

C. Michael Lanphier, York University

After the first flush of success, the Survey Research Centre is confronted with an overriding query: How does a centre provide to academic and non-profit clients a complete survey research service on a continuing basis, economically, with precision, efficiency, and payoff to the Centre as well as to the client?

Such a query rarely reaches the lips or the pen of the Centre director when discussing business with a potential client, whose project occupies their undivided mutual attention. Such a system-maintenance-and-update function hardly quickens the pulse of a researcher, whose project must occupy the forefront of academic consciousness. On the other hand, members of the Centre express the concern incessantly.

Admittedly the query is complex and intricately woven into the fabric of social science research, funding policies of both sources both outside and within the university; and finally, it is beholden to the line of development to be traced over time by the Centre itself.

For the first, the fabric of social science research, the surveys must contain the dual function of adhering to a social science problem on the one hand and contemporary relevance for Canadian Society on the other. The notion of regionalism takes on great potency in survey research, for example. Two studies in the problems of absorption of immigrants have taken different form when replicated in Alberta metropolitan areas than when the study was conducted in Toronto. Again, the bilingual character of studies which are conducted in Québec and any other province represents cultural differences. A panoply of differences in legal and political structure not only reveals differences in electoral jurisdictional boundaries but also different conceptions of legal offences. The term, "assault & battery" does not exist in French-Canadian parlance, for example.

In the second instance, social science developments have been closely allied to the increasing use of social science data and funding of social science research by the Canadian federal government. Principally, the Canada Council has been charged with subsidizing both social science and the arts. The hospitality of this organization to large-scale survey projects has dramatically widened in recent years, so that most social scientists will seek funding under that aegis alone. Other government departments have allocated significant sums to survey research indirectly. Funding from private foundations has played only a minor rôle, although one which promises increasing significance.

Universities have¹ received almost no funds particularly earmarked for research.

Thus, the original query finds its principal constraint in the character of social research in the Canadian scene -- a scene which involves the structures of experience, cultural complexity, and sources of funding. Although the ingredients are familiar to any North American context, the particular configuration assumes uniqueness.

QUESTS

The Centre has opted for the creation of probability sampling frames of households as the most robust and general-purpose type of sampling frame for initial operation, stratified by the federal divisions of electoral districts.² Although such an option appears traditional in the development of survey centres, additional factors contributed heavily to this decision. The Census tabulates these areas by household, classified by small Enumeration Areas, which are used by enumerators for convenience. It is thereby possible to "blow up" all sample estimates to population values. Because these electoral districts may be sub-divided into units of just over 300 households, they serve as excellent proxy units to indicate other variables, such as degree of urbanization, ethnic composition or political orientation. Such frames may aggregate when these units are employed. That is, the first sampling frame comprehended 95% of the population in the Province of Ontario. We anticipated that other frames would be drawn in the future for other provinces and for metropolitan areas within the provinces as well. The Electoral District is common to all such frames.

How does such strategy of development affect linkage with another survey unit? In practical terms, this question related to the interest of York University to join forces with an academic survey centre in the province of Québec to provide co-ordinated bi-lingual capability and to allow simultaneously an independence of the two centres.

¹Fred Schindeler and C. Michael Lanphier, "Social Science Research and Participatory Democracy in Canada," *Canadian Public Administration*, 12 (1969), 481-498.

²Eighty-five such districts are found in the Province of Ontario (population more than seven millions). The choice was dictated as well by consideration of temporal continuity of survey data. The task of re-adjustment of boundaries after the decennial census is fairly simple, if time-consuming.

In the fall of 1969, York University and Université de Montréal formulated an accord which arranged for such co-ordination between the Survey Research Centre and the newly-created Centre de Sondage. The pertinent features of the accord include the following:

1. Sampling frames and all pertinent materials for the Province of Québec are developed by Centre de Sondage. Correspondingly, the Survey Research Centre would develop sampling frames for all other provinces, providing access to all such materials on a free-exchange basis.
2. Interviewing and supervision would be geographically divided, with Centre de Sondage in charge of all interviewing in Québec. Standards of fieldwork and supervision are conventionally agreed upon. Field supervision is local, regardless of language of interview.
3. Translation and co-ordination of bilingual aspects of surveys fall primarily to Université de Montréal.
4. Coding is centralized at whichever centre originates the study in question, in order to facilitate update of bilingual codebooks.
5. Data are deposited in the data bank of the originating centre, with a copy of the data provided the other centre at cost.
6. Either centre may initiate a contract with a client with work involving the other centre, over which the latter Centre retains the right of first refusal.
7. All time not reserved for co-operative studies will be used at the discretion of the particular centre.

While the first fruits have been reaped from such a union, the initial yield has been small, if promising. That is, the organizations have been chastened in terms of questionnaire design, code co-ordination, and the deposition of data in machine readable form. It is yet to be seen whether such lessons in research conduct generalize beyond the first year of the accord. Yet is it possible to trace significant advances, such as the development of a program of estimation for survey data with appropriate weights attached to each record. This tabulation program has drawn upon the talents of statisticians at both Centres.

QU'EST-CE QUE C'EST?

What organizational implications exist from the specification of a particular case of one survey centre? Among the general conclusions, the following stand prominent:

1. A standard, household sampling frame model, based upon geographical subdivisions has proved its robustness for nine studies in the past two years. Each of these nine required either some modification, or it

initiated a new geographical area to be so included. Another ten studies, however, could not take advantage of any such frame, even though five of them have employed probability sampling from some other frame (student lists, lists of universities, assessment rolls, lists of recipients). The remainder of the studies have followed essentially a quota sampling procedure, primarily because of the rarefied nature of the target population (e.g., families who move into selected geographical areas within a city, classified by type of dwelling).

