

The heart of the book consists of seventeen chapters in which scholars from a variety of social and behavioral science disciplines define and justify their ideas that collectively made up a large portion of the 2006 Pilot Study and present their analyses and conclusions about how those ideas fared in that study.¹ These chapters are organized along substantive themes, and we provide a brief introduction to each new section of the book to set the stage for the contributions that follow. As is appropriate for a pilot study, all the contributions revolve around new instrumentation that, in theory, could improve our understanding of voting and turnout. In many cases, the authors make a convincing argument that the new instrumentation advances our understanding of political outcomes. In other cases, the authors conclude that the current ANES instrumentation is preferable to the proposed new measures. In either case, the research advances our understanding of best practices in the measurement of core constructs and advances our understanding of the dynamics of voting and turnout. Finally, we should note that the 2006 Pilot Study, like all ANES surveys, is freely available for further analyses. As you read the following chapters, questions may arise that you would like to analyze. Further, the studies reported here and available online have been analyzed only in their component module forms. We look forward to additional analyses of these data that cut across these modular ideas.

¹While these seventeen empirical analyses cover a wide range of topics and proposed new instrumentation, they do not cover the full range of ideas examined in the 2006 Pilot Study. These additional topics include the following: a single question tapping individuals' beliefs about the stability or malleability of character (Module 1); a five-question Need for Closure scale (Module 3); a single question to measure individuals' beliefs in a just world (Module 4); three questions about ability to borrow money, aimed at capturing individuals' levels of financial security (Module 8); a battery of questions measuring pessimism and optimism about the individual's and the nation's future (Module 12); a social networks battery (Module 13); a battery of questions assessing beliefs about the efficacy of the president and Congress (Module 16); tolerance of Muslims (Module 21); two questions about death and "end times" beliefs (Module 29). In addition, many ideas that were proposed were unable to be included in the pilot study itself. Interested readers can examine the archives of the ANES Online Commons (<http://www.electionstudies.org/onlinecommons/overview.htm>) for more information.

CHAPTER 2

The American National Election Studies and the Importance of New Ideas

Jon A. Krosnick and Arthur Lupia

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS participate in elections for the president and Congress of the United States. These elections draw great attention from every corner of the nation. In the months leading up to each Election Day, news and opinions about candidates are the focus of numerous newspaper headlines, television programs, and websites. Questions about many election-related topics are brought to the fore. Some topics remain focal for the duration of the campaign. Others fade into obscurity. The influence of all such news extends beyond the media and into many workplace discussions and dinner-table conversations. After the votes are cast and the confetti falls from the ceilings of partisan gatherings in large cities and small towns, the winners celebrate, the losers ruminate, and debates about the meaning of it all reach a fever pitch. In every case, the results of our federal elections are recorded as high-water marks in the evolving history of our nation.

Why do people act as they do in federal elections? Why do some people vote, while others choose not to do so? Of those who vote, why do they vote for the candidates that they choose? There is great interest in the answers to these questions. How myriad observers understand what happened during each U.S. presidential and congressional election fuels many assessments of the health of the world's most visible democracy. Observations about stability and change in how different kinds of Americans feel about political candidates, political parties, and major issues provide a clearer understanding of the continuing relationship between citizens and government. Such clarity can reveal which aspects of policy voters appreciate and which aspects make them angry, anxious, or ambivalent. In popular and individual perceptions of, and feelings toward, election-related phenomena lies the legitimacy of a country's democratic experience.

It is critical for a nation that cherishes its democratic legitimacy to seek credible measures of how citizens think, feel, and act in electoral contexts. The reason is that following every election, we see many attempts to convince broad

audiences that the Election Day actions of the American people are evidence of the political, moral, or ethical position that the author wishes to advance. After every federal election, inward-oriented political interests have strong incentives to try to spin these electoral moments toward fictional narratives that support their preferred worldviews. If credible measures of citizen attitudes and opinions, and analyses of them, are not available, there will be no strong evidentiary basis for differentiating propagandistic tall tales from empirically defensible and logically coherent readings of electoral history. To the extent that a nation benefits from having its history constrained by evidence and logic, the availability of credible data about voter attitudes and opinions is a public good of significant value.

