich data, especially on Latino
4 immigrants and their experiences, too.

5 MS. JASSO: It's in Spanish, also?

6 MR. KLINEBERG: And it's always
7 translated in Spanish. In two of the years, in 1996 and
8 2002, we added a major survey of the Asian population in
9 Houston where we -- we did 28 percent of the interviews
10 in Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin and Creole. It seems
11 like every seven years. So next year, we're back. Thank
12 god we talked about it. Can we do this?

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

23 And then we took a random Asian in those
24 random, and a tremendous undertaking to get a truly --
25 but then it became a truly representative sample. We

1 really can tell you how the Philipinos differ from the
2 Indians in their -- in their experiences and what does it
3 mean to be a Vietnamese refugee as opposed to a -- to a
4 professional immigrant --

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

7 MR. KLINEBERG: So we build on that --

8 MR. BRADBURN: So you add 2200 or --

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

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

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

25 It gets used -- that's, of course, part

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

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

20 And because of that migration, there's a
21 tremendous -- there's a nationwide relationship between
22 ethnicity and age, of course. The aging of America is
23 largely Anglo aging. More clear in Houston than anywhere
24 else because the Anglos pour down here until 1982 and
25 then all the young people who came as immigrants. So,

1 you know, one of the most powerful charts in my survey is
2 of that of everybody in Harris County age 60 and older,
3 72 percent are Anglos. And of everybody under the age of
4 30, 75 percent are non-Anglos. Here we are, this
5 endogeneity.

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

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

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

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

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

23 MS. HAMILTON: Houston Endowment does a
24 lot of work. We don't really care about having our name
25 all over everything anymore. And so we do a lot of work

1 looking at gaps, where the gaps are; and this study helps
2 us see those gaps and where they -- they are with regard
3 to health and human services and environment and planning
4 issues --

5 MR. KLINEBERG: Education.

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

9 MR. KLINEBERG: One of the interesting
10 things that Houston is aware of now is that the
11 strategies for economic prosperity for Houston in the
12 21st century are different from the ones that worked in
13 the 20th century, above all having to do with quality of
14 life, with making this city a more beautiful, attractive
15 place where people who can live anywhere will say, "I
16 want to live in Houston."

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

24 MR. SCIOLI: So let me put on my fiscal
25 administrator hat for a second and ask me, why do we need

1 two sheriffs in town? Why don't you do the panel study?

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

5 MS. JASSO: Marshals.

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

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

21 So your objective -- I mean, you heard us
22 struggling with let's understand what the objectives of
23 the panel study would be. And it seems to me, without
24 great knowledge of it, that there's a potential
25 partnership here; as opposed to you using this or this

1 informing another study, that there's a partnership where
2 both boats would rise and there would be a conservation
3 of resources, a pooling of resources. I mean, is there
4 something going on that I don't know about where Rice
5 won't, you know?

6 MR. KLINEBERG: No.

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

9 MR. KLINEBERG: Oh, no.

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

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

15 MR. SCIOLI: Oh, okay.

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

21 And the idea would be to combine these
22 two, because you have got a cross-sectional study that is
23 now going to go on, we think, indefinitely. But we can't
24 answer the kinds of questions that a panel study can.
25 And -- and the panel study doesn't have to worry so much

1 about, "Are we continuing to represent the city?"
2 Because we now -- we have a pretty good picture of how
3 the city is changing. We can take human beings and watch
4 their lives unfold, you know, where it provides
5 enormously understanding. So that's sort of what we're
6 thinking of.

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

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

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

1 is, say, a fact.

2 MR. KLINEBERG: I see.

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

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

18 MS. JASSO: Sure.

19 MR. KLINEBERG: "Thanks for your help."

20 (Motions.)

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

23 MR. KLINEBERG: And then we ask
24 everybody, "Where were you born and where were your
25 parents born?"

1 MS. JASSO: Yeah.

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

7 MS. JASSO: More intrusive you think than
8 ethnicity?

9 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Absolutely.
10 Absolutely. If you have --

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

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

14 MS. JASSO: No, I was not, but
15 nonetheless.

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

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

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

24 MS. JASSO: Well, you need exogenous
25 variables.

1 MR. BRADBURN: I wasn't sure what you
2 said about the people who are -- basically self-identify
3 as multiethnic or however you put that.

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

6 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. And then what?

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

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

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

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

19 MR. KLINEBERG: Font.

20 MR. BRADBURN: I mean, it -- the -- well,
21 the census has introduced the multi-racial and so forth
22 category and with much controversy and so on and so
23 forth. But I think -- again, this sort of speaks to
24 trend data and maybe possibly longitudinal and so forth,
25 that that's -- it's good to have something early on when

1 it's not yet --

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

3 MR. BRADBURN: -- an important category.

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

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

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

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

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

23 MR. EMERSON: One of the -- a lot of
24 changes happened, I think -- and I think maybe since
25 Steve started -- with Hispanics. Houston is

1 overwhelmingly -- population was overwhelmingly of
2 Mexican origin 27 years ago. So you identify a
3 relatively small number of non-Mexican origin Hispanics.
4 Now, that's increased very substantially. We're probably
5 now 62 percent, 64 percent Salvadoran immigration and
6 some Central America, some South American. We have
7 almost no black Hispanics. So we have a very tiny
8 overlap in this community of persons who say they are
9 black and Hispanic, very different than New York City, of
10 course. But that's picking up a little bit.

11 We had almost no foreign-born blacks.
12 Virtually all blacks were born in the United States.
13 That's changing. Migration from West Africa.

14 MR. GEYEN: Yeah. And Africa, yeah.

15 MR. EMERSON: We probably have more
16 Nigerians here now than --

17 MR. GEYEN: And the Caribbean.

18 MR. EMERSON: So these questions have --
19 you know, have changed a little bit over the 27 years
20 because our racial ethnic categories are getting more
21 diverse, more people are saying "other," not identifying
22 with a primary census category. So these are good
23 questions to consider going forward.

24 MR. KLINEBERG: And, again, it makes the
25 point that -- that Houston is a kind of mirror in the

1 sense that new America takes shape.

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

7 MR. KLINEBERG: No.

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

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

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

20 MS. CALLAGHAN: And race of the
21 interviewer match?

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

1 MS. LEE: Okay.

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

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

10 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.

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

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

17 MR. MURRAY: They're dispersing as well.

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

25 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Absolutely.

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

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

15 MS. LEE: It can be worse.

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

23 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. That's a
24 good point. The -- our -- the survey that I've been
25 involved with has been just enthusiastically embraced by

1 the -- by the minority communities across the board.

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

3 MR. KLINEBERG: There's great excitement.

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

7 MR. KLINEBERG: Uh-huh. Here, here.
8 Public -- public impact.

9 MS. SIEBER: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

1 MR. BLAIS: Yeah.

2 MR. KLINEBERG: We have -- well, we have
3 700 from a representative sample of 2 million in an -- in
4 an -- in an area the City of Houston that covers 620
5 square miles. You could put inside the city limits of
6 Houston simultaneously the cities of Chicago,
7 Philadelphia, Baltimore and Detroit.

8 MS. SIEBER: Oh, my God.

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

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

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

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

1 MR. KLINEBERG: Right.

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

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

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

12 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. We have some --

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

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

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

24 MR. KLINEBERG: Well, we have --

25 MR. BRADBURN: Five years probably

1 pooling would --

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

4 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

5 MR. KLINEBERG: Some issues vary.
6 Concerned about attitude changes --

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

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

19 In fact, just to give you an example,
20 when we were doing -- I mentioned the Cuban missile
21 crisis had occurred in the middle. When we tracked --
22 and we were able to re-interview everybody within a week,
23 I mean. But if you look -- if you plotted the -- the
24 reaction in terms of, you know, sort of anxiety-type
25 reactions and so forth, by the day of the interview after

1 the -- the major -- well, you know, when the missiles
2 were back and forth, you can see that it drops off. You
3 know, by the end of the week, the people were much, much
4 less worried than the people who were interviewed the day
5 after and so on and so forth. And -- and it's -- these
6 kind of things really have amazingly short half lives
7 compared with the kind of attitude -- you know, sort of
8 more general attitude.

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

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

19 MR. BIEMER: No, not at that track.

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

25 MR. ESCHBACH: 2010 from 2005.

1 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It will be a
2 five-year aggregated sample for every tract. So that
3 it'll have essentially a five-year moving average of
4 tract-level information for every tract in the country.

5 Cities at the moment are relatively badly
6 treated by ACS. Since the census categorizes places
7 rather than population aggregation; so that in the big
8 cities, you can only get PUMAs -- PUMA-level data. You
9 can't -- whereas in a town of 25,000, you already have
10 ACS data. For big cities, it won't be until the tract
11 data become available. But then after 2010, we'll have
12 the equivalent of a long form every year.

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

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

19 MR. KLINEBERG: I see.

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

22 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. But
23 that's -- these are places of 25,000 or more.

24 MR. BIEMER: Right.

25 MR. KLINEBERG: But cities don't count.

1 MR. BIEMER: So at the Houston level, you
2 could do it?

3 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. Every year
4 for -- every year for the metropolitan areas.

5 MR. ACHEN: Could -- could I ask a
6 question about how you manage your agenda. Partly you've
7 got a tremendously interesting city here and even from
8 1500 miles away we know that. So there's a lot of
9 descriptive things and just tracking and -- and -- that
10 are important and must be important to your sponsors.

11 How do you -- do you have an advisory
12 board for that and then do you also have an advisory
13 board for a more strictly scientific agenda where there's
14 something particular research thing that you want to do
15 and so you focus more in a given year or how do you
16 manage those -- how do you manage those competing
17 agendas?

18 MR. KLINEBERG: We're in this transition
19 from being -- I've been all by myself for these 27 years.
20 I have an undergraduate class that works with me in the
21 spring each year to -- to think about the questions and
22 to develop the pilot interviews and then they work on
23 papers and stuff. But we have no graduate students now
24 in sociology; we're moving toward a graduate program of
25 sorts.

1 So it's been just building on, you know,
2 and knowing what's happening in the city and talking to
3 people, inviting people to talk to us about thoughts they
4 have. But one of the things we're planning with this
5 building of a new institute and to raise the funding is
6 to -- is to finally do it right and have a full regular
7 advisory committee and -- and hopefully also -- to be
8 able to bring consultants in from outside and to help us
9 think about various methodological issues and to have a
10 full-time executive director that would be independent of
11 the faculty director to do a lot of the -- but it's been
12 a -- it's -- it's just been me and my graduate students.

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

15 MR. KLINEBERG: There are reports.

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

20 MR. KLINEBERG: Thank you.

21 MR. ESCHBACH: Steve, going forward, are
22 you content with telephone survey mode as the way to
23 conduct the survey, particularly with respect to
24 differential nonparticipation across different ethnic
25 groups or pop -- population growth mode?

1 MR. KLINEBERG: The belief that a
2 70 percent response rate was the minimum that you could
3 require if you were going to, you know, apply sampling
4 theory. I'm very upset by a 38 response rate. When I
5 was a graduate student, you would have tossed those away;
6 those aren't real surveys. And they're as good as you
7 can get, you know.

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

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

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

21 MR. MURRAY: \$34 per interview.

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

24 MR. MURRAY: So if there's 1700 times 34,
25 \$54,000 field costs roughly.

1 MR. KLINEBERG: And then a lot of other
2 incidental things that are part of that, but it's -- it's
3 in excess obviously. It costs --

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

7 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: We couldn't
8 afford --

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

11 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: NORC would -- it
12 would cost a lot more to do it a NORC. It would cost a
13 lot more just to talk to us.

14 (Laughter.)

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

17 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: You're going to
18 get billed for this.

19 MS. SIEBER: I think Stephen deserves a
20 medal.

21 MS. JASSO: Yes, he does indeed.

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

24 MS. JASSO: On this issue that
25 everyone -- everyone in social research is worried about,

1 the telephone problem, the coming problem of -- of
2 nonresponsive, I wonder if it might be useful for us to
3 think about a different source for the sampling frame
4 than using telephone vendors or other means in order to
5 make the initial contact with the sampled individuals.
6 I -- I -- I think we're all going to have to -- to -- to
7 worry and think hard about this. What would be
8 alternative sampling frames?

9 Chris mentioned, for example, voter
10 lists. But of course that only -- yeah. I know.
11 Driver's license databases.

12 MR. KLINEBERG: There are Internet
13 surveys, which are -- have the same problems as NAD
14 surveys.

15 MS. JASSO: They have the same problem,
16 that's correct. That's correct.

17 MR. BRADBURN: Well, they are more
18 sampling problems because --

19 MR. MURRAY: Or tracking. We did a
20 survey years ago at Sam Houston High School that's
21 overwhelmingly blue collar Hispanics, high immigrant
22 community. We -- and the kids were -- we get their
23 records of the parents from the school, so we can call
24 parents, bilingual interviews.

25 But just in the couple of years we were

1 surveying, 70 percent of these working class Hispanic
2 households had Internet connections; and that had gone up
3 dramatically. So we're probably never going to reach the
4 level of telephone penetration, but we are seeing even in
5 a -- a very historically underserved community, due to
6 computer connections and so forth, dramatic increases.
7 And there's this good potential to weed out some of these
8 problems as we shift -- as we will have to in the 21st
9 century from less and less telephone-based interviewing.

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

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

22 So, I mean, we -- I think -- I mean,
23 there are various experiments going on in which -- in
24 using face-to-face interviewing to contact people to get
25 an e-mail address and so forth and then actually doing

1 the -- it's sort of an analog of what Willie was talking
2 about, is you get the interviewer to make a contact and
3 sort of establish a relationship and then you do the
4 actual interview through the -- over the Internet or
5 whatever or web if you -- for -- at least, for those
6 people who have internet.

7 MR. BIEMER: You could provide it.

8 MR. BRADBURN: You can provide it, that's
9 true. You can provide it.

10 MR. BIEMER: It works through the TV.

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

22 And it was relatively successful, at
23 least, as a demonstration project in that using three
24 slightly different procedures we got recruitment rates
25 between 60 and 70 percent of people who signed up to do

1 this. And then about 70 percent or a little more
2 actually did it. So, I mean, there's -- there's a whole
3 sequence of lost points in any operation like this. But
4 this is a very low -- relatively low cost and small scale
5 operation. And I think it suggests that we could do
6 it -- probably get recruitment rates over 70 percent.
7 And John Kosnik [sp] has now got money, I think, also
8 from NSF, from one of these center grants or --

9 MR. SCIOLI: To do research
10 instrumentation.

11 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right. To try --
12 try this out on a larger scale.

13 MR. BIEMER: Well, you know, Craig Hill
14 at RTI is experimenting with these --

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right.

16 MR. BIEMER: -- devices which -- these
17 handheld Internet devices which you -- basically you
18 approach them face to face. You recruit them into a
19 panel and provide them with this device as well as pay
20 their monthly fees and, in exchange, they agree to do so
21 many surveys over a period of a year, which are short
22 surveys. They can be conducted on this, but they occur
23 more frequently. So you're able to, you know, cover the
24 same ground as you would with a telephone survey, say,
25 15, 20 minutes but they're only getting it in like

1 five-minute doses.

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

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

7 MR. GRANATO: How is the expense on that?

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

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

12 MR. BIEMER: I think it's comparable.

13 MR. GRANATO: Is it?

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

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

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

23 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

24 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Because this --
25 this is really the -- the example that Norman gave

1 earlier of essentially impaneling this group. This is --
2 this is not a panel in the sense of trajectories for
3 individuals. This is more a -- a group of people who
4 would then do a set of relatively unconnected surveys for
5 you, and the advantage is that you collect the basic
6 sociodemographic information only once so that each
7 client who buys 10 attitude questions or 15 marketing
8 questions, also, gets all of the sociodemographics at
9 relatively low cost.

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

21 Knowledge Networks, which has been doing
22 this now for 10 years, I guess, has a -- a true response
23 rate of single-digit response rate. So if you look at
24 the true response rate, it's less than 10 percent. And
25 that's kind of not -- you know, we've gotten used to

1 70 percent and 50 percent and 40 percent and for RDD now,
2 30 to 40 percent. Market research has gotten used to
3 20 percent, sometimes 10 percent. But single digits
4 still upset even the --

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. KLINEBERG: Give us a little more
7 time.

8 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- the survey
9 researchers. But on the sampling -- sorry.

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

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Sure. And I guess
16 it's -- the issue is how representative of the population
17 is it.

18 MS. RIGBY: Yeah. Okay.

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

1 MS. RIGBY: Right.

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

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

19 MS. RIGBY: Thank you.

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And there's
21 attrition of another couple percentage a month or 10
22 percent a month of the people who are in it. So if
23 you're getting kind of the middle of the panel -- and I
24 think -- I don't think they would challenge these
25 numbers. I mean I think they --

1 MR. BIEMER: Well, they can -- I mean,
2 they can jump it up a little if you start with a
3 face-to-face recruitment rather than an RDD.

4 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, sure.

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

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

9 MR. BRADBURN: Generalization.

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

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

1 you've got a group, those kind of things.

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

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

24 MR. KLINEBERG: Even though it's not a
25 representative sample?

1 MR. BRADBURN: Well, you -- you do run
2 into self-selection problems.

3 MS. SIEBER: Well, yeah.

4 MS. LEE: You always have that.

5 MS. SIEBER: You always have that.

6 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I do think that --
7 I was interested that -- Steve, that you said that doing
8 a face-to-face survey in Houston would be a daunting
9 task, which of course is true. But if one were designing
10 a face-to-face sample in Houston, it wouldn't be
11 equivalent of an RDD sample. It wouldn't be an AREM
12 sample. It wouldn't be a sample of individual
13 households.

14 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.

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

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

19 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Clusters.

20 MR. KLINEBERG: -- box and --

21 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And possibly
22 tracts. I mean, I know we use tracts as our unit in
23 major urban areas as the -- as the clusters in our
24 national samples. And tracts are relatively small. You
25 can use block groups if tracts are too big.

1 I mean, I -- so it depends on -- but it's
2 certainly not -- you wouldn't envisage that your sample
3 would be spread out uniformly across the area if -- if
4 travel costs, for example, are so large. And with all
5 the information that we -- we have in small areas, you
6 can stratify really quite tightly in terms of selecting
7 areas so that you reduce the cost greatly by having
8 adequate work loads for an interviewer in a relatively
9 small area, so they're not driving 20 miles from one
10 interview to another. So certainly for a face-to-face
11 survey, I wouldn't start with the assumption in Houston,
12 although you might in Manhattan, of a direct sample of
13 households or housing units. And that -- you can change
14 the cost very dramatically by changing the clustering of
15 the -- the sample.

16 MR. BRADBURN: Just to go back to the --
17 before the break kind of question about comparative
18 costs, when we were talking about panels or luges [sic]
19 and not necessarily being more costly than things,
20 implicit in that was that the mode was the same.

21 I mean, if you're contrasting an RDD
22 sample with a longitudinal sample which is face to face
23 or, at least, for several ways face to face and so forth,
24 then you are talking about big cost differences. But
25 that's not due to the panel versus cross-section. It's

1 due to the mode -- difference cost.

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 So you want to minimize the number of

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

7 MR. BIEMER: Well, you know, if you have
8 10 households that are in the sample in the same area,
9 then the interviewer is more productive. They go to the
10 area, they can, you know, go to all of those households
11 and they'll find somebody. So it's not always a wasted
12 trip.

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

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

21 I mean, now we use almost always the USPS
22 delivery sequence file so the address frame from the
23 postal service, which especially in urban areas tends to
24 be quite complete in terms -- in terms of the dwellings
25 since these are delivery points for -- for -- for the

1 postal service, I mean this has reduced very considerably
2 the cost of small area or local area face-to-face
3 surveys.

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

6 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Huh?

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

9 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah, absolutely.
10 I mean, it's never -- it's never as good as we hope. But
11 it's certainly -- well, my guess -- or our results
12 suggest that it is, in fact, as good as our own survey
13 listers would get. So that's, also, of course, not
14 perfect, so...

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

17 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Sure, right.

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

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

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

1 MR. SCIOLI: An hour?

2 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah.

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

6 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's -- that's a
7 -- that's -- I'm glad to say I'm not an interviewer. Our
8 interviewers are better at this than our researchers are.
9 I mean, both gated communities and -- and apartment
10 buildings that -- where you have to phone ahead.

11 We can, as -- as Norman says, get
12 telephone numbers for addresses for probably 50 percent
13 of the addresses in the country, maybe 60 percent,
14 depending on -- depending on the area. So the
15 interviewers can get -- can get telephone numbers in
16 those cases.

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

24 But it is -- it is a challenge. And
25 there are some places, I think, where interviewer just

1 can't crack it and then it's nonresponse. So it's a --
2 it's a higher level nonresponse. So it's not at the
3 level of the selected person, but at some -- some larger
4 level. I don't think we've ever lost a whole cluster
5 because --

6 MR. BIEMER: I think you could probably
7 except, what, 70 to 75 percent response rates on a
8 face-to-face survey these days.

9 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yes. I -- I --
10 this has been remarkably consistent really over the last
11 30 years -- well, 20 years. So 70 percent is still --
12 our face-to-face surveys are typically -- GSS is just
13 over 70 percent. Bagley [ph] is around 7.

14 MR. BIEMER: Ours is our 70.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Older respondents
16 was 75 percent for a 2 1/2 hour interview a couple years
17 ago. So we still expect 70 percent -- between 70 and 80
18 percent, I guess, would be...

19 But in my -- my suspicion is -- and
20 Norman might be able to confirm this. We now spend a lot
21 more to get that is my feeling.

22 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

23 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So we've managed
24 to maintain the rate, but by greatly increased
25 expenditure.

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

4 MR. BLAIS: Cost per interview.

5 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Huh?

6 MR. BLAIS: Cost per interview.

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

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

12 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No. This is --
13 this is the total --

14 MR. BRADBURN: -- total costs.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- cost, that's
16 right, would be between 400 and 1,000 a case. So between
17 400,000 and a million would be my guess. Would you
18 think, Paul?

19 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. I think so.

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

22 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, sure.
23 That's included.

24 MR. BRADBURN: And now I'm under the
25 question -- I mean, that's the total cost?

1 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's really the
2 whole --

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

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

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

12 MR. BRADBURN: And an unspeakable word of
13 overhead.

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

16 (Laughter.)

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

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

23 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: A third to a half.
24 It might be a half.

25 MR. BRADBURN: Well, I don't -- well --

1 and, again, it depends on your overhead structure.

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

5 MR. SCIOLI: The big three, General
6 Social Survey, American National Election Study, Panel
7 Study of Income Dynamics is anywhere now between
8 2 million and 4 million per year. That's gold standard.
9 That includes training, questionnaire design, advisory
10 board that was mentioned earlier, implementation of the
11 instrument, cleaning of the data, archiving of the data,
12 webinars, et cetera. And of that, 55 percent is overhead
13 perhaps.

14 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

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

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

1 less on one hand.

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

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

18 MR. KLINEBERG: And our changes.

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

25 MR. BRADBURN: And actually the data --

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

7 But the -- the number of the churnings or
8 at least the people who didn't seem to me out -- in fact,
9 I was surprised that it was as low as it was compared
10 to -- I mean, in general in the country, I think it's
11 18 percent now, 19 percent, something like that. And you
12 said it was 20 percent?

13 MR. ESCHBACH: 20.

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

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

25 MR. MURRAY: We have a net in migration

1 gain of about 2 1/4 percent per year.

2 MR. BRADBURN: Per year.

3 MR. MURRAY: High for a metropolitan
4 area.

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

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

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

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

11 MS. RIGBY: Okay.

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

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

24 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Well, that --

25 MR. KLINEBERG: That answers the question

1 about how the city is changing, which there's concern for
2 the panel study to really follow along...

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

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

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

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

24 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, I don't
25 think anybody has -- at least, none of the panels that

1 except for the first and the --

2 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: First and fifth.
3 For CPS, almost all interviews, apart from the initial
4 recruitment interview and the interview after the eighth
5 month hiatus, are telephone. And that's been the case
6 for a --

7 MR. KLINEBERG: A long time.

8 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- 20 years --
9 more than 20 years. So perhaps...

10 MR. BIEMER: But if you have interviewers
11 on the ground, if they won't -- you know, if you can't
12 get them by phone, then you can always send an
13 interviewer out there, even though it's designated as a
14 telephone...

15 MR. GRANATO: Got you. So it's the
16 reverse of what Colm was saying. If it had been -- you
17 actually use the -- the phone as initiate and then you
18 go with the --

19 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. You try to get them
20 as phone, but then as a last resort you have to go out.

21 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. Which raises your
22 costs, but it's still just the coverage.

23 MR. BIEMER: Yeah, because you want to
24 maintain a response rate. If you only did try to do it
25 by phone, then your response rate is going down.

1 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But CPS designed
2 it such that the -- there's a new group recruited every
3 month in the same locations as the existing panel. So
4 essentially it has interviewers in every location every
5 month. So that's where the construct is entirely exactly
6 the opposite of what it would be if you had a telephone
7 operation, then you wanted to try to use face to face.

8 MR. GRANATO: Sure.

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

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

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

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

22 What I'd like to do is pursue these
23 design issues some more. And one of the things -- I was
24 talking to Paul Biemer. One avenue, I think it's
25 probably, given the infrastructure we have in the City of

1 Houston region, is we probably want to go the route of
2 something called -- I believe they're called design
3 contracts.

4 MR. BIEMER: Design contracts.

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

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

23 And let's set aside for -- for a while
24 the substantive questions and deal with the design issues
25 and the trip wires we have to go through to -- to create

1 a plan and design contract that would be something that
2 we all would be comfortable with.

3 So if we were to do a PSID --

4 MR. SCIOLI: May I interject?

5 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. Go ahead.

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

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

18 So, Norman, what are the objectives.

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

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

22 MR. BRADBURN: And so -- but I was going
23 to make essentially the same point that the PSID was
24 designed with a particular objective in mind, and it's
25 evolved, so -- you know, but you've -- you've got to

1 have, at least, some broad objectives to know how to -- I
2 mean, to even make a handle, a start on some of these
3 questions, the design parameters.

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

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

20 So they came up with this idea -- and
21 this is not a new idea -- of doing a design contract, and
22 they set that out for bid. RTI bid on that. We won the
23 design contract. And one of the things we did was we
24 convened several panels of experts, just like this panel,
25 to come up with sort of brainstorming what are the --

1 what should the objectives be for a survey like this.
2 Now, these were people -- you know, in a situation like
3 you have here, would be people who would be kind of the
4 end users of the data, the people who would have -- who
5 are stakeholders, those kind of people, to kind of
6 brainstorm and get all that on paper.

