

Report on Conference on Congressional Elections Research

A conference on Congressional Elections Research, sponsored by the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies, Center for Political Studies (The University of Michigan), was held at the University of Rochester on October 27-28, 1977. Chaired by Board Member Richard F. Fenno, Jr., the conference was attended by the following: Alan I. Abramowitz, William and Mary; David W. Brady, Houston; Charles S. Bullock III, Georgia; Robert Erikson, Washington University; Heinz Eulau, Stanford (Board); Morris Fiorina, California Institute of Technology; Linda L. Fowler, Syracuse; Barbara Hinckley, Wisconsin (Madison); Gary C. Jacobson, Trinity; Malcolm Jewell, Kentucky; Henry C. Kenski, Arizona; Samuel Kernell, California (San Diego); Warren L. Kostroski, Wittenberg; James H. Kuklinski, Wichita State; John C. Macartney, Air Force Academy; Thomas E. Mann, APSA; David R. Mayhew, Yale; Arthur H. Miller, Michigan (CPS Staff); Warren E. Miller, Michigan (Principal Investigator); Candice J. Nelson, University of California (Berkeley); Benjamin I. Page, Wisconsin (Madison, Board); Glenn R. Parker, Miami (Ohio); Samuel C. Patterson, Iowa; Ann Robinson (CPS Staff); Maria Sanchez, Michigan (CPS Staff); John Sprague, Washington University (Board); Walter J. Stone, Grinnell; Eric M. Uslaner, Maryland; Robert Weissberg, Illinois (Urbana); Raymond E. Wolfinger, California (Berkeley); Gerald C. Wright, Florida Atlantic.

This was the first in a series of research conferences organized by the Board in its effort to bring the ideas, interests and talents of particular segments of the larger research community to bear on the studies of elections and electoral behavior conducted biennially by the Center for Political Studies. The conference was in many ways experimental, designed to implement the Board's mandate to serve as a bridge between the Center and the research community and to orient the conferees to the opportunities for expanded research on congressional elections. The purposes of the conference were essentially two: First, to explore what degree of consensus might exist among the conferees, as representatives of the research community, with regard to needs and priorities in the field of congressional elections research; and, second, to suggest long-term steps that might be taken

in the congressional elections field following the 1978 election.

Apart from the formal proceedings which followed the seminar format, allowing a free flow of conversation, the conference served to bring together for the first time individual scholars who, though acquainted with each other's work, had not met before in an atmosphere of sustained informal discussion rarely possible at larger professional meetings. Much of the formal discussion centered in themes, issues and topics dealt with in working memoranda prepared by the conferees (and also by many others who, because of budget limitations, could not be invited to the conference). Among these themes, the problem of congressional incumbency or of the "vanishing marginal district" served as a point of departure to specify the data that are needed, and that might be collected by NES/CPS, to test a great variety of hypotheses suggested in both conference memoranda and recent publications. Incumbency proved a convenient starting point because it seems to be a link par excellence between electoral outcomes and legislative outcomes. There is, on the one hand, the problem of understanding the "incumbency effect" on voter attitudes, perceptions and behavior; and there is, on the other hand, the problem of assessing this same effect on the attitudes, cognitions and conduct of congressmen. Some of the round-table discussion was detailed and technical (for instance: what are the advantages and disadvantages of alternative question wording in regard to voters' perceptions of congressmen's issue stands, constituency services, the pork-barrel allocations that they may have obtained for the district, or responses to "home style?"). Much of the discussion was broad-gauged and general (for instance: how is it possible to compare meaningfully both incumbents and challengers across congressional districts with highly variable contextual properties that challenge the validity of inferences essential to the construction of theory?).

By moving back and forth between technical details and generic concerns, the discussion was enlightened by both broad theoretical assumptions that would permit maximal agreement on research priorities and by an awareness of those methodological difficulties that inevitably constrain an ideal research design. For instance, it was suggested that instead of thinking in dualistic terms of "incumbent and challenger" at *one* point in time, it is important to realize that incumbency effect is a conceptual artifact, and that it may be more fruitful to inspect the range of empirical coordinates that both determine and limit the relative success or failure of both incumbents and challengers *over* time. Similarly, sharper conceptual discrimination between voter perceptions of and attitudes toward the Congress as an institution, on the one hand, and of congressmen as individuals, on the other hand, would require a range of new interview questions for testing relevant hypotheses. Given the many complexities associated with major alternatives, a highly rational

approach to the trade-offs necessary for the construction of optimal interview schedules was considered essential.