During recent election cycles, many polls were described as reflecting the public's views. Many of these surveys, however, had severe limitations that limited their potential to reflect public opinion accurately. For example, nearly all public polls involve very short interviews. They typically focus on just a few issues that are prominent in public discussion at the time of the poll. Moreover, findings from these polls are reported in relatively simple, descriptive ways. While it is common for reporters or pollsters to claim that these surveys clarify processes underlying the latest horse-race numbers, the surveys themselves are typically insufficient to support the kinds of statistical analyses necessary to validate such causal claims. Indeed, the vast majority of polls reported by the news media are conducted long before Election Day and do not allow analysts to relate beliefs held at that time to what citizens actually do in the voting booths. The few postelection surveys made available come in the form of exit polls, which include a remarkably small set of measures of the potential causes of vote choices and offer no opportunity for understanding turnout decisions (since no nonvoters are interviewed). While news-media-sponsored and candidate-sponsored polls of the kinds described above can provide quick snapshots of election-related activity, and hence make electoral politics entertaining, these polls are limited in the depth of understanding that they provide.

The legitimacy of our democratic system requires more than numbers that entertain. It requires us to ask questions that go far beyond which "horse" is ahead or behind on a particular day. It requires us to be open to the possibility that the answer to important questions about whether and how people voted cannot be condensed to a sound bite or a single headline. We must be open to the possibility that the answers to many of these questions come from a multitude of factors that are related to one another in sometimes intricate ways, and that the relationships between these factors may be different for diverse subgroups of the electorate. To uncover these relationships, analysts need large, multifaceted, and credible data sets.

For these reasons, high-quality election surveys can be valuable public goods. But as public goods, they are likely to be underprovided by market forces. As long-prevailing and highly influential neoclassical microeconomic theories attest, if a good is large and nondivisible (that is, if one person's consumption of the good does not prevent others from also deriving benefit), if the total cost of the good is greater than the benefit that it provides to any single person, and if the benefit that the good provides to society is greater than its cost, then the amount of the good supplied by market forces will be less than the amount that would most benefit society. Over the last sixty years, this logic has led a growing number of legitimacy-valuing governments around the world to sponsor credible and broadly relevant data collections capable of illuminating the election-relevant thinking and actions of their citizens. These public goods are often known as national election surveys.

The United States was one of the first countries to make such an investment. The project now known as the American National Election Studies has been in operation for more than fifty years. The project began in the 1950s, when researchers at the University of Michigan created interview-based election data capable of benefiting a wide range of research hypotheses. Since 1977, the U.S. government, through the National Science Foundation, has funded the ANES. Around the world, the ANES is widely regarded as the gold standard of election studies. Thousands of scholarly articles and books use ANES data and findings, and many aspects of its design have been used to improve election studies around the world.

This success, however, generated some expectations of the project that were not being met at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Many scholars were disappointed that topics about which they cared were not well covered in the ANES questionnaires. Moreover, the means by which ANES selected questions to ask its respondents were not transparent to the academic community.

In 2004, the National Science Foundation challenged the scholarly community to update the ANES in ways that would increase its scholarly and social value. In response, we developed a plan to change how the ANES conducted its business. Part of the plan included reactivating the use of pilot studies, which in the past had allowed ANES users to evaluate new measures. Another part of the plan was a mechanism for incorporating ideas from many people into the process of questionnaire design. Two elements of our vision for greater transparency and participation in questionnaire development were the ANES Online Commons, a means by which scholars could make proposals about questionnaire content, and this book. The Online Commons was intended to collect as many insights as possible about the best way to design and implement upcoming ANES data collections. This book, in turn, is meant to document the con-

tributions of scholars who designed new questions for ANES surveys and to facilitate the effective use of ANES data by highlighting the theoretical and empirical origins of new ANES questions.