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

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

24 MS. SIEBER: Jim, one of the things that
25 I'm wondering about is whether you are interested in

1 having this data shared as a publically accessible
2 resource perhaps on-line or whether you would be
3 providing the data to discrete groups? Because if -- if
4 it's going to be publically accessible, you're going to
5 have to think about not only how to document the data for
6 any sort of purpose, but also how to make sure that
7 there -- that it wouldn't be easy to deductively identify
8 individuals.

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

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

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

22 However, there are some things coming up
23 in terms of data enclaves and so forth which allow you to
24 get both worlds, that is, you can have a public data set
25 which -- which is, you know, somewhat higher level, some

1 things have been changed and so on and so forth. But you
2 can also have, with appropriate safeguards and so forth,
3 allow licensed researchers essentially to sign away their
4 life, ends up with -- to have access to microdata. So
5 it's -- you can -- can do both.

6 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

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

20 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. There's different
21 levels of public availability. Because you can -- you
22 can say there's a public use file that's out on the web,
23 anyone can download it. Or another way of doing it is
24 people have to apply to you for usages, in which case
25 they have to sign certain forms which guards -- sort of

1 guards against their elicited use of the data and
2 usually -- well, we do this. We don't give the data to
3 anyone who is not at an organization that has an IRB and
4 does research. But still, you know, we have very
5 sensitive data because this is all about children who
6 have been abused and neglected and so forth. It's called
7 a -- it's more of a protective file rather than a public
8 use file, but still researchers in universities can get
9 the file. They just have to apply for it and abide by
10 the rules in terms of how to keep the data secure within
11 their organizations, that kind of thing.

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

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

1 MR. BIEMER: No.

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

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

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

9 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

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

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

23 The -- one of the big problems now is
24 that we geocode everything and -- and address -- any
25 address in the country we can geocode, and 90 percent of

1 the time it will be in the right place. That's close
2 enough. And from that, we can add block group data.
3 We've had block data. We can add block group data. We
4 can add track data. We can -- so putting the address in
5 is the same pretty much -- and I -- and I have a file of
6 128 million addresses, and I put a name -- a name to
7 them, not necessarily the right name, but a name to them.
8 So if you -- any of you give me his or her address, I can
9 find out a lot more about you -- I could find out a lot
10 more about myself than I know if I were to bother to do
11 so.

12 So -- so address is really almost the
13 same as name.

14 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Address and -- and
16 very simple sociodemographics give you the -- identify
17 someone.

18 MR. KLINEBERG: I would think you could
19 release the data without addresses. These are anonymous
20 names. You have a -- you have a --

21 MR. BRADBURN: Well, you need to be
22 careful have you --

23 MR. KLINEBERG: How do you identify them?

24 MR. BRADBURN: I mean, geography is -- is
25 a give-away for lots of things these days, I mean, ZIP

1 code or whatever. So you have to be very careful of
2 geographic data attached to files, because that really
3 makes it -- and -- and the thing is, it's not so much --
4 I mean, for years, I've always thought and most people
5 think about deductive closure [sic] as what you do if you
6 cross-tab something 500 times and find the right person,
7 so on and so forth, but that's not the problem anymore.

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

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

22 I mean, I've seen some demonstrations of
23 this that are just, you know, hair raising in terms of
24 what people can find, you know, with cancer registries
25 and other things in terms that you would think you

1 wouldn't -- you know, like the person has ZIP code and a
2 diagnosis or something like that and, you know, they --
3 within a -- and the state maybe or something like that
4 and, you know, within a couple of hours, they can find
5 the individual.

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

9 MR. BRADBURN: Right, yeah.

10 MR. GRANATO: Right.

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

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

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

24 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

25 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It's not going to

1 be one of the problems that you need to deal with.
2 Somebody is going to have dealt with that by the time
3 we've dealt with the other trivial problems that you have
4 on the list. That will be taken care of.

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

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

20 MR. GRANATO: Right.

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

23 MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

24 MS. SIEBER: Also, for those who want to
25 hack in or -- that's not the right word. Those who want

1 to snoop and find out things they shouldn't find out,
2 there's a lot of costs connected with that for them. So
3 the question always is, is there something so valuable
4 that someone would to that cost.

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

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

10 MS. RIGBY: Advertisers, advertising.

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

18 MR. KLINEBERG: Right.

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

25 So, for example, for the New Immigrant

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

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

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

18 MR. ACHEN: I would -- I would even say
19 that in some instances data that are publically
20 available, for example -- again I know the -- the voter
21 registration files very well -- name, address, telephone
22 number, and party registration are all on there. And
23 actually with our public use files, those that are
24 available to students, I've actually stripped the name
25 and the address and the phone number out of there just

1 because I don't want to be on television explaining that
2 this is public information, because a lot of people don't
3 know that it is. And so, I think, bending over backwards
4 and letting the abuser be someone who found your files
5 not that helpful is -- is probably just sound caution.

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

11 MR. ACHEN: Yeah.

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

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

16 MR. GRANATO: That's right.

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

21 MR. GRANATO: Right.

22 MR. KLINEBERG: -- to document
23 experiences?

24 MR. GRANATO: And if someone twists my
25 arm a little bit more, I would say let's pick a sub --

1 let's pick -- I don't want to use the word PSID. But
2 let's just say income, let's just track -- and income
3 mobility. Let's track just that. We ask some questions
4 related to your economic resiliency, just that, a battery
5 of questions on that.

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

11 MR. ACHEN: For how --

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

15 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

16 MR. ACHEN: And for how long.

17 MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

18 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Okay. I just
19 now -- I think that Paul is -- not to -- not to preempt
20 our discussion here or to render it useless, but if -- or
21 as you go ahead with this, I think the notion of devoting
22 a fair amount of effort in the early stages to planning
23 the design is very good one. Panels are enormously
24 expensive in terms of what you're going to do over the
25 long run, and an investment beforehand could save a lot

1 of expenditure later and more likely would just make the
2 same expenditure much more valuable.

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

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

15 MR. KLINEBERG: That's right.

16 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So when -- when we
17 have a panel, before we leave the household, the
18 interviewer will collect from the respondent -- first of
19 all, we tell them and also collect from the respondent
20 typically the names and telephone numbers and addresses
21 of three close friends who would know where they have
22 moved to should they have moved and we wanted to come
23 back. So we always say, "Would you mind letting us know
24 if you moved" but more likely we say, "We know -- we know
25 it would be hard for you to remember to let us know if

1 you move. So in case you move, could you give us the
2 names of some close friends or neighbors who would be
3 likely to know where you were so that we could get in
4 touch with you?" And that reduces greatly the cost of
5 follow-up, tracking people who have moved.

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

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: You seem to be
18 interested. You may even have given them money. And
19 they kind of feel like "Yeah, this is really something I
20 wouldn't mind doing again." So -- but all -- and then
21 you have a plan for keeping in touch with them. Even if
22 you don't go back for two years, you may send them a
23 report after six months or a -- a Christmas card -- not a
24 Christmas. I forgot I'm in the United States -- a
25 seasonal greetings card to -- just to remind them who you

1 are or give them a pen, although the danger with pens is
2 it makes the probability of identification much higher if
3 they have a ballpoint pen in their house that says "A
4 member of the Houston area panel," then you can find them
5 a lot easier. And if you don't know their -- so many of
6 surveys, we can't give people anything where -- that
7 carries the name of the survey because it increases
8 disclosure risk.

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

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

23 But it took -- it took a lot of experts a
24 long time to try to figure out -- because you don't --
25 you don't have the luxury of oversampling ever group that

1 you're interested in. You have to kind of decide on what
2 are the key groups that you want to oversample -- and
3 there's probably always going to be some oversampling of
4 Hispanics or some other group -- and try to figure out
5 what -- you know, whatever those groups are and how much
6 precision you need in the estimates and -- and so forth
7 is a really critical issue.

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

10 MR. BIEMER: Right, yeah.

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

13 MR. BIEMER: A year.

14 MR. GRANATO: A yeah.

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

19 MR. GRANATO: Wow.

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And one of the key
21 issues that came to mind, as Paul was speaking, was a
22 design in Houston that was interested in neighborhood
23 context would be different from a design that wasn't. So
24 if your plan was to -- to look at impact on
25 neighborhoods, including neighborhood observation or the

1 kind of video'ing that PHTCN [sic] did or -- or some
2 other -- talking to other informants in the community,
3 church leaders or community leaders, then you'd select a
4 sample of fewer clusters with more respondents in each of
5 these clusters. So you might say what we need is 20
6 places in Houston and this will be -- the panel will be
7 based on these 20 places rather than dispersing them so
8 that -- but that just -- that depends on whether that's
9 what you want to do.

10 MR. GRANATO: Right.

11 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But if you do want
12 to do that, then you will change the overall design of
13 the sample, which will have implications for the
14 precision of individual level estimates, but will give
15 you great richness in terms of community-level
16 information and will bring into play issues like using
17 the community to help recruitment. Let's say, if it is
18 community-based, then you can use local people. NORC
19 typically won't use anything like that because our -- the
20 density of sampling is so low in a community that it kind
21 of doesn't make sense to say, "We are here and we'll be
22 interviewing 40 people in Chicago in the next six weeks."
23 Sort of, it doesn't have -- have a lot of impact, but...

24 So these are the kinds of design issues
25 that really take time and expertise from different kinds

1 of people. So it's not just one group of people that
2 will look at this. There will be different groups with
3 some overlap that would look at different aspects of the
4 design.

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

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

24 So that's why there's this intimate
25 relationship between what you're trying to accomplish

1 over time and -- and how you do the design. And as, I
2 think, Paul or somebody said earlier, you know, it will
3 be an optimizing issue. Because, you know, your first --
4 the first answer is "We want all of those." And -- you
5 know, and that will be true for lots of other things.

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

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

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

1 assumption is that you would need at least 3,000.

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

4 MR. BLAIS: That would be my assumption.

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

8 MR. BIEMER: Contact.

9 MR. KLINEBERG: Face-to-face contact?

10 MR. GRANATO: I would think so.

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

13 MR. GRANATO: Right.

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

16 MR. KLINEBERG: Can you do it by
17 telephone?

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

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I think your
21 response rate -- your 38 percent is at the high end of
22 regular RDD surveys. I would think that for standard RDD
23 now, if you've got 40 percent, which is the latest one
24 that I was involved in Chicago, we were pleased with
25 40 percent, not ecstatic, but we wouldn't have been

1 surprised by 35. So I don't think you can do much
2 better. And that -- you know, you are making unlimited
3 numbers of calls pretty much, you know, and ignore
4 refusals pretty much, you know, unless they're couched
5 in -- in litigation terms. So I don't know that -- and
6 starting -- starting at a level of one-third really
7 undermines the ability of the panel very substantially.

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

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

22 MR. BRADBURN: No.

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

25 MR. SCIOLI: But with the Houston study,

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

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

12 MR. SCIOLI: -- appealing to citizenry?

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

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

25 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah. And the key is --

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

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

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

19 And in addition, we have -- in the GSS,
20 we do and, I think, some other things, too -- and this --
21 people worry about this. I don't know whether IRBs worry
22 about this. But you essentially bribe the really
23 hard-core refusals. And we used to -- I don't know what
24 we're doing now, but we give the interviewers a sum of
25 money that they could use flexibly.

1 Because it turns out, actually, that it
2 isn't the money itself. Sometimes the interviewers would
3 say, well, if I had some money to hire -- so I could hire
4 a baby-sitter for the respondent who has a small child
5 and has -- I can't interview the person because they
6 don't -- they can't -- the child is always sort of there
7 of various sorts. But if I could -- you know, if I had
8 \$10 that we could hire a baby-sitter for an hour, hour
9 and a half so the mother could be free, that sort of
10 thing or sometimes, you know, just a gift -- some flowers
11 or something. You know, it depends.

12 So you're giving flexibility to the
13 interviewer to -- to do something which in that
14 particular case -- I mean, the -- the most famous case
15 was the -- you probably know about this on the -- when we
16 were doing the national deliberative poll, we had to hire
17 somebody to take care of the cows of one respondent
18 because she couldn't leave her cows to come. And
19 there we were -- I mean, there we did pay people, but...

20 But you know, it's -- everybody has a
21 particular problem. And sometimes it's just -- you know,
22 money will do it. But sometimes it's cheaper in a way to
23 do something that solves the particular problem about why
24 a person who would be otherwise willing to do it can't --
25 can't do it.

1 MS. SIEBER: Norman, do you typically
2 give cash? I -- I think checks are problematic for some
3 people who don't have bank accounts.

4 MR. BRADBURN: We give cash, yeah.

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

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

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

19 MR. BRADBURN: Right, right.

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

22 MR. BRADBURN: Right, yeah.

23 MR. FRANCIS: 1099 is 1,000 bucks.

24 MR. BRADBURN: 1,000, yeah.

25 And there are -- with drug studies, there

1 are some legal shield law things and so forth, which
2 allow things that would not be permissible in other kinds
3 of things because --

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

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

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

25 And it's this about whom that -- that

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

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

22 But for a study of this importance, it
23 seems to me that you'd want to get the stakeholders
24 involved at the early stage. So antecedent to, you know,
25 the Center spelling out the objectives, it would be the

1 Center with the Endowment with the -- whoever, you know,
2 as Willie said, there's some great topics.

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

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

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

10 MR. SCIOLI: Okay.

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

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

19 The -- and then -- now, if -- if you're
20 thinking of programatic approach, so you say, "We're
21 going to try to accomplish these goals" -- I mean a not
22 uncommon one among political actors of various sorts is,
23 you know, we're going to -- we have some objective; we
24 want to abolish poverty or we want to have everybody, you
25 know, health insured or we want to have everybody have

1 access to some kind of services or so on and so forth.
2 And then you use the -- the surveys to try to, not just
3 see whether that's happening, because that you can do on
4 cross-sectional basis, but to understand what -- since
5 these programs hardly ever work, what it is that -- or at
6 least work in the way you think they're going to do to
7 understand what it is that people -- the barriers that
8 people are having or how they work or it turns out it
9 wasn't the people you thought it was that -- that you
10 were helping. You're helping some other group or
11 whatever. I mean, there's lots of difference things.

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

24 So it's -- sort of having that kind of
25 back and forth is very important, I think, to get people

1 thinking about what it is that they really want to know
2 and -- and -- and priorities. Because, I mean, in every
3 experience IS people want to know more than they can
4 afford. But, you know, even if they put the entire GDP
5 to work on it, you know, they still wouldn't get the kind
6 of information they really -- they think they want to
7 various degrees. But -- so you have to kind of work back
8 and forth in these kind of ways to come up with
9 something.

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

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

1 they're not becoming American.

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

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

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

18 MR. KLINEBERG: That's right. And
19 then -- and I think you would commit to following them
20 wherever they go. And one of the things that might be
21 interesting is what happens to people who leave Houston
22 and do they -- compared to those that have stayed and
23 stuff. So I think that's right. I think you would want
24 to -- this should not be a survey that is focused on
25 understanding Houston in quite the same way that the

1 Houston area survey is that does this annual study of the
2 year, but instead to understand the unfolding of lives
3 that began in Houston, most of them will stay in Houston,
4 but not all.

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

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

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

17 MS. JASSO: Yes.

18 MR. KLINEBERG: Okay.

19 MS. JASSO: Yes, yes.

20 MR. KLINEBERG: Oh, great.

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

24 MR. KLINEBERG: And showing the same
25 evidence of --

1 MS. JASSO: Well, it's too soon here.
2 Except that one can already trace, for those who have
3 been in the country several years before they become
4 green-carders, one can already see the progression. And
5 moreover with the children, it's astounding. The --
6 the -- the children tend to be perfectly fluent in
7 English. They prefer to speak English. And the most
8 remarkable finding is that the children of immigrants who
9 have had illegal experience are more fluent in English
10 than the children of parents who have not had illegal
11 experience.

12 MR. KLINEBERG: How do you explain that?

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

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

24 MS. JASSO: Well, see, our case was
25 different because for 20 years there were all these

1 groups, both academics and policymakers, getting together
2 at meetings and conferences and saying, "We need to know
3 this. We need to know that. We need to answer this
4 question or that question and we can't with the data
5 that's available." So what would the right data look
6 like?

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

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

19 By the time we got to the pilot stage,
20 the question was, "Can it be done? And if it can be
21 done, how can it be done cost effectively?" And then we
22 had fabulous peer reviews, including the old fashioned
23 that hardly happens anymore where Ray brought, you know,
24 20 people to Washington to interrogate the PIs and all of
25 that honed the research design.

1 And so by that point, it was -- the --
2 the one remaining thing that we've not been able to do
3 because the sampling frame doesn't yet exist -- and this
4 echos something that came up earlier today. I forget who
5 brought it up -- about trying to get people as early in
6 the process as possible. We would like and we would like
7 to be able to have a cohort of people who have their
8 first visitor's Visa to the U.S. and then see who among
9 them decide to stay and do they overstay, do they become
10 illegal, do they transition to legal, et cetera,
11 et cetera. But getting that sampling frame of first-time
12 visitors is -- is -- remains a challenge, but I think now
13 it may be around the corner in the sense of three or four
14 years from now.

15 MR. ACHEN: I think it's worth thinking
16 another set of stakeholders, too, who may be a little bit
17 more invisible at the early stage and that's the
18 University of Houston and its stake in your having some
19 real academic success here. I don't know that there will
20 be any single identifiable person who will be the key
21 representatives of that, but I'm listening to people here
22 and I -- I think it's not as visible to the outside world
23 as it might be that after Texas and Texas A&M, both of
24 which are pretty well known, that the number three
25 institution is -- is the University of Houston.

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

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

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

1 characteristics of the metropolitan area that pose
2 important challenges.

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

20 The old way, the city would just annex
21 people in -- but, for various reasons, the Voting Rights
22 Act, resistance from suburban voters, that doesn't work.
23 And people from the City of Houston don't want to annex
24 anybody anymore. The City is relatively prosperous. Why
25 bring in a bunch of losers from outside?

1 But it's a growing problem, and it's one
2 that would be very worthwhile over time to see this
3 increasingly not working local governmental services and
4 how that's impacting people's lives.

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

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

15 We have some unique issues like Florida,
16 susceptibility to hurricanes. And we had a near miss
17 here that produced a major policy disaster. Over 100
18 people were killed fleeing a storm that didn't hit.
19 60 percent, 70 percent of the population was displaced.
20 One of the things that we need to be able to do to
21 improve the quality of life here is convince people,
22 "you-all can't leave the city when a hurricane
23 approaches. That's just not possible."

24 And so we have some unique factors here
25 that I think would be very worthwhile to explore over

1 time. Of course, this list is a great list. It's the
2 major issues people confront everywhere in America;
3 income, health, education.

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

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

14 And I think there is a richness here that
15 we can put together good practices from other cities and
16 good techniques with our unique set of local problems
17 here that you could produce a -- a very interesting,
18 ongoing project that hopefully will have legs like the
19 27-year project now. And, obviously, we can -- we can
20 play off some of the work that he's done. There's a lot
21 of stuff that his survey work suggests needs to be looked
22 at more intensively. But we have some other
23 characteristics of the special area that, I think, will
24 make it exciting to try to develop a -- a design that
25 will be of interest to national scholars, but

1 particularly of value to decision makers and citizens in
2 this community.

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

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

9 MR. BIEMER: Right.

10 MR. MURRAY: The City of Houston, which
11 is basically now -- boundaries have been frozen for --
12 well, we had one annex in 1996. But the City's
13 boundaries are largely what they were 30 years ago, and
14 the population has moved around. We have very high
15 mobility here, a lot of land, a lot of new housing being
16 constructed, no zoning in many areas; so people could
17 easily move. And you don't have stable ethnic
18 neighborhoods, excepting a minority of the population,
19 the black population is increasingly moving around a lot
20 more. So I think that that reality means we want to cast
21 our -- our geographic unit very broadly to encompass the
22 5 1/2 million people who live in this -- this --

23 MR. BIEMER: So it would be Harris
24 County?

25 MR. KLINEBERG: So the ten-county area?

1 MR. BIEMER: Well, no. More than Harris.

2 More counties.

3 MS. LEE: No, no, no. Parts of Houston

4 are outside of Harris County.

5 MR. MURRAY: Yeah. Probably

6 eight-county.

7 MR. BRADBURN: Well, is that --

8 MR. MURRAY: Adding a couple more that

9 don't make much sense, but --

10 MR. BRADBURN: MR. BRADBURN: Well, is

11 that the MSA?

12 MR. MURRAY: But effectively you need to

13 get the large suburban counties of Montgomery and Fort

14 Bend and Brazoria and Galveston.

15 MR. BRADBURN: That would be the unit.

16 MR. KLINEBERG: And the eight-county

17 covers a geographical space larger than the State of

18 Massachusetts.

19 MR. MURRAY: Or bigger than New Jersey,

20 let's say. But people move around in this metropolitan

21 area very quickly. We don't want them to move in and out

22 of our -- if they're stay in the Houston area, in the

23 Houston economy, we want to keep interviewing them.

24 MR. BRADBURN: It -- I mean, this will be

25 a -- like apple pie, I suppose. It sounds like what you

1 need is some large question or -- and vision, which then
2 encompasses several important next-level kinds of
3 question and -- but are sufficient -- is sufficiently
4 broad that allow you -- first of all, allow you to design
5 it in a way that you're comfortable with. But then as it
6 goes forward -- and this is what's happened to most of
7 the -- of the long-term longitudinal studies, they have a
8 core and then other -- each year or every other year or
9 however long you do them, you begin to explore some
10 topics of various sorts.

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

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

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

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

18 MS. JASSO: Let me ask a question --

19 MR. BRADBURN: Could I just -- it reminds
20 me. I just realized a little while ago with something
21 Stephen said. He and I come to this from quite different
22 presumptions, because he is talking about attitude
23 surveys and what I keep talking about are behavioral
24 surveys in which there's relatively little attitudinal
25 component and so that's another cross way of cutting it.

1 Most of the examples of the things that
2 I've talked about and so forth have been largely
3 behavioral data of various sorts and very little
4 attitudinal. And I think that -- you could do -- on the
5 behavioral side, you can do more perhaps combining
6 cross -- time may be less important for some of these
7 than -- than if you're thinking about attitudinal issues,
8 although even there I don't think they change that much.

9 MS. JASSO: All right. That's excellent.
10 Let me try a little twist that can fit exactly into
11 everything that Norman just said, and the twist arises
12 from the fact that there's budget constraints and so
13 any -- anybody, any advisory body that's going to be
14 thinking about this is going to have to be asking
15 themselves "Which of these questions can be answered by a
16 cross-section and which require a longitudinal
17 survey?" --

18 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

19 MS. JASSO: -- and then reserve for the
20 long -- so in that spirit of how would we ask this
21 question, I wonder if it would be useful to go back to
22 the -- to the -- the classical idea of the purpose of a
23 longitudinal survey and to add to what the -- the
24 beautiful PSID example that Norm already talked about,
25 which was that even though the fraction poor may be the

1 same, it's different people who are poor.

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

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

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

1 question like that, longitudinal data.

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

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

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

24 So I think it's really important to
25 define it in terms of the kinds of things that our

1 colleagues have mentioned. In other words, it should be
2 a Houston study and not -- and it should be interesting
3 to Houston and take advantage of the -- in a -- in a
4 nonbenevolent way of the -- of the problems that Houston
5 has or the -- the challenges that Houston has to tackle.

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

17 I have undertaken a lot of sample size
18 estimation problems in my -- in my life and taught other
19 people to do the same thing in the tradition of
20 perpetuating pointless activity. And I have never yet
21 had a problem of that kind where the answer wasn't as big
22 as you can afford, if not bigger. You know, there just
23 is no -- there is no -- I don't know what anybody else
24 has had. But I've never had -- never -- answers never
25 come out smaller than we could afford.

1 So essentially, once you have the design
2 right, if you get more money, you can do more of that
3 better. I mean, you can have more subclasses, for
4 example. So instead of just having an estimate for all
5 of Houston, you can have a separate estimate for
6 different sociodemographic and ethnic groups in the city.

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

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

25 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Absolutely.

1 MS. RIGBY: And then you could weight it
2 back up if you wanted to average Houston and you could
3 compare those three.

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

7 MS. RIGBY: Yeah.

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

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

24 MS. JASSO: And then from the point of
25 view of analysis, there's the difficulty that that's been

1 a choice and so there's endogeneity. And -- and you're
2 very limited in what you can say when you -- when you
3 analyze the data. So it's -- there are pitfalls all
4 around.

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

8 MR. GRANATO: Intervention, right.

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

17 If you expect changes in policies --
18 different changes in policies within the same community
19 and you would see how, you know, individuals in these
20 settings react differently because, you know, you have
21 the control group, if you like, no change in policy, and
22 people who can observe the status quo when it comes to
23 behavior and you can compare with the other group or even
24 people moving from one place to the other. I mean,
25 that's the kind of scenario where, I think, you can get

1 greatest leverage. So if you have any indication about
2 the kind of policies you where you expect changes and
3 differential changes within the community, that's where I
4 would go.

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

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

23 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Uh-huh.

24 MR. GRANATO: I think that's what you do
25 for those type of things.

1 MR. ACHEN: And short-term rather than
2 longitudinal?

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

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

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

23 MR. GRANATO: Oh. I was thinking just
24 strictly on crime, so it's just for five years and it
25 stops.

1 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. But -- so then
2 after that you do something else, and so you've got to
3 start. So in 10 years you've done two startups rather
4 than one.

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

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

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

25 MR. GRANATO: Is there sufficient

1 flexibility in that type of design to allow for the
2 interventions?

3 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Sure.

4 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

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

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

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

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right. They were,
21 at least, initially recruited in your grand panel or
22 their -- at least, their places were. This is easier if
23 you take -- make it a housing unit panel because then
24 that's what you're going back to. You don't have to keep
25 in touch with the people, who 10 years down the road if

1 you haven't been in touch with them, are going to be
2 gone. But at least you have set your basic design, and
3 you have it and nobody has it. So the marginal costs of
4 doing these short-term panels is much lower for you than
5 it would be if you were trying to start it up again.

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

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

13 MS. JASSO: Sure.

14 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I'm sure it would
15 be a big success.

16 MR. SCIOLI: Did you mention late night
17 TV?

18 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Maybe for sweeps
19 month, you could have waiting.

