A chapter from

A Meeting Place

The History of The American Association for Public Opinion Research

Edited by
Paul B. Sheatsley
and
Warren J. Mitofsky

Copyright © 1992 American Association for Public Opinion Research All Rights Reserved

ISBN: 0-89089-479-5

For PDFs of other chapters and the entire book see

http://aapor.org/history

Membership Helen Crossley

AAPOR members represent a broad and diverse range of occupations and interests. Most are practitioners of survey research: polltakers, market researchers, and employees of academic research centers or government agencies. Many are professors who teach courses in survey methods. Others are users of survey data in such fields as business, sociology, political behavior, public health, education, journalism, economics, or the law. Some represent public or private funding agencies that commission surveys to provide needed data on particular problems. What brings them together in AAPOR is a common interest in the methods and applications of public opinion and social research.

Members join AAPOR as individuals, not as representatives of their employer firm or agency. The only requirements for membership are an interest in the field, subscription to the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, and the payment of annual dues. In return, members receive a subscription to AAPOR's official journal, the *Public Opinion Quarterly (POQ)*, and to *AAPOR News*, a periodic newsletter, as well as the opportunity to participate in the Association's activities. These include the annual conference, for which all members are invited to submit papers, service on the various standing and ad hoc committees of AAPOR, the right to vote and to stand for elected office in AAPOR, and attendance at local chapter meetings.

Forty years of AAPOR have seen a six-fold growth in membership numbers, from 194 founding members at Williamstown in 1947 to 1,261 in 1986. But the basic commonalities and divergences characteristic in the beginning are still in evidence as scholars and researchers from government and industry join in mutual challenges and discussion—annually at the national conference and more frequently at meetings of local chapters.

What Is an AAPOR Member?

AAPOR's first constitution put the stamp of recognition on public opinion research as a profession. While the original draft proposed that "all persons" residing in the U.S. might become active members, Article III, as adopted at the Williamstown conference on September 4, 1947, stated that "all persons professionally engaged in the field of public opinion research or teaching in the field of public opinion, without regard to race, color, creed or national origin, may become active members of the Association." Later constitutional revisions, culminating in the current 1982 by-laws, broaden the spectrum of eligibility by including "any person professionally engaged or interested in research or study in the field of public opinion and social behavior." At the same time, these revisions tighten the requirements by adding "who acknowledges in writing that he or she has read and subscribes to the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices."

Although the early prohibition against discrimination (now removed) did not mention sex, women were never excluded from AAPOR, and indeed represented 15 percent of the original members. In every year since 1949 except for two years in the early 1960s, at least one woman has served on the Executive Council.

The original Central City resolution called for the formation of an "association of public opinion organizations," but AAPOR became and has remained steadfast as a professional group of individuals rather than a trade association of companies or research organizations. This concept has put AAPOR at a disadvantage at times, especially when profession-wide issues had to be faced and individual dues did not yield a full enough treasury to handle broad or longtime problems. Business contributions have been sought, and gratefully accepted, to cover such things as conference program costs and directory expenses. Nevertheless, AAPOR remains oriented to the individual, and thus accommodates, in addition to for-profit researchers and users, a large number of persons from academic and nonprofit institutions, whose interests tend to center on methodology and publication. Commercial concerns are now largely covered by trade associations, such as the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) and the National Council on Public Polls (NCPP), which operate through organization memberships. AAPOR members are and always have been individuals—in every sense of the word.

Types of Membership

While the original constitution provided only for "active" members, there are now four types or classes of membership. As defined in the current by-laws, these are: "(a) Regular membership; (b) Student membership, limited to full-time students at an accredited college or university; (c) Joint membership, available to two individuals living in the same household; (d) Honorary life membership, for which AAPOR members are eligible when they attain the age of 65, provided they have held membership in AAPOR for at least 20 years and have relinquished full-time employment." Those eligible must apply for the privilege.

Joint memberships were set up in the late 1960s to accommodate the many husband-wife pairs involved in AAPOR activities. At reduced dues they allow two members to share one POQ subscription; both members may vote and otherwise participate individually in association activities. This privilege was originally limited to married couples, but the language was broadened in 1981 to include parent-offspring, sibling, and other same-household relationships.