In this chapter, we explain our rationale for introducing these changes to the ANES. We begin by arguing that broader participation and greater transparency in the process of survey design improves the content and legitimacy of survey-based election research. We then review our attempts to achieve such outcomes through the Online Commons and the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

A STRATEGY FOR OPENING THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The ANES produces surveys that are used by scholars, journalists, students, and citizens from across the world. ANES data are a focal part of the literature on voting behavior, and many ANES-developed methods have been adopted by other studies. As a whole, the ANES provides data and intellectual infrastructure for many scholars who seek to evaluate an ever-expanding range of important hypotheses about turnout, vote choice, and related topics.

The agenda of the ANES distinguishes it from most other election surveys. Many valuable surveys, for example, are proprietary. Some surveys sponsored by news media organizations, political campaigns, political parties, interest groups, and others are never released to the broad community of scholars, so only limited analyses of their findings are reported publicly, if any findings are released at all. These practices limit the value of such data for enhancing public wisdom. Other surveys have different limitations. Most media and campaign polls, for example, are conducted quickly (in just a few days) and involve low response rates and very short questionnaires (rarely longer than ten minutes on average). While such polls can augment news headlines with exciting numbers, most serious analysts have not found them useful for in-depth explorations that consider simultaneous or interactive relationships between multiple variables. Media and campaign polls ask only a handful of questions repeatedly over any period of time. Instead, they shift the focus of questionnaires from survey to survey to address the events of recent days. Hence, the surveys provide little or no basis for explaining the changes in attitudes or perceptions that take place during the course of a campaign. And it is exceedingly rare to see *the same respondent* interviewed extensively before an election and then again after the election in order to understand individual-level vote choice or turnout more deeply. Most importantly, few if any political surveys of any variety solicit extensive feedback from broad arrays of social scientists about the most effective way to draw samples, conduct interviews, or ask questions. As a result, many

surveys produce data that are difficult to interpret and not well suited for credible analyses.

We based the version of the ANES that we oversaw (our term began in 2005 and ended in 2009) on three premises. The first premise was that the ANES's core mission is to promote cutting-edge and broadly collaborative research on American national elections. We believed that to honor and help expand the existing literature on voting and elections, we had to continue to pursue the traditions of excellence established by past studies. At the same time, we and many other people wanted to take ANES in new directions so as to empower scholars around the world to enhance the depth and breadth of our collective understanding of electorates. For us, what mattered most was the value that the project could provide to the scientific community. As a result, we focused on how to increase the value and credibility of ANES surveys. Also recognizing the broad interest in the ANES, we wanted to find new ways to learn from the community of users and provide them with greater rewards for their willingness to contribute their ideas to the ANES's public goods.

A second premise was that the ANES provides maximum value to its user community by focusing on activities other than those that individual scholars and other organizations do just as well or better than the ANES. There was no need, for example, for the ANES to conduct surveys that feed headlines in real time. Plenty of organizations do that. Instead, we saw the project's mission as being to provide data that support rich hypothesis testing, maximize methodological excellence, measure many variables, and enable comparisons across people, contexts, and time.

A third premise, and the factor that most distinguishes the ANES from all other political surveys in our minds, was that our production efforts should be based on broad scholarly input. We believe the study is at its best when it is driven by the ideas of many scholars and when it provides mechanisms for converting these ideas into more precise and scientifically relevant instrumentation. That is why we wanted the ANES to be as open as possible to new ideas in questionnaire development. By finding new ways to solicit and make constructive use of new ideas from the scholarly community, we believe that the ANES has the best shot at providing data that gives science and society the means to make significant contributions to knowledge of vote choice and turnout in American national elections.

These three premises motivated the proposal we sent to the National Science Foundation in the spring of 2005 and guided every decision we made as principal investigators. In particular, they led us to create a new way of communicating about questionnaire design with the scholarly community (the ANES Online Commons) and to conceptualize a new way to constructively and effi-

ciently convey insights gained from such interactions to interested audiences (the production of this book).

THE ONLINE COMMONS AND IMPROVING PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS

The Online Commons (OC), an ANES innovation, first opened between March and June 2006 to solicit and evaluate suggestions for new questions to be tested in a pilot study. The OC was designed to improve the breadth and quality of scientific input that informs ANES questionnaire development. The OC was also designed to make the process of proposal submission and evaluation more transparent to users of ANES data and to increase the public accountability of ANES decision makers. We knew of no models for soliciting input for a major survey in this way, so we designed the OC from scratch.