20 MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes.

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

23 MS. JASSO: Well, the possibilities are
24 endless.

25 MR. ACHEN: There are some interesting

1 questions, it seems to me, that a longer term panel would
2 really be extremely useful for. One of them is this
3 question of Latino immigration and -- and long-term
4 assimilation and so forth. And there's just, you know,
5 as Willie's been saying, no substitute for following
6 people over time.

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

17 And Houston is actually kind of a cockpit
18 for this, because unlike the rest of Texas which has gone
19 from being reliably Democratic to reliably Republican in
20 national studies, Houston has got some -- been bouncing
21 back in some ways, and the Democratic party is a little
22 stronger than anybody thought it was going to be 20 years
23 ago. So, again, following we -- we just don't have any
24 long -- any longitudinal surveys of -- of voters
25 anywhere.

1 Now, you'd have to face the fact that 10
2 years from now, the people you'd be talking to would just
3 be the people who had been in Houston 10 years and that's
4 not a random sample of the population. And so you'd want
5 to supplement with people who have gotten here more
6 recently and so on. You can't do, you know -- the point
7 is obvious.

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

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

23 MR. FRANCIS: Well, I don't see why you
24 couldn't ask those questions in the cross-sectional
25 survey. I mean, people could usually generate who they

1 voted for in the last two elections.

2 MR. ACHEN: They can generate it --

3 MR. BRADBURN: Not very accurately.

4 MR. ACHEN: -- but not accurately.

5 MR. KLINEBERG: The classic, after
6 Kennedy's election.

7 MR. FRANCIS: Everybody voted for him?

8 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.

9 MR. BRADBURN: After -- after the Regan
10 election, the post-election, Michigan voter election
11 study wouldn't have thought he got elected. Because
12 all -- all the Regan Democrats then refused to -- or
13 didn't admit that they voted for him.

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

18 MR. KLINEBERG: Yeah.

19 MR. MURRAY: They're pretty good at that.
20 They're not so good at telling who they voted for.

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

25 MR. MURRAY: McGovern actually tied

1 Nixon. We just didn't realize it.

2 MR. BRADBURN: I think Nixon lost.

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

17 MR. MURRAY: Another good aspect of a
18 longitudinal study here would be to get in the Robert
19 Putnam mode of social connectedness. Houston probably is
20 going to score low on that because so many people moved
21 here and they don't have a traditional church, they don't
22 have family. So how are people over time, are they
23 becoming socially connected and does that seem to have
24 any significant behavioral consequences? But it seems to
25 me, there again, you really need longitudinal data that's

1 following specific individuals over a long time frame
2 because we would almost certainly start very low on a
3 metropolitan comparison of people at any given point in
4 time having a significant level of social connection
5 here. So what happens to them as they are here longer.

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

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

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

24 MR. BRADBURN: But as the -- I mean,
25 again, you can get this survey in terms of time. As the

1 economic base of Houston changes and maybe moves -- you
2 had mentioned biotech-type technology and other things,
3 that's going to change the -- the kinds of people who
4 come and that may then change the things like, you know,
5 other amenities of the city which -- because there you
6 may have more competition for other centers for -- for
7 those industries, not the kind of drawing power that
8 energy or the oil industry has here. Or even as the
9 energy industry changes, that you may get more
10 competition for -- in different types of -- of companies,
11 which would require a different kind of mix of people and
12 there may be more competition there, so...

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

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

22 MR. BRADBURN: Metropolitan area.

23 MR. BIEMER: Metropolitan area. What --
24 are they longitudinal? I know the Detroit wasn't
25 longitudinal.

1 MR. BRADBURN: I don't think Lamas' was.

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

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

7 MR. GRANATO: Metropolitan.

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

10 MR. GRANATO: Right.

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

14 MS. JASSO: Because people move a lot.

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

24 But it sounds like what I'm hearing
25 earlier today, we may -- that's not as devastating a

1 threat as it might be the case.

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

13 The other type were event driven and, in
14 a way, PSID is sort of event driven. None of them are
15 place based. The nearest place based one, I think, is
16 the Chicago Neighborhood Study and that's only -- that's
17 not -- it's only accidentally placed based because it's
18 really focused on -- on criminal -- you know, on
19 socialization into criminality is what it was really
20 about. But because they thought the -- the neighborhood
21 context was determinate -- or, at least, largely
22 determinate if all that happened, it got -- but it's --
23 even though there's a lot of neighborhood connections and
24 so forth, I don't think people are studying the change in
25 neighborhoods. It's -- it's the synthetic cohort of kids

1 who are raised in these neighborhoods or moved to other
2 neighborhoods, and their -- their involvement with the
3 legal system. That's the focus of the attention of
4 various sorts. So.

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

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

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

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

1 wrong, and I might arguing that this is quite wrong.

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

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

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

17 So we're happy are individual-level data
18 because we know how to deal with that, linking --
19 multilevel modeling is really quite new in terms of
20 incorporating measurement of different levels. And, I
21 mean, you're one of the few people I know, Paul, who's
22 had any interest in spatial analysis and in using context
23 for -- for data. Geography has not been an -- an equal
24 partner in social research, and -- and I think that's why
25 people haven't had the idea because they're not looking

1 at it. But it seems to me in many ways to be much more
2 fruitful as a -- as a basis for social science research
3 than -- than artificial countries.

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

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

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

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

18 We do a lot of map restudies in my lab,
19 and Houston is incredibly diverse, if you consider, you
20 know, the larger Houston, not just the City of Houston.
21 Even just Harris County in terms of its mix of urban
22 designs, its mix of socioeconomic status, its
23 neighborhood level, and then the mix within those two, if
24 you plot those against each other. So I don't know. I
25 like that idea a lot, including the geography, but then

1 thinking of this unique opportunity as Houston is sort of
2 the lab that's been generalized to the rest of the...

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

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. LEE: It's all here.

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

10 MS. LEE: Right.

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

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

25 So I don't see the restricting it to

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

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

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

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

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

25 MR. BIEMER: But are you saying then --

1 I -- are you saying that -- I picked up some -- something
2 that in what you said that indicates that this maybe
3 should be a place study; that we should be tying -- tying
4 the -- the unit to geography rather than individuals who
5 could move anywhere.

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

16 MR. ACHEN: Bear Stearns.

17 (Laughter.)

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

21 MS. LEE: Yeah. And Houston seems to
22 have this sort of this -- this sort of strange situation
23 where you have more people coming in than going out,
24 right, so that's maybe less of a concern than following
25 them. And also within, there's a lot of mobility.

1 People are moving around in their neighborhoods.

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

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

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

1 we've got bigger moves.

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

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

13 MR. BIEMER: Right.

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

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

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

23 MR. BIEMER: Right. Now, why -- why
24 wouldn't that work for the objectives that are being
25 contemplated for this?

1 MR. KLINEBERG: Because you're not
2 following the same people. You're not able to obtain --

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

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

9 MR. BIEMER: That's the question.

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

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

23 You know, the map from 20 years ago, if
24 you look at the aerial view, it's very different looking
25 than the one you look at now. And I think that that is a

1 real challenge to the linking to the households, I mean,
2 depending upon how long we want to go, but I think
3 there's -- it's a much more temporal sort of housing
4 structure, not always. I mean --

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

8 MS. LEE: Yeah, it is.

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

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

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

1 ones that carry the attitude.

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

10 MR. KLINEBERG: Both very interesting.

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

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

1 have a big investment in it, I mean.

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

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

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

1 MR. KLINEBERG: Very good point.

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

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

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

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

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

25 MS. JASSO: Yeah.

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

19 MS. SIEBER: There's a topic that I'm
20 going to talk about a bit more when we get to human
21 subjects issues and that is that there is a distinct
22 disadvantage to taking Federal money. If you can
23 persuade your IRB to uncheck the box that says that
24 Federal -- that any study will be supervised like a
25 Federally funded study, if they'll uncheck that box on

1 their assurance then you have much more freedom to do
2 things without the IRB hovering over you. So there's a
3 disadvantage to Federal money.

4 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I've always
5 welcomed it personally, Federal money.

6 MR. GRANATO: Green.
7 André, you want...

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

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

24 MR. GRANATO: Well, I mean, that's a --
25 as a basic research question, it's huge because it's

1 definitely -- my expectations take hold in economics and
2 they've -- they've done wonderful things with that. But
3 in the other, social sciences hasn't taken effect yet.
4 So this type of design may feed into political and social
5 modeling that actually starts to create analogs for
6 expectations, and now you've got the data to test it.

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

9 MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

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

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

25 (Recess 3:27 to 3:49.)

1 MR. GRANATO: Okay. We're in the final
2 stretch. Secretariat is in the lead again.

3 David Francis, wants to lead off.

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

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

15 MR. BRADBURN: Well, it depends on what
16 you want to say about individuals and how -- and how you
17 conceptualize the individual. Paul and I were talking
18 about this, even if you -- if your sample unit is the
19 dwelling unit, the data you're getting is from
20 individuals. I mean, pretty much all this is your --
21 you're always getting -- so you can be saying something
22 about individuals. It's -- it's -- but they're -- but
23 they're -- they're the individuals who live in those
24 houses and that's different from individuals, per se, so
25 to speak.

1 Now, you can -- you know, again, it
2 depends on your resources. Obviously, you can follow, at
3 least, for some limited amount of time or if you've got
4 large resources for long periods of time, the -- both.
5 That is you can stay with the people who are living in
6 the units, and you can follow the people who are out of
7 the units, but it becomes much more expensive relatively
8 quickly.

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

19 If you want to study the people who --
20 like immigrants or you want to study people who grew up
21 in Houston, let's say, or some -- some other
22 characteristic such that they carry it around with them,
23 but over time they will spread out, then you're going
24 to -- you want to follow the individuals.

25 But if you want to say something about

1 the area and the people who live in it, then it seems to
2 me you stay more focused on the -- on the dwelling units
3 as the stable element.

4 Rebecca just mentioned something. A
5 study I had completely forgotten about, which is a -- it
6 actually is a longitudinal study, and it's place based.
7 It's the Almeida County study in the Bay area, but
8 that -- that just focuses on health issues. And I don't
9 know the design of that. As I suspect, they stay with
10 people who are in -- living in the county because they
11 want to relate it to the supply of -- of healthcare and
12 things in the county and other kind of things that go on
13 in the county. But that is one that is both kind of
14 place based, but it's -- it is -- has a focus on only one
15 of the -- the areas that one -- that we've been talking
16 about. But it would be worth looking more at design
17 issues about that one just to see how they handle some of
18 these issues.

19 MR. FRANCIS: Well, can -- so we -- can
20 I -- so if we were interested in both kinds of things,
21 would it be more efficient to just augment the Houston
22 area survey to get at neighborhood information and just
23 do that cross-sectionally or do you -- would you be
24 missing something in looking at the neighborhood
25 information cross-sectionally as opposed to

1 where people have -- in urban renewal kinds of things,
2 where people have done -- maybe -- I don't know what your
3 neighborhood was before it got changed to things that
4 suggest that --

5 MS. LEE: That neighborhood disintegrated
6 after the bottom of oil boom fell out.

7 MR. BRADBURN: That sounds like a
8 neighborhood that was -- that had deteriorated and then
9 they came in and so on and so forth. But if you look at
10 that cross-sectionally, you may find that, oh, it's --
11 you know, gee, the neighborhood has improved and so forth
12 so the people there must be a lot better off. But it
13 isn't the same people or the people who were there got --
14 in Chicago we say urban renewed out -- or -- and -- and
15 all of a sudden new people came in. Well, that's a
16 different story, so to speak, or different meaning about
17 the effect of the change than people often take away from
18 studies about urban renewal, which say, oh, isn't it
19 wonderful this neighborhood went from a very poor
20 neighborhood to -- to middle class or upper middle class
21 neighborhood. But it isn't that the individuals who live
22 there got -- got -- and I've -- I've seen that in other
23 studies where it was some aspects of urban change where
24 you've had new schools or new things like that, new --
25 new housing, et cetera; but it -- it's not -- I mean,

1 it's one of the ironies of many -- of many things is that
2 the people who you're trying to help, it turns out,
3 aren't the ones who get helped. Somebody else gets
4 the -- the benefits of the -- of what you're doing and
5 that's -- and that, I think, is one of the things that
6 longitudinal studies allow you to see vividly in ways
7 that you -- you might be able to tease it out of
8 successive cross-sections, but you are less likely to see
9 it I think.

10 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But I think that
11 we shouldn't overemphasize the difference between those
12 two designs. A lot of the elements in the -- in the
13 panel will be the same, whether you do it for people or
14 for -- or for place. So -- and I guess this is
15 something -- there's reasonably good information on this
16 as to how many people -- if 80 -- if 80 percent of the
17 people are in the same place five years later, for
18 example, that means that there's an 80 percent overlap
19 between the place based, the housing -- the housing unit
20 based and the person based.

21 MR. GRANATO: Sure.

22 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So it's not as if
23 it's all of one or -- or all of the other. A lot of the
24 design is going to be similar, and it's at the edge
25 really that you're making a decision. And it may be that

1 you want to say -- you know, it's a cost issue. So you
2 can keep the location, keep the housing units and follow
3 half of the people who move or follow all of the people
4 who move or follow a tenth of the people who move or
5 follow them only once, or follow them once and then again
6 five years later.

7 So I don't think it's as fundamental a
8 contrast as we've been making it. I mean, it's good to
9 think about which is your priority because that's where
10 you're going to focus the efforts. But a lot of what
11 you're going to do is going to be similar under the two
12 designs.

13 Jim mentioned earlier that the energy
14 folks might be interest -- well, energy studies are all
15 place base -- they're all building based. So the
16 national energy studies are studies of buildings. So
17 they'd like -- that's what they focus on. They don't
18 care really who's in them. I mean, they just want to see
19 what's being used by the buildings, and so that's an area
20 where there would be an overwhelming priority given to
21 keeping the same units, the same housing units, or the
22 same structures rather than the same people.

23 Attitudes, as Norman pointed out, is
24 somewhere where you really do want to have individuals
25 because you -- you want to track what happens to

1 individual's attitudes, not so much the house attitudes,
2 although a politician might be more interested in the
3 house-based attitude. If it's in your -- if it's in your
4 district, you want to know what the people in that house
5 think. You don't care that the people that used to be
6 there are now somewhere else voting. So it really does
7 depend.

8 But my guess is that for a period of high
9 proportion of what you're doing, you're going to have the
10 same thing. So it's not -- you don't have to discard one
11 entirely, and you can recover from other.

12 MR. BIEMER: I think the thing -- the
13 thing to worry about if you, for example, select a sample
14 of housing units and you keep that as your fixed panel
15 and anyone who lives in those housing units, you know,
16 even if it's 80 percent overlap from interview to
17 interview, the people who move may have different
18 characteristics than the people who don't move on those
19 things that you're interested in, and you will only be
20 able to do the longitudinal analysis on the people who
21 stayed -- stayed there. So if that's going to be a
22 problem -- if you think about, you know, what you want to
23 do with the data and you think, well, most of our
24 objectives have to do with the way people change,
25 although we do have some objectives that have to do with,

1 you know, what's happening in their neighborhoods in the
2 context where they're living, you know, it's really a
3 trade off. You have to think -- and then -- and then
4 you're into sort of what Colm was talking about and
5 having to do something about those people who moved out
6 to follow them if you think that they're -- you know,
7 it's important that you try to represent movers.

8 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But, remember, you
9 do, of course, represent movers in a place, in a housing
10 unit.

11 MR. BRADBURN: In-movers.

12 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So you get the
13 in-movers.

14 MR. BIEMER: In-movers, right.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So there is an
16 issue as to what the modeling is.

17 MR. BIEMER: But it's not the -- it's
18 not -- I mean, you're not getting a longitudinal record.

19 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No, no.
20 Absolutely. You're absolutely right. But you do get
21 information about movers, so it's not --

22 MR. BIEMER: On a cross-sectional, yeah.

23 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: And depending on
24 what your model is of movers, you may or may not be happy
25 with these. And if you have a fixed housing stock, then

1 you are, of course, getting a representative sample of
2 movers simply by having a representative sample of
3 housing units that people move from.

4 MR. BIEMER: Right. It's just the change
5 estimates will be biased.

6 MR. BLAIS: What about those who move
7 within the region, I assume you want to follow them?

8 MR. BIEMER: Well, not necessarily.

9 MR. BLAIS: Not necessarily.

10 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: But it's cheaper
11 to follow them. So it's more realistic to follow people
12 within the region because --

13 MR. BIEMER: Rather than outside the
14 region.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. Because
16 your data collection is geared toward the region, so...

17 MR. BRADBURN: But the question is
18 whether you let the sample grow or not. I mean, it's the
19 same issue about the family, if the family breaks up, you
20 now have two -- two families. So your sample can
21 potentially grow if you follow everybody if you don't
22 have a rule for --

23 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The PSID, I think,
24 got the perfect balance by the growth being
25 counterbalanced by attrition. Not quite. They had to

1 subsample, but it was a considerable part of the sample
2 growth that was accommodated by the attrition in the
3 original sample?

4 MR. GRANATO: Is the PSD about 8,000
5 right now?

6 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. But it
7 started at 5.

8 MS. JASSO: 5,000.

9 MR. GRANATO: And the British Household
10 Survey, what's that up to?

11 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: It's going 100,000
12 for the new one.

13 MR. GRANATO: Oh, okay.

14 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The Millennium
15 study is going to be 100,000 people. It may -- it may
16 be -- it may be only 25,000 housing units. Everybody --
17 everybody in the household is included, so -- but I think
18 it's 100,000 people.

19 MR. GRANATO: Okay. So we're -- I
20 just --

21 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That's one of
22 these European Millennium initiatives. You know, that's
23 kind of like -- a bit like Roznik -- what's that --
24 what's that thing called? His major research.

25 MR. SCIOLI: MRI?

1 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: MRI, yeah. So
2 that's one of the mega things.

3 MR. FRANCIS: So there was another point
4 that came up that seemed to be sort of two alternatives
5 out and it was kind of an either/or case and that was
6 random digit dialing versus face-to-face interviews for
7 the first interviews. And the concern about the RDD was
8 that low response rate leads to not -- potentially
9 nonrepresentativeness.

10 And what I wondered about is actually
11 designing an experiment into the survey such that you
12 randomize people to either get their first contact as
13 face to face versus telephone and can you then use that
14 to judge the -- both judge the degree of
15 nonrepresentativeness of the random digit dialing, but
16 also sort of then weight it back up to get it to where
17 it's representative, maybe save some money in the
18 process.

19 MR. BIEMER: It's more than just the
20 initial response rate because there's some evidence that
21 suggests if you do a telephone recruitment, they won't
22 stay in the panel as long as if you did face to face. So
23 you'd have to run it -- you'd have to run it longer than
24 just the first interview to be able to see what effect
25 that's going to have on future attrition.

1 MR. FRANCIS: Okay.

2 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean -- I mean,
3 and there's -- an additional issue, which is telephone
4 samples, especially if they commence with RDD have very
5 poor context information. You know, so even though -- I
6 think Steve was saying that he links telephone numbers to
7 tracts, that's kind of guesswork.

8 You know, telephone numbers cannot be
9 link to tracts. They can be linked with a higher
10 probability to some tracts than to others, but unless you
11 use an address matching system, you can't mix those
12 tracts. And we can do that for maybe 40 percent, maybe
13 50 percent of telephone numbers. So you lose all the
14 context information, unless you get addresses from
15 people, which is a little difficult. Not impossible.
16 And that -- that also means that certain kinds of
17 analysis that you might want to do with -- with the panel
18 can't be done.

19 MS. SIEBER: It sounds like that
20 essentially destroys the community part of the study,
21 which we have decided is very important.

22 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yeah. I mean, we
23 can now -- sometimes we can get as many as 60 percent --
24 we can locate as many as 60 percent of telephone numbers.
25 And it may be eventually we could be able to link them

1 all. I mean, I'm horrified personally by how much we can
2 link, and the issue about databases out there. If you
3 ever ordered a pizza, we can probably -- we probably
4 know your -- we can probably link your telephone number
5 to your address, at least, if you have your pizza
6 delivered to your home address. If you haven't, we could
7 also let you know about that. But if you're -- if you're
8 not governor of New York, I guess it's not important,
9 so...

10 But you certainly --

11 MR. BRADBURN: A lot of commercial
12 databases are based on telephone. I mean I --

13 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Yes. But most of
14 them link --

15 MR. BRADBURN: And link the telephone to
16 the address.

17 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Most of them are
18 based on marketing lists of some kind.

19 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah.

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So -- and some
21 things that we've done and we do sometimes in surveys
22 where they're -- particularly not so much in NORC
23 surveys, but surveys that we do at the survey lab at
24 University of Chicago, which is much leaner and less
25 expensive version of doing surveys -- is to use dual

1 frames where you use a telephone -- a listed telephone
2 number frame and an address frame and match them and,
3 therefore, maybe get 50 or 60 percent coverage -- these
4 are for small area surveys, so for neighborhood
5 surveys -- and maybe get a frame that would contain
6 60 percent of the addresses in the -- in the neighborhood
7 and use that as our frame and just write off the other
8 40 percent, you know, so there...

9 You can -- you can certainly approach it
10 both ways. You can telephone frames and link them to
11 addresses. You get address frames and try to get
12 telephone numbers for them. And the commercial marketer
13 Donnelly and the other commercial marketers will sell you
14 lists that will probably contain between 40 and
15 60 percent of any urban community in the country together
16 with a lot of information you don't want, you know, the
17 financial information, there's stuff that we don't use
18 for our sampling generally.

19 But -- but they're all separate from a
20 very -- for serious academic or -- or government surveys,
21 the undercoverage is such that we wouldn't use them as
22 the frame because 40 percent undercoverage to start with
23 is kind of too much to carry on top of the nonresponsive
24 that you have in the survey. So we just don't use them
25 for that.

1 But they may be better than RDD. RDD is
2 very -- you know, pure RDD we never use anymore, but
3 which I mean just generating telephone numbers and
4 calling. We would always try to abide by lists and
5 nonlists. So we will identify all listed numbers, all
6 listed telephone numbers and select a sample from these
7 and then generate a sample of -- of random numbers from
8 nonlisted numbers because it's more efficient in terms of
9 resources than a straight RDD.

10 So I'm not sure what -- so we don't ever
11 do just a straight RDD telephone number generation
12 anymore.

13 MR. BIEMER: Do you usually use advanced
14 prenotice letter for the enlisted numbers?

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Well, I mean, this
16 depends on the survey. Yes. I mean, whenever -- I mean
17 the general answer would be yes. There have been times
18 when they haven't been used. But -- and as Paul says,
19 for those, you will always send an advanced postcard
20 perhaps just saying someone will call and there's very
21 strong evidence this will increase your response rate,
22 but probably not by more than a couple of -- 2 to 5 --

23 MR. BIEMER: Well, if you send a letter
24 with -- with some money in it to the household.

25 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: That we don't do

1 typically.

2 MR. BIEMER: Well, we do that and it
3 seems to have a positive effect. Even though you don't
4 have a name, they seem to report that they received it
5 more reliably. At least, they know that they received it
6 and that helps in -- in terms of a -- versus a cold
7 introduction where you're just calling a number and
8 they've never heard of you.

9 MR. GRANATO: I'd like to -- I'm going to
10 bring it up, sample size. I have to ask about this.
11 When I -- when we were recompeting the ANES, and I
12 proposed to Roger Toronjo, what would it take we just did
13 a bona fide longitudinal panel study for the American
14 National Election Study, how many people would we need?
15 He said 8,000.

16 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: All right.

17 MR. GRANATO: Does that sound...

18 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The number?

19 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. I mean...

20 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean, it's a
21 good number. It's not the only number.

22 MR. GRANATO: Right. But it seems like
23 there's a floor --

24 MR. BRADBURN: Probably 16.

25 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I could do 4.

1 MR. GRANATO: Where's the auctioneer?

2 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: We can thank you
3 at dinner with that. Before we leave, we'll give you a
4 number in a sealed envelope and you can open it up.

5 MR. GRANATO: And the winner is...

6 MR. SCIOLI: What is it, Chris, the
7 number now for ANES?

8 MR. ACHEN: I don't know what their
9 target is for this year. They've been up and down
10 depending on funding, as you know better than I. It's
11 been close to 2,000 some years and it's been about 1,000
12 in others.

13 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. The number I
14 remember was 1200 when I was doing...

15 MR. BRADFORD: That's kind of standard.

16 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: What question did
17 you ask about, Jim? What question did you ask?

18 MR. GRANATO: I just asked what we were
19 talking about, there was the idea of trying to get ANES
20 to become a panel. I mean, they had been -- they had a
21 panel for, what, the '70s.

22 MR. BRADBURN: One funder.

23 MR. GRANATO: I think they had three
24 panels, I believe, and two panels in the '70s I believe.

25 MR. ACHEN: Yeah. It's never gone longer

1 than four -- no panel has ever gone longer than four
2 years.

3 MR. GRANATO: Exactly. Because that gets
4 you your three national and...

5 MR. ACHEN: Exactly.

6 MR. GRANATO: And so I just -- we had a
7 conference, and I asked them about this and what would it
8 take. He said 8,000 and then -- which is the PSID number
9 that -- that we know about now. And NOVO SR [sic] out is
10 5,000, I mean...

11 MR. BIEMER: Well, you know, in deciding
12 of the sample size for the child abuse study, you know we
13 did a lot of power analysis, you know, to find out, you
14 know, what -- what people -- what people -- first of all,
15 what -- what are they trying to measure, what kinds of
16 change estimates do they want to make, what -- how much
17 of a change would be important enough that you'd want to
18 be able to declare it significant. I mean, there's lots
19 of questions that one has to ask about, you know, what --
20 what precision you need in the estimates to be able to
21 answer that question.

22 And then -- and then if you're doing
23 subgroup analysis and there's domains of analysis that
24 you're interested in, that's going to increase the sample
25 size. So it's really one of those things that's very

1 hard to answer in that -- that type of question. I don't
2 know how he did it, but he's an amazing guy.

3 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The key -- the key
4 issue is the one Paul raised as to how many domains do
5 you want estimates for. So what drives it is the
6 smallest domain, I mean, the domain group for which you
7 need an estimate of a given precision.

8 If you want it for one overall sample
9 estimate, which is never what you want, but if you only
10 wanted the national mean or whatever it is, then the
11 sample size might be 800. But if you want to do it for
12 10 different groups in the country, it's going to be
13 8,000, you know, because you need that many for each of
14 the domains for which you want the same precision.

15 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. It seems to me if
16 we're looking at neighbor effects or things like that,
17 that's really going to push it up.

18 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I mean...