A great deal of the conference discussion centered on analytic issues that arise from a change in the primary sampling unit from the present county level to the congressional district level, a change in sampling already initiated by NES/CPS as a result of suggestions made earlier by the Board of Overseers. The conference participants approved the change in sample format, though they recognized that problems of an analytical sort remain, especially those involving the aggregation of individual responses to the level of the congressional district. (Even with the congressional district as the primary sampling unit, the number of individual interviews per district remains relatively small.) Perhaps the most far-reaching consequence of the shift to the congressional level as the primary sampling unit will follow from the possibility of assembling at this level of aggregation a portfolio of (non-interview) contextual data that previously were not easily linked to the survey data. A great deal of the discussion therefore involved the strategy of collecting not only conventional census-demographic, aggregate-electoral and congressional roll-call data, but also constituency-relevant data on campaign activities of party or candidate organizations, on mass media of communication, on campaign expenditures, and so on, all of which can be assumed to have some relationship to both voter behavior and the campaigns of the competing candidates. In this connection, the problem of testing for the relative impact of national and local issues, and their interaction, was raised.

The sampling problem was again considered in connection with questions of representation raised by those conference participants more interested in the consequences of elections and electoral behavior than their causes. A proposal to oversample in a few districts did not seem feasible because, due to limited resources, this would involve a severe reduction in the total number of districts available for analysis and, therefore, a reduction in the efficiency of the sample as a sample of the national electorate.

There was agreement that congruence between congressmen's and voters' attitudes on issues, as an approach to representation, must be supple-

mented by questions concerning institutional evaluation, because, as widely pointed out, congressmen are generally more oriented toward national issues than are voters. It is for this reason, also, that the congressman's "home style" may need as much attention as his/her positions on public policy. In this connection the interesting hypothesis was suggested that voters' attitudes toward Congress as an institution may well vary with the home style of the congressman.

This brief report by no means covers all the many worthwhile suggestions for future research on congressional elections that emerged from the conference. Because of the informality and easy interchange that characterized the conference, participants also explored research alternatives and opportunities that might be created, with or without the Board's sponsorship, by cooperative arrangements among scholars. Emphasis was given to more intensive state or substate data collections not possible at this time in connection with the national random probability studies conducted by the Center for Political Studies.

This report also cannot readily convey the sense of intellectual excitement among the participants. There was a sense that the conference marked a new beginning in elections research. Indeed, follow-up activities are being planned by the NES/CPS Board of Overseers as well as by subgroups of conferees. As a first step, the Board has established a ten-person "Standing Committee on Congressional Elections Research," which will undertake research and development planning in the Congressional arena for the 1982 and 1986 elections and beyond. Members appointed at the Board's December meeting for the purpose of designing the 1978 study include: Richard Fenno, chair; A. Abramowitz, M. Fiorina, B. Hindkley, G. Jacobson, T. Mann, D. Mayhew, G. Parker, R. Wolfinger, and G. Wright. Conferees also agreed to present to the Board their own list of priority questions they would like to see included in the 1978 interview schedule, as well as lists of contextual data they wish to see collected and made part of the final data assembly.

Persons interested in the work of the Board of Overseers and in the follow-up activities of the conference on Congressional Elections Research in particular should write to the Board, Box Z, Stanford, California 94305.

BOARD OF OVERSEERS

NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

Report on Conference on Congressional Elections Research

A conference on Congressional Elections Research, sponsored by the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies, Center for Political Studies (The University of Michigan), was held at the University of Rochester on October 27-28, 1977. Chaired by Board Member Professor Richard F. Fenno, Jr., the conference was attended by the following: Alan I. Abramowitz, William and Mary; David W. Brady, Houston; Charles S. Bullock III, Georgia; Robert Erikson, Washington University; Heinz Eulau, Stanford (Board); Morris Fiorina, California Institute of Technology; Linda L. Fowler, Syracuse; Barbara Hinckley, Wisconsin (Madison); Gary C. Jacobson, Trinity; Malcolm Jewell, Kentucky; Henry C. Kenski, Arizona; Samuel Kernell, California (San Diego); Warren L. Kostroski, Wittenberg; James H. Kuklinski, Wichita State; John D. Macartney, Air Force Academy; Thomas E. Mann, APSA; David R. Mayhew, Yale; Arthur H. Miller, Michigan (CPS Staff); Warren E. Miller, Michigan (Principal Investigator); Candice J. Nelson, University of California (Berkeley); Benjamin I. Page, Wisconsin (Madison) (Board); Glenn R. Parker, Miami (Ohio); Samuel C. Patterson, Iowa; Ann Robinson (CPS Staff); Maria Sanchez, Michigan (CPS Staff); John Sprague, Washington University (Board); Walter J. Stone, Grinnell; Eric M. Uslaner, Maryland; Robert Weissberg, Illinois (Urbana); Raymond E. Wolfinger, California (Berkeley); Gerald C. Wright, Florida Atlantic.

This was the first in a series of research conferences organized by the Board in its effort to bring the ideas, interests and talents of particular segments of the larger research community to bear on the studies of elections and electoral behavior conducted biennially by the Center for Political Studies. The conference was in many ways experimental, designed to implement the Board's mandate to serve as a bridge between the Center and the research community and to orient the conferees to the opportunities for expanded research on congressional elections. The purposes of the conference were essentially two: First, to explore what degree of consensus might exist among the conferees, as representatives of the research community, with regard to needs and priorities in the field of congressional elections research; and, second, to suggest long-term steps that might be taken in the congressional elections field following the 1978 election.