Individuals or teams of researchers were invited to submit questions for testing in the pilot study. Participants could also comment on proposals that had been submitted. The OC thus allowed for the improvement of the ANES pilot study questionnaire, and allowed submitters to obtain feedback from a broad community of scholars on questions they might decide to include on their own survey instruments.

The OC was structured to encourage participation from a broad array of scholars. Any faculty member, student, survey researcher, or social science professional could apply for membership in the Commons by submitting verifiable contact information and a statement of interest in the Commons and by agreeing to the Code of Conduct. Participants did not need to be academics, though they had to have the ability to express interest in making future ANES data collection more credible and useful to the project's scientific and social constituency (this ability was gauged by answers to a few simple questions on the OC membership enrollment form).

The OC opened and closed on specific dates for each ANES study. For each study, any OC member could submit as many proposals as he or she liked. To increase the likelihood that proposals would be read by others, and that evidence and argument in favor of particular questions would be presented efficiently, proposals were limited to ten double-spaced pages. To increase the likelihood that the proposals would offer the kinds of information needed for readers to make informed judgments about the likely value of the proposed questions, each proposal was required to contain the following information:

- Exact wording of proposed question(s).
- An explicit argument about why the proposed question(s) merited inclusion in an

ANES survey. We reminded participants that the primary mandate of the ANES is to explain vote choices and turnout, but remained open to the fact that this mandate could be advanced in ways that incorporate insights from many different disciplines or approaches.

- An explicit argument about the kinds and range of statistical analyses that the question(s) allowed and the benefit of such analyses to science and society. Submitters were encouraged to provide clear presentations of modeling frameworks, power statistics, or analogous analytic concepts in order to make their arguments more persuasive.
- An explicit argument about the conceptual and theoretical foundations of the question(s).
- Evidence about the empirical performance of such questions.
- Evidence that the proposed way of asking the question(s) yielded better data than obvious alternate ways of asking the same question(s).

After deadlines for submitting and commenting on proposals had passed, the ANES Board of Overseers spent several weeks reviewing the proposals. The proposals and the reviews were then discussed at a board meeting. Ultimately, the PIs—who are formally accountable to the National Science Foundation for the content of each study—made decisions about which questions to include. At the conclusion of the questionnaire-development process, the PIs sent each proposal author written feedback about his or her proposal.

This review process was designed to produce study-content decisions whose logic was transparent and public, and substantial public input about conceptualization, theory, and measurement before each study was fielded. Such outcomes constitute a contrast to existing practice in the development of most surveys, in which public conversations about questionnaire construction occur sporadically if at all.

The OC was intended to raise the benefits and to reduce the real and perceived costs associated with proposing new questions for inclusion in ANES surveys. On the benefit side, having a question appear in an ANES questionnaire allows a scholar to gather evidence about how answers to his or her question relates to a wide array of other ANES measures. Given the focal role that many ANES questions play in the scholarly literature, inclusion provides an opportunity for scholars with innovative ideas to link them to many core concepts in the social sciences. In addition, the OC provides benefits to scholars beyond those that accrue directly to improved ANES questionnaires. Consider, for example, benefits to senior researchers who have sufficient resources to conduct their own studies. While many innovative insights have come from such work, such scholars often have limited incentives or opportunities to solicit broad feedback about study design from other highly skilled persons. The OC

provides such scholars a forum for vetting their ideas. Whether or not these questions ultimately appear on an ANES survey, scholars receive constructive feedback about their proposals.

OC benefits also accrue to younger scholars. Consider, for example, that some junior faculty and graduate students are fortunate enough to be in settings where they get good advice about study or question design. But many others do not have easy access to such feedback. Even those who can get good advice from nearby senior scholars often lack a means for learning additional lessons from a broader network of experts. The OC provides such an opportunity.