Student memberships were introduced early on (before the 1963 incorporation) in order to stimulate interest in the field on the part of those just considering it. The student paper competitions provided a source of candidates for these non-voting introductory memberships; many who began as student competitors have become active, contributing regular members. The number of student members in 1986 was 61.

The honorary life membership was also created in the formative years before incorporation to recognize those who contributed to the early and continued development of AAPOR and the field it represents. To qualify, one originally had to be sixty-five years old, retired, and an active AAPOR member for ten years. To keep the proportions manageable in an aging population, the requirements were later tightened to those cited above. Honorary life members pay no dues and receive a free subscription to *POQ*.

The first honorary life member (HLM) was Oscar Riegel, who was given this status by a vote of the Executive Council on February 27, 1969. In 1986 there were thirty-nine honorary life members on the AAPOR rolls.

Directories of AAPOR Members

In its early years AAPOR did not publish a membership directory. In order to improve membership communication Joseph Bachelder volunteered in 1952 to publish and distribute one if someone would compile it. Louise Franzen undertook the job, and another AAPOR tradition was founded.

The early directories, however, were just consolidated mailing lists, which reproduced the addresses where people wanted their mail to go-more often than not, their home addresses rather than where they worked. Only in 1974 was a conscious decision made to make the annual booklet more useful as a general reference tool by giving members' professional addresses along with telephone numbers and a geographical index. The first area list, prepared laboriously by hand, by Dorothy Crossley (Mrs. Archibald M.), even included company groupings within cities. This index made it much easier for members working or living in adjacent areas to make contact with each other, and led directly to the formation of four additional local chapters (see below). The directory was also expanded to include the names of outgoing and incoming Council members and committee chairs, as well as the code of ethics and lists of honorary life members, former officers, and AAPOR Award winners. Current directories are now prepared by computer, which permits reliable tabulations of certain types of information about members.

Characteristics of AAPOR Members

To get a trend view of AAPOR membership, one must go back to hand-tabulation of the limited information in the early directories and to occasional mail surveys of membership over the years. Most useful of these are surveys conducted by Don Cahalan in 1959 and by Joseph Klapper in 1965. Tables that follow summarize an effort to compare available past and current data on distribution and developments in AAPOR membership in the four decades since AAPOR's inception.

These tables, in brief, indicate the following facts about AAPOR membership distribution:

Geographic distribution. In the beginning well over half of AAPOR members were located in the northern part of the Middle Atlantic region, mostly in the New York metropolitan area (Table 1). In 1986 this proportion was down to something over a third. Chief gain-

TABLE 1
Membership Distribution by Geographical Area, 1947–1986*

	1947	1961	1975	1986
New England	8%	5%	7%	6%
Middle Atlantic, North (NYC, Philadelphia)	56	52	43	37
Middle Atlantic, South (Baltimore, Washington)	8	7	10	16
Midwest/Mountain	19	19	15	18
South	0.5	2	4	6
Southwest	_	1	2	3
California, Nevada	1	10	12	9
Northwest	0.5	2	2	1
Foreign	7	3	5	4
TOTAL:	100%	100%	100%	100%

^{*}The 1947 figures are tabulations of the list of 194 registered participants at the Williamstown conference (the actual founders of AAPOR). Data for 1961 and 1975 are hand tabulations of the directories for those years, while 1986 figures are primarily computer-based. No bases (N's) are shown for these tables, and some later ones, because the figures are partially estimated.

ers were the southern Mid-Atlantic section (Washington-Baltimore), the South, and the West (California, Nevada). The Midwest/Mountain and New England areas retained their original proportions of members, while the Southwest and Northwest continue to be sparsely represented in the total membership.