Apart from the formal proceedings which followed the seminar format, allowing a free flow of conversation, the conference served to bring together for the first time individual scholars who, though acquainted with each other's work, had not met before in an atmosphere of sustained informal discussion rarely possible at larger professional meetings. Much of the formal discussion centered in themes, issues and topics dealt with in working memoranda prepared by the conferees (and also by many others who, because of budget limitations, could not be invited to the conference). Among

these themes, the problem of congressional incumbency or of the "vanishing marginal district" served as a point of departure to specify the data that are needed, and that might be collected by NES/CPS, to test a great variety of hypotheses suggested in both conference memoranda and recent publications. Incumbency proved a convenient starting point because it seems to be a link par excellence between electoral outcomes and legislative outcomes. There is, on the one hand, the problem of understanding the "incumbency effect" on voter attitudes, perceptions and behavior; and there is, on the other hand, the problem of assessing this same effect on the attitudes, cognitions and conduct of congressmen. Some of the round-table discussion was detailed and technical (for instance: what are the advantages and disadvantages of alternative question wording in regard to voters' perceptions of congressmen's issue stands, constituency services, the pork-barrel allocations that may have obtained for the district, or responses to "home style?"). Much of the discussion was broad gauged and general (for instance: how is it possible to compare meaningfully both incumbents and challengers across congressional districts with highly variable contextual properties that challenge the validity of inferences essential to the construction of theory?).

By moving back and forth between technical details and generic concerns, the discussion was enlightened by both broad theoretical assumptions that would permit maximal agreement on research priorities and by an awareness of those methodological difficulties that inevitably constrain an ideal research design. For instance, it was suggested that instead of thinking in dualistic terms of "incumbent and challenger" at one point in time, it is important to realize that incumbency effect is a conceptual artifact, and that it may be more fruitful to inspect the range of empirical coordinates that both determine and limit the relative success or failure of both incumbents and challengers over time. Similarly, sharper conceptual discrimination between voter perceptions of and attitudes toward the Congress as an institution, on the one hand, and of congressmen as individuals, on the other hand, would require a range of new interview questions for testing relevant hypotheses. Given the many complexities associated with major alternatives, a highly rational approach to the trade-offs necessary for the construction of optimal interview schedules was considered essential.

A great deal of the conference discussion centered on analytic issues that arise from a change in the primary sampling unit from the present county level to the congressional district level, a change in sampling already initiated by NES/CPS as a result of suggestions made earlier by the Board of Overseers. The conference participants approved the change in sample format, though they recognized that problems of an analytical sort remain, especially those involving the aggregation of individual responses to the level of the congressional district. (Even with the congressional district as the primary sampling unit, the number of individual interviews per district remains relatively small.) Perhaps the most far-reaching consequence of the shift to the congressional level as the primary sampling unit will follow from the possibility of

assembling at this level of aggregation a portfolio of (non-interview) contextual data that previously were not easily linked to the survey data. A great deal of the discussion therefore involved the strategy of collecting not only conventional census-demographic, aggregate-electoral and congressional roll-call data, but also constituency-relevant data on campaign activities of party or candidate organizations, on mass media of communication, on campaign expenditures, and so on, all of which can be assumed to have some relationship to both voter behavior and the campaign of the competing candidates. In this connection, the problem of testing for the relative impact of national and local issues, and their interaction, was raised.

The sampling problem was again considered in connection with questions of representation raised by those conference participants more interested in the consequences of elections and electoral behavior than their causes. A proposal to oversample in a few districts did not seem feasible because, due to limited resources, this would involve a severe reduction in the total number of districts available for analysis and, therefore, a reduction in the efficiency of the sample as a sample of the national electorate.

There was agreement that congruence between congressmen's and voters' attitudes on issues, as an approach to representation, must be supplemented by questions concerning institutional evaluation, because, as widely pointed out, congressmen are generally more oriented toward national issues than are voters. It is for this reason, also, that the congressman's "home style" may need as much attention as his/her positions on public policy. In this connection the interesting hypothesis was suggested that voters' attitudes toward Congress as an institution may well vary with the home style of the congressman.

This brief report by no means covers all the many worthwhile suggestions for future research on congressional elections that emerged from the conference. Because of the informality and easy interchange that characterized the conference, participants also explored research alternatives and opportunities that might be created, with or without the Board's sponsorship, by cooperative arrangements among scholars. Emphasis was given to more intensive state or substate data collections not possible at this time in connection with the national random probability studies conducted by the Center for Political Studies.