On the cost side, in the years before the opening of the OC, much ambiguity and uncertainty surrounded the process by which the ANES selected questions for its studies. Some researchers believed that the process favored senior scholars. Other researchers believed that the ANES was biased against their ideas. With such beliefs widely held, it was understandable why many people did not go out of their way to engage the ANES.

By contrast, proposal evaluation was procedurally transparent with the OC. In addition to maintaining an archive of proposals on its website, the OC outlined the criteria for the inclusion of questions in surveys. This transparency reduced the ambiguity and uncertainty involved in the question selection process, thereby altering the benefit-cost calculation associated with submitting a proposal.

Because ANES surveys are of limited length, it is not possible to include in the surveys every question sent to the OC. In chapter 20, we discuss the criteria by which we evaluated proposals for questions sent to the OC for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. In that case, so many proposals were sent that the ANES could not promise inclusion of all proposed questions, even of all meritorious questions. But the ANES could promise that each submission would receive thorough review and that constructive feedback would be provided to every author. We made this promise and we kept it. While this activity was very time consuming, we believe that it was worth the time and effort. In some cases, critical feedback led to the production of improved proposals that, in turn, yielded items that were included in later surveys. In other cases, the feedback did not return benefits directly to the ANES, but scholars used it to refine their own research projects, which, in turn, have advanced the scholarly study of elections in other ways.

Another cost pertains to credit for new ideas. An open marketplace of ideas, such as the OC, introduced challenges regarding privacy, responsible use, and intellectual property. Once researchers submitted proposals to the OC, they had very little control over the use of their ideas. Participants and guests who accessed the OC could borrow materials submitted by other users in order to

enhance their own research projects—and they could do so without acknowledging the intellectual contributions of their peers. Although research is a community endeavor, researchers usually enjoy the ability to implement and test their own ideas before sharing them with others, and it was possible that the OC would reduce the likelihood of that occurring.

To limit such costs, ANES sought ways to institute property rights for scholars who submitted proposals. This was done in two ways. First, the OC archived all proposals. Hence, the ANES maintains a public record of a particular scholar proposing a particular idea at a particular time. As of the time of this writing, all proposals remain posted on the ANES website at <http://www.electionstudies.org>. Second, we instigated publication of the book you are now reading.

We envision this book as including revised and enhanced versions of successful OC proposals. We want this information to be available to the public so that they may better understand the theoretical and conceptual origins of ANES questions. Such a book, we believe, benefits ANES users by giving them a questionnaire-oriented guide that is far more comprehensive than a typical codebook that is released with publicly available surveys. This book reveals the theory behind the questions and permits users to interpret the data in deeper ways. The book may also benefit proposers by giving them publication-based credit for their ideas—which can be of particular value to young scholars who have comparative advantages in theoretical or conceptual underpinnings of survey research. Today, many questions are asked in surveys—including the ANES—without documentation of the rationale for their inclusion. Instead of such contributions being unrecorded and unavailable to researchers who use a data set years after it is collected, the OC archive and this book are intended to document and encourage rigorous discussion of what survey questions and responses mean and to facilitate subsequent theoretical and conceptual contributions to the survey-based study of elections.

THE OUTCOME OF THE ONLINE COMMONS AND THE CONTENT OF THE 2006 ANES PILOT STUDY

In past years, the ANES implemented pilot studies to test new questions for possible inclusion in later national surveys. Data from these pilot studies have been very informative. Some have been used to make substantive and methodological advances in widely read publications, while others yielded technical reports that improved subsequent ANES data collections. Reinstating pilot studies was a key part of our strategy for increasing the credibility and value of subsequent ANES surveys.

We opened the OC for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study on March 15, 2006, and closed it on June 22, 2006. More than 300 scholars became OC members during that time. Those members submitted almost 100 proposals and proposed more than 1,100 questions. The OC participants were diverse, including scholars from a wide range of disciplines and many graduate students. More than one-third of the proposals were from disciplines outside political science, which surprised many outside observers and demonstrated the intellectual reach of the ANES. Collectively, OC participants brought a new energy and creativity to the study of elections. They provided the ingredients for a very strong pilot study.