19 MR. GRANATO: Because you have the
20 cluster issue, birds of a feather, I mean, you've got all
21 that.

22 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: For
23 neighborhood -- psychologists are the best people to
24 answer this question. They spend their lives doing
25 effect size and sample size analyses, right? I mean, you

1 wake up in the middle night and do them?

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So it's kind of
4 a -- so it -- so it all depends on how big the effect --
5 if it's a big effect, you don't need a big sample to find
6 it. But a small effect, you need a big sample to find
7 it. So it's one -- it's a great secular argument where
8 if something has a major impact, small samples will pick
9 it up.

10 If it's a very fine difference, then you
11 need bigger samples to identify it. So you -- you have
12 to start by saying if there were a difference of
13 10 percent in something between two parts of the city and
14 we wanted to pick that up, how big a sample size would
15 you need; and you can answer that question.

16 But if it's a 30 percent difference that
17 you want to plot, then you need a smaller sample size.
18 And if it's really very refined analysis, you say there's
19 a 2 percent difference between the two, then the sample
20 size will increase exponentially, so...

21 But there is a calculation that can be
22 done for every one of these, and survey researchers
23 generally don't do that, you know. But -- but in
24 psychology, in particular, and in medicine, I guess, in
25 the biological sciences, there's a much stronger

1 tradition of writing down your hypothesis in advance and
2 specifying the effect size that you're looking for and
3 the alpha value and the beta value and then the number
4 comes out the other end. You know, it's kind of -- and
5 it's strange enough, it always comes out to the number
6 that you first thought of, so...

7 Because there are three unknowns and you
8 can fix any of them, so... it's all of them, I guess,
9 and you can get the right answer.

10 MS. LEE: Well, PSID was a -- is a
11 national -- national representative study, right, and I
12 it's done throughout the United States. So because
13 Houston is somewhat smaller from the United States, not
14 much but somewhat, perhaps there is less representing
15 that needs to be done.

16 MR. BIEMER: Well, one thing it helps you
17 with is that -- and if you're talking about a national
18 survey and you're talking about clustering the sample,
19 you need more clusters across the United States because
20 you have a lot more variation across the clusters.

21 But within Houston maybe it's more
22 homogeneous. You can get by with fewer clusters, which
23 means that you can concentrate the sample more in fewer
24 places. But, you know, when we were doing this work
25 for the -- for -- well, all the studies that I know of

1 when you're thinking about cluster size, you also have to
2 weigh into that what's the size of an interviewer
3 workload. Because you don't want to -- you don't have a
4 cluster size that's too big for one interviewer but too
5 small for two. Or it's -- it's -- you know, it's not
6 balanced properly in terms of efficiency, in terms of how
7 you're actually going to do the interviews there. So
8 that's another thing that has to be considered.

9 But, you know, in a place like Houston, I
10 would imagine that it's more homogenous compared to the
11 United States. You need fewer clusters, depending upon
12 the size of those clusters, like block groups of -- or
13 tracts or something like that. So that would help your
14 cost, if you can -- if you're doing a face-to-face survey
15 then have fewer clusters rather than more.

16 MS. SIEBER: Now, this is probably a very
17 unorthodox maybe unworkable idea, but you -- you want, of
18 course, to also help students in this university take
19 advantage of the kinds of entre you can offer. If there
20 are particular cohorts where you would like to really
21 hone in and learn more about lifestyle, why not have some
22 psychology and sociology and anthropology graduate
23 students go and do a study within your study of those
24 particular cohorts. Is -- is that a reasonable thing to
25 do? I don't know.

1 Dead silence.

2 MR. GRANATO: Yeah.

3 MR. ESCHBACH: I don't know if we've --
4 I'm thinking about the discussion before the break and
5 the -- and the assertion and question about why would a
6 national funder fund a local study. As I've been
7 thinking, I think I can think of about 70 or 80 examples
8 where they have. It's not that big a deal, but the trick
9 is, is that it's not by selling a study as being about a
10 particular place. A lot -- I mean, and what -- how can I
11 get to 60 or 70? I'm thinking of all the various
12 programs. But nobody said that East Boston, you know,
13 the -- you know, was representative of the country and we
14 had to study East Boston for that reason.

15 It's -- I mean, a lot of these studies
16 are funded by NIH, and it's because I think there's an
17 assumption that the processes, the physiological
18 processes, work the same anywhere. So what -- the reason
19 you're doing it in the local area is because it's
20 feasible. Because if you want to track a longitudinal
21 population, it's more feasible to do that with a local
22 sample than a national sample at a given sample size.

23 Similarly, when I'm thinking of studies
24 like the Chicago Human Development Study or the LA FAMS
25 or I'm thinking of the -- also, Portez and Rumbaut, the

1 Chicago -- and they're not -- Miami and San Diego looking
2 at immigrant incorporation. I don't think they were sold
3 as being -- the research design is, is we've got to study
4 this because they're so distinctive.

5 They're sold as we've got a strong
6 intellectual reason to study something, and it's feasible
7 to do it here. And it seems to me that that could be a
8 way of thinking about justifying such a study. I mean,
9 you have to have a strong intellectual reason. I mean,
10 it helps to have that, you know.

11 But it seems to me that place effect
12 studies are one reason -- place effect studies almost
13 have to be smaller area, all right. Because to have --
14 to have it be feasible to be -- you know, to be
15 describing characteristics of neighborhoods and of
16 individuals in neighborhoods, it's not really very
17 feasible to do that in a larger area.

18 I think immigrant incorporation -- I
19 mean, there are a lot of health studies that look at -- I
20 mean, the new Hispanic cohorts that NH -- NHLBI is
21 establishing of, like, four cohorts of 8,000 going to
22 local areas. I mean, the national Timberland study is
23 implicitly -- it samples areas. I mean, it's national
24 but it's also strongly clustered.

25 It seems to me like there's -- one way to

1 think about this is not how do we sell the importance of
2 funders studying Houston, but what good idea do we have
3 that we can do here where maybe subparagraph 3 in the
4 significant section is, yeah, and we've seen
5 neighborhoods in Chicago and we've seen them in LA, but
6 Houston might be different. That's not the main purpose,
7 right. Because if you make that the main purpose, it
8 seems to me you fail the research design requirement to
9 have comparison from get-go and you don't even get
10 scored, right.

11 But you say, okay, well, there's a
12 process that's interesting and important and we can study
13 it here because of the characteristics of this place,
14 so -- so let's do it.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: I think that's
16 very heavily -- very different among disciplines. So I
17 think that social scientists, especially sociology
18 related sciences and statisticians tend to -- social
19 statisticians think about representation and, therefore,
20 do think about national studies.

21 The National Children's Study is a
22 wonderful example because there was a sustained
23 battle over a period of three or four years between the
24 medical epi wing and the social science wing in terms of
25 whether it should be a probability sample of the country

1 or not. And it was only after prolonged resistance on
2 the part of the NIH that it became a probability sample,
3 and now partly for their own -- for their own peace of
4 mind, they're reinterpreting it as a set of places even
5 those these places are a set of probability sample
6 conduits in the country and the locations within these
7 are also a probability sample of the places.

8 So I think there's no cred -- no
9 additional credibility in these medical studies of having
10 a national sample because they don't think about
11 representation. I mean, representation is not --
12 representation of the population is not their interest.
13 It's the process. So they believe the underlying process
14 is what's being examined.

15 But I think if we were to go through
16 to -- to a group of social science reviewers, there would
17 be more -- that would be a real issue. It's not that it
18 can't be done, but it would certainly be an issue as to
19 what the representation -- nature of the representation
20 was.

21 MR. BIEMER: And another way of saying
22 that is just what you find in Houston can be inferred to
23 any other part of the country.

24 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Right.
25 Absolutely. Well, I think it's entirely defensive -- not

1 just defensible. It's a very strong case for -- for
2 social science to do something like this, but it's not --
3 but it mustn't be -- you could do 73 of them and you'd
4 have to fund all of them. Is that this really a place
5 where there's the energy and the -- and the commitment by
6 the stakeholders, so it can be done and it wouldn't be
7 done anywhere else and that's why -- that's why it's
8 here. And it's really interesting, because it's a
9 microcosm -- either microcosm of the country is a good
10 shot.

11 If that doesn't work, it's a -- it's a
12 leading -- it's a vanguard site where things are
13 happening and are going to happen elsewhere later, so you
14 can get them here. But, I mean, there's always a
15 conceptualization that will make it look like the right
16 one.

17 MR. BRADBURN: Well, I think, it would --
18 it would also depend on the particular type of funder,
19 that is, someone -- a funder that's interested in Houston
20 would be responsive to arguments that this is something
21 that would benefit Houston or particularly segments.

22 A group that's interested in, you know,
23 developing social science or might be interested in it
24 as -- you know, a new way to look at social processes or
25 social systems or something. I mean, it would have been

1 if the human social dynamics program was not coming to an
2 end, it sounds like there would be something that could
3 be well positioned to -- to be in the competition like
4 that at NSF.

5 MR. SCIOLI: Like policy, statistics?

6 MR. BRADBURN: Right, yeah.

7 MR. SCIOLI: Are there groups involved,
8 like, core cadre?

9 MR. BRADBURN: Economic.

10 MR. SCIOLI: Yes.

11 MR. BRADBURN: And environmental issues,
12 yes.

13 MR. SCIOLI: -- scholars working around
14 the topic. That would have been an excellent place.

15 MR. BRADBURN: And, similarly, I think
16 the other, the place that might -- places that are more
17 likely to be -- it'd be attractive to if it's -- I don't
18 think you have to pitch it, depending on what it is,
19 but -- and that's some of the large private foundations.

20 MR. SCIOLI: I'm just going to raise
21 that.

22 MR. BRADBURN: Because they are moving
23 to -- back into the research, but -- but more
24 policy-related type research kind of thing, so...

25 And they are -- well, first of all,

1 there's some foundations that are place based, I mean,
2 like -- and you know ones that are place based with
3 regards to Houston. But there are others, I think, that
4 would be sufficient -- you know, whose interest in, you
5 know, sort of urban development or something like that
6 would could see it as a -- you know as a kind of new way
7 of looking at some of the -- some of the perineal issues
8 that they have on -- or -- or one that's interested in --
9 in intergroup relations, the assimilation of Hispanics
10 and immigrants and so forth into an economy. Or -- or
11 one -- maybe the -- I don't know what the Sloan
12 Foundation is going to be doing these days.

13 But, you know, the sort of changing
14 economy from how does an area move from being dependent
15 on energy so on and so forth and you characterize that to
16 a more diversified economy where you try to balance out
17 biotech and other things or develop -- I mean...

18 So there are different foundations that
19 have different missions of various sorts. But this is
20 sufficiently broad kind of in a way that it could be --
21 parts of it could, at least, be supported by different
22 foundations and...

23 MR. SCIOLI: I think Colm's points were
24 excellent ones; that it's the crafting of the question in
25 a way that the appeal is targeted and, you know, your

1 sentences -- heaven knows I've seen things that are very
2 successful because of the way they are crafted in terms
3 of the importance.

4 And while Houston is a single site, as
5 Norman just mentioned, the human social dynamics program
6 at the National Science Foundation would have -- you
7 know, agents of change within a metropolitan area within
8 a standard, yeah, that would have been certainly on the
9 table.

10 Good night and good luck.

11 MR. GRANATO: Well, let's -- let's wrap
12 this up for today. Tomorrow we'll meet again at -- well,
13 start time will be 9:00 but feel free to come here by
14 8:00 and mingle and have your breakfast.

15 We'll focus on aspects of IRBs and
16 budgeting. Also, I want to go back to this issue of
17 design contracts and have like kind of a greater focus on
18 an action plan that we would want to put into a report
19 that we're going to do when we get to that, which will be
20 over the summer and the fall.

21 Thank you very much for coming. There
22 will be a van, I think, to pick you up at -- is it going
23 to be 5:45 again? I don't know. Does the itinerary say
24 that?

25 MR. SCIOLI: 5:45, Michael?

1 MR. ANGEL: 5:45.

2 MR. BRADBURN: Tomorrow, there's a -- is
3 a break scheduled in the morning in terms of checking out
4 we can do it then rather than...

5 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. There will be a
6 break at 10:30.

7 MR. BRADBURN: Okay. So we can check out
8 then rather than...

9 MR. GRANATO: Yeah. I would say the
10 last -- we'll adjourn at noon tomorrow, so I would say
11 the last half hour is really going to be sober second
12 thoughts and thinking about what we should take from
13 this.

14 MR. FRANCIS: I was going to say, you can
15 probably get late checkout.

16 MR. BRADBURN: So that we can come here.
17 Rapid checkout time.

18 MR. GRANATO: Thank you very much and see
19 you tonight.

20 (Off the record, 4:29 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE STATE OF TEXAS :

2 COUNTY OF HARRIS :

3

4 I, Dorothy A. Rull, a Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify
6 that the preceding proceedings were reported by me at the
7 time and date stated on page 1 hereof;

8 I further certify that said proceedings
9 were reported by me in machine shorthand, later reduced
10 to typewritten form under my personal supervision, and
11 the above and foregoing 241 pages constitute a true and
12 correct transcript thereof.

13 GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE on this
14 9th day of April, 2008.

15

16

17

18

19 _____
20 Dorothy A. Rull
21 C.S.R. No. 3978, Expires 12/31/08
22 Notary Public, State of Texas
23 Commission Expires: 05/27/2008

24

25 Allied Advanced Reporting, Inc.
Texas CRCB Firm Registration No. 252
1647 Colquitt
Houston, Texas 77006
Ph 713.524.6777 Toll Free 1.800.223.9409
Fax 713.524.6888
aari@alliedadvancedreporting.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY
HOUSTON AREA PANEL STUDY WORKSHOP
March 22, 2008

BE IT REMEMBERED that the aforementioned
proceedings were heard on the 22nd day of March, 2008,
beginning at 9:16 a.m., at the University of Houston
Hilton, 4800 Calhoun, Waldorf Astoria Ballroom, Houston,
Texas 77004, reported by Dorothy A. Rull, a Certified
Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, as
follows, to-wit:

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 MODERATORS:

3 Frank P. Scioli, Ph.D.,
4 Jim Granato, Ph.D.

5 WORKSHOP PANELISTS:

6 Christopher H. Achen, Ph.D.
7 John J. Antel, Ph.D.
8 Paul P. Biemer, Ph.D.
9 André Blais, Ph.D.
10 Norman M. Bradburn, Ph.D.
11 Karen Callaghan, Ph.D.
12 Michael O. Emerson, Ph.D.
13 Karl Eschbach, Ph.D.
14 David J. Francis, Ph.D.
15 Dashiel J. Geyen, Ph.D.
16 Guillermina Jasso, Ph.D.
17 Mark P. Jones, Ph.D.
18 Rebecca E. Lee, Ph.D.
19 Richard W. Murray, Ph.D.
20 Colm O'Muircheartaigh, Ph.D.
21 Joan E. Sieber, Ph.D.

22 ALSO PRESENT:

23 Ann Hamilton, Houston Endowment
24 Elizabeth Rigby, U of H Political Science

25 CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY:

26 Mike Angel
27 Renée Cross
28 Kelly Le

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. SCIOLI: Well, good morning
3 everybody. I guess we should begin. A couple of
4 housekeeping things. Jim has assured me that we will be
5 finished by noon. Apparently, box lunches are coming in
6 to take with you as you see fit.

7 The transcript that's been developed will
8 be circulated to you to redact untoward things that you
9 may have said during the course of the meeting. Things
10 said last night at the restaurant will forever be
11 indelibly imprinted in my mind. But since Dick Murray
12 was not there, he doesn't have to worry about the
13 reputation of the institution. See, I will redact that,
14 for example.

15 So two ways of looking at this, the hard
16 work is done or the hard work begins now. I tend to
17 think that tremendous advice was provided yesterday by
18 everyone in attendance. In my view, attending these
19 kinds of meetings over the years, this is the best I've
20 been to in terms of the openness of the discussion, the
21 willingness to provide advice.

22 My experience has been that you bring in
23 good people, and they don't -- they're not always as
24 forthcoming as this group was. I don't know. Maybe it's
25 something about the environment in which I work, the

1 city, the intimidation --

2 MR. BRADBURN: It's because they always
3 think you're going to give them money.

4 MR. SCIOLI: Yeah. It's delighted -- I'm
5 delighted to not be loved to death at this meeting.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. SCIOLI: In any event --

8 MR. BIEMER: You can redact that, too.

9 MR. SCIOLI: But I mean that. I think
10 some nominal advice was -- some thoughts -- as Jim
11 started yesterday, he wanted this to be a conversation;
12 and I was quite impressed with the tone, that it was
13 conversational. It was not pedantic, but it was
14 certainly erudite and it was instructive. It was -- if I
15 were in his shoes, Ann Hamilton, Richard Murray,
16 Dr. Francis and Klineberg, I'd be very hopeful about the
17 direction this might take as time goes on.

18 I think there were considerable
19 conclusions reached or, at least, preliminary
20 conclusions. Design mode still has to be talked about a
21 bit today. But I think that the sense, unless someone
22 wants to speak against it, was that at least at this
23 stage it's important to think about a well-planned,
24 well-developed, top-drawer study.

25 So let's use that as the kickoff point.

1 Would anyone like to comment on that?

2 I -- and -- and accompanying that is, it
3 may well be that it's going to be an expensive study to
4 do it the way this group would like to see it done. So
5 thoughts? Why don't we use that as a kickoff point.

6 Norman.

7 MR. BRADBURN: Just to add for the -- for
8 the record what I said off the record last night is that
9 just remember Daniel Burn's injunction, make no small
10 plans. So that's how Chicago grew to be what it is. And
11 if Houston wants to aspire to be what -- replace Chicago
12 as the number two city, at least -- and I guess Chicago
13 has fallen to three now, so it's on the downward slope.

14 But any case, if you start off thinking
15 what's the best thing to do, the right thing to do and
16 then if you can't fund that, it's always -- you can scale
17 back. But it's harder to go the other way. If you start
18 with a plan that's too small and then realize that you've
19 got to do more, it's much more difficult to -- to go up.
20 So that would be my major advice.

21 MR. BIEMER: I guess I would say also
22 that -- and I agree with that. But you could also think
23 in terms of phases, you know, so that you don't have to
24 hit the ground on day one with, you know, the full plan,
25 but rather build on it as time goes on. So you could

1 think about -- you know, well, sample size, for example,
2 is something you can adjust moving forward. And I think
3 it might work if you can sort of build a base of -- of
4 people who are interested in the data and, you know,
5 you're being very responsive in the survey to their needs
6 for data; and that base begins to build and more and more
7 interest, you know, accumulates. Sort of what we were
8 hearing yesterday from Steven, you know, that now he has
9 a base of -- of users who, you know, they don't want to
10 see the survey go away. Now, it's going to be sort of
11 going on in perpetuity. But to get there, you have to
12 kind of build that base.

13 And so initial funding might -- might
14 only fund a fraction of what you want the thing to be,
15 but you can think big but maybe also think in terms of
16 phases. And a phase one would be a smaller version of
17 the survey.

18 MS. SIEBER: The other thing on Paul's
19 point, the corporations who may be some of your sponsors
20 will want the data yesterday. And -- and I think that it
21 would be useful to think about what kinds of useful
22 preliminary data you can spin out very quickly before you
23 go into fancy modeling with your full data set. This can
24 be very tantalizing to your sponsors and would be
25 sponsors, and it shows that you're not just an academic

1 who will say, "Well, we'll get the full report out in
2 three years, but we haven't finished our survey, but
3 here's -- here are a few means and cross-taps of
4 interest -- that might be of interest to you."

5 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I'm inclined to
6 think that Norman's approach is likely to be more
7 successful in this case, which is to sell the vision
8 rather than the data.

9 I mean, do you really want to go out
10 there and say, "We can put Houston on the map with a
11 study that would be a beacon in the -- in the darkness to
12 areas that just haven't thought about these things. It
13 lights the way for the future that takes an exciting
14 metropolitan area and follows it in a systematic way to
15 reveal things we couldn't do otherwise."

16 For a lot of things, in my work, it's
17 better to start the way Paul says, you know, to get a
18 demonstration project and build up from there. But
19 you're not -- you know, you have an idea, which is, I
20 think, possibly easier to sell a big idea than a small
21 one. In some sorts of circumstances, it's easier to get
22 big money than little money. You know, you get sponsors.
23 You bring them on board. The University buys into it.
24 The area buys into it. And you do all that before you
25 present any data, which makes you realize the difference

1 between the vision and the realities.

2 MR. MURRAY: I think there's several key
3 constituencies or players that we have to get support for
4 if this is going to have a good chance of moving forward.

5 One, might be the new administration at
6 this university. We have a new president, 52-years old,
7 at the very impressive arc of her career; and it happens
8 to be a political scientist with a background in public
9 administration but has been mostly an administrator. But
10 she's looking for some good ways of convincing the
11 community to become more supportive.

12 The university is about to launch a
13 pretty large public drive. So I think we've got some
14 possibility if we can develop a very good big plan of
15 getting our president's support because she's at a
16 particular juncture where she's looking for new ideas.
17 And this would have, I think, pretty high visibility in
18 the community.

19 A second key player is the mayor of
20 Houston. It's a very, very strong mayor system here,
21 similar to New York. We have a very popular who's term
22 limit -- he's only got another couple years in office,
23 but he's almost certainly going to run for governor of
24 Texas; so he's interested in big projects, big ideas. A
25 very smart guy, very data oriented. I think we would

1 have a pretty good possibility of getting his backing and
2 support, which would help us with the business community
3 here that's been generally supportive of Bill White.

4 And so I -- I think I would echo the
5 comment, "Let's think big at this" because I think if
6 we -- if we start out with a major proposal with teeth in
7 it, we've got a better opportunity of selling it and
8 getting key supporters who help us deal with this very
9 important issue of getting significant funding.

10 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: And I think to
11 pick up Paul's point, Steve Klineberg's survey in a way
12 provides that smaller scale demonstration of the value of
13 data. And it's almost ideal in that it's been long
14 running, it's Houston, but you can show what it doesn't
15 do, you know. So you're saying, now, this is a great --
16 this is what happens if you do it on a shoestring. You
17 can get this. You can get it every year, but it doesn't
18 answer the fundamental questions about what's happening
19 to the community, what's happening to people in the city
20 so that it's almost like having some somebody else do
21 this demonstrate that that's not the way to do it -- I
22 mean, not that that's not a thing to do it, but that's
23 not the way to do what you want to do, which is much
24 broader and more policy relevant than behavioral --
25 measuring behavior as well as attitudes, but more

1 importantly tracking trajectories rather than just
2 getting snapshots because I think that's something the
3 policy people would like to have and that's what --
4 that's what's interesting in a way.

5 And that would give you a contrast with a
6 good product already -- that's there; but that's why you
7 don't need another 250,000 a year; that's why you need to
8 talk to people who have -- who are thinking in millions
9 and not in hundreds and thousands.

10 MR. MURRAY: Something I did not hear --
11 and maybe I just wasn't present when we discussed this --
12 the length of time. What would be the optimal initial
13 plan here? And I'm thinking -- I would think minimally
14 10 years, but longer? What -- what's the sense about
15 what we should start out projecting?

16 MS. JASSO: Let me answer that first and
17 then I'd like to make some other comments. Let me just
18 tell you our vision in The New Immigrant Survey and then
19 you can take it from there. Our vision is that that
20 survey will still be going on when all of us are dead
21 because it will be the only way to know what happens to
22 third generation, the fourth generation, the quest for
23 roots, et cetera, et cetera.

24 But coming back to -- to some of the
25 larger issues, nothing that has been said is mutually

1 exclusive; and I agree with everything. I think Norm is
2 absolutely correct that it's essential to have the large
3 vision of the ideal. There will be plenty of time to
4 scale back. We'll to scale back. For example, if the --
5 if it turns out that the questionnaire is so long that
6 you have to keep the respondent there for eight hours,
7 obviously, you will have to cut. And it also will be
8 natural in the implementation to think of things as
9 phases, exactly as Paul said. If nothing else, a little
10 pilot to -- to begin with.

11 Now, I want to go back to Joan's point
12 because I think it's very important. If it is possible
13 to identify one thing, just one thing that could be
14 quickly answered, just with an average or in proportion
15 but that is really important and that nobody knows,
16 that -- that would be the catalyst for enormous extra
17 funding and support.

18 And I will give you the example from The
19 New Immigrant Survey, which is that before the pilot of
20 The New Immigrant Survey nobody knew one thing that
21 everybody -- and certainly everybody in Congress wanted
22 to know, which is the schooling of a legal permanent --
23 new legal permanent residents. All that was available
24 was the schooling of foreign born in the census, and
25 everybody knew that was no good; that was distorted. And

1 so we were able to come up immediately with this number,
2 which shows that the average is two years larger than the
3 average for the -- for the regular foreign born. And
4 that just -- if -- if you can find one thing that people
5 want to know and that -- that -- that only you can
6 uniquely get, that will be dynamite.

7 MS. SIEBER: It's a lot of publicity,
8 too.

9 MS. JASSO: Yeah.

10 MR. BIEMER: Let me give you an example
11 of what I was talking about phases. In the survey I'm
12 working on currently, this child abuse study, the first
13 cohort that was fielded, there was only funding for three
14 waves. Once we did the data for -- data collection for
15 the first two waves and published a report looking at
16 changes, there was a groundswell of interest that wasn't
17 there initially. And people began to realize what these
18 data could do, only after they saw some of the data come
19 out and see what longitudinal analysis really meant.

20 And if you think that you're going to
21 start out with all the interest that you're ever going to
22 get, I think, you know, you're -- you're -- you're
23 deceiving yourself. I think what -- you may get some
24 initial interest, but that's probably nothing compared to
25 the interest you're going to get once you start

1 publishing this data and you'll see that more people will
2 want to contribute. And that's why I'm saying that this
3 will build, and you need to think in terms of how you're
4 going to build.

5 MR. BRADBURN: Let me go back to Dick's
6 question. The -- in Chicago, there's a group called The
7 Civic Committee, which is a group of business CEOs and
8 top professionals that has been around, I mean, in
9 various guises since the famous Vernom[ph] plan in 1893
10 or '5 or whatever it was. And they periodically
11 undertake a major plan -- vision for a plan for Chicago.
12 And right now, it's Chicago 2020.

13 But -- but they use a 20-year planning
14 horizon. And I think this -- that sort of developed over
15 the last hundred years or something like that, and I
16 think that's probably a good time period. It's long
17 enough that you can think about changes, major changes of
18 various sorts, but it's not so long that it's -- you
19 know, you -- you have no chance of really know what's
20 going to go on. So something on that order of magnitude.