Professional affiliation. The four tabulations in Table 2 show a consistent plurality of members in the various commercial sectors over academic, government, and other occupations. These figures should not be taken too literally, however, as distinctions and definitions are not always clear or consistent over the years. As an example, the status of independent research organizations is hard to classify, as some are profit-making and hence classified as "commercial," some clearly academic, and some, including many "non-profit" organizations, are

Membership Distribu	ition by i it	nessional A	umanon, 15	4/-1200
	1947	1961	1975	1986
Commercial	53%	54%	47%	52%
Academic	31	24	36	40
Other (including government, non- profit, self-employed, retired, unreported, etc.)	16	22	17	8
TOTAL:	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 2
Membership Distribution by Professional Affiliation, 1947–1986*

somewhere in between, since they may make money for academic sponsors rather than for owners or stockholders, or may be subsidized by public or private funds. Nevertheless, in terms of total numbers of members, the edge is clearly, if slightly, with commercial over noncommercial (although contributors of conference papers tend to be disproportionately academic).

Results of several membership surveys taken over the years confirm and fill out this finding. A mail survey done by Don Cahalan in the spring of 1959 yielded 329 replies—a 61 percent response from 545 paid members. Defining "commercial" as "organized for profit or trade association," this study reported 61 percent as commercially employed, 29 percent academic, 6 percent in government (federal, state, or local) and 4 percent in nonprofit organizations. Breaking these down by geographic locale showed 70 percent of the commercial respondents living in the tri-state New York/New Jersey/Connecticut area, as opposed to only 35 percent of the noncommercial. Massachusetts, Illinois, and Michigan housed the next highest numbers of noncommercial members.

The 1959 survey also contained some data on the stability of survey research jobs at that time. About a third of the respondents had held only one job in the last ten years, while a fifth had held four or more in the same period (ranging up to nine). Crossover between commercial and noncommercial jobs was substantial: 26 percent of 1959 respondents had held both kinds of jobs in the previous ten years, as shown in

^{*}See note on table 1.

TABLE 3
Nature of Full-Time Jobs in Last Ten Years (1959 Survey)

Present Joh

		Present job	
	Commercial (200)	Noncommercial (129)	Total (329)
All Jobs Commercial	71%	-%	43%
Commercial and Academic	19	15	17
Commercial and Government	6 (29%)	1 (21%)	4 (26%)
Commercial and Academic and Government	4	5	5
All Jobs Academic	_	58	23
Academic and Government		11	4
All Government	_	10	4
TOTAL:	100%	100%	100%

Table 3. The turnover from business to nonprofit, or vice versa, is noteworthy and indicates the catalytic role that AAPOR itself has played in the careers of many survey research people.

An extensive mail survey undertaken in 1965 and analyzed by Joseph Klapper and others yielded the membership distribution shown in Table 4, based on 384 responses.

As can be seen, men were represented more strongly in academic fields and in research components of commercial firms, women in non-profit organizations. There was no clear trend by age. Members in the high income group were more likely than others to have commercial jobs. Those with lower incomes were more often found in academia.

Research function. AAPOR members have historically been mostly suppliers or practitioners of research, though a sizable minority have been primarily consumers. For example, according to the 1965

TABLE 4
Professional Affiliation by Sex, Age, and Income (1965 Survey)

	•	Sex	X		Age			Income*	
				Under		50 &			
	Total	Men	Women	30	30-46	over	Low	Med	High
	(384)	(325)	(54)	(161)	(154)	(39)	(105)	(112)	(150)
Independent Commercial				(101)	(- (-)	(6)	(601)	(CTT)	(132)
Research Agency	23%	22%	76%	24%	16%	34%	15%	12%	33%
Research)
Component of Commercial Firm	27	29	15	29	27	22	17	19	39
Nonprofit Research								ì)
Agency or									
Component	16	15	24	16	18	12	23	22	∞
College/									
University Staff,									
Faculty	27	29	13	27	28	25	33	40	13
Other, none	14	111	26	13	14	12	20	12	6
TOTAL: **	107%	106%	104%	109%	103%	105%	108%	105%	102%

* As defined in 1965: Low—under \$13,000; Medium—\$13,000-\$19,000; High—\$20,000 and over ** Totals add to more than 100 percent because of moonlighting or double jobs.

survey, 14 percent saw their main function as purchasers of research packages; 79 percent planned research and/or directed a research staff, and 41 percent primarily performed research operations such as sample design and questionnaire writing, while 11 percent had other functions (these figures add to more than 100 percent because of overlap). Male members in 1965 were more likely than female to be purchasers or managers, females to be operatives. No current data are available on level of responsibility.