Data collection for the pilot study was carried out from November 13, 2006, to January 5, 2007. Telephone interviews were conducted with 675 respondents by the survey firm Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas. All respondents had participated in the 2004 ANES Time Series Study. As a result, pilot study questions could be evaluated using data collected during the pilot study interviews and data collected from the respondents two years earlier. The pilot study interviews lasted about thirty-seven minutes on average, and the reinterview rate was 56%. The study was funded by the National Science Foundation through grants to Stanford University and the University of Michigan.

The 2006 Pilot Study questionnaire was organized by topic in twenty-nine modules. Each module corresponds to a specific OC proposal (see table 2.1). Because of space constraints and the content priorities of the ANES, we were not able to include all questions from all the proposals listed there. In many cases, we worked with OC authors to revise question wording in ways that were consistent with current theories of optimal question wording (see, for example, Krosnick and Presser, 2010). The questionnaire also contained questions pertaining to vote choice, turnout, and demographics in order to facilitate rigorous evaluation of the new questions with respect to the topics most important to the ANES. Details about the conduct of the pilot study are available on the ANES website (<http://www.electionstudies.org>).

Soon after the last interview was completed, the ANES released the pilot study data set to the public on its website. The data became available to all scholars at exactly the same moment. Neither the PIs, nor the ANES Board of Overseers, nor the OC proposers received early or privileged access to the data. This practice is in keeping with the public mission of the ANES and our desire to make all ANES practices as transparent as possible.

As the range of topics described in table 2.1 suggests, the contributions of OC proposals allowed ANES users and the scientific community at large to evaluate the performance of an expansive series of new questions in an election-survey context. In chapter 20, we describe how we used information from the pilot

TABLE 2.1
Pilot Study Modules and Their Sources

<i>Module</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Affiliation(s)</i>
1	“Character Judgments and Voting Behavior”	Daniel Molden	Northwestern Univ.
2	“Defensive Confidence and Exposure to Political Information”	Dolores Albarracin	Univ. of Florida
3	“The Need for Closure and Political Attitudes”	Christopher Michael Federico John T. Jost Antonio Pierro Arie W. Kruglanski	Univ. of Minnesota New York Univ. Universita delgi Studi di Roma Univ. of Maryland
5	“Self-Monitoring and Political Attitudes”	Adam Berinsky Howard Lavine	MIT Stony Brook Univ.
6	“Generalized Trust Questions”	Eric M. Uslaner	Univ. of Maryland
7	“Basic Values” “Figuring Out Voters’ Values” “Values Assessment Proposal”	Shalom Schwartz Steven Hitlin Kennon M. Sheldon Charles Nichols	Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem Univ. of Iowa Univ. of Missouri-Columbia Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
8	“Financial Resources and Security”	Katherine Porter Teresa A. Sullivan Deborah Thorne Elizabeth Warren	Univ. of Iowa College of Law Univ. of Michigan Ohio Univ. Harvard Law School
9	“Sociotropic Voting and the Media”	Stephen Ansolabehere Marc Meredith Erik Snowberg James M. Snyder, Jr.	MIT Stanford GSB Stanford Univ. MIT
10	“Religion and Electoral Behavior”	David C. Leege Stephen T. Mockabee Kenneth D. Wald	Univ. of Notre Dame Univ. of Cincinnati Univ. of Florida

TABLE 2.1 (cont.)

Module	Title	Author(s)	Affiliation(s)
11	"Born Again Identity"	David Barker L. J Zigerell, Jr. Heather Marie Rice	Univ. of Pittsburgh Univ. of Pittsburgh Univ. of Pittsburgh
12	"Questions about Social Mood"	Wayne D. Parker	Socionomics Foundation
13	"Political Networks" "Everyday Political Talk"	Betsy Sinclair Vivian Martin	Caltech Central Connecticut State Univ.
14	"Measuring Political Interest"	Danielle Shani	Princeton Univ.
15	"Alternative Measures of Partisan Ambivalence" "Measuring Ambivalence about Government"	Marco Steenbergen Howard Lavine Stephen C. Craig Jason Gainous Michael D. Martinez	UNC-Chapel Hill Stony Brook Univ. Univ. of Florida Univ. of Louisville Univ. of Florida
16	"Extending Political Efficacy"	Daniel Schneider	Stanford Univ.
17	"Federalism and Trust in Government" "Political Trust: Reconciling Theory and Practice"	Joe Gershtenson Dennis L. Plane	Eastern Kentucky Univ. Juniata College
18	"Testing a New Generation of Media Use Measures for the ANES"	Scott Althaus David Tewksbury	Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
19	"New Abortion Items"	David Barker L. J Zigerell, Jr. Heather Marie Rice	Univ. of Pittsburgh Univ. of Pittsburgh Univ. of Pittsburgh
20	"Abortion"	L.J Zigerell, Jr. Heather Rice David Barker	Univ. of Pittsburgh Univ. of Pittsburgh Univ. of Pittsburgh