This report also cannot readily convey the sense of intellectual excitement among the participants. There was a sense that the conference marked a new beginning in elections research. Indeed, follow-up activities are being planned by the NES/CPS Board of Overseers as well as by subgroups of conferees. As a first step, the Board has established a ten-person "Standing Committee on Congressional Elections Research," which will undertake research and development planning in the Congressional arena for the 1982 and 1986 elections and beyond. Members appointed at the Board's December meeting for the purpose of designing the 1978 study

include: Richard Fenno, chair; A. Abramowitz, M. Fiorina, B. Hinckley, G. Jacobson, T. Mann, D. Mayhew, G. Parker, R. Wolfinger, and G. Wright. Conferees also agreed to present to the Board their own list of priority questions they would like to see included in the 1978 interview schedule, as well as lists of contextual data they wish to see collected and made part of the final data assembly.

Persons interested in the work of the Board of Overseers and in the follow-up activities of the conference on Congressional Elections Research in particular should write to the Board, Box Z, Stanford, CA. 94305.

BOARD OF OVERSEERS
National Election Studies
Center for Political Studies of the University of Michigan

Reply to: P.O. Box Z

Stanford, California 94305

(415) 497-2612

BOARD MEMBERS

Kristi Andersen
Ohio State University
(614) 422-3807

James A. Davis
Harvard University
(617) 495-3812

Heinz Eulau, Chair
Stanford University
(415) 328-3003

Richard F. Fenno, Jr.
University of Rochester
(716) 275-4294

Warren E. Miller, ex. off.
University of Michigan
(313) 763-0265

Benjamin I. Page
University of Wisconsin
(608) 263-2414

David O. Sears
Univ. of Calif., Los Angeles
(213) 825-2160

J. Merrill Shanks
Univ. of Calif., Berkeley
(415) 642-1104

John Sprague
Washington University
(314) 863-0100-Ext. 4946

BOARD STAFF

Arlee Ellis
Stanford University
(415) 497-1806

Ann Robinson
University of Michigan
(313) 763-0266

December 14, 1977

reports
To: Mayhew, Hundley, Fiorina,
Wolfiger, Mann

I am writing to report on an action taken by the Board in implementing some of the recommendations stemming from the conference on Congressional election research at the University of Rochester in October, and to seek your continuing and active participation in the Board's work as well as in the work of the Center for Political Studies.

The Rochester conference was a first step in the Board's effort to associate the larger research community with the work of the CPS National Election Studies. As a second step in this effort, the Board decided, at its meeting on December 8-9, to establish a "Standing Committee on Congressional Election Research" whose responsibility will be to work closely with the Board and the CPS/NES staff in planning for Congressional election research in general and in designing the 1978 study in particular. In order to underline its belief in the importance of wide scholarly participation in Congressional election research, the Board has set aside funding to expedite the work of the Committee. I hope very much, therefore, that you will accept appointment as a member of the Committee which will be chaired by Richard Fenno.

As we presently envisage it, the Committee will concern itself with those long-term aspects of Congressional election research which, of necessity, provide a perspective for any particular study and what can be done in any particular election year. However, the Committee's specific task will be to work with the CPS/NES staff in designing the 1978 study. As became clear at the Rochester conference, the scholarly community is interested not only in having the kind of interview data traditionally collected by CPS but also in assembling a portfolio of what is being referred to as "contextual data." It is the Board's sense, therefore, that the Committee might well consist of two sub-committees--one charged with helping the construction of the interview schedule for the 1978 study, the other charged with organizing relevant contextual data collections. Needless to say, the two tasks must be closely related if the two somewhat different data sets are to complement each other. It is for this reason that, in the Board's

judgment, a single Committee with two sub-committees seems to make for a viable structure. We would like you to serve on the sub-committee specifically charged with the production of the 1978 interview schedule.

Because the tasks faced by the Committee require careful but immediate planning and sequencing, we would like the entire Committee to meet as soon as possible. In particular, it will be a task of the first meeting to set the agenda for the work of the proposed sub-committees. If at all possible, therefore, the Board would like the entire Committee to meet in Ann Arbor on Monday and Tuesday, January 9-10. Should you accept our invitation to join the Committee but find this date totally unacceptable, please call Ann Robinson at CPS (313-763-0266).

Let me emphasize that we expect the Committee and especially its sub-committees to be exceptionally active from January through March because their recommendations for the over-all design of the 1978 study as well as for both interview questions and the contextual data collection must reach the Board at its meeting scheduled for March 30-31. For, at that meeting, the Board will have to integrate these recommendations with other demands made on the resources available for the 1978 study. Of course, following the Board's March meeting, there will be further conversations between all interested parties concerning the shape and content of the 1978 study prior to the Board's June meeting when the final study design will have to be approved.

My purpose in specifying all this is to impress on you the Board's own commitment to this novel cooperative venture in social science research and our expectations as to the commitment of those who will be directly and specifically involved in the design of particular studies. We would like you to be an active participant in the very specific tasks of the Committee that will have to be carried out within a relatively short period of time.