Academic discipline. Among AAPOR's academic members, the largest proportions have consistently come from sociology, social psychology, and related fields, followed closely by communications/media and political science (Table 5). Psychology accounts for a somewhat lower proportion of academic members than might have been expected in view of the major role of some prominent psychologists in the early development of public opinion research.

The academic side of commercial research, the teachers of business and marketing, accounts for a fairly consistent 6 to 9 percent of academic members over the years. The percentage in journalism has decreased somewhat, but the change may be partly explained by the increase in the communications/media field, which often encompasses journalism. The proportions in political science and related fields have increased in the last decade, while psychologists have become fewer.

Among the most interesting findings of this analysis are the similarities and differences by sex in academic discipline. Through 1975 the most popular field for women members was public health/medicine, in which women were particularly strong. They were also well represented in sociology, but very weak in journalism and communications, as well as business/marketing.

As shown in the most recent tabulation (1986), women are now participating in about equal proportions with men in communications but are still relatively low in journalism, while their high relative position in public/medicine health has been reduced. Women members have also substantially increased their share of jobs in the academic research centers, which now employ a quarter of all academic members.

Sex. The survey research profession, as represented by the membership of AAPOR, was and remains male-dominated (Table 6). In the four decades from 1947 to 1986, however, women have doubled their proportionate membership, from 15 percent to 30 percent. There is a clear trend toward increasing female participation in recent years.

Age. The only data available on the age distribution of AAPOR members are contained in the two mail surveys organized by Joe Klap-

TABLE 5 Academic Discipline

		1961			1975			1986	
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
Teaching Fields:									
Sociology, Social Work, Anthropology	70%	21%	20%	21%	18%	21%	19%	15%	18%
Communications, Media	7	1	9	19	7	17	15	13	14
Polit. Science, Government, Law	∞	I	7	9	6	7	15	6	13
Business, Marketing	7	1	9	11	4	6	∞	9	7
Journalism	12	5	12	11	I	6	6	~~	7
Public Health, Medicine	S	42	10	9	27	10	4	11	9
Psychology	7	1	9	9	6	7	3	1	2
Other (Including administration)	3	δ.	3	9	2	'n	∞	∞	∞
Academic Research Centers	32	26	31	41	24	16	20	38	25
TOTAL:	101%	%66	101%	100%	100%	101%	101%	101%	100%

TABLE 6
Membership Distribution by Sex, 1947–1986*

	1947	1961	1975	1986*
Men	85%	86%	79%	70%
Women	15	_14	21	30
TOTAL:	100%	100%	100%	100%

per in 1965 and 1971. Both showed about four-tenths of AAPOR members to be in their forties (Table 7). Only six years apart, however, these data indicate a rapidly aging membership, with the oldest group increasing from 17 to 25 percent over the period. Assuming that the biases of nonresponse, etc., commonly found in mail surveys are reasonably equivalent in both studies, this finding appears valid. The age factor played a part in the tightening of requirements for honorary life membership, and has a bearing on the continuing need for recruitment of younger members, discussed below.

Education. The 1959 survey showed AAPOR members to be a broadly educated group (Table 8). Of the total 329 respondents, 41 percent held the Ph.D. or LL.D. degree, while only 4 percent had no college degree. Those in commercial work most often had studied economics, those in noncommercial positions sociology. The university most often attended by 1959 respondents was Columbia, followed by the University of Chicago.