21 And obviously, it would be more detailed
22 in five -- for five years and 10 years than it is in --
23 for the 20. But still, if you're going to think about
24 particular dynamics of Houston and both where you want to
25 be and where you think you'll be, you need something like

1 that, that length of time, I think.

2 MR. BIEMER: Does that mean, though, that
3 you'll have to get sponsors on board to commit for
4 funding this thing for 20 years?

5 MR. BRADBURN: Not necessarily. But I
6 think that you -- it -- you're fooling them if you
7 think -- and probably not in good faith if you think this
8 is something, you know, that can be accomplished in -- in
9 five years or something like that. I mean, it's --
10 because it's not only --

11 MR. BIEMER: Would you turn down money if
12 they said, "Well, you know, I'll support it for a couple
13 of years and see what" -- you know.

14 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: No, I don't think
15 so. But I think -- I think one of the things that's
16 different between -- perhaps between this and the project
17 you were working on, Paul, is having an infrastructure,
18 you know. So at NORC or RTI or University of Chicago,
19 there's a big infrastructure that can support development
20 of things; and it's going on all the time. Some with no
21 funding, some of it with a lot of funding.

22 But if you want to set up an operation
23 where you don't have that infrastructure, then core
24 funding, I think, is kind of critical. But, see, you can
25 set up something like this with just the money to do the

1 bits that you described in the sense of saying, so much
2 for questionnaire design, so much for sample design, so
3 much for field work. You really need to have some sort
4 of institution or some entity that does it, whether it's
5 the Center For Public Policy or the separate Houston 2050
6 plan or whatever it is.

7 You don't need to have money for all the
8 field work for 20 years, but you need to have at least
9 enough money -- money for long enough that people can
10 commit to it and know that this isn't something that's
11 going to be gone by the time they get started. So you
12 think about getting good people to commit to working on
13 this, you have to have a place for them to be that has
14 some existence.

15 And the university might provide that in
16 some places and not in others. I mean, it's not here at
17 the moment. You know, if you were in Michigan, ISR in a
18 way would provide that sort of base for you. Maybe NORC
19 would do it in Chicago. Because that's why I think you
20 have to have this big plan, and certainly getting money
21 for the field work doesn't have to be locked in for 20
22 years.

23 Five years funding seems to me to be a
24 perfectly reasonable period of time for data collection
25 money. It's long enough so that you have at least -- you

1 know, you can fit it better than the linear model data
2 with three or four or five waves of data, but not so long
3 that people feel they're signing for something they have
4 no idea what it is. So there, I think, you do build up
5 by saying --

6 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. That's what I'm
7 saying.

8 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- getting
9 underway. But I think getting the whole thing in place
10 is really critical and that's where I think Dick's point,
11 that the university president and the city would welcome
12 this. And this is the kind of thing Chicago welcomes as
13 well --

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

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- a big idea,
16 it's worth putting money into because it's not just what
17 I'm interested in or you're interested in. It's a thing
18 the whole city feels that it's represented well. That, I
19 think, is the vision that you'd be selling; and that I
20 think, you want to put in place and then you can devote
21 people -- people would devote sort of part of their
22 career to it. It's like something they -- it's worth
23 getting involved in rather than just getting five hours
24 of somebody's time a month or...

25 MR. BRADBURN: It's -- to give you an

1 analogy, I -- in looking at the sort of brochure we got
2 about the university -- and this is true -- I mean, this
3 idea that you -- you have a master plan for the campus.
4 And that says, oh, the next 20 years or something, this
5 is what we'd like to build. This is where they're going
6 to go. You look at nice architectural pictures of
7 things, which never like that, but, you know and that's
8 what you -- but you're not going to build it all in one
9 year.

10 You know, you -- you get the money for
11 this building or that building or -- and you build
12 this -- you build up this college or you build up that
13 college or whatever. But it's all in the -- within a
14 framework that you can show people, this is -- you know,
15 this is where we're going and we'd like to be and -- and,
16 you know, help us get there and this is --

17 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. A phased approach.

18 MR. BRADBURN: -- the steps, and the
19 steps to get there.

20 MR. BIEMER: That's actually my
21 experience.

22 MR. BRADBURN: At the risk of
23 complicating things, a possible way of -- of moving
24 there, which is -- which I think would have several
25 advantages. And that's to -- to think about a kind of

1 indicator system for Houston or the Houston area.
2 There's a lot -- there's a great revival of interest in
3 particularly social indicators and environmental
4 indicators as well as economic indicators. And there's a
5 group actually at Brookings called the NIC -- what does
6 it stand for? Anyway it's something about small area
7 indicator systems of various sorts.

8 And if you -- that's something which
9 essentially starts with existing data and what it does --
10 if you start to build the kind of system, it does two --
11 or it could potentially for this project do two things.
12 First of all, you can get started right away. It's
13 cheap -- fairly cheap to do, something students can do
14 and you can get -- your center could take the lead in it.

15 And it forces you, then, to ask the kind
16 of questions we were asking yesterday, what do you really
17 want to know and how much do we know already from -- from
18 census and other -- other -- from Stephen's surveys or
19 other -- other data around or things -- or rearranging
20 census data or whatever, the -- the state center could
21 help on that sort of thing.

22 But then it also points up what you don't
23 have. And now, granted, what you have is all
24 cross-sectional time series, if -- if that. But it -- it
25 does begin to fill in an otherwise vague picture of what

1 systematic data about an area means. So people can -- it
2 gives some more flesh to -- to what -- what it means.

3 But also it points out what's -- what's
4 not there and that becomes, then, part of what feeds into
5 what you're going to want to put into the -- into the
6 panel study and in two different ways. First of all,
7 some of it's even -- even stuff that might -- could --
8 could be done cross-sectionally, but -- but still it
9 didn't -- it doesn't have any dynamics of it and so
10 forth.

11 So it's -- it's a kind of relatively -- I
12 would say it's a kind of supplementary, but things which
13 could -- could well help people who aren't very data
14 oriented to begin with understand what the power of
15 something like this could be. And it's certainly a
16 great -- now, if you have a mayor who's data oriented,
17 you know, he probably has something like this kind of in
18 an informal sort of way. But formalizing it, taking on
19 some responsibility for the -- the -- the -- the
20 University of Houston indicator series or whatever, you
21 know, the -- would be a kind of first step in that, so...

22 MR. BLAIS: I'd like to support this
23 view. I think this is -- the social indicators approach
24 seems to me extremely attractive. I suppose you could
25 make the case that there's never been sort of a

1 longitudinal study of using social indicators as such.
2 So this would be sort of a -- you know, indicating --
3 showing on one end that what a longitudinal study usually
4 can do and using -- you know, showing a lot of changes,
5 much more than we -- we usually think.

6 MR. BIEMER: Could you give me an example
7 of what you're talking about with the social indicator?
8 I'm not -- what would we be measuring? What -- what kind
9 of a characteristic are you talking about that would
10 capture the imagination of city leaders?

11 MR. BLAIS: Well, putting --

12 MR. FRANCIS: Quality of life.

13 MR. BIEMER: What?

14 MR. FRANCIS: Quality of life, which we'd
15 combine maybe a variety of indices that are used in some
16 of the publications that talk about quality of life, but
17 actually get at behavioral indicators and how they change
18 over time.

19 MR. BLAIS: And -- and satisfaction, I
20 guess, with public services, for instance, and...

21 MS. SIEBER: If I could toss -- toss
22 another idea in the hopper, there has been a lot of
23 interest nationally and internationally on measures of
24 happiness, which don't necessarily correlate with the
25 other quality of life variables that we think influence

1 happiness. And I would think that politicians would be
2 very interested in knowing how generally happy their
3 people feel they are with their life, not with the
4 government, but with their life.

5 MR. BIEMER: Is that something we want to
6 monitor longitudinally?

7 MS. SIEBER: I have never seen it
8 monitored longitudinally --

9 MR. BRADBURN: Oh, yeah.

10 MS. SIEBER: -- but I think that would be
11 fascinating.

12 MR. BRADBURN: The GSS does it.

13 MS. SIEBER: Oh, does it?

14 MR. BRADBURN: In '72.

15 MS. JASSO: No.

16 MR. BLAIS: But that's not series, no.

17 MR. BIEMER: It's a cross-section.

18 MR. BRADBURN: Cross -- you mean
19 longitudinally?

20 MR. BIEMER: I meant longitudinally, you
21 know, looking at changes --

22 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Well, I mean, the
23 first long --

24 MR. BIEMER: -- individual level.

25 MR. BRADBURN: The first longitudinal

1 study I did that, but for two years. Not for
2 longitudinal.

3 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: But I think one
4 of the problems of measuring happiness, of these kinds of
5 measures, is that they're not -- that people adjust to
6 whatever --

7 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

8 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: So that they're
9 not useful in the long-term because --

10 MS. SIEBER: No.

11 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- they -- they --
12 they -- they move a little, but there isn't a fundamental
13 change over time. People --

14 MR. BIEMER: Well, is quality of life
15 more objective?

16 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I think -- I
17 think --

18 MS. SIEBER: Oh, yes.

19 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- there's a lot
20 of social indicators and economic indicators. I mean,
21 all you have to do is read the -- and it's easier to get
22 a student to do this -- is to go through the last two
23 years of Houston Chronicle and see what are the headlines
24 that relate to data that are published. You know,
25 there's crime data, there's police report, there's

1 housing, there's all these things come out all the time
2 and people look at them and say, "My God is that true?"
3 And because they don't remember -- they never remember
4 what it was before.

5 But if you track these things in a
6 systematic way, in other words, if you have a plan that
7 says here's a battery of indicators and maybe get an
8 index or two, people are always enthusiastic about the
9 Houston quality -- you know, the Houston index or
10 whatever it is.

11 But I think Norman's point is very
12 important in that if you do this first, it means that
13 when people ask questions about what the panel would do,
14 you know already what -- you know what's already there so
15 you don't sell it by saying, "It would tell us this," and
16 they say, "But we already have this" from -- from the
17 city or we have this from the state or we have this from
18 EPA or whatever. So in a way it's like preparation for
19 putting meat on the plan is that you know what's there
20 and you can say, "Here are these things, but they don't
21 tell us this." As Norman suggested, they identify the
22 gaps in the information and tell you what you might need
23 to do and maybe it'll turn out you don't want the panel
24 because the data are already there. I don't think that's
25 true, but...

1 MR. BIEMER: Well, I mean, I think you're
2 right, though, I mean, the American Community Survey, for
3 example, is going to be providing data on Houston.

4 MR. BRADBURN: Yes, now -- that's
5 right -- now --

6 MR. BIEMER: You need to -- you need to
7 say how you're going to distinguish -- you know, what --
8 what you're collecting you can't get from that?

9 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: But -- I mean,
10 but the key as always there would be individual-level
11 panel data.

12 MR. BRADBURN: Yes.

13 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: So ACS will never
14 produce --

15 MR. BIEMER: No, it won't.

16 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: -- longitudinal
17 data.

18 MR. BIEMER: That's why it has to be, you
19 know, focused on that kind of --

20 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Sure.

21 MR. BIEMER: -- longitudinal analysis.

22 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: That's why, I
23 think, a panel is where I think the real added value is.

24 MR. BRADBURN: Well, and that -- you
25 know, to go back to the original PSID issue, that's -- I

1 mean, that's where you can discover things which in the
2 ACSR aren't changing but, in fact, giving you a false
3 picture of the dynamics of what's going on and so forth.
4 Or -- or things are --

5 MS. SIEBER: My understanding of the
6 happiness index is that it's usually how people perceive
7 their life relative to somebody else's life. So that if
8 a country is quite poor and everyone is poor, they may
9 adjust to that and be quite hope. But I think that in a
10 longitudinal study, you will see what group has rising
11 expectations and a lot of anger about not meeting those
12 expectations. So from the point of view of any kind of
13 political turbulence of some subpopulation, I would think
14 you would have a useful measure of a hot spot that's
15 emerging.

16 MS. JASSO: If I could jump in here and
17 just -- I -- I think it's very useful to think about
18 concrete things, and so let me just say that building on
19 the foundation of the classical literature and social
20 indicators, it would be nice to add some new indicators
21 based in part, as Colm was -- was talking about, the
22 issues that are gripping people right now and also the
23 issues that -- that -- that scholars are starting to talk
24 about.

25 So I -- I just made a little list and --

1 and let me throw it out. I think happiness is essential.
2 I -- I would not throw out happiness simply because it's
3 subjective.

4 In Europe, there's a growing tradition, I
5 think, of including in the surveys perceptions of the
6 fairness of own something or other, either own pension,
7 own earnings, own grades is asked of children, for
8 example. I -- I think there's a big future in asking
9 what you -- are you being fairly treated. Are you
10 over-rewarded or under-rewarded, et cetera. Big battery
11 of new questions, for example, in the German service.

12 Excuse me.

13 Now, with respect to foreign born -- and
14 I don't know how much you want to go into that. After
15 all, you -- you can't overload the instrument with --
16 with -- with questions for the foreign born, but here's a
17 list of some new ones. Excuse me.

18 Remember the old idea that when someone
19 dies there's a set sequence in which physical systems
20 shut down? Well, some of us are thinking that when
21 people assimilate, there may be a set sequence in the way
22 they do things. And so some of the things that would be
23 really interesting to -- to get at are, if they start
24 giving up religion, in what sequence do they do it? What
25 aspects do they give up first, et cetera? What -- if

1 they embrace a religion, say they come from a country
2 that had no religion as we're finding in The New
3 Immigrant Survey, in what sequence do they do it, what
4 are the steps?

5 The same thing with language, in what
6 sequence do they start using English. And then for
7 people who don't use English at a really important
8 indicator of egalitarianism is in what sequence do they
9 stop using the old distinction between formal and
10 familiar that marks practically every language of the
11 world except English and Hebrew.

12 And these are dynamite things for
13 becoming American. We can also think as -- I mean, these
14 are minor things but they turn out to be very important.
15 When do people stop using "kilos" and start using
16 "pounds" or stop using "kilometers" and start using
17 "miles"?

18 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: When will the
19 U.S. start using the right one?

20 MR. BRADBURN: When we assimilate.

21 MS. JASSO: Good question. In the New
22 Immigrant Survey, we didn't -- I mean, it would have been
23 fabulous to ask about do you use pounds or... However,
24 we do ask height and weight and we said just whatever
25 unit -- whatever measure you want. So we have this

1 wonderful indirect way of knowing who is using pounds and
2 who is using kilograms, for example.

3 MR. BIEMER: Well, Willie, is it -- is it
4 important to sort of tie that to Houston? I mean, the
5 things that you're mentioning there, wouldn't they be
6 more, you know, for generic populations, but are -- is it
7 more important to try -- since the Houston area is going
8 to be funding this, is there some -- something from what
9 you just said that could be, you know, specific for
10 Houston that Houston needs to know, apart from sort of --
11 the general -- the general theory of, you know, of social
12 sequencing or whatever you want to call that.

13 MR. BRADBURN: Well, I'll give you an
14 example. I -- if -- if -- out of your research, let's
15 say you -- you developed an index of assimilation and
16 then you've measured that in Houston because one of the
17 things you would want to know is how are the new people
18 moving into Houston assimilating? I mean, are they
19 integrating or not? And where are pockets of places
20 where assimilation is going very rapidly and where is --
21 are pockets of places where it's not going on?

22 So you -- the idea would be, is to build
23 from general research, national research and so forth to
24 indicators or to measures that have policy relevance
25 in -- in Houston. So -- not that you're building the

1 indicator out of Houston, but you're applying it --

2 MS. JASSO: As Colm said about paying
3 attention --

4 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

5 MS. JASSO: -- to what's in the headline.

6 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. And, again, just --
7 this is something for homework for -- for one of your
8 students. There is a big -- enormous effort going on
9 in -- in Washington. It's something which used to be
10 called the Key National Indicators Initiative. It's now
11 called State of the USA, which is a -- now a separate
12 public/private corporation that is going to develop
13 indicator system, economic, environmental and social, for
14 the United States as a whole. And these are -- there's
15 going to be an attempt to harmonize these with some world
16 indicators. The OCD was working on the upside.

17 And on the downside, on the smaller side
18 is they're very interested in developing local
19 indicators, versions of these indicators. And the --
20 basically they're -- they're -- they're starting with a
21 very, in some sense, simple -- maybe simplistic is the
22 word. They -- they have big areas, and they want
23 essentially one or two indicators in each of these areas
24 and -- and to monitor and to go...

25 Now, again, they're hampered -- as you

1 move away from the more traditional indicators, hampered
2 by the fact that there aren't very good indicators for
3 things like well-being or happiness or whatever the
4 particular concept. Because they -- they -- I've been
5 urge -- I've been on the planning committee, and I've
6 been urging them to use some of these things. Social
7 connectedness, for example, is one of the one's that
8 we're trying to do. Religious behavior is -- is another
9 one.

10 So it's a -- it's a -- it's -- and if you
11 could, in some sense, tie the development of the ones for
12 Houston into that and you could feedback to -- onto them
13 because the problem -- I mean, I think this -- is as it
14 gets going, assuming it gets off the ground but it's got
15 an enormous amount of money behind it at the moment, that
16 they -- they're facing the issue about where new or
17 better measures of the indicators can be developed. It's
18 particularly true in the environmental area. It turns
19 out the environmental area is much harder -- I mean,
20 hardest, the social is, the environmental are even harder
21 because there's not a tradition of -- of environmental
22 statistics the way there is about demographic and social
23 statistics and economic statistics. But I can give you
24 the references.

25 MR. GRANATO: Okay.

1 MR. ACHEN: One quick suggestion I have
2 here that you might ask for seed money for is -- is GIS
3 system for Houston, geographic information system. And
4 the nice feature of those is that you can have data at
5 different units. So census data will come in one set
6 of units and political data will come in another set.
7 You might want to use voter turnout rates as an
8 indication of people's attachment to the system and that
9 sort of thing. Air quality data will -- may come in at
10 various locations.

11 When you see people who are skillful at
12 this do the presentations -- some of you may have seen
13 the networks now on primary nights, they can just use
14 their fingers on a screen and drill down to particular
15 areas. And a presentation like that, as Norm and others
16 were suggesting, might get going really quite early with
17 data that already exists. And people will see the
18 potential of it, see how the different neighborhoods are
19 doing, and then you can then say, "It would be great to
20 have this. It would be great to have that. It'd be
21 great to have the third thing, but we don't have the
22 money to do that." So it's a way of putting, you know,
23 kind of a promise in a very visual form that often works
24 well for -- for people who don't do -- don't do
25 statistics for a living.

1 MR. BIEMER: Try to highlight the gaps in
2 the information --

3 MR. ACHEN: Yeah.

4 MR. BIEMER: -- is what you're talking
5 about now.

6 MR. ACHEN: -- in a very visual way that
7 will make a good presentation. So the problem with this
8 is doing something like Arc View is hard work. It's not
9 something you pick up on a weekend. So you probably need
10 a -- probably need somebody to do this, somebody who --
11 you know, student's feed in the data, but then this
12 person runs it.

13 MR. GRANATO: We can do it right now.
14 Actually, we have the capability -- so, I mean, what
15 you're saying, you're preaching to the choir. We're
16 working with folks at the Johnson Space Center and for
17 The Texas Lottery Commission Survey and for The Study For
18 Conductive Energy Devices, we did exactly that.

19 And now we're starting to do some
20 population projections. And I'm learning about something
21 called Tiger Data for the first time. That's what we're
22 starting to overlay, so -- and we're making it dynamic.
23 And we've got different ways to make certain parts of the
24 city -- you know, we're thinking about experimenting, one
25 part rise and another part stay the same so can actually

1 get differentiation.

2 Or right now, what we've done initially
3 is bar graphs to see one. So if you have Harris County
4 and you compare it to Bexar County, you can actually see
5 the difference in terms of who plays a lottery. You may
6 have a -- some type of demographic indicator like gender.
7 And so what's the difference between male and female?
8 And you click on that, and you actually see the bar
9 graphs start to change. So it's that kind of thing that
10 we -- we can do right now. But I'm -- I'm glad I could
11 say there's something we can do quickly, which I think
12 you're right.

13 I mean, what we've learned is -- for sure
14 is people are titling at bar graphs and cross-tabs and
15 graphs that just show things over time. They glaze over.
16 Once you put a geographic picture that's colorized that
17 moves over time and they could overlay --

18 MR. BIEMER: It's the animation that
19 probably gets them.

20 MR. GRANATO: -- it is. They learn
21 instantly because you're getting space and time tied
22 together, and it's just -- it just -- it wins people over
23 quickly. They're asking questions, things of that sort.

24 MR. BRADBURN: You can have a great
25 demonstration some data like -- I don't know -- like

1 TARK [sic] data or something like that in which you
2 show -- who this and so forth. And then you want some
3 other thing about social involvement or social
4 connectedness and so forth, and you could sort of have it
5 there. And then you push in, nothing happens, and you
6 say, "Ahh. That's because we don't have the data." So...

7 MR. BLAIS: Question mark.

8 MR. BRADBURN: Question mark.

9 MR. GRANATO: I mean --

10 MR. BIEMER: With a price tag on it.

11 MR. BRADBURN: Answer this question.

12 MR. GRANATO: And we want to move beyond
13 that. We want to move beyond that. So right now it's at
14 the display stage, and then we've got all these nice
15 little features there. But we want to make it smart now.
16 The next step is to tie in property and statistics so it
17 can show how these things are changing that's related to
18 power laws and things of that sort.

19 MR. ACHEN: Well, I think this is also an
20 answer to a question that I'm expecting you're going to
21 get, which is that we already have Steve Klineberg's
22 survey. What is it exactly that you're adding to this?
23 And Steve was enormously generous and helpful this --
24 this weekend, and that was a classy thing for him to do;
25 but I think you're going to want to think about how the

1 two of you can -- you know, you want the town to be big
2 enough for both of you and -- and that you're doing
3 different things and you're -- you're clear about that,
4 you're clear about the value of what he's doing, but that
5 you're doing something different.

6 So that working on -- working on --
7 working that out with him and working it out with your
8 donors and having some kind of classy way to show that
9 you're not in his way, you're doing something new and
10 interesting is, I think, also an important part of this
11 whole packet.

12 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Following
13 Willie's point about foreign born, it seemed to me that
14 one of the characteristics of Houston that people have
15 talked about is its diversity in terms of racial and
16 ethnic mix and that might well be an important aspect of
17 this.

18 But one of the things that's always
19 struck me as a -- as a foreign born person -- I don't
20 think of myself as foreign born. I think of myself as
21 Irish born.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: And it reminds me,
24 often people -- people occasionally ask me -- it seems a
25 little intrusive -- whether I'm a citizen or not. And I

1 say, "Of course I am." And they say, "When did you
2 become a citizen?" I say, "When I was born."

3 MR. GRANATO: I always trace it to when
4 he became a white --

5 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: They don't ask me
6 whether I'm a U.S. -- don't ask me whether I'm a U.S.
7 citizen or not, which is of course a different question.

8 So this whole notion of foreign born is
9 an interesting to me as is ethnicity in general which
10 applies to certain groups, it turns out. So most people
11 are not ethnic in the United States strangely. But one
12 of the things that --

13 MS. JASSO: They are, but they don't know
14 it.

15 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: One of the things
16 that's interesting to find out in Houston is whether, in
17 fact, assimilation means moving toward the Anglo or
18 assimilating. These are not the same thing. So the
19 question as to whether you give up your religion and your
20 language and then your bad habits and take up good Anglo
21 habits is not the same as saying whether there's
22 assimilation.

23 So one of the questions is Houston would
24 be is developing a different model of being an American
25 or being U.S. Is the Houstonian now no longer trying to

1 be like the 75 percent over 65 who are Anglo? Are they
2 more trying to be like the 75 percent of non-Anglo who
3 are under 30 or 25 or whatever the number was yesterday.

4 Norman Tebbett, who was one of Margaret
5 Thatcher's fairly extreme right -- but by British
6 standards, extreme right ministers, was very much
7 exercised by the presence of nonassimilated foreign-type
8 people in Britain. And his key question for citizenship
9 was if England -- this is for a particular group. If
10 England plays Pakistan in cricket, which team do you
11 support? Because every time any king visited England,
12 all of the people of that nationality or ethnicity
13 supported England's opponents.

14 But one of the things that was striking
15 of that was there were no people of Pakistani descent on
16 the English cricket team. And as the team became more
17 diverse over a period of time, then this also changed.
18 So I think you have to be very careful in asking the
19 questions as to what you mean by "assimilating." If
20 you -- if you live in a Latino, is assimilation learning
21 Spanish or is it having everybody else learn English? It
22 does seem to me that -- I don't have an answer of course
23 to these questions. And I'm not hopeful that all of my
24 neighborhoods in High Park will learn Gaelic anytime
25 soon.

1 But it does seem to me that it's a
2 distinctive feature of Houston that you can look to it as
3 a different -- it's a different balance in terms of race
4 and ethnicity and language and whether, in fact, what
5 you're looking at is a different model or a model
6 where the questions take on a different flavor. And this
7 might be something that, even in social science terms, to
8 go back to the general question of, you know, is this --
9 why not national? I may be, why not national? Because
10 Houston is really the only place -- or one of a few
11 places that you're going to get this particular kind of
12 mix and, therefore, it's important to study it here
13 because this is a model that might apply elsewhere if you
14 get that kind of change in the -- in the mixture in
15 neighborhoods.

16 So I -- I certainly, if I were a
17 Houstonian supporting this, would be more impressed if it
18 had that flavor of saying, not how would it apply
19 elsewhere, but here we have a very different situation
20 and what is it -- what's happening here and how should we
21 define what things mean because, I suspect, it might mean
22 something different.

23 MS. CALLAGHAN: On that note, I'd like to
24 say I'd like to see assimilation of negative racial
25 attitudes, that is, people coming from other countries

1 that don't hold negative views of African Americans and
2 countries that are black African that have an in-group
3 notion of -- that's not prejudicial. But do they come
4 here and they adopt the prejudice as well.

5 MS. SIEBER: Coming from the Bay Area,
6 which is very much like Houston in many regards, I think
7 what Colm was saying is something that's imperceptible to
8 the people there, that is, the culture changes and the
9 only way you know it is when your relatives from
10 elsewhere come to visit and say, "Huh?" When you go in a
11 restaurant and nobody there is acting Anglo. When you go
12 to Chinatown and that's just how it is.

13 And capturing that is really good at
14 capturing what's going to be happening to America. It
15 may not be a popular message to put out. I'd be careful
16 how I'd put it out, but it's a dynamic which we don't
17 notice because it's happening all around us.