Although the Board has established a "standing committee", we do not at this time propose a fixed term of membership on the Committee much beyond 1978. The Board would like to be free to review the 1978 experience and the Committee's composition at a later time.

Let me say in conclusion that the Board was glad to hear about the enthusiasm evidently generated at Rochester, and that your own contribution to the conference was greatly appreciated. I hope very much, therefore, that you will accept this invitation to be more closely associated with the Board and

CPS/NES. If at all possible, I would like to hear from you
at the first opportunity. With best wishes,

As always,

Heinz Eulau
Chairperson

cc: Board
R. Fenno
W.E. Miller
R. Dawson

HE/bs

BOARD OF OVERSEERS
National Election Studies
Center for Political Studies of the University of Michigan

Reply to: P.O. Box Z

Stanford, California 94305

(415) 497-2612

BOARD MEMBERS

Kristi Andersen
Ohio State University
(614) 422-3807
James A. Davis
Harvard University
(617) 495-3812
Heinz Eulau, Chair
Stanford University
(415) 328-3003
Richard F. Fenno, Jr.
University of Rochester
(716) 275-4294
Warren E. Miller, ex. off.
University of Michigan
(313) 763-0265
Benjamin I. Page
University of Wisconsin
(608) 263-2414
David O. Sears
Univ. of Calif., Los Angeles
(213) 825-2160
J. Merrill Shanks
Univ. of Calif., Berkeley
(415) 642-1104
John Sprague
Washington University
(314) 863-0100-Ext. 4946

BOARD STAFF

Arlec Ellis
Stanford University
(415) 497-1806
Ann Robinson
University of Michigan
(313) 763-0266

December 14, 1977

To: Wright, Abramowitz, Parker, Jacobson

I am writing to report on an action taken by the Board in implementing some of the recommendations stemming from the conference on Congressional election research at the University of Rochester in October, and to seek your continuing and active participation in the Board's work as well as in the work of the Center for Political Studies.

The Rochester conference was a first step in the Board's effort to associate the larger research community with the work of the CPS National Election Studies. As a second step in this effort, the Board decided, at its meeting on December 8-9, to establish a "Standing Committee on Congressional Election Research" whose responsibility will be to work closely with the Board and the CPS/NES staff in planning for Congressional election research in general and in designing the 1978 study in particular. In order to underline its belief in the importance of wide scholarly participation in Congressional election research, the Board has set aside funding to expedite the work of the Committee. I hope very much, therefore, that you will accept appointment as a member of the Committee which will be chaired by Richard Fenno.

As we presently envisage it, the Committee will concern itself with those long-term aspects of Congressional election research which, of necessity, provide a perspective for any particular study and what can be done in any particular election year. However, the Committee's specific task will be to work with the CPS/NES staff in designing the 1978 study. As became clear at the Rochester conference, the scholarly community is interested not only in having the kind of interview data traditionally collected by CPS but also in assembling a portfolio of what is being referred to as "contextual data." It is the Board's sense, therefore, that the Committee might well consist of two sub-committees--one charged with helping the construction of the interview schedule for the 1978 study, the other charged with organizing relevant contextual data collections. Needless to say, the two tasks must be closely related if the two somewhat different data sets are to complement each other. It is for this reason that, in the Board's

judgment, a single Committee with two sub-committees seems to make for a viable structure. We would like you to serve on the sub-committee specifically charged with the collection of contextual data.

Because the tasks faced by the Committee require careful but immediate planning and sequencing, we would like the entire Committee to meet as soon as possible. In particular, it will be a task of the first meeting to set the agenda for the work of the proposed sub-committees. If at all possible, therefore, the Board would like the entire Committee to meet in Ann Arbor on Monday and Tuesday, January 9-10. Should you accept our invitation to join the Committee but find this date totally unacceptable, please call Ann Robinson at CPS (313-763-0266).

Let me emphasize that we expect the Committee and especially its sub-committees to be exceptionally active from January through March because their recommendations for the over-all design of the 1978 study as well as for both interview questions and the contextual data collection must reach the Board at its meeting scheduled for March 30-31. For, at that meeting, the Board will have to integrate these recommendations with other demands made on the resources available for the 1978 study. Of course, following the Board's March meeting, there will be further conversations between all interested parties concerning the shape and content of the 1978 study prior to the Board's June meeting when the final study design will have to be approved.

My purpose in specifying all this is to impress on you the Board's own commitment to this novel cooperative venture in social science research and our expectations as to the commitment of those who will be directly and specifically involved in the design of particular studies. We would like you to be an active participant in the very specific tasks of the Committee that will have to be carried out within a relatively short period of time.

Although the Board has established a "standing committee", we do not at this time propose a fixed term of membership on the Committee much beyond 1978. The Board would like to be free to review the 1978 experience and the Committee's composition at a later time.