Membership in other professional or trade associations. Twothirds of AAPOR's commercial members surveyed in 1959 also belonged to the American Marketing Association (AMA). For noncom-

TABLE 7
Membership Distribution by Age

1965 Surv	ey	1971 Sur	vey
39 and under	42%	40 and under	37%
40-49	41	41-50	38
50 and over	_17	51 and over	_25_
TOTAL:	100%		100%

TABLE 8 Highest Degree Earned (1959 Survey)

Present Job

	Commercial	Noncommercial	Total
	(200)	(129)	(329)
Ph.D. or LL.D.	21%	71%	41%
M.A. or M.S.	29	19	25
B.A. or B.S.	40	8	27
No College Degree	5	2	4
Not Reported	5	eastern.	3
Total:	100%	100%	100%

mercial members the major other organization was the American Sociological Association (ASA). In the 1971 survey, AMA was still the leading other affiliation of AAPOR members (45 percent of the total), followed by ASA (27 percent). Sizable proportions of both groups also belonged to the American Psychological Association (20 percent), American Statistical Association (11 percent), or the World Association for Public Opinion Research (14 percent).

About half of these members of other associations also attend their respective other conventions. Thus, AAPOR is by no means the only association for all its members. This, coupled with the divergent interests of those for whom it is the major channel, makes AAPOR much more of a melting pot than most other professional associations.

Length of membership. When asked in the 1965 survey how many years they had been members of AAPOR, 29 percent of respondents reported belonging for over ten years, 32 percent five to ten years, and 38 percent for less than five years. Thus, nearly two-thirds of the members at that time had been in AAPOR for at least five of the eighteen years it had been in existence and nearly one-third for ten years or more. Groups most likely to have been members for over ten years include those aged fifty or over, members in the highest income group, representatives of commercial research agencies, and women. A repeat of this question in the 1971 survey showed 37 percent had been members for ten years or more and only 27 percent for less than five.

For many years a mark of distinction in AAPOR was to be a "Central City survivor"—one of the 73 persons present at the first gathering in 1946. Only six 1986 members—all but one of whom served at least once on the Executive Council—could make that claim (Dick Baxter, Joe Belden, Don Cahalan, Jack Elinson, Jack Maloney and Paul Sheatsley). Comparing the 1947 list of Williamstown founders of AAPOR with the 1985-86 Membership Directory reveals that 20 individuals of the original 194 (19 men and one woman) were still on the AAPOR membership rolls; nine (45 percent) were honorary life members. Of those still active, nearly all were in academic or government work; only two were in the commercial field.

Financial support. About half the 1965 survey respondents could count on 100 percent of their conference expenses being paid for by their organizations. Some 13 percent got no financial conference support at all; the rest might get partial or conditional expense contributions. Least likely to receive conference expenses were women and academic or non-profit members. Other findings of the 1965 survey:

- From 22 to 36 percent of respondents attended one or more of the 1960-1964 conferences (22 percent Berkeley, 36 percent Lake George and Atlantic City).
- From 7 to 12 percent were on the conference programs.
- About 15 percent belonged to a regional chapter.
- 84 percent were married; 16 percent had spouses active in research or allied fields; 6 percent of spouses were also AAPOR members.

Why AAPOR?

A substantive finding of the 1965 survey gave some indication of what members think of AAPOR and why they belong. Table 9 lists, in order of magnitude, the percentages checking each of nine potential functions in response to the question, "What are the major functions which AAPOR now serves for you?"

Most likely to see AAPOR as an instrument for providing dignity for the profession were members from commercial research agencies, as well as those who were older and/or better paid. Newer members and those in the lowest income group were least likely to see AAPOR as a pleasant social occasion. Members from commercial research agencies tended to see more value in AAPOR than did those with other types of affiliation.

Major /
or /

	•		•		
AAPOR Functions	Commercial Research Co (87)	Commercial Department (102)	Non- Profit (62)	College/ University (102)	Total (384)
Is an instrument for providing identity and dignity for the profession	71%	%65		87%	%09
Is generally intellectually stimulating	49	59	48	45	51
Is a pleasant social occasion	47	43	50	49	48
Is an instrument for upholding standards and ethics of the profession	52	46	37	39	44
Affords opportunity for informal discussions of professional problems	84	39	40	35	40

Helps me keep up with new research techniques	53	45	34	29	39
Helps me keep up with recent research in my fields of major interest	38	38	37	41	39
Helps me initiate or maintain contact with people who are potential employees, employers, clients, contractors, etc.	46	30	47	25	35
Helps me keep up with recent research outside my major fields of interest	22	40	35	29	33
Other, no answer	19	21	21	26	21

Why Not AAPOR?