TABLE 2.1 (cont.)

Module	Title	Author(s)	Affiliation(s)
22	"Crime, Perceived Criminal Injustice, and Electoral Politics"	John Hagan Ross L. Matsueda Ruth D. Peterson Lauren J. Krivo	Northwestern Univ. Univ. of Washington Ohio State Univ. Ohio State Univ.
23	"Candidate Gender and American Political Behavior"	Kira Sanbonmatsu Kathleen Dolan	Ohio State Univ. Univ. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
24	"People's Attitudes toward Equality, Redistribution and a Progressive Tax System"	Ruben Durante Louis Putterman	Brown Univ. Brown Univ.
25	"Perceptions of Entitativity and Similarity of Political Groups" "Polarization and Perceived Polarization on Policy Issues"	Sara Ann Crump David Hamilton Charles Judd Leaf Van Boven David Sherman	UC-Santa Barbara UC-Santa Barbara Univ. of Colorado Univ. of Colorado UC-Santa Barbara
29	"End Times Beliefs"	Michael K. Earl	Trinity Univ.

study, and in particular pilot study reports written by OC authors and other scholars, to inform decisions about subsequent ANES survey questionnaires. In many cases, the evaluations revealed that new questions had great potential to advance scientific and social knowledge of why people choose to vote (or not) and to select candidates as they do.

Of course, not everyone thought that opening up the ANES questionnaire-development process through the OC was a good idea. We heard doubts expressed about the ability of people with little or no experience in survey design to make meaningful contributions to the study. We believed differently.

When we were younger scholars, we encountered many people who had potentially interesting suggestions for ANES content but, from their perspective, no viable way to convey those ideas to ANES decision makers. The broad participation in the OC and the wealth of ideas that it produced is a testament to

the talents and insight of the scholarly community. Table 2.1 lists many scholars who are not yet “household” names in the fields of survey research or election studies. Yet when given an opportunity, they offered interesting ideas that could benefit a broad set of scholars. Including these individuals in the design process seems to have been win-win for all involved.

CONCLUSION: THE VIRTUE OF GREATER PARTICIPATION AND TRANSPARENCY

More than anything else, what distinguishes the ANES from many other political surveys is the premise that it can and should be based on broad scholarly input. We believe the study is at its best when it is driven by the ideas of many scholars and when it provides mechanisms for converting these ideas into precise and scientifically relevant instrumentation. This premise has driven us to open questionnaire development for ANES surveys to a wide range of new ideas. By finding new ways to solicit and make constructive use of new ideas from the scholarly community, we believe that the ANES has the best shot at providing data that give social science the means to make significant contributions to knowledge of vote choice and turnout in American national elections.

We are grateful to everyone who contributed to the Online Commons. The ANES website (www.electionstudies.org) contains an archive of the ideas sent by all such persons. While the planning for the pilot study is long past, the energy and creativity of many of those ideas remain available for anyone who has both an Internet connection and the desire to gain a deeper understanding of why people act as they do on Election Day.

REFERENCES

- Krosnick, Jon A., and Stanley Presser. 2010. “Question and Questionnaire Design.” In *Handbook of Survey Research*, 2nd ed., edited by J. D. Wright and P. V. Marsden, 263–314. West Yorkshire, UK: Emerald Group.

PART 2

Individual Predispositions