Let me say in conclusion that the Board was glad to hear about the enthusiasm evidently generated at Rochester, and that your own contribution to the conference was greatly appreciated. I hope very much, therefore, that you will accept this invitation to be more closely associated with the Board and

CPS/NES. If at all possible, I would like to hear from you at the first opportunity. With best wishes,

As always,

Heinz Eulau
Chairperson

cc: Board
R. Fenno
W.E. Miller
R. Dawson

HE/bs

NOV 9 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
Rochester, New York 14627

November 7, 1977

To: Heinz, Warren, Art, Ben, John

From: Dick

Subject: I have typed up some notes I made in reading the memos from our conferees. The notes are in the order in which I read the memos--i.e., random--and hence, the notes on the early ones may be more complete and the ones on the later ones assume previous reading. Anyhow--I thought they might be helpful to you in some way.

Abramowitz

Special importance of incumbency - it is his suspicion (as mine) that we shall need to emphasize candidate centered questions.

- 1) How much do voters know about inc. and chall.
- 2) How do voters get info about inc. and chall.
- 3) What criteria do voters use to evaluate inc. and chall.
- 4) How does cong. performance in office affect standing

Wants "a significant departure in the design of the midterm election study" - then "it might be desirable to select a limited no. of cong. districts for intensive study."

He wants to ask voters re their knowledge and evaluation of (1) personal characteristics (2) issue position (3) services provided (4) district interests helped.

The question here is: What are voters "most concerned about" with regard to the congressman's performance.

Nelson

Agreement on incumbency advantage is a starting point for research.

She argues that "we are inaccurately measuring how aware constituents are of their congressmen." I.e., the recall vs. recognition.

Nelson - cont.

She found that voters who couldn't recall any candidate, defected at same rate as voters who recalled candidates, i.e., behaved same way if the behavior you wish to explain is defection from party.

She argues that we need to measure recognition since recognition is lowest level of awareness.

"We also need more information about the knowledge constituents possess about incumbents." She wants to test for constituent knowledge and evaluation of Mayhew's categories.

She argues that we need to measure recognition since recognition is lowest level of awareness.

"We also need more information about the knowledge constituents possess about incumbents." She wants to test for constituent knowledge and evaluation of Mayhew's categories.

Relationship of party ID to incumbency--both are long term forces--are they additive or are they alternative cues? Also, study imp. of incumbency in rel. to short term forces. Not clear how survey helps to get at these questions. They are data analysis questions.

Hinckley

Conference should "concentrate collective wisdom on maximum return for a small number of basic survey questions."

She emphasizes two areas where we need data - (1) voter information about congressional races (2) advantage of incumbency

She particularly emphasizes range, content, types, sources and conditions (pre-election or election) of information voters have and how information is processed into votes.

Hinckley - cont.

Interesting point: in Senate races, incumbency advantage is declining!

In Senate, the incumbents, not the marginals are "vanishing". How come?

We need data on: 1) Voter information about incumbent and challenger

2) Voter perceptions of incumbent and challenger

3) Sources of information

Is information in some way the source of incumbency advantage? She wants to probe the link between information and incumbency.

[Do we know, for Presidential contests, how voters process info into choice?]

She also raises question re. sample - but it's of minor importance to her.

As questions (1) dichotomous know, DK about candidate, party

(2) probing for more re information - kinds and degrees of info

(3) open-ended like-dislike questions

(4) presidential type questions re issue, party and candidate perception

(5) sources of info about candidates

Patterson

1) How explain non-voting in congressional elections? Might help understand low public esteem of Congress and low info re Congress. This can be done through questions about information and evaluation.

2) Why do voters respond to collectivity the way they do - what are voter attitudes and orientations toward the institution. "We need pretty detailed probes of citizen's imagineries of this entity" and "sensitive and sophisticated probing of the meaning of collective representation to ordinary people."

3) Incumbency problem

4) Identifying the constituency--by "developing oversized samples in sampled congressional districts, so as to get district-specific data on attentive

Patterson - cont.

constituents and the structure of constituencies." He wants "a full blown replication with finer constituency tuning of the Miller-Stokes linkage analysis."

5) Congressional elections are good elections in which to include contextual data so as to address question of importance of context in elections--by context he means campaign spending, economic conditions, competitiveness.

Jewell

Sees priority setting as important. Past studies more useful to students of voting behavior than to students of Congress.

He sees representational process as a focus that is needed - but wouldn't replicate M-S because representation is broader than that. He thinks non-issue aspects of representation need more attention. He wants questions on:

- (1) scope and subject of contacts re individual service
- (2) constituent awareness of what congressman has done for the district
- (3) what the communication channels are between congressman and constituency

He specifically downplays idea of district oversampling - says that 1978 survey will give us "a base point, an overall picture," but not "the richness of detail in individual districts."

Fiorina

His speculation is that basis of voting in congressional elections has shifted from partisan ideology to constituent service.

Key question is "What have you heard or read about your Congressman."

- (1) Start with name recognition test
- (2) Can you recall anything you have heard or read about him?