To grow with the profession, AAPOR must both retain old members and attract new ones. Of the 1,072 paid-up members of AAPOR in May 1984, 89 percent were renewals and 11 percent new recruits. The latter group did not quite make up for those who failed to renew from the previous year—the dropouts. This dropout-recruit balance has fluctuated over the years, making for fitful rather than steady growth. To find out why some members did not renew, an extensive survey was carried out in February 1983 by Selma Monsky and Pearl Zinner, co-chairs of the newly reconstituted membership committee.

Of the 535 questionnaires mailed to 1978-81 dropouts, nearly a fifth were returned as undeliverable, suggesting that moves, out of town and/or out of the profession, are a major reason for leaving AAPOR. Only 146 usable questionnaires were received, 33 percent of those delivered. These respondents selected most often the following five (out of eleven suggested) reasons as very or somewhat important in their non-renewal:

1.	because POQ was not very useful for me	33%
2.	because I belonged to an organization other than AAPOR that was more important to me	31%
3.	because the dues were too high	31%
4.	because I left survey research	28%
5.	because AAPOR did not address my particular interests	23%

Basically, AAPOR seems to lose annually about 10 to 15 percent of its membership. Given the cross-disciplinary nature of the profession, this phenomenon seems likely to continue. Thus, with a modest turnover as the normal pattern, future Executive Councils will probably worry less about dropouts (unless the rate increases noticeably) than about the need to recruit new members as the profession grows.

Organizational Support

Although a membership committee was proposed in the preliminary draft, the first formally adopted constitution did not include one. Hence the handling of membership problems was not recognized early on as a major AAPOR function, and for years such problems were shunted around among various Council members and standing or ad hoc committees. The collection of dues and the maintenance of mailing lists have always been considered the province of the secretary-treasurer, and in the early years that person and his/her secretary (usually subsidized by their employer) performed these tasks. But as the membership burgeoned, the help of a paid assistant or secretariat was sought and obtained. For many years the records work was ably handled by the New York office of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). Their growing bills and decreasing subsidy, however, climaxed by the breakdown of the original addressograph machine and the need to computerize membership records, led eventually to contractual relations with an outside firm. Since 1978 membership services, and many others, have been admirably performed by the firm of Rosenberg, Druker, and Co. of Princeton, New Jersey.

Beyond record-keeping, however, the membership of such an association as AAPOR needs other support, such as communication and recruitment. The former function was usually handled by the secretary-treasurer until the early 1970s, when a modest in-house newsletter was begun. This is now a regular publication, attractive and useful and an important part of the formal functions of the Association. The task of recruitment fell first on the Public Relations Committee and then passed to Research and Development. Later the Nominations Committee was expanded and renamed the Nominations and Membership Committee. In 1981 the membership function finally got its own committee, with a chair and co-chair, to handle both membership relations and chapter affairs.

Successive chairs gave varying attention to the recruitment function. Sidney Hollander, 1974 chair, made a sizable effort to win back non-renewers with individual letters. Another comprehensive attempt at increasing membership was made in 1977-78 by Membership Chair George Bishop, whose recruitment drive included five major steps, as follows:

 A mailing to selected former AAPOR members considered most likely to renew.

- Mailing of regional membership lists to members in the New England and Dallas-Houston areas, with a suggestion for the formation of a local chapter in each.
- Distribution of the call for conference papers to selected research centers and individual researchers.
- A special mailing of conference materials to nonmembers in the D.C./Maryland/Virginia and Carolina areas to encourage their participation.
- Mailing of the preliminary conference program to sociology and political science departments at selected colleges and universities in Virginia and North Carolina.

Also contributing to membership recruitment was the booklet *What is AAPOR?*, produced by the Public Relations Committee and periodically revised. This is made available at the annual conferences and has been sent out at irregular intervals to selected mailing lists. On a more regular basis, it has been the practice for some years to enclose application blanks with a regular membership mailing each year asking members to suggest or recruit new applicants.

