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About the project

• Goal: history of SSDAs, sustainability

• Level of analysis:
  • field level organizations (e.g. IASISST)
  • Individual case SSDAs

• Question: What tactics have SSDAs used to remain relevant through fifty years of change?
  • How have SSDA collaborated and competed?

• Data
  • Organizational documents (reports, plans, budgets, members lists)
  • Interviews
  • Today: social network analysis drawn from IQ articles
Methods and questions

• Social network analysis of SSDA interactions as represented in IQ articles from 1976-2002, using NodeXL.

• Nodes: 4 types of institutions
  • Institutional home of authors
  • Data providers
  • Collaborating institutions that provided other labor
  • Funders

• Links: 4 types of relationships
  • Data Provider relationship
  • Collaborating Institution relationship:
  • Funding relationship.
  • International relationship

• Questions:
  • To what degree are international relationships represented in IQ articles?
  • what gaps in the relationships between institutions stand out?
  • To what extent are highly linked institutions interlinked with each other?
Q1: International relationships over time

• Tend to cluster, gaps
• Nations appear in IQ, but not as part of relationships
• Not correlated with conference location
• Most international relationships:
  - Germany -25
  - Denmark -20 ISSP
  - USA-19
  - UK-8

Dominated by Northern European and US relationships
Q2: Gaps in networks

• The number of US-UK links is small.

• Leaving out funders, the majority of highly linked nodes are at universities or US Census.

• Funders are an important bridge between nodes

• Certain relationships and nodes disappear never to reappear
Q3: Who links with whom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall 1976-2002: Institution with the Highest Number Of Links To Other Nodes</th>
<th># of Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Social Survey Program (ISSP)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Bureau of the Census (USA)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) USA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex UK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison USA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Davis USA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralarchiv fur Empirische Sozialforschung (ZA) Germany University of Cologne</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Opinion Research Center (NORC) USA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester UK</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Data Archive (University of Essex)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Edinburgh UK</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota USA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3: Who links with whom cont?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Linked Institutions</th>
<th>% Links with other top linked archives</th>
<th>Total Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zentralarchiv fur Empirische Sozialforschung (ZA) Germany</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota USA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Bureau of the Census</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) USA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Social Survey Program (ISSP)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison USA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Opinion Research Center (NORC) USA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester UK</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Davis USA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex UK/UK Data Archive (combined)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8+15 (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• Summary
  • Q1: International relationships skewed toward Europe/US.
    • Few US/UK relationships
  • Q2: Churn: disappearance of relationships and nodes, funders often the only link between larger nodes
  • Q3: Outward looking: Biggers nodes tend to connect outward to less connected nodes rather than connect with each other.

• Limitations: What’s left out of this view of interconnections among SSDA?

• Project ongoing: Hope to include IFDO