Fiorina - cont.

- (3) What? or What might make you vote for or against?
- (4) Have you written your congressman - what about
- (5) Approved disapproval of Congress as institution and reasons

Wright

He's interested in policy representation and thinks there is more than we think. He thinks voters do vote for people whose issue position is like theirs. "The inability to cite specific issue information is not sufficient evidence to conclude a lack of an issue basis for voting in congressional elections." A) Voter may have heard something that changed his attitude, but forgot what he heard. B) Voter may get opinion filtered through some other person--two step flow--and thus vote close to their preferences.

But it's not clear what the survey can do about this line of argument except to ask where and how voter got his opinions.

I guess these are Hinckley type information questions.

His second interest is in explaining incumbency advantages in terms of decline of challengers.

His generalization calls for "closer assessment of the electoral choices offered to voters in congressional elections.

1) Information on candidate and voters policy positions--on issues salient to campaigns. Perceptions of candidates by media - retain open-ended candidate image questions of 1958--especially since it's only series.

2) Measure of candidate attractiveness - experience, presentation in media.

3) Campaign information - expenditures and endorsements

Mann

He thinks candidates influence voting and he wants to do a better job with better data than he had--on this question. (1) He thinks voters do know more than we think and that we've got to get at that. (2) He thinks that congressional elections turn on local contextual factors to some degree and we must get at them.

He found that "large numbers of voters have impressions of the candidates" -- and that candidate preference model fits the data; incumbency is an unevenly used resource; public response to candidates help account for swings in individual districts.

He wants questions on

(1) Candidate recognition and reputation

(2) Identify attentive publics on salient local issues

"The national congressional electorate itself has little political meaning. The most important unit is the Congressional district electorate". Hence some change in sampling design to keep district as unit of analysis.

Jacobson

He stresses the need to collect "information on the context and conduct of the election campaigns in the sampled states and districts and organizing it to be used in conjunction with the survey items." "The basic question is... What if any difference in the behavior of voters can be attributed to the campaign itself?" Point is that we need to know what went on in particular campaigns--unlike presidential election.

He wants data on campaign spending, uses of media, campaign organization, candidates activities. Says we cannot "evaluate" voter replies on information unless we know these things. Issue content of campaign also needs to be studied.

He wants to make "cross district comparisons" and suggests that we select a small number of districts that vary in interesting ways.

Macartney

Emphasizes incumbent's service and promotional activity at home. (Agrees, he says, with Mo Fiorina). Campaign is constant and service is the key campaign activity.

Politicians and political scientists differ on how elections are won. (What are implications?) Politicians learn about constituents through their staffs. So questions must include information re staffs.

Kastrowski

Wants to make sure Senate gets equal treatment.

Wants people to compare one Senator with another.

Otherwise, same questions for Senators as others want for House.

Erickson

- 1) Open-ended candidate evaluation questions - He's especially interested in candidate information on elections.
- 2) Better recognition questions
- 3) Closed end evaluations of incumbent performance
- 4) Closed end evaluations of Congress
- 5) Closed end evaluations of candidates along ideological scale
- 6) House candidates responses to same questions
- 7) Use congressional district as psu instead of county - it will produce what he calls more "within district representativeness"

Kenski

He's interested in economic conditions on elections and has got district level ec. data. He wants to do cross sectional--in addition to longitudinal--analysis. And he wants survey data on "self perceived economic change" - wants "to tap

Kenski - cont.

Incumbency advantages - testing Mayhew - direct and indirect contacts voters have with member.

Contextual variables need to be added - newspaper, campaign expenditures, demographic data.

Fowler

She starts with idea that there remains considerable evidence that one-party districts continue to exist and to protect incumbents.

She then thinks it likely that "partisan dominance of a district is associated with an underlying consensus about issues and values." Homogeneity

She seems particularly interested in discovering how much homogeneity on issues and values there is in congressional districts.

We need (1) survey of voter attitudes in a stratified sample of congressional districts, (2) way for respondents to determine salience of issues on which the homogeneity-heterogeneity measure is based, (3) attitudes be measured by 7 point scales, (4) voters be asked to describe their congressman's coalition and whether or not they belong.

She says until we have answered these questions about coalitions in the district and possible coalitions in the district, we won't get anywhere in study of incumbency advantage.

Uslaner

He's interested in issues, issue voting and representation

He surveys strengths and limitations of existing data sets and says that "future studies should pay particular attention to questions which can be matched with roll call behavior of members.

Uslaner - cont.

He stresses asking voters about both candidates, since the choice is the key fact of life for the voter.

He does not think we can feasibly go to a beefed up Miller-Stokes study, because we can't get large enough district samples, and can't get a large enough number of districts and, besides, if we try we'll take too much away from rest of project.

He thinks we should estimate district voter positions via Munger techniques or we should move away from district level to that of individual elector choosing between candidates.

Stone

He's interested in representation and linkage - 2 foci design and question.