18 MR. BIEMER: You know it -- it just
19 strikes me that -- because I think we have a lot of
20 social sciences in the room, we tend to -- we tend to
21 suggest indicators that are more social indicators. But
22 I -- you know, this is, I think, the value of gathering
23 experts from different fields of economics, education,
24 you know, even you know looking at child care issues,
25 whatever and -- and, you know, trying to brainstorm about

1 what kinds of things this survey should measure. And I
2 think when you're going to do that is what we found, with
3 just a narrow field like child abuse, you're going to
4 have so much information that this survey could collect
5 that you're going to have to then, you know, take the
6 next hard step, which is to try to prioritize things
7 and -- and decide, you know, there's only about maybe
8 10 percent of all these things that we can actually do in
9 the survey because otherwise the survey would last all
10 day and we've only got one hour in the household or
11 something like that.

12 But you know, this is why I think you
13 really need to take some time. And a year is not a lot
14 of time to really meet with various, you know, people in
15 academe and people who are city leaders and so forth
16 and -- and try to identify all sorts of indicators that
17 this thing could measure and what are the main ones. And
18 those might even -- you know, as we were talking
19 yesterday with these topical modules, could change over
20 time.

21 MS. JASSO: And by the way, in an actual
22 questionnaire, you never ask are you assimilating, have
23 you, et cetera. I mean, all you do is get objective
24 information. You know, "Do go to church? Did you go to
25 church before you came? What language are the services

1 conducted in" da, da, da, da, da. You just get facts,
2 and then it's the analyst who then puts them together
3 into a picture about who is doing what, going in which
4 direction, toward or away from whatever may be the --
5 the --

6 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Although the
7 definition of the -- of the factors or the indexes is
8 heavily culturally related. So what do you consider
9 assimilation is really -- is not value. So I agree
10 that the -- and to some extent, even the questions you
11 ask are -- are -- imply that. So if you don't ask the
12 same questions of the nonforeign born population.

13 So, I mean, it always strikes me when I
14 come down to this part of the country where, you know,
15 the definition of food is really now Mexican American
16 food or Tex-Mex food or whatever. You know, this is very
17 different from Chicago and the northeast. And it's --
18 it's seen as American here, and it wasn't seen as
19 American, I'm sure 20 or 30 years ago, Paul. I don't
20 know, but my guess is good Americans didn't eat that kind
21 of food.

22 MR. BIEMER: It was hot dogs and
23 hamburgers.

24 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: You know, so
25 that's a change. And that's -- but people don't think of

1 that as -- they think the foreigners are assimilating,
2 but in fact, you know, the culture has changed. The
3 whole meaning of what it is you're moving toward is
4 changing and that's -- and that's very significant in
5 terms of even -- and how you think about it and what you
6 measure because we don't think of both groups moving
7 toward a new position. They're still at this feeling
8 that people come in, and they're -- and are assimilated
9 into something that's there by becoming more like that,
10 instead of having the whole thing change so it's no
11 longer...

12 MS. SIEBER: A great example of that is
13 what acceptable child care and elder care. It's very
14 culturally laden, but the whole culture is changing in
15 regard to that.

16 MR. BRADBURN: There is truth --

17 MS. SIEBER: It has tremendous
18 implication for social services.

19 MR. FRANCIS: Yeah. I actually have a
20 question I want to raise, and it gets back to this point
21 about the length of the survey. One of the things that
22 was on the -- one of the bullets yesterday that we didn't
23 talk about is the period of data collection should be
24 quarterly, semiannual, you know, annual, every two years?

25 And what I wondered is, is there any --

1 how would you -- how do you react to the idea of having
2 shorter surveys, but higher frequency where certain
3 things are collected maybe in a spring way, then other
4 things are collected in a fall way. So you're making
5 contact every six months, but you're not getting contact
6 on every data point each time?

7 MR. BRADBURN: Well, it obviously depends
8 on -- on the -- the total size. But in an ideal world,
9 continuous collection would be best, that is, you having
10 a small but a sample every month or two months. And --
11 and then you have a dedicated staff and you sort of do
12 things around.

13 You have -- one of the great advantages
14 that you can always take advantage of unexpected events
15 because you don't have to -- because you're always sort
16 of in the field. That's the way it sort of was with the
17 CPS -- I mean, the ACS model.

18 But you need -- in fact, in -- and the
19 predecessor to the general social survey was something
20 Frank -- only Frank and I are old enough to remember, a
21 continuous national survey which NSF sponsored initially;
22 and that was a small sample every week actually. The
23 questionnaire could change once a month. I mean, so
24 you -- and if you wanted a bigger sample, you just left
25 the same question in for -- for several cycles or many

1 cycles or the whole year if you wanted to build up a
2 big -- big enough.

3 If you were interested in rapid response,
4 then you'd -- you know, you could change it in a month.
5 And that turned out to be extremely beneficial during the
6 energy crisis because we -- that happened to be going on
7 at that time. So for this emergency energy office at the
8 White House, we could put in a question, you know, this
9 month about, you know, gas rationing -- you know, what
10 sort of gas -- if you had to ration gas, what method
11 would you, you know, want to use and one on going to year
12 daylight savings time, which we did briefly in that
13 period.

14 So that -- that's, in a way, the -- the
15 best way to do it, but it has -- you know, you've got
16 to -- and you can, you know, keep a status. So -- but
17 that's -- well, it depends on how big -- but even that, I
18 guess, we were doing that -- I think we had -- the weekly
19 sample was 150 or something like that and so, you know,
20 it built up over the years to what it had to be --

21 MR. SCIOLI: Well, but what about in a
22 less than ideal world?

23 MR. BRADBURN: Well --

24 MR. SCIOLI: I mean, what about
25 practical...

1 MR. BRADBURN: I guess it's -- it's, you
2 know, in some sense, the principle that Colm and the GSA,
3 that the more the better. You know, the bigger the
4 sample, the better. So the more frequent you can do it
5 the better. And that's -- but again, it sort of depends
6 on what you think what variables are subject to rapid
7 change of various sorts.

8 I -- most things aren't. The major
9 advantage of -- so from that point of view, doing it once
10 a year or every other year or something like that, is --
11 is not too much different, aside from the kind of
12 logistical advantages of keeping track of people if
13 you're doing it more frequent and so forth.

14 But if you -- if -- in terms of the -- of
15 the, not only the general change of various sorts, you do
16 want to think about it as a potential instrument for
17 short-term things. Is there policy tests or taking
18 advantage of -- of unexpected events, then -- then
19 something that's close to continuous as possible is the
20 better strategy.

21 I think you would basically need to look
22 at cost differences of various sorts. I'm not sure that
23 they're -- I mean, there are certain economies of doing
24 it continuously. You've got to train staff, you know,
25 the training. When you have to gear up once every year

1 or two years, I mean, that involves training costs for
2 interviewers and all that sort of stuff. And if you --
3 if we're using a strategy that we're talking about
4 yesterday of -- sort of initial impanelling people
5 through personal visits and so forth, but a large -- at
6 least lots of them after that, doing it on the phone or
7 doing it on the web, then the continuous nature is
8 easier. I mean, you wouldn't want to do everybody every
9 week or every month and so forth, but doing you know
10 subsamples on a monthly basis or basis or something would
11 be practical, which would allow you then to -- to put in
12 something if there's something -- you know, an emergency
13 came up and so forth and so on.

14 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I agree with
15 Norman. And there are two separate issues. One is in
16 what way do you -- in purely operations terms, what way
17 do you want to structure the field work. So do we want
18 continuous field work or field work every so often?

19 And the second is how often do you want
20 to measure each individual. So how often do you want to
21 go back to each individual.

22 And then the third point, which crosses
23 both of these, what mode are you going to use? And for
24 face to face really, it's not practical to go back
25 frequently to the same household unless you have

1 Houston panel by providing them with Internet access. So
2 making it an Internet-based data collection. So either
3 you pay their Internet connection fee or you give them
4 one of these lower grade web TV, MSN TV2 terminals that
5 they can use. And then I think you -- you -- it's
6 reasonable that they might well respond to you briefly on
7 a number of occasions during the year. It wouldn't be --
8 that would be in keeping with the fact that you're paying
9 some regular subscription for them that once a quarter,
10 they would do some survey for you. And if you do it more
11 frequently, the burden is less each time. So there's the
12 additional advantage that you keep in touch with them so
13 they haven't forgotten you by the time you come back at
14 the end of the next year.

15 MS. SIEBER: Are these gadgets that their
16 kids can use for educational purposes and so forth or --

17 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: No.

18 MS. SIEBER: -- are they just dedicated?

19 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Just barely. Just
20 bare. But they're so much less sophisticated than
21 most --

22 MS. SIEBER: Ah-hah.

23 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: -- PC or Mac-based
24 Internet that their children would probably have much
25 better access to it at school than these. But, yes, you

1 can. I mean, you can use them but they're very clunky
2 really for -- and it might even be that you give them a
3 computer and Internet access. These costs are now
4 relatively low, but that's a -- but that's a big --
5 that's a capital investment.

6 MR. BRADBURN: Get one of your Texas
7 computer companies to donate machines.

8 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: No. Sure.

9 MS. JASSO: That would be great.

10 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: You can get a
11 sponsor or two sponsors, so that the Internet connection
12 and the computers are provided by different sponsors --

13 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

14 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- who become gold
15 sponsors or --

16 MS. JASSO: The Dell survey.

17 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Let's save
18 platinum for the people who are paying your salaries.

19 MR. BIEMER: I got overexcited.

20 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Just losing
21 perspective here.

22 MS. JASSO: I'd like to build -- oh, I'm
23 sorry. Go ahead.

24 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I think it's wise
25 because I could have gone on indefinitely.

1 MS. JASSO: Which would have been fun.
2 I'd like to build on something that born Norm and Colm,
3 and that is that periodicity to answer data may differ by
4 different topic. This is a question that -- that
5 immigration researchers have talked about and thought
6 about for about 30 years.

7 There's a point of view that says all we
8 care about is outcomes. If you give people the green
9 card, look at them 20 years later, look at their -- look
10 at their kids 20 years later and compare them to the ones
11 who didn't get the green card and see what happened.

12 There's another point of view that says,
13 the process is really important. The trajectory of how
14 these changes occurred. And some -- some will occur
15 really fast and -- and others very slow. They're going
16 to have different growth curves with different concavity,
17 et cetera.

18 And so one needs to think a lot about the
19 particular substantive area before deciding what's the
20 optimal periodicity for that set of questions.

21 MR. BIEMER: But, you know, I think what
22 we found though is there's a balance if you -- let's
23 suppose that you're worried about the burden on the
24 respondent and --

25 MS. JASSO: We're always worried about

1 that.

2 MR. BIEMER: -- and interviewing them too
3 often. But if you go, say, on a yearly basis, you do
4 have the opportunity to collect retrospective data. And,
5 you know, to the extent that the events can be recalled
6 with some accuracy, you know, you can actually place
7 events that way with some new techniques that are
8 available in surveys. So you can think of in terms of --
9 you know you might -- you might not have to, you know,
10 set the periodicity of the survey to catch these events.
11 You might be able to do it with recall.

12 The other -- the other thing I wanted to
13 mention is this idea of what's called matrix sampling or
14 have different subsamples where the two -- where two
15 subsamples would be fielded simultaneously, but they
16 would have different -- maybe different field periods.
17 There would be -- they would be offset in terms of when
18 you would actually visit these households in order to be
19 able to, you know, flatten the -- flatten out the
20 interviewer workload. But they could have a common core
21 but maybe different questions in a module, you know, so
22 you could actually have like two series going on. Now,
23 that would cut down on the sample size for those topical
24 modules, but you would have, you know, the full sample
25 size for the core. So things that you needed, you know,

1 high precision on could be in the core and then other
2 things that could maybe -- precision could accumulate
3 over time could be in these modules. You can -- it's
4 very sophisticated in those designs.

5 MR. SCIOLI: These are issues, I think,
6 that are going to be extremely important as Jim develops
7 this further with whatever group he establishes and
8 perhaps some or many of you will be involved in -- in
9 that level of detail of design, et cetera.

10 But it segues nicely into a topic that
11 I'm interested in which I've had almost no experience,
12 save for long ago when I was involved with research
13 applied to national needs and we had users involved in
14 all of our advisory panels. We had firefighters, we
15 policemen, we had trash collectors, we had health service
16 deliverers mixed with academicians and that was extremely
17 interesting and important part of -- the academicians won
18 out at the National Science Foundation, as you probably
19 know. We decided that it was -- it was important to have
20 the science first.

21 Now, in terms of best practices, have any
22 of you had experience with involving community in terms
23 of the antecedent discussions for the sophisticated kinds
24 of topics that we're talking about right now? And is it
25 best to establish exclusively community groups, have some

1 scientists involved or have -- have just -- or make it
2 equally balanced? Has anybody had experience with this?

3 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I thought --

4 MR. SCIOLI: The users, if you will.

5 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I've had some in
6 The Making Connections Project that I mentioned
7 yesterday, which is the Annie E. Casey Foundation
8 project. We do have -- the evaluation is carried out on
9 behalf of the foundation, but the operating group in each
10 neighborhood is the local learning partnership, which is
11 a consortium of local community leaders and local
12 community residents.

13 And there's been a -- what I think
14 Hollywood calls "creative tension" between the parties in
15 developing what goes on. The foundation largely
16 determines the questions that have to be asked. So this
17 is -- because they determine that these will be
18 evaluation questions, but the community also has input in
19 terms of the questionnaire. And the community also wants
20 to have input in terms of hiring interviewers, for
21 example.

22 In the first wave, we more or less
23 neglected to do this and ran into a lot of trouble in
24 some communities where they felt that -- you know, the
25 foundation, the whole process was failing the residents

1 and that they weren't being given an opportunity to be
2 interviewers in the survey. So, though, in the first
3 four communities I think we failed to do this and then we
4 took it on board for the next six community, and it was
5 another lesson in how everybody thinks something is going
6 to happen that isn't going to happen.

7 So we launched a local recruitment and
8 asked all of the local community leaders to propose
9 people who -- who could become interviewers. One of the
10 things, I think, people don't realize is how little we
11 pay interviewers. I think that -- I think people think
12 interviewers get paid a lot, and interviewers get paid
13 very little. Sadly, that's the fact of the matter so
14 there wasn't nearly as much demand for it as -- as had
15 been anticipated and very few people, in fact, were
16 generated. And -- and as is my experience in many of
17 these cases, the people who complain most loudly and
18 wanted most vociferously to be engaged were the people
19 who produces fewest candidates for recruitment, but
20 that's politics. And that's the way life is often.

21 But it was still very important to do it,
22 so it's not -- and we also had a -- we had an opportunity
23 for communities to propose additional questions to the
24 core questionnaire that could be included only for their
25 community. Technically, they had to pay for these, but

1 they were going -- essentially they were going to get the
2 money from the foundation. But they were able to come up
3 with additional questions that they felt were relevant,
4 and we have incorporated questions from different
5 communities into the questionnaire as additions to the
6 core questionnaire.

7 MR. BIEMER: Was there a spokesperson for
8 the community? Was there like a community leader?

9 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Well, there was
10 already this entity, the local learning partnership,
11 which was a consortium of community organizations that
12 were already actively involved in the kinds of activities
13 the foundation supported. So there were literacy groups
14 or community groups, community action groups,
15 neighborhood watch groups, beautification groups, all the
16 kinds of people who -- who tended to work with the
17 community had representation on the -- on the local
18 learning partnership.

19 And it certainly meant that in terms of
20 accept -- these are quite small neighborhoods we were
21 going into with quite a lot of interviewers. So their
22 having local acceptability was important in terms of
23 doing the survey. It's not like, you know, you're doing
24 40 interviews in Chicago. You know, you don't need --
25 Chicago doesn't know this, but you're doing 800

1 interviews in Denver in a particular neighborhood in
2 Denver and then it really is noticeable. In one
3 locality, we were going to every other household. So
4 there you do -- you're fairly visible to the community.

5 So that -- that, I think -- I mean, it's
6 a lot of work, you know, for everybody, not just the
7 survey people but the community people as well. And it
8 doesn't generate, I guess, input in proportion to the
9 amount of work. But I still think in terms of
10 acceptability -- and sometimes I must say in terms of
11 input, it generates things that you wouldn't have thought
12 of, you know.

13 So there are a couple of cases where the
14 questions that were proposed by one community were
15 adopted by others, that were then offered to all the
16 other neighborhoods as possible add-on questions. And in
17 some questions, they generated topics that more people
18 were interested in that weren't generated by the
19 foundation or by the NORC group.

20 MS. JASSO: And you -- go ahead.

21 MR. MURRAY: There are a couple entities
22 here that are -- would be very important, I think to get
23 on board. One is the -- we call The Center for Houston's
24 Future. It's a spinoff of The Greater Houston
25 Partnership, the -- the sort of the leading corporate

1 entity. But they will be very interested in this project
2 if it goes forward. I mean, that's -- it's a 20-year
3 initial time frame. That's about what they're thinking
4 about is, you know, their task with how do you grow from
5 5 1/2 million people to 8 million in 20 years with half
6 of those people coming in from the United States and
7 other issues like the major human capital challenges we
8 have here with a higher birth rate than most parts of the
9 country, but a lot of young people seem to be lagging in
10 getting the formal educational credentials and skills.
11 But I think their support would be very, very important.
12 The good news is they've been around for a while.
13 They've got a -- they're an organized structure.

14 There's one called Leadership Houston
15 that's been around for around 20 years. And they -- they
16 would be very important, I think, to -- to, first, let
17 them know what we're thinking about and seek their input.

18 Then we -- of course, we've got multiple
19 subsections. We have a very large African-American
20 population here that's relatively cohesive politically
21 and closely tied to Texas Southern University and, you
22 know, getting -- getting their -- some of the key leaders
23 there involved early. The Hispanic community is even
24 larger, but -- but more fragmented, more dispersed, less
25 politically sophisticated, but becoming a really vital

1 force in our community.

2 So it is a lot of work in this -- but we
3 do have some structural connections that are existing
4 that we can plug into that'll -- that will be of some
5 benefit, I think, if we can convince them that this is a
6 good thing.

7 MS. LEE: That's really true. You have
8 to pick your partners strategically. And I think broader
9 participation is even vital.

10 It seems that in a lot of these kinds
11 of -- you know, research studies, we the scientists come.
12 We do the research, and we go away.

13 So the advantage of the partnership then
14 is both in terms of advancing improvement -- and I know
15 someone over on that side of the table brought up, when
16 you do that, then you get sort of this bias sample, but
17 you're going to get a sample of volunteers anyway. So,
18 to the extent that you can make it known that this is
19 coming and it's an important thing with your partners,
20 that's -- that's really important.

21 Informing, as both of you have discussed,
22 what are the issues of the community, what are the issues
23 of the partners and then translation of your findings to
24 the community, not just to the policymakers, but also to
25 community because the community is the constituency for

1 the policymakers. That's really an important thing.

2 MR. FRANCIS: What do you guys think
3 about the inclusion of groups representing say public
4 education, you know K-12 education, the Texas Medical
5 Center, energy sector, or would you just focus on greater
6 Houston partnership and the subsets?

7 MS. LEE: Well, I think it's really
8 important to get all of those people at the table. And I
9 think you will get some representation of those groups
10 that you mention that -- but I think specific targeting
11 is also important. And you will know you have reached
12 everybody when you start realizing that you're seeing the
13 same people -- same people's names coming up, you know,
14 when you have your snowball strategy like that.

15 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I have some
16 concern about representation on these things, partly
17 because you don't want to set up a situation where people
18 feel they're delegates and their responsibility is to get
19 their topic on the questionnaire. You know, this is
20 really not what you want. And some kinds of
21 organizational structure like this lead to somebody
22 arriving from public education saying, you know, "your
23 job is to get public education on the agenda" or else
24 "your job to make public education doesn't go on the
25 agenda."

1 So these -- these are not -- so that's
2 not -- so it's very important to distinguish between a
3 political representative structure -- and I'd make these
4 a board of some kind, you know. Give them a fancy
5 title --

6 MS. LEE: Well, how many people --

7 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: -- and have them
8 meet and give them dinner.

9 MS. LEE: -- ground work, you know, sort
10 of the formative work to determine what kind of issues we
11 want to focus on in the survey, you know, and once
12 those -- and perhaps all those partners can be a part of
13 that formative piece that comes before, before you
14 actually design the survey and decide it's going to --
15 you know, the specific questions that are going to be on
16 it.

17 MS. CALLAGHAN: I -- I would just
18 caution. I think there's a disadvantage. It depends on
19 how much inclusion we want to have because as Colm
20 mentioned, the political side, I think that we want to
21 draw the line at the topic and the groups are not
22 involved in question wording because there you'll see
23 some anger over --

24 MR. BIEMER: No, don't do that.

25 MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Right. And so

5 MR. BIEMER: The bottom line is just --
6 is to create something that's salable, right, so people
7 will support it and, you know, that should be the goal.
8 You -- you want to -- you want to get monetary support.
9 You want to get people who have the money. I guess,
10 they -- they need to be involved in improving...

11 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: The thing about
12 it, I think you want people to be involved in improving
13 the general vision, but not any of the operations, so...

14 MR. BIEMER: No. That's right.

15 MR. O'MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Because there,
16 again, I've -- we've have all been to many meetings,
17 inappropriate groups, you know, groups that aren't
18 really -- dysfunctional groups because they're trying to
19 do something they're not supposed to be doing. And I
20 think that's -- so perhaps Rebecca's point of getting
21 involved first as putting them on some high-level group
22 where, like a board, they don't get to see any detail.
23 They just get to the decide, you know, is this a
24 direction in which you're going, but certainly not as
25 "how many questions are there going to be" or "what are

1 they sort of questions," that's not their business.

2 MS. LEE: There's certainly levels of
3 involvement in this kind of community participatory sort
4 of strategy. But I think it is very common -- I think
5 you mentioned this earlier, also, that you know, you have
6 the agenda. We have the agenda. We are setting the
7 agenda. You know, we are trying to get information.

8 Whether the agenda will play, whether
9 this agenda's even a possibility in the current context
10 and whether, you know, we're on target and then support,
11 you know, adoptability and that kind of stuff. So, you
12 know, I think there's ways that are acceptable to all
13 groups. But I think it is really important to have
14 community involved at the beginning, if for no other
15 reason than just to kind of keep them informed this is
16 coming down the pike eventually.

17 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. The -- it's -- I
18 mean, you want to be sure that what you end up doing is
19 relevant to the people who -- who are going to be users
20 and supporters and so forth.

21 Just to draw out a distinction that's
22 been sort of been made, but not made precisely; and
23 that's the different levels at which you -- the word
24 "question" is used. The -- the -- there's the -- the
25 general question that -- that -- that people are trying

1 to answer and then there's the specific -- as I say, the
2 question that you ask real people. And that's
3 different -- that's the embodiment maybe of the
4 measurement of the some of the big kind of questions.

5 And you want to be sure when you're
6 talking -- well, there are different techniques for
7 involving people at both levels. But at the top level,
8 when you're trying to figure out what the big questions
9 are that people really want to have answered, doing
10 that -- I mean, I -- I quite agree that it's very
11 important that people do not see -- are not recruited or
12 see themselves as delegates from some political position
13 or -- or some group or something like that. You want to
14 draw on their -- you know, in some sense, expertise, but
15 not -- you don't want them there as a representative.
16 You want them there as a person.

17 But I've been in those kind of meetings
18 of various sorts and run some and so forth, and it's very
19 hard -- you have got to be very careful how you do it
20 because the major thing that I find is that at top levels
21 people -- and particularly people who are in Houston
22 running companies and things and so forth, they don't
23 distinguish very closely between what they want to know
24 and how they want to know it. And so they -- they --
25 they lap over from what you are trying to get out of

1 them, which is what's the big question that really
2 concerns them, by -- by telling you how to do it.

3 And it's -- it's a very difficult -- I
4 mean, touchy sort of thing to run meetings like that in
5 which you can sort of separate out the -- what -- what it
6 is that they're -- they're really concerned about and --
7 and get out their conception of how you -- or what the
8 answer is. I think it's both how you do it and what the
9 answer is. And, you know, you can get irritated at
10 various times because it looks like they're, in one
11 level, saying, "We don't need research because we know
12 what the answer is," but at the same time they -- other
13 things, they really want to know what the answer is and
14 so on and so forth. And so it's -- that irritates me.

15 So at the level of how to ask the
16 question of real people there, you know, we -- we use a
17 number of techniques. But one that, again, is a bit
18 different than the way many people use focus groups, but
19 I -- I like to work with people that are like the people
20 we're going to be -- respondents, real respondents
21 because you -- and to see what -- how they frame -- what
22 language they use to talk about a particular problem.

23 Let me give you an example. We were
24 developing -- we developed the methodology for the U.S.
25 News and World Report ratings of hospitals. And when we

1 been doing was asking people what -- what they wanted to
2 know. You know, sort of say, okay, you know, you're
3 sponsor you're involved in the environment of your town
4 and so on and so forth, what do you want to know about?
5 What questions do you have that you would like to have
6 answered? You know, not -- not what the answer is or --
7 and sort of putting it in that framework and then trying
8 to think about how you operationalize things that might
9 answer those big-level questions. But it's -- it's not
10 as timely and difficult.

11 MS. JASSO: To build on a couple of
12 points that Norm raised, for some of the questionnaire
13 items on some topics, there will already be a large
14 volume of work using focus groups, et cetera, how best to
15 ask this. And so for comparability, it might be useful
16 to -- to have the exact modules and -- and keep track --
17 always keep track what module came from where because
18 then when questions are raised of you and, "Where did you
19 get these questionnaire items," et cetera, you can say,
20 "Well these have a long history," et cetera.

21 A problem that may arise will be when you
22 go to other languages where there may not be a similar
23 body of work. And -- and if it comes to that, then talk
24 to the people at the Census Bureau who -- who translate
25 to other languages, talk to us because we have 10

1 languages for a lot of these modules on health,
2 retirement, assets, earnings, et cetera.

3 And finally, one last point -- and I --
4 today is probably not the day to discuss it, but since
5 Colm brought it up, I am deeply uneasy with using
6 interviewers from within a community to interview people
7 there. And there's lots and lots of reasons and things,
8 et cetera. It's probably a topic for another day, but I
9 don't think it should be done lightly.

10 MR. SCIOLI: Let me, at the risk of
11 putting David on the spot -- and I'm sorry Stephen is not
12 here this morning, but Richard may also have had
13 experience. Is it fairly easy to meet -- I mean, I would
14 imagine that Stephen has generated a lot of goodwill in
15 the community.