2. The standards developed for presumably fixed items in any survey repertoire shift from study to study. The accompanying list of occupational codes describes what is probably the most uniform question appearing throughout all instruments. The decisions to employ one as opposed to another code depend largely upon the intent of the principal investigator, who intends to compare the data with some other corpus. A standard form of coding would involve a double effort and likely a lower reliability as a result of interference of two similar codes.

3. The accord with Université de Montréal Centre de Sondage stands without precedent, although it sets one which implies a variety of alternative modes of liaison between two universities and geographically-based organizations. There is little question that co-operation in the present instance could have taken no other form. Whether all universities could formulate such bi-lateral (multiple?) accords calls into question the establishment of infrastructure which continues the liaison after the glow of good feeling subsides.

It can be argued in the present case that this accord is unique because of its bilingual-bicultural dimension which squares with geographical districts. It should be emphasized as well that the agreement is bi-lateral, so that co-ordination of field and coding schedules may be arranged with minimal difficulty. Such arrangements might well prove difficult if the co-ordinating task involves the combined forces of several organizations.

4. A recent governmental task force, charged with inquiring into the problems of dissemination of information about the federal government, recommended that a governmental social survey unit be constructed, along the lines of that established in the United Kingdom. While the proposal has met with varying degrees of warmth in reception, a director of the unit is currently being sought. It is likely that any such development of a governmental social survey unit of approximately 100 persons with an infrastructure budget of \$2½ millions per year would seriously hamper academic developments, since the former would compete for the scarce human resources, whatever long-run advantages might accrue to either or to survey research in general.

5. The challenges for academically-based survey research units lie principally in the development of survey research as itself a legitimate area of academic inquiry. At the same time, the obvious practical advantages which accrue to the conduct of surveys in providing descriptive data, from which all theoretical advances would doubtless originate, means that survey research organizations will probably continue to "bootleg" research under the guise of the quest on behalf of a given principal investigator for purity of his research findings! Although the goals of principal investigators are rarely at odds with those of a survey organization, the hierarchy of benefits clearly differs.

After the initial problem of survival, the more goal-oriented question of research contribution assumes paramount stature for a survey research organization. Because of the intimate connection between the practical and theoretical contributions which survey research makes, the direction of the latter course awaits the interchange between the two sets of researchers: principal investigator and survey researchers. Without the contribution of either, the advances will be halting.

APPENDIX

OCCUPATIONAL CODES USED FROM 1968-1970

- I. Project 101, "An Analysis of Attitudes toward Unemployment Insurance Compensation"
 Project 106, "Attitudes toward Government Information"
 Project 109, "Study of Caloric Intake"
 Project 117, "Evaluation Research for Unemployment Insurance Commission"

-
1. Professional
 2. Managerial, owners
 3. Sales
 4. Clerical
 5. Skilled Labour
 6. Unskilled Labour
 7. Farming
 8. Retired, Unemployed

- II. Project 105, "Political Socialization of Non-party Elites in Canada"

-
0. Professional, technical, and kindred workers
 1. Farmers and farm managers
 2. Managers, officials, and proprietors, exc. farm
 3. Clerical and kindred workers
 4. Sales workers
 5. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers
 6. Operatives and kindred semi-skilled workers
 7. Service workers
 8. Farm labourers and foremen
 9. Labourers, exc. farm & mine
 (From 1960 Census of Population, United States)

- III. Project 112, "Community Participation in Bowmanville, Ontario"

-
1. Managers
 2. Intellectuals
 3. White collar workers
 4. Skilled blue-collar workers
 5. Semi-skilled blue-collar workers
 6. Unskilled blue-collar workers
 7. Farmers

- IV. Project 107, "Attitudes toward Crime and the Police in Toronto"

-
1. Professional
 2. Semi-professional
 3. Proprietors, managers, officials: large organizations
 4. Proprietors, managers, officials: small organizations
 5. Clerical and sales
 6. Skilled labour
 7. Semi-skilled labour
 8. Unskilled labour
 9. Farming

- V. Project 102, "Political Attitudes in Ontario"
 Project 110, "Residential Allocations and Preferences"
 Project 111, "Social Effects of Housing"
 Project 114, "Survey on Neighbourhoods and Population Movement"
 Project 116, "Non-medical Use of Drugs"

001-009	1. Managerial	Administrateurs
101-199	2. Professional and technical	Professions libérales et techniciens
201-249	3. Clerical	Employés de bureau
301-339	4. Sales	Vendeurs
401-459	5. Service and recreation	Travailleurs des services et des activités récréatives
510-588	6. Transportation and communication	Travailleurs des transports et communications
601-609	7. Farmers and farm workers	Agriculteurs et travailleurs agricoles
611-615	8. Loggers and related workers	Bûcherons et travailleurs forestiers
631-633	9. Fishermen, trappers, and hunters	Pêcheurs, trappeurs et chasseurs
651-659	10. Miners, quarrymen, and related workers	Mineurs, carriers et travailleurs assimilés
701-919	11. Craftsmen, production process and related workers	Ouvriers à la production et travailleurs assimilés
921-970	12. Labourers, n.e.c.	Manoeuvres, n.c.a.
980	13. Occupation not stated	Professions non déclarées

(From Dominion Bureau of Statistics Occupation Code, 1961 Census of Canada)