(Who and what?)

He wants congressional district as psu.

Thinks we can oversample types of districts--"marginals," open seats, redistricted.

Thinks we can study longitudinally if we do it this way.

Thinks we should interview candidates and especially "interviewing elites within the district." Since they shape perception and evaluation and information of voters with respect to congressman. And since they may help us determine the "actual" constituency.

He raises problems associated with identifying these elites.

Turning to changes in interview schedule, he stresses (1) continuity in items --since representation is dynamic relationship between representative and constituents over time; (2) sensitivity to leadership--since representation is two-way relationship - "transactional" - and here he stresses what

voters know about incumbent activities - he calls them "exposure questions" - that would probe "exposure to and awareness of incumbent activity, salience of the incumbent and his behavior, and affect toward the representative. In this whole area, he wants panel study with representation as its focus."

"It is my hope that future CPS panels will be mounted with representation as the substantive focus."

(3) The constituency problem - who are constituents to which representative responds - he proposes that the idea of proximity be utilized and that partisan proximity, policy proximity and personal proximity be probed - ask voters questions so that their full range of activity with regard to congressman and his campaign can be mapped.

Final pitch for representation as a focus.

Weissberg

Two questions: How much representation exists?

What is relationship between electoral outcome and representation behavior?

1) He wants improved ways of comparing mass preferences and legislative action. Legislators may face alternatives different from those asked voters. Or, voter may vote on "the best deal possible" among the candidates and not on basis of an issue match. Or constituents may "settle for" any number of legislative outcomes--so that on some matters any outcome is OK. For all these reasons, there may be very little policy representation.

2) What is a safe seat from legislator's point of view. He thinks it has more to do with predictability of outcome than marginality. He wants to know how legislator interprets outcomes--in terms of key areas rather than gross % changes in margin. What kind of outcomes will cause changes in member behavior.

Kuklinski

Interested in "the parameters of representation." - "the limits within which constituents are willing to tolerate congressional behavior which is not in accord with constituency preference."

Do constituencies expect greater response on salient issues and ignore response on less salient issues? What is mix of representative behavior that constituents want--within districts or across districts, i.e., policy service. Can we account for electoral competition by knowing these kinds of things?

We need measures of representativeness--within districts and not across districts. Representative looks at his own district and distribution of preferences therein.

He wants to make sure we have "equivalency of congressional votes and district opinion." They should be addressing same alternatives.

Wolfinger

Success of incumbents - name recognition item is important.

He thinks "defection from party" is the key behavior to be explained in new surveys.

Wants to get at individual assessments of member and of Congress as a whole.

Wants "master code items" asked about congressional candidates.

Senate elections might be studied via cooperative arrangements with state polls.

He's like campaign expenditures and ballot forms included on questionnaire.

Mayhew

He divides matters into who to ask and what to ask.

Under "who", he urges "experimenting"--with 10-12 districts in which you sample elaborately and "then do good panel studies all year". Most elaborate of all suggestions!

Mayhew - cont.

Should try to locate people who have opinions about "congressional matters" and find out what their opinions are. The point is that we shouldn't continue to ask everyone questions when the results keep telling us that they don't have much to say on the subject. He thinks the "two step flow of communication" should be investigated.

Under "what," he suggests we need "better questions on how people perceive Congress and their congressional candidates and how they come to have their perceptions"

He has some questions: newsletters, questionnaire, have you met congressman, service - to get at activity of congressman and its perception by voters.

He has large number of questions about role of Congress and representation.

What does voter think job is--legislating vs. overseeing, Washington vs. home, House vs. Senate, District vs. Nation, expenditure vs. saving, TV vs. no TV, careerists vs. amateurs, etc.

Parker

He's interested in popular evaluations of Congress and congressmen. "Underlying dimensions of institutional evaluations" should be probed.

He finds congress and president popularity responding to same conditions--state of economy and active, positive President--but orientations toward the two institutions, he finds, are not the same. So--what are "the objects or sources of negative or positive evaluations"?

He wants open-ended questions - asked over time.

He's also interested in incumbency advantage. What is basis on which members are evaluated? He thinks district service. Evaluations based on district service, he finds, are positive.

Kernell

He's been interested in aggregate vote analysis - especially "These marginal but politically consequential fluctuations of the vote."

But he now thinks we need to focus on "individual level relationships".

His questions are: "How does the voter perceive and evaluate the environment?"

"What events and conditions are important, noticed, how noticed. Are negative or positive changes equally relevant to political behavior?"

Then, how are these perceptions of (environment and environmental change) translated into partisan choices? He has some of Ray's interest in partisan choice as a kind of base line against which to measure change--but it's mostly an aggregate concern.

Brady-Bullock

They want oversampling in selected congressional districts--to get at representation especially where votes of member and demography of district suggest misfits and where states have Senators of different parties: "Why will the same constituency choose representative of opposing parties within the span of only two years?"