16 MR. MURRAY: Absolutely.

17 MR. SCIOLI: And he's interacted with
18 folks and he said 95 presentations a year. So he's out
19 doing what Rebecca said, translating the social science
20 into lay persons and saying, "This is what we do at this
21 tower, the weirdoes that we are" -- strike that -- "and
22 here's what it means to you. Here are the broader
23 impacts." So have you --

24 MR. FRANCIS: Well, yeah. We're very
25 involved in K-12 education in the state and certainly

1 local here in the city and down in Brownsville. So
2 we're -- the work that I've been doing is largely either
3 in educational or in health. So we're connected with
4 folks in the Medical Center, but mostly in K-12
5 education.

6 MR. SCIOLI: And, Richard, have you
7 gotten on speak out in communities?

8 MR. FRANCIS: He's a household name in
9 this city.

10 MR. SCIOLI: Oh, okay. Well, you guys
11 then have to be allied with this newbie. And, you know,
12 you don't want to bring the new gun into town and all of
13 a sudden going to be telling the people what's important.
14 I mean, Norman's point about it, be very very delicate,
15 the balance, so that you don't come off -- I mean, you
16 come off as wanting to enlist their support, listen to
17 them, certainly not be patronizing, but at the same time
18 not having them change the agenda.

19 MS. LEE: It's delicate, but it can be
20 done.

21 MR. SCIOLI: Well, there are people on
22 campus. Good. That's -- that's --

23 MR. FRANCIS: Well, the president -- the
24 chancellor of the university sits on the executive board
25 of The Greater Houston Partnership. I don't know if the

1 Rice president also sits on there or not. But I know
2 that U of H does. I believe TSU is on that board as
3 well. So the universities are connected to this business
4 partnership within the city.

5 MR. SCIOLI: So Jim is going to need the
6 allies in that room. And I -- probably premature to have
7 the -- the other gun, so to speak, with the
8 sophistication.

9 If I might, Jim, can we have a 10-minute
10 break.

11 MR. GRANATO: Absolutely.

12 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Just -- just one
13 small topic I just wanted to cover probably before we
14 finished in case we lose sight of it. Translation is
15 a -- is a really important issue for the questionnaires.
16 And the -- the conventional wisdom on translation was
17 that, you know, translation and back translation pretty
18 much took care of things. This is no longer the accepted
19 view.

20 MR. SCIOLI: What's the issue? I'm
21 sorry. I'm trying...

22 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Translation of
23 questionnaires.

24 MR. SCIOLI: Oh, different language. I'm
25 sorry. Okay.

1 of guidelines on translation. They have an accepted
2 standards for translation, which are really quite strict.
3 And the reason the Census Bureau did this was that it's
4 such an appalling record on translation until they did
5 it, you know. So the fact they've done it is partly a
6 condemnation of their previous practices where they found
7 with important questionnaires -- I think the original
8 Spanish version of the ACS questionnaire had unforgivable
9 errors of syntax in -- in the published form. I mean,
10 even though the translation was done in good faith.

11 And my guess is -- so one of the things,
12 for example, is that in many cases asking questions about
13 public services, you can't translate the term. It may
14 well be that in the Spanish-speaking community, they use
15 the English language for the whatever office of -- in the
16 city is where the translator will find a formal language
17 translation of the employment office is and put it in;
18 but that's not what anybody calls it.

19 So trans -- and especially if you're
20 going to sell this as a -- you know, a multicultural,
21 cross-cultural instrument, that has to be built in right
22 from the beginning. And there should never be a meeting
23 about the questionnaire, certainly at the point of
24 developing the questions, that doesn't have people who
25 are going to be writing it in the languages that you're

1 going to use. And I would make that both a selling point
2 and also a resourcing point. I mean, that means you have
3 to have people on board who can do this.

4 And it's -- clearly, Spanish is going to
5 be a critical language, so you have to have Spanish and I
6 don't know what else you have to have, but it may be that
7 you have to have other things as well.

8 And, actually, I should have referred to
9 Andre. Canada has, I assume, struggled with this issue
10 and overcome it?

11 MR. BLAIS: The -- the Canadian National
12 study, we build two questionnaires simultaneously, at the
13 very same time. And you have to be quite experienced
14 because in a ways, you know, someone is talking English,
15 but they try to move to French into English. You know,
16 we amend the initial English question because of the
17 problems we have translating it. And sometimes I've been
18 accused of vetoing some questions because, you know, I
19 couldn't find the French equivalent.

20 But it's really enriching at the same
21 time, so it has to be the research community on your
22 board, people who create the questions, have to try to
23 build the two questionnaires at the very same time. And
24 there is a -- sometimes you might decide that some
25 questions cannot be asked the same way, and then you sort

1 of agree that there will be some differences. You have
2 to live with them and to check the -- the result at the
3 end. But I think it's extremely important in your case
4 that you build, at least, two -- two questionnaires at
5 the same time.

6 MR. FRANCIS: Are there some guidelines
7 about the specific numbers of representatives of each
8 language?

9 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: No. Well, I
10 think that the Census Bureau report -- it's the statistic
11 research division which produced this report, which is
12 available on-line. If you can't get it, ask me. I find
13 it -- I don't know how to do it either, but I know the
14 people who did it so we can get it easily.

15 And Janet Harkness, who is at -- in
16 Nebraska now was at ZUMA, was involved in this whole
17 translation business.

18 And there's quite an interesting
19 conference that's going to be held in Berlin in June --
20 you might want to go -- on multicultural multi --
21 multi-country multi-cultural surveys in which this is one
22 of the topics on the -- on the agenda and will be --
23 that's one there will be a monograph eventually with the
24 main kind of the featured papers of this conference that
25 will be published. So Janet Harkness at University of

1 Nebraska survey department, survey program are...

2 MR. GRANATO: She works with Alan
3 Kutchin?

4 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: Yes.

5 MR. GRANATO: Okay. I know him.

6 MR. MURRAY: We'll have to make a
7 decision as this goes forward. Of course, Spanish is
8 essential here. But the third one is Vietnamese and to
9 have the Vietnamese component. 90 percent of our
10 metropolitan area should be able to communicate fully in
11 Spanish or English.

12 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: I do think
13 André's point is really important. I know this idea
14 that -- the vetoing something because you can't have a
15 question in French. So if you're multicultural in your
16 view, you say that's disgraceful. If you're
17 multicultural in your view, it wouldn't be wise to pose a
18 question that couldn't be asked in both languages. Even
19 though, the notion that this vetoing process betrays a
20 monocultural approach.

21 I'm very sensitive to this. My native
22 language is not English and, therefore, I have always
23 been aware of the difficulties of translation and the
24 difficulty of expressing the same thought in two
25 languages, which is why I frequently struggle with

1 English.

2 MR. SCIOLI: What do you mean?

3 MS. JASSO: To add to that very briefly.

4 The New Immigrant Survey went over this, and we designed
5 by the New York staff committee approach. And, in fact,
6 as Norm said, put on the committee were the people who
7 were going to be like the respondents, et cetera,
8 et cetera. And we developed a glossary, a list of words
9 and phrases that will always be said in English. And all
10 that is in a paper on the web that you can get. And of
11 course, if you want further detail, any of us on the
12 survey would be delighted to give you the further detail.

13 MR. GRANATO: Thank you.

14 MS. JASSO: Janet Harkness is superb,
15 and -- and I talk to her a lot. I also talk to Ilysue
16 Schulebare [sp], yeah -

17 MR. O'MUIRACHEARTAIGH: USC.

18 MS. JASSO: -- who is absolutely tops.

19 MS. SIEBER: Since this is a panel study
20 and you're going to be going back to the same people
21 again and again, it seems to me that version of the
22 principles has to be built into what you disseminate to
23 the different language groups because you can really make
24 a nice report into a nightmare by making -- doing the
25 wrong nuance. It's not quite as critical as in the

1 survey design, but still very important.

2 MR. SCIOLI: Okay. I was serious about
3 the break. And I've never -- I've never had a meeting in
4 my other life where people have resisted going onto a
5 break. This is a tribute to this group.

6 (Recess, 10:50 to 11:08.)

7 MR. SCIOLI: Okay. Let's resume. Chris
8 will be here in a second. This is the denouement, and
9 we've already lost one of our participants, but --

10 MR. GRANATO: I must -- I like --

11 MR. SCIOLI: Jim, should -- actually, I
12 thought he told us we had the accent.

13 MS. JASSO: We are the unassimilated.

14 MR. SCIOLI: Exactly.

15 Jim, why don't you do with us what you
16 wish before we leave and you're free to take full
17 advantage of us. We'll just lay back, as it will.

18 MR. GRANATO: I'd like to ask Joan to
19 make a few comments about IRBs and human subject pool
20 because since this is going to be a panel study of some
21 sort, that's going to be a big issue. So Joan.

22 MS. SIEBER: Okay. I want to -- I want
23 to talk about three sorts of interrelated things.

24 One is IRBs and regulations and the
25 disconnect between them. The second is perceived risk

1 and benefit. You know, you're not talking about
2 operating on someone's liver. You're talking about
3 asking them questions, which you may not think are risky,
4 but perceptions differ and the same for benefit. And
5 then the final is creating a relationship and/or versus
6 informed consent.

7 I think that probably what we've all had
8 experience at recognizing that IRBs are very inconsistent
9 from one to another based upon their level of expertise
10 with the kind of project that you're presenting and this
11 has really to do with whether they're doing a worst-case
12 analysis because they don't understand the situation very
13 well or whether they understand it well and can really
14 help you to do very good science.

15 The regulations are actually quite
16 reasonable and flexible, and so the problem as with any
17 regulation is in interpretation. And I think it's --
18 it's important to -- well, I don't know what the IRB
19 structure is here. How many IRBs does the University of
20 Houston have?

21 MR. FRANCIS: We have two. We have a
22 social science IRB and then a basic sciences IRB.

23 MS. SIEBER: Okay. So the social science
24 IRB would be the obvious one.

25 MR. FRANCIS: Sure. Uh-huh.

1 MS. SIEBER: And I think it's really
2 vital, as you get geared up, that -- that the project
3 makes sure you have at least one person on the IRB who
4 has expertise in cattle research, but who is not part of
5 this project. So there would be no conflict of interest,
6 but someone who could -- could educate -- educate the
7 panel.

8 I think that beyond that, you're probably
9 going to ask some sensitive questions about health, about
10 criminal activity. You may be doing some research about
11 children or even have some children that you survey. And
12 I think on all of these kinds of things, as you -- as you
13 develop the questions, you really need to, I would say --
14 I would recommend communicate with members of this panel
15 who have had that kind of experience, with Paul about
16 interviewing kids.

17 MR. BRADBURN: Could I just --

18 MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

19 MR. BRADBURN: One of the -- the problems
20 you certainly will face is that at some point or other
21 your respondents will be in jail when you're -- when
22 their time comes around.

23 MR. GRANATO: Hopefully no one on the
24 advisory board.

25 MR. BRADBURN: I hope not.

1 And -- and as you probably know that
2 there are special restrictions and so on and so forth
3 with regard to people in prison.

4 And actually there would be two problems.
5 One is what the IRB thinks about it, although they
6 shouldn't really be particularly concerned because this
7 is not prison research in the -- since they were in the
8 panel before they were in prison, it's not technically
9 prison research.

10 The other problem that we've encountered
11 in panels where our respondents are in jail. First of
12 all, they're extremely cooperative because they don't
13 have anything else to do and they love to be interviewed
14 because it takes their mind off the other things they're
15 doing.

16 Some prisons won't let you bring
17 computers in -- into the prison or to do things. So you
18 may -- I mean, there's some -- some problems that come
19 with that. But it's -- the IRBs sometimes end up giving
20 unnecessary trouble, I mean, from my point of view, I say
21 trouble, but that's where you're probably hit problem.

22 MS. SIEBER: So that really would be
23 another problem to anticipate, I suppose, as...

24 MR. BIEMER: May I just comment. You
25 know, RTI is doing a prison rape study. And the person

1 to talk to, if you'd like some information on that, would
2 be Rachel Casper who is leading that project there. I'd
3 be happy to put you in touch with her about some of the
4 issues that she's run into in that study. There -- you
5 know, this is for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and
6 they're interviewing prisoners in -- I don't know --
7 hundreds of prisons across the United States, using --
8 well, using computer technology, in fact.

9 MS. SIEBER: You know, what --

10 MR. BRADBURN: We just recently started
11 having trouble getting that.

12 MR. BIEMER: Oh, really?

13 MS. SIEBER: You know, I think one of the
14 advantages that you have in that you're going to have a
15 considerable startup period developing your questions is
16 that that's also a time to be creating a relationship
17 with the IRB and letting them know what you're going to
18 do and bringing in consultants who can say, "Well, here
19 is how this has been handled at another institution."
20 Give them a chance to digest all of that instead of
21 thrusting it upon them at the last minute when they're --
22 when they don't have a chance to make a judgment.

23 I'd be interested to hear Paul's and
24 Norman's and Willie's experience of how really you start
25 talking to your IRB and how -- how you work that process

1 of educating them and having them educate you.

2 MR. BRADBURN: Well, I mean, I think for
3 Paul and me, it's different because we -- our
4 organizations have their own IRBs. And since surveys are
5 what we do, the -- the IRB is -- is very, you know,
6 understanding of all the ins and outs and so forth.

7 MS. SIEBER: Sure.

8 MR. BRADBURN: The difficulty sometimes,
9 although this is -- I don't know how RTI does it. But
10 one -- the IRBs have to have a community member. You've
11 got to be sure that you -- the community member is
12 somebody who doesn't just react and say, "Oh, I -- I hate
13 surveys and so on" and use their own experience as a
14 respondent in a market research or a poll or something
15 and to -- to decide what's intrusive or what's -- those
16 kinds of things.

17 MS. SIEBER: Get some very odd-ball
18 responses. I think one -- one of the difficulties that
19 IRBs have is finding good community members who are
20 willing to give their time to be on the IRB. And you
21 might even be able to help them by finding people who
22 will volunteer.

23 MR. BRADBURN: Actually, Houston doesn't
24 have a medical school does it, does it?

25 MR. FRANCIS: University of Houston does

1 not. Houston, the city has two.

2 MR. BRADBURN: In my experience is the
3 universities that do not have medical schools have less
4 IRB problems in the social sciences than universities
5 that have medical schools.

6 MR. BIEMER: What we've run into problems
7 with IRBs on, you know, we're interviewing children or
8 the caregivers as well as the children who have been
9 investigated for child abuse and neglect. You know, you
10 can imagine the sensitivity of this information, child
11 custody battles and all that kind of thing. It's the
12 release of data, and you know the IR -- where the IR --
13 where we really ran into difficulty was, you know, what
14 data are you going to be releasing -- well, that and
15 informed consent.

16 Of course, you know, telling respondents
17 exactly what we're going to be doing in a survey and
18 letting them decide whether they're going to proceed with
19 it and what's going to happen with the data after they
20 give it to us and then what are we going to do with the
21 data once we get it in terms of releasing it to the
22 public or what kinds of restricted release options would
23 there be for researchers.

24 And -- and so we actually -- it took a
25 long time, I would say a year roughly, to get through all

1 of those issues because it was -- you know, the IRBs,
2 they don't work very quickly. They kind of have a lot of
3 other things to do in addition to what they're doing on
4 that board, and -- and there's really no advantage to you
5 to try to rush into a decision. Some of these things
6 take a lot of time to think about.

7 MS. JASSO: Uh -- oh, sorry.

8 MS. SIEBER: No. Go ahead. Because I
9 wanted to hear what you experienced.

10 MS. JASSO: Okay. In -- in our case,
11 four points. The first one is exactly as Joan said, the
12 sooner you let them know that something is coming, the
13 better. So I think what each of us PIs did was e-mail
14 our respective contact person in the human subjects
15 committee staff and just say, "We're in the process of
16 developing this proposal. You can expect it. You know,
17 we have to submit it to NIH at such as such a date and it
18 will be coming to you."

19 The second thing is that in our case,
20 which probably, but maybe you'll see, won't be the --
21 the -- the case here. There were five IRBs involved
22 because there were four PIs, each in a different
23 institution, plus NORC which was doing the field work.
24 And what had happened over the years is that the IRBs
25 have educated each other. So, for example, a question

1 will come up from some member of one IRB and -- and --
2 and then I'll get an e-mail that says, Well, has this
3 come up with the other IRBs? What do they have to say?"
4 And it has now come -- it has formalized such that
5 whenever any one of us comes up in the cycle for renewal,
6 we are requested to submit the current approvals for all
7 the other -- from all the other IRBs, and so they're
8 constantly educating each other.

9 The third thing is the only problem we
10 encountered -- and it was one that -- that makes us cry
11 to this day. I don't know if Norm -- Norm, if you ever
12 heard about this. People who have their green cards as
13 the spouses of U.S. citizens are sometimes under age 18.
14 And we wanted to interview every -- you know, sample from
15 among everyone who got a green card who had attained the
16 age of majority, which we defined as 18 or married. And
17 certainly we wanted the ones married to -- to a U.S.
18 citizen.

19 And it turned out that we couldn't do it
20 because in some of the states where we would be
21 interviewing, the age of majority is not defined
22 according to marriage. It's defined only according to
23 age, and so then we ended up having to drop from the
24 sampling frame all these spouses of U.S. citizens who
25 were under 18. And -- and -- and that was something

1 that -- that we all regret, and -- but -- but there was
2 no other way.

3 MR. BRADBURN: Couldn't you invoke the
4 permission of the spouse as the -- as the...

5 MS. JASSO: No. In fact --

6 MR. BRADBURN: But you could interview
7 kids with somebody's permission?

8 MS. JASSO: Yes. That's right. We --
9 we -- that's right.

10 MR. BRADBURN: I wouldn't think you'd
11 have to throw them out. You'd find some imaginative way
12 to get permission.

13 MS. JASSO: It was complicated and, in
14 fact, it was -- it was NORC which finally said to us --

15 MR. BRADBURN: Too much.

16 MS. JASSO: -- we can't just -- and part
17 of it had to do with operational things like you --
18 you -- you can't spawn the spouse -- "spawn" being the
19 field word organization term -- until you get the
20 respondent. But you can't get the respondent because
21 they're not 18.

22 MR. BRADBURN: It's a catch 22.

23 MS. JASSO: Yeah.

24 And then finally the fourth thing, the
25 IRBs are extremely useful when it comes time for the data

1 reviews, as -- as Paul was saying. And -- and here
2 everybody closes ranks and everybody has the same
3 objective, which is to protect the confidentiality of the
4 respondents.

5 MS. SIEBER: There is -- there is one
6 thing that is often violated by IRBs where you can really
7 help them. IRBs are required by Federal law to have on
8 their board the competency to review whatever comes to
9 them or to bring in a consultant. And I think that one
10 can very gingerly and politely suggest that this is a
11 specialized area where risk and benefit differ from other
12 kinds of social research; and that -- that you would pay
13 the freight for the consultant and suggest some
14 consultants that wouldn't have a conflict of interest.

15 I was wondering, have any of you ever
16 done that?

17 MS. LEE: I didn't know you were allowed
18 to do that, and that is an excellent idea.

19 MS. SIEBER: Well, they're violating
20 Federal law when they don't have the competence to
21 review.

22 MS. LEE: I'm sure they don't know that.

23 MS. SIEBER: No, they don't.

24 MR. BIEMER: Like you say, it's very
25 delicate.

1 MS. SIEBER: It is very delicate.

2 MS. JASSO: My impression is that -- is
3 that many of the IRBs actually do have -- because the
4 universities are so large, do have -- can draw in members
5 who have experience or expertise in practically
6 everything.

7 MS. SIEBER: And they can certainly draw
8 in faculty who are not regular IRBs members --

9 MS. JASSO: That's right.

10 MS. SIEBER: -- and wouldn't want to be.

11 MS. JASSO: That's right.

12 MS. SIEBER: You know, one of the reasons
13 that many people with special competency don't want to be
14 on the IRB is because the work load so huge and the
15 reward so little. It would be suicide to a young faculty
16 member to serve, but they would probably be very happy to
17 be a consultant to the IRB on a given project.

18 MR. BIEMER: You know, my experience at
19 UNC with IRBs, which is limited, but is very different
20 from my experience at RTI and it sort of follows on
21 Norman's point about having a medical center.

22 MS. SIEBER: Uh-huh.

23 MR. BIEMER: But there it was very
24 difficult to get across to one IRB that follow-up of
25 nonresponse is a normal part of survey practice. They

1 saw it --

2 MS. SIEBER: As coercion.

3 MR. BIEMER: -- as coercion, as harassing
4 people and so forth. You know, for example, you send
5 them a -- you send a questionnaire. And if you don't get
6 it back undeliverable, that means -- and if you don't get
7 it back at all, that means that they don't want to do it.
8 You don't send another questionnaire, you know --

9 MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

10 MR. BIEMER: -- which just flies in the
11 face of what we know about the survey practices. So
12 that's one of the things that can happen if you don't
13 have an educated IRB.

14 MR. FRANCIS: We have someone in our
15 department in IO psychology who actually does research on
16 survey nonresponse and has -- we've been involved in
17 educating our IRB to those issues. And so her polls are
18 now going through without any -- any problems, but that
19 was an issue when we first got started.

20 MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

21 MR. ACHEN: Maybe I can pick the IRB on
22 the journal whose reviews I'm late for.

23 MS. JASSO: That's great.

24 MS. SIEBER: I wanted to -- to revisit
25 the issue of unchecking the box, the little box on the

1 IRBs assurance that says that anything that they review,
2 whether federally funded or not, will be treated as
3 though it's Federally funded in terms of adherence. And
4 initially, IRBs thought they would really curry favor
5 with the Feds by checking the box.

6 Now they realize this is the kiss of
7 death because they can be caught doing things with
8 unfunded research and not treating it as though they were
9 funded if they checked the box. So there's a whole
10 movement now to uncheck the box, and I could get you some
11 workshops on that. It would be good to find out if your
12 IRB has unchecked the box, and I'll get you some
13 literature on reasons to do so.

14 MR. FRANCIS: I can assure you that, at
15 least as of six months ago, they had not.

16 MS. SIEBER: Well --

17 MS. LEE: I didn't even know there was a
18 box to uncheck.

19 MS. SIEBER: Well, I'll -- I'll send you
20 some of the workshop literature on that.

21 MR. FRANCIS: Okay.

22 MS. JASSO: Good.

23 MS. SIEBER: And -- you know, in the
24 event that you don't get federal funding, it would be
25 tremendously advantageous.

1 MS. CALLAGHAN: We had talked at one
2 point about having bioswabs to correlate with our
3 environmental study. And I think Willie had made
4 mentioned the use of legal advice in addition to the IRB
5 that you had sought so that we covered all the bases.

6 Is that something we should consider and
7 are we still considering that medical assessment as well?

8 MR. GRANATO: It's -- I would keep
9 everything open at this point, so... We haven't limited
10 ourselves in anything we're going to investigate.

11 MS. CALLAGHAN: Would that change the IRB
12 that you would go to since you have two? It would still
13 be a social science study?

14 MR. FRANCIS: Good question. I'm not
15 exactly sure if that would kick it over. It might have
16 to go -- there might be portions that go to both because
17 the medical -- the natural sciences IRB would not have
18 the capacity to review the survey side. So it may end up
19 with a little chunk going to each group. I'm not sure.

20 But there's certainly some psychologists
21 that serve on the IRB -- in the social sciences IRB that
22 have expertise in medical studies. So it may be that
23 they would feel competent to review it, but they may want
24 to kick it over.

25 MS. SIEBER: Well, one of the things I'm

1 quite curious about -- I talked to Colm a bit, but he
2 deferred to Norman on this. If you're going to ask quite
3 sensitive questions -- and I think some of your questions
4 will be in the areas of health and criminal behavior and
5 so forth -- you may need signed consent. And I'm
6 wondering, if you have an initial face-to-face recruiting
7 intake contact as Colm had suggested, if you can get an
8 omnibus consent form signature that would carry forth to
9 subsequent parts of the panel, because you -- you don't
10 want to have people signing -- having to sign something
11 and mail it back to you if you're going to phone them.
12 And I'd be very interested --

13 MR. BIEMER: I know, in our study, we
14 have signed consent. Of course it's face to face. And I
15 don't know -- I think in studies that we've done where
16 we're on the phone and, say, we need release of medical
17 records, we can have the interviewer sign on their
18 behalf.

19 MR. BRADBURN: Usually on things like
20 that, you can get the -- the interviewer attests that she
21 did, you know, ask them and they said yes or something.
22 That, for most IRBs is, as -- we, I think we're kind of
23 past that. I'm -- I mean, my view is that we should
24 avoid signed consent for surveys because it's so easy for
25 people to refuse. I mean, it's really --

1 MS. SIEBER: Yes.

2 MR. BRADBURN: -- gilding the lily a bit.

3 MR. BIEMER: It's kind of an IRB issue.

4 MR. BRADBURN: I know. I know. But I
5 keep -- we should all fight it.

6 The -- the -- the other problem that you
7 need visit is partially an IRB problem, but it's really a
8 more general problem; and that is making sure your --
9 your respond -- your interviewers are not liable if they
10 have information about illegal activity. And with
11 immigration, that's, you know, sensitive I'm sure here.

12 Now, there's -- well, if it's -- if it's
13 federally funded, you can get shield from a -- from and
14 IA. Even if it's not a public health service blanket
15 one, you can upon application get a shield that -- that
16 shields you from things like that. The child abuse is
17 the one area that -- that's -- that they've tended not to
18 give any.

19 MS. SIEBER: You don't have to be
20 federally funded to get a certificate of confidentiality.

21 MR. BRADBURN: Oh, really?

22 MS. SIEBER: No, you don't.

23 MR. BRADBURN: But it's -- it's
24 something -- now, you can look -- there, I think, it's
25 worth consulting the lawyer because laws in different

1 states are different on these sort of things. With
2 regard to child abuse, in some states only if you are
3 directly a service provider and -- like a social worker
4 or something like that and working on a case and you know
5 about child abuse is it reportable. If you are
6 incidentally learn about it as in an interview or you're
7 neighbors, you're not required to. But in some states,
8 you are. So you have to -- and it would be -- you know,
9 you have to find out like if you -- what applicable Texas
10 law or maybe U.S. law -- I don't know this one -- if you
11 know somebody who is an illegal immigrant, do you have to
12 report it? I mean, are you legally obligated to report
13 it or are you possibly liable to -- the interviewer
14 itself is liable? And, if so, if you're going to get
15 into -- that would, I think, be the one -- the obvious
16 one where you need to make sure that your -- your
17 interviewers are protected.

18 MR. BIEMER: Yeah. We have a mandatory
19 reporting in our child abuse where if we -- if we through
20 interviewing get evidence that the child is currently
21 being abused, that the abuse is current or there is some
22 suicidal tendencies on the part of the child, we have to
23 report that. And the IRB requires that. And of course,
24 we comply with that.

25 And also there are -- there are states

1 that, you know, we requested their participation and they
2 will not participate because they needed the consent of
3 the caregiver to release any information at all that
4 would allow us to then sample. So we couldn't even draw
5 a sample until they -- they would have to draw the
6 sample. They would have to go and get, you know, the
7 consent up front before they would even release the
8 information for us -- to us. We tried that and we got
9 like a 2 percent response rate. So we just had to
10 exclude those states. There were about maybe four or
11 five states.

12 MS. SIEBER: Well, if you're going to be
13 asking any questions where it's likely that you would get
14 evidence of child abuse, that's -- that's rough because
15 then you have to say in the informed consent --

16 MR. BIEMER: We did, yes.

17 MS. SIEBER: -- that you would be
18 mandated to report that.

19 MR. BIEMER: But, you know, it's
20 interesting, even after we say that and they sign it and
21 they understand that, we still get evidence that they're
22 being abused, so...

23 MS. SIEBER: Well, often -- often what
24 goes on in families --

25 MR. FRANCIS: And you report it?

1 MR. BIEMER: And we report it. We've had
2 reports.

3 MS. SIEBER: -- what goes on in families
4 is that they are -- they don't even perceive what they're
5 doing. I mean, there was a case at my own institution
6 where a faculty member and some interns were going around
7 to homes doing counseling and the -- the five-year-old
8 girl was wearing a tutu with no underpants and went and
9 sat on one of the men's laps in the living room, and he
10 was fondling her. Now, of course, the faculty member and
11 the student just about dropped their eyeballs. The
12 family didn't see anything strange about that.

13 So one can walk into some rather strange
14 situations. But, of course, they -- although they were
15 mandated reporters, that wasn't something that they got
16 consent -- and that was not included in the consent
17 because they had no notion they were going to see that.

18 Are there any more comments on the -- the
19 characteristics of IRBs and how to get on with them?

20 MR. FRANCIS: I have -- I have one
21 question and, that is, have you ever encountered or is
22 it -- in your experience, is it required that you
23 re consent the subjects at each wave of a longitudinal
24 study?

25 MS. JASSO: Yes. I think we do.

1 MR. FRANCIS: You re-consent?

2 MS. JASSO: I think so.

3 MS. LEE: So we do a lot of follow-up
4 contacting with the same people, and we try to always
5 make sure in our informed consent we state that we may be
6 calling you in the future. And does that cover that
7 adequately?

8 MS. SIEBER: I -- I think --

9 MS. LEE: Or do you really have to do
10 informed consent?

11 MS. SIEBER: -- I think that it does. I
12 think it varies with study. You know, if -- if you were
13 doing something that was terribly invasive, I think it
14 would be treated differently and I think that the consent
15 can be -- it doesn't have to be signed. I'd be very
16 interested to hear Norman's and Paul's experience.

17 MR. BIEMER: You mean about what we say
18 in terms of our repeat visits --

19 MS. SIEBER: Yes.

20 MR. BIEMER: -- in the future?

21 We disclose that we'll be back over --
22 you know, right now, for example, with this new cohort,
23 all we know is we're going to be doing two new waves -- I
24 mean, two waves on each one. So all we can say is that,
25 you know, we're going to be two interviews with your.

1 We'll do one now and we'll do another one in 18 months.

2 Now, what happened the last time is we
3 got funding for additional waves, and so we went back
4 and -- you know, they weren't expecting us because at the
5 second wave we didn't tell them we'd be back. So we --
6 but we did go back to the -- to this -- in the first
7 cohort when we had additional funding and did more
8 interviews. We were allowed to do that. But you have
9 to -- I think, in our case, we found it necessary to
10 state what they were agreeing to.

11 MR. BRADBURN: Right. No, I think you
12 have -- when you're enlisting in the panel, you have to
13 be up front that this is something you're going to do.
14 You're going to be back to them every year or whatever it
15 is, every other year or so on and so forth.

16 I would argue that once you've done that
17 and they've consented to that, you don't need to, quote,
18 consent them every time you do it. So, you know, I mean
19 I'd just argue, in general, consent in the -- in an
20 interview situation is so different from when you're
21 going into the hospital or having your tonsils removed or
22 something like that. I mean, it's so easy to -- to
23 refuse. It's just absurd to be talking about written
24 consent and things like that.

25 MS. SIEBER: I think it will be really

1 important to educate your IRB to that point ahead of time
2 because people -- I mean, and of one, I get so sick and
3 tired of having to listen to an informed consent on a
4 phone interview. Let's get on with it.

5 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

6 MS. SIEBER: And that's how most people
7 feel.

8 MR. BIEMER: I think it depends on the
9 topic. I mean, in the case of this abuse study, it's
10 very very sensitive. And so --

11 MS. SIEBER: Yeah.

12 MR. BIEMER: -- they didn't want to make
13 mistakes on that one. But, you know, you're not planning
14 to do anything quite like that. So I agree with Norman,
15 getting a -- you know, what we do -- you know, one thing
16 we do is we have an audio recorder on our laptop
17 computers and we actually can tape -- we can actually
18 record the interviewer asking the respondent if they'll
19 consent, and then the respondent will -- response will be
20 recorded and so that's kind of documentation right there.
21 So that, you know, we don't really need any external
22 microphone or anything. It's all built into the laptop
23 computer and that suffices for that some of our surveys,
24 just that kind of response. Can we proceed? The
25 respondent says "yes." When that yes is entered, then

1 the interview proceeds.

2 MS. SIEBER: And I think that if you go
3 through a slow process of educating your IRB, you're in a
4 very good position to remind them that a very unethical
5 thing to do is something that will interfere with the
6 validity of the study; and that to be two onerous about
7 informed consent to do a survey when they can just hang
8 up is -- is really not ethical. It makes for a bad risk
9 benefit ratio.

10 MS. JASSO: Let me jump in here. I -- I
11 have to look at the exact wording of -- of the new
12 letters for the old respondents, and I'll -- I'll get
13 back to you. But in our case -- and it may also to turn
14 out to be the case with you -- we also have new people in
15 the household, and so they get consented for the first
16 time. And we have different letters for them.

17 MR. GRANATO: Interesting.

18 MS. SIEBER: Okay. Well, let me move on
19 to perceived risk benefit. An awful lot of what you
20 should be concerned with and that IRBs are concerned
21 with, even when you have removed all the objective risks,
22 there's a perception by subjects of risk. And this is
23 important because IRBs don't want people to be upset.
24 But it's also important because if people are upset about
25 a study, they either won't participate or they may lie to

1 you. They may not provide the information. The polite
2 thing to do is just smile and lie.

3 So it's important to know in given
4 communities what they perceive as risk and what they
5 would perceive as a solution to that problem. And this
6 is also an important way to get acquainted with the
7 community, to create a relationship ahead of time, and to
8 provide information -- you know, we've been talking about
9 all the sorts of input that you need both to advertise
10 the study, get good PR, and -- and help you design the
11 study.

12 So I think that focus groups in
13 communities about their perception of the risks of
14 participating and their perception of what benefits there
15 would be or what benefits they would like to be are very
16 useful, and this information should be gathered somewhat
17 formally so you can present it to the IRB. And it's also
18 information that you can publish because it's -- it's a
19 useful model of how to know a particular context.

20 And often what investigators think would
21 be a useful benefit, useful feedback isn't what they
22 want. They -- they may have some good ideas of what they
23 would like to get out of it and how.

24 So, you know, just think of those focus
25 groups as providing -- serving a lot of different

1 purposes; educating the IRB, educating you, educating the
2 community. And, you know, Colm's idea of recruitment
3 face-to-face interview will provide a little further
4 feedback early on in the -- in the study that can be
5 useful. I'm sure that there's ideas from those of you
6 who've worked with audiences.

7 MS. JASSO: Well, let me jump in here.
8 Because this is something that keeps coming over and over
9 again. I am really uneasy with going to -- quote
10 unquote -- "community" and treating them as valid
11 gatekeepers. I actually think it may interference with
12 the science.

13 It seems to me the -- the model we want
14 is that of treating each potential respondent as an
15 independent observation. I obviously realize that --
16 that there may be response rate implications, et cetera,
17 et cetera. But I -- I think this is something that needs
18 to be thought about more deeply.

19 MR. BIEMER: What do you mean by going to
20 community? I don't understand.

21 MS. JASSO: Well, for example -- and --
22 and, Joan, correct me if I'm wrong. But I understood
23 what Joan was saying, let's suppose you're going to be
24 interviewing some people in an area that you know is
25 heavily Muslim, okay. Going to a community, I interpret

1 as meaning that you go to a community organization,
2 whatever it is, and -- and say to them, "We're going to
3 be interviewing here. This is a very important study.
4 It's going to have benefits for you," blah, blah, blah,
5 blah, blah. Am I right, Joan? Is this...

6 MS. SIEBER: I have to confess that I
7 have not thought that through. And I think who you
8 select to get information about communities you're
9 pointing out is very critical. And how would -- how
10 would you do that? Obviously you want to have feelers
11 out there. You want feedback. How would you recommend
12 getting that?

13 MS. JASSO: Well, see, this is a very
14 good question. I -- I tend -- I tend to prefer -- I can
15 be persuaded otherwise, but I tend to prefer the
16 unobtrusive quiet things like reading blogs, keeping your
17 ear to the ground.

18 When we were doing -- maybe I think it
19 was the pilot to The New Immigrant Survey, some quote
20 unquote community elders heard that we had interviewers
21 in a particular neighborhood. And these elders called
22 field staff and said -- this wasn't NORC. This was in
23 the pilot. Rand was doing it -- you know, and said,
24 "Well, you need to talk to us because we're the ones who
25 decides who comes in and"...

1 And we had a long, long, long, long
2 discussion among the PIs and field staff, et cetera. And
3 we finally came down on the side of "no." We do not go
4 through gatekeepers. We -- we go to individual persons
5 at the community level.

6 Now, there are still -- there's a further
7 problem, which is gate -- gatekeepers in the household,
8 usually husbands of fundamentalist religions. A -- and,
9 again, our -- we -- we are to talk to the named
10 respondent -- remember, in our case, we have a list of
11 names -- and we want that person to agree. That person
12 can, of course, say, "Give me a few minutes. Let me
13 think about it. Let me talk it over with my family."
14 They -- they can do anything they want. But we
15 officially do not get permission from someone else to
16 speak to the respondent.

17 MR. BIEMER: I guess --

18 MS. JASSO: And -- and we have very good
19 luck.

20 MR. BIEMER: There are other ways of
21 getting the community involved. For example, I'm
22 thinking about my years at the Census Bureau where the
23 Census Bureau spent a lot of effort getting community
24 leaders to get their members to respond to the census and
25 then -- and, you know, trying to emphasize to them and

1 stress how important it is that they be counted and so
2 forth.

3 And although the Census Bureau didn't get
4 their permission to go in, they used the community
5 leaders to help support it. Now, the community leaders
6 say, "No. I don't want to do that." But in a lot of
7 cases, they did and it made a big difference having the
8 community leader saying, "This is what you ought to do."

9 MS. JASSO: Yeah. We decided not to do
10 that. And -- and we certainly talked with the -- with
11 people from the Census Bureau, and one can certainly make
12 a case for doing it. So all I'm doing is raising the
13 idea that there's more to it than may meet the eye.

14 MR. BRADBURN: Well, this is, I think,
15 another instance of what we were talking about earlier
16 about whether people are participating as individuals or
17 as representatives of some group.

18 MS. JASSO: Yes.

19 MR. BRADBURN: And what -- the census is
20 a special case, I think, I mean, because there people do
21 have vested interests in having the census report
22 accurately or overaccurate.

23 And -- but in -- in most studies, you run
24 a risk because it isn't all that clear what the benefit
25 to the -- to the people who are seeing themselves as the

1 elders in the community or whatever and so forth. So I
2 sort of agree and disagree. I mean, I think what Willie
3 is saying about it is very important.

4 In -- in the '60s when there was -- the
5 government was supporting, I mean, a lot of community
6 organizations and there was whole kind of community
7 development kind of ethic was going on. There -- we ran
8 into that a lot because we were doing evaluations of
9 neighborhood action programs, in other words. And you
10 know, you can effectively be barred from a community by
11 the -- the community organization leaders, you know,
12 wanting to be bribed in a way, I mean, sometimes -- I
13 mean, it's just various things.

14 But I think that you want to generally
15 think about this as individual participants, and I
16 would -- I would interpret the word about community is
17 that you want -- again, like other things, you want to
18 know what the local -- insofar as you can, what the local
19 concerns are, interests are and so on and so forth, but
20 not organized by some gatekeepers person.

21 MS. SIEBER: Would you -- sort of taking
22 off on Willie's great point of having your ear to the
23 ground, would an ethnographic approach be a better way to
24 learn what's going on in the community and how -- what
25 their feelings are?

1 MR. BRADBURN: Well, if you can afford it
2 and...

3 I mean, that -- that takes a long time
4 and effort and so forth. I don't think -- what we're
5 talking about on a whole, I don't think, is -- is that
6 big a deal that it requires -- I mean, you'll pick up a
7 lot of it if you're doing just focus groups and, you
8 know, if you're doing cognitive interviewing to help
9 questions and so on and so forth.

10 MR. BIEMER: Especially -- I mean, it
11 depends on how you cluster the sample, you know, and how
12 much you may be in a neighbor. You may -- you may not
13 be -- your presence may not even be noticed for some
14 designs.

15 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. These -- these
16 problems come up typically when you're doing a lot of
17 interviews in a very small area, so that there's...

18 MR. BIEMER: Like any census.

19 MR. BRADBURN: Right.

20 MS. JASSO: We know we ended up with
21 cases where -- where the person agreed to be interviewed,
22 but -- but said, "I will call you or you call me on the
23 phone" and probably our inference was that person then
24 told the neighbors they -- they were not going to be
25 interviewed, but they were interviewed and...

1 Now the only -- the only real -- there
2 was one -- only one incident and it does not involve
3 community gatekeepers. But we had a respondent who was a
4 husband. And when the interviewer started with the
5 consent, et cetera, the wife who was there, got very
6 upset and said, "You can't do it. You can't do it." And
7 he said, "But there's no harm. And -- and it's an
8 interesting thing. And we do something for science,"
9 which is part of what was in the letter. To make a long
10 story short, he ended up doing it against the wishes of
11 his wife. And the interviewer -- these were NORC
12 interviewers -- told us that for the length of the
13 interview, they kept hearing dishes breaking in the
14 kitchen.

15 MR. BIEMER: You know, there's another
16 interesting story. You know, the Census Bureau used to
17 in the current population survey -- I don't know if this
18 is true. It sounds true -- but they used to use compact
19 clusters of four -- you know, segments of four households
20 on a street. Well, that meant that if you were in the
21 sample and you knew the design, you were pretty sure that
22 your neighbor was in the sample, you know, the one next
23 to you.

24 And so at a meeting, Steve Fineberg got
25 up at a meeting -- this is what I -- I didn't hear this,

1 but he heard the story -- and -- and told -- the Census
2 Bureau was present at this meeting and said, you know, he
3 was in CPS and that told him that his neighbor was
4 also -- one of his neighbors on either side of him was
5 also -- probably both of them, if he was in the middle of
6 segment. He didn't know. And -- and so that was a
7 breach of confidentiality because you shouldn't know if
8 your neighbor is in this survey. That prompted the
9 Census Bureau to actually change the design. So they're
10 no longer selecting four consecutive households on a
11 street. They're breaking it up. So the neighbors have
12 less -- you know, first of all, the neighbors don't know
13 who is in a sample. But in your case, they wouldn't
14 necessarily have that much impact on the respondent --
15 whether the other neighbors respond, if they don't -- you
16 know, have no idea if the other neighbors are getting to
17 participate.

18 MS. JASSO: Right. And -- and this was
19 not an area sample. This was a list of names.

20 MR. BIEMER: I see. So that didn't
21 effect you.

22 MS. JASSO: So there might not have been
23 anybody nearby.

24 MR. BIEMER: Well, that's a good argument
25 now to have consecutive households on the street.

1 MS. JASSO: That's right.

2 MS. SIEBER: Let me run another flag up
3 the flagpole on how to sense what's going on. In --
4 in -- in my limited experience of doing surveys, I found
5 that it was extremely useful to have very frequent
6 meetings of the surveyors to bring back information about
7 what was going on, what was working.

8 MR. BIEMER: Like debriefings?

9 MS. SIEBER: Debriefings. And, of
10 course, it helps the surveyors do a better job because
11 they'll have some experiences that they've gotten in.

12 You know, what this means, this is not
13 something you can tell the IRB or that you want to put in
14 your informed consent, but it is risk benefit information
15 that you're bringing in, that you're feeding into the
16 project and can use. I'd be interested to hear people's
17 experience with this.

18 MR. BIEMER: Oh, it's absolutely -- I
19 mean, we do that in our pretesting stage a lot. Of
20 course, during the survey, supervisors are talking with
21 the interviewers, you know, at least once a week about
22 their experiences. I mean, one of the purpose -- one of
23 the jobs of the supervisor is to help the interviewer
24 complete their assignments and try to, you know, discuss
25 strategies for converting nonresponses and things like

1 that, gatekeepers, whatever.

2 So, no. But -- I mean, but during the
3 pretesting stages -- and I think this comes back to a
4 point, I think, Willie made earlier about having a pilot
5 study. You know, there are different ways of pretesting.
6 You know, you definitely need to do something to pretest
7 your methodology, pretest the questionnaire, pretest your
8 interview methodology, bring these interviewers in for
9 debriefing interviews, maybe even convene focus groups
10 that -- focus groups of respondents and have them comment
11 on the process and their experience and so forth as part
12 of the pretesting stage.

13 But then during the -- the interviewing
14 when the actual data collection is going on -- we don't
15 do it that often, but it sounds like it might be a good
16 idea also to convene meetings -- you know, maybe
17 telephone meetings of the interviewers and discuss their
18 experiences.

19 MS. SIEBER: Now, given that they're very
20 ill paid people, you have to give them some kind of perk
21 to keep them focused and -- and help them to deal with
22 the problems that come up.

23 MR. BIEMER: Well, in one of our surveys,
24 I know for sure The National Survey of Drug Use and
25 Health, we give the interviewer incentives based upon

1 achieved goals. So they -- you know, these goals tend to
2 change over time just to keep it interesting. But, you
3 know, it may be some goals set to improving the response
4 rate in their area; the way that they fill out their
5 paperwork is, you know -- the number of errors are found
6 in that, conversions of refusals, various types of ways
7 in which they can achieve these rewards. And that seemed
8 to work pretty well because that's a long-standing,
9 long-term survey. And you can imagine that over time,
10 they kind of get beaten down by rising refusal --
11 reluctance to participate, refusal rates and so forth.

12 And it can actually be an attitude that
13 is given to the interviewers from their supervisors.
14 What we found is sometimes when the supervisors are sort
15 of beaten down by the process, the interviewers kind of
16 reflect that. And what -- you know, one way to
17 counteract that is through some incentive program.

18 MS. SIEBER: That's neat. That's
19 marvelous.

20 One of the key risks is breach of
21 confidentiality or perceived breach. And I think
22 figuring out a plan of data security and confidentiality
23 on the part of interviewers is extremely important. And
24 I would be interested to hear, especially given the juicy
25 information that you have interviewers obtain, how do --

1 how do you train interviewers on confidentiality?

2 MR. BIEMER: You mean in terms of keeping
3 information confidential?

4 MS. SIEBER: Uh-huh.

5 MR. BIEMER: I don't know that we do
6 anything more, but just to stress the importance of that
7 in our training. Certainly, they sign confidentiality
8 agreements that -- that they will keep it confidential.
9 But I don't know that -- I don't know that there are any
10 other -- anything else you can do. I mean, we've had --
11 we have had breaches of confidentiality.

12 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. The -- the most
13 likely place you get it -- well, there are two.
14 Deliberate ones are where an interviewer just takes it
15 upon him or herself because they feel sorry for some
16 respondent to want to publicize that respondent's case
17 to -- to the press or something like that. I mean --

18 MS. SIEBER: Wow.

19 MR. BRADBURN: It's a complete mistake in
20 the purpose of what they're doing and so on and so forth
21 but it's usually -- when they're deliberate ones, it's
22 usually from some misguided positive motive because they
23 think they're -- they're doing something that helps the
24 respondent, but in fact doesn't of course.

25 The one which is -- is more likely -- I

1 mean, that happens very rarely. I think in my career,
2 I've only heard of one -- one case that I know of that we
3 had an interviewer do that.

4 The more likely case is that you have
5 data in a laptop and the laptop gets stolen or lost in
6 some kind of way. So there it's very important that all
7 the data be encrypted and pretty difficult to -- not that
8 most of the people who steal laptops really care what's
9 in them, you know. So it's not that. It's the
10 perception problem and -- I mean the Census Bureau is up
11 in arms because they lost 100 or 200 laptops --

12 MR. BIEMER: It was a big number.

13 MR. BRADBURN: -- and something -- a big
14 number in Kansas City. We had --

15 MR. BIEMER: Over a long period.

16 MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. We had -- in NLSY,
17 I think we had one interviewer's laptop was stolen. And
18 there were, you know, two or three respondents' data in
19 there that -- that was a problem.

20 The only other -- actually, there is one
21 other problem that -- again, this is so rare. I think
22 this happened once in my career and so forth. It's --
23 it's a different one from the one that Willie mentioned
24 about the spouse that didn't want.

25 This was the spouse of an interviewer.

1 We were doing a sex study, and so the interviewer had
2 been interviewing a lot of people about sexual practices
3 and so on and so forth. And the husband of the
4 interviewer who knew she was interviewing but didn't know
5 what it was about somehow or other saw a questionnaire,
6 which of course that was a bad -- she should not have
7 ever let him see the questionnaire. So -- but anyway he
8 was so horrified at what she was doing that he grabbed
9 all the questionnaires that she had been -- and -- and
10 wouldn't let them go. So we had -- and you know -- we
11 had --

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. BIEMER: Sensitive data.

14 MR. BRADBURN: I mean, these were the raw
15 questions. This was before computers and so forth. So,
16 you know, where we transmitted raw questionnaires from
17 the field to the home office and so forth. But anyway,
18 we had to negotiate with him a long time. Finally, we
19 ended up agreeing -- mutually agreeing that he would --
20 that a third party would destroy the questionnaires. And
21 so, you know, the supervisor, he knew they were
22 destroyed. We knew they were destroyed. And -- but
23 that's...

24 MR. BIEMER: You know, that's -- that
25 reminds me of -- you know, following on the heels of this

1 incident in the Census Bureau where they had all these
2 laptops stolen, we had a rash -- I don't know. It was
3 sort of this unusual rash of lost laptops on one of our
4 studies, The Early Child Longitudinal Survey, and
5 which -- which really, you can imagine, upset everybody,
6 including the client.

7 After that -- following that, we were
8 required to put in some very, very stringent rules about
9 how laptops would be handled in the future including, you
10 know, of course, all the encryption software we could
11 possibly put on it, but also when the interviewer -- how
12 the interviewer actually handled the laptop at home. And
13 it had to be in a locked cabinet or a locked case. It
14 couldn't be just left out, you know, in a study or a den.

15 And so -- but there were a lot of things
16 that were also put into place to monitor and to check to
17 see whether or not these data were being handled
18 properly. Some of the forms that they were carrying in
19 their files, you know, that they use to help with the
20 field work were automated and put on the laptop so they
21 could be secured because there was confidential
22 information that was on this -- on these paper documents
23 that they were using.

24 So we really went through extreme
25 measures as a result of this because it just brought up

1 to the client the possibility that this information, not
2 intentionally, but there could be breaches of
3 confidentiality accidentally.

4 MR. GRANATO: It's now noon and I
5 promised we would end the -- the workshop at noon. I
6 just want to say a few things. First, thank you very
7 much for coming. I really mean it, especially these two
8 weekends. I mean, I very much appreciate that and for
9 your participation in all of this. I also want to Renee
10 Cross and Mike Angel and Kelly Le, what they did to set
11 this up was amazing.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. GRANATO: And we're at the concept
14 exploration stage right now. What you did here is going
15 to help enormously as we go forward.

16 And I will say this, I've been through
17 enough of these where we've started from the ground up
18 and you -- you don't know what's going to happen, but I
19 think -- I'm confident over time we'll have something
20 very significant come out of this initial effort, and I
21 am very grateful to all of you. Thank you very much.

22 MS. SIEBER: Thank you, Jim.

23 MS. JASSO: May I say something, I just
24 want to thank Jim enormously and also Frank for
25 moderating and then one other thing. Probably everyone

1 feels like I do, I learned an enormous amount in this day
2 and a half. And I want to say one particular thing, how
3 grateful I am that Norm came. I -- I -- to me, this was
4 like a master class. A lot of what Norm said, in his
5 characteristically modest way, is stuff that he invented,
6 the words that he invented, the protocols that he
7 invented, what's become the foundation of -- of survey
8 research. And we don't often get a chance to be in a
9 master class, and I think we did. Thank you, Norm.

10 MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. You're
11 embarrassing me.

12 (Off the record, 12:01 p.m.)

13

14

15

* * * * *

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE STATE OF TEXAS :

2 COUNTY OF HARRIS :

3

4 I, Dorothy A. Rull, a Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify
6 that the preceding proceedings were reported by me at the
7 time and date stated on page 1 hereof;

8 I further certify that said proceedings
9 were reported by me in machine shorthand, later reduced
10 to typewritten form under my personal supervision, and
11 the above and foregoing 241 pages constitute a true and
12 correct transcript thereof.

13 GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE on this
14 11th day of April, 2008.

15

16

17

18

19 _____
Dorothy A. Rull
20 C.S.R. No. 3978, Expires 12/31/08
Notary Public, State of Texas
21 Commission Expires: 05/27/2008

22

23 Allied Advanced Reporting, Inc.
Texas CRCB Firm Registration No. 252
1647 Colquitt
24 Houston, Texas 77006
Ph 713.524.6777 Toll Free 1.800.223.9409
25 Fax 713.524.6888
aari@alliedadvancedreporting.com