While all these measures help increase recruitment, the greatest single source of new members is undoubtedly the annual conference, which attracts newcomers, often by word of mouth from their professional colleagues. The importance of personal contact is also demonstrated by the growth of local chapters, themselves a good channel for entering the national association. Still other stimuli for members include the annual student awards program, which provides publicity for the association as well as inspiration to younger people just entering the profession.

Chapters

As of 1986 there were five very active local chapters of AAPOR: Washington-Baltimore, Pacific (PAPOR), Midwest (MAPOR), Central New Jersey, and Metropolitan New York. Some comparisons of these chapters are shown in Table 10. A formerly lively Southern chapter, temporarily moribund, was being reactivated, and a fledgling group was being organized in the Boston area. Occasional rumblings are also heard in the Southwest and Northwest, where semiformal chapters existed for some time several years ago.

TABLE 10 VAPOR Chapters

		MOJUV	AAF ON Chapters		
	Washington	Pacific	Midwest	Central	Metropolitan
	Baltimore	(PAPOR)	(MAPOR)	New Jersey	New York
Founded	c. 1953	1960	1975	1977	1978
Dues	\$3	\$10	\$15	\$10	\$12
Membership, (paid	Ş		;		
voting)	49	20	66	120	211
	,	,			4 evenings
	8-9 ,	3 plus	2-day	33	snld
Meetings	lunches	conference	conference	dinners	lunches
		Occasional	Directory	qof	Christmas
Other activities		social	announcement	service	party

For its first thirty years AAPOR offered most of its members little contact beyond the annual national conference. Gregarious AAPOR members in the Washington, D.C. area stimulated local interest with some meetings, and the relatively isolated members on the West Coast established a formal group early on, but it was not until the publication of geographic membership lists in the 1974 directory that chapter growth really took off. Sidney Hollander, Membership Chair in 1974-75, identified areas where new chapters might be promoted, and new standards for official status were incorporated in the by-laws in 1976. These required applicant groups to: agree to uphold and abide by the purposes of AAPOR; adopt by-laws consistent with AAPOR's; ensure that all officers and voting members were national AAPOR members; and submit an annual report to the Executive Council on chapter members, finances, and activities.

Chapter activities are recorded and encouraged by the relatively new Membership and Chapter Relations Committee, established in 1981. Committee and chapter representatives meet at the annual AAPOR conference to share ideas. Despite these contacts, however, the chapters are quite distinctive, each with its own way of organizing and promoting its activities. On the basis of newsletter reports and special forms filled out by most current chapter heads, here is an abbreviated history and description of each.

Washington/Baltimore. The oldest regional group of AAPOR members to have local meetings is in the Washington-Baltimore area, where they began in the early 1950s, shortly after AAPOR was founded. In April 1953 Martin Kriesberg wrote to then-President Archibald Crossley requesting a charter for a D.C. chapter. Presumably because national AAPOR as yet had no provision for local chapters, no charter was granted, but the group continued to meet on an informal basis for the next twenty years. It surged up and down in enthusiasm and membership, was "reactivated" in 1966, and finally, in the mid-1970s, ratified formal by-laws acceptable to the Council, which in 1977 proudly welcomed its "newest" member!

In its early years, Washington chapter meetings were held in the evening, often at the Brookings Institution. With so many members living in suburbia, however, luncheon meetings attracted larger groups and they are now the established forum. Meetings usually include a preliminary get-together, a speaker, and a question period. Topics range widely, covering such things as current political attitudes, social programs, communications, methodology and potential or existing government regulations. Largest attendance was at the Foreign Service

Club in June 1978, when former AAPOR Presidents George Gallup and Archibald Crossley, invited as co-speakers to reminisce on the beginnings of public opinion research, passed lightly over their assigned topic and proceeded instead to discuss potential future directions.

The chapter had no formal dues for many years, expenses being met by tacking on a small fee to the luncheon price. In the mid-1980s, however, with rises in both postage and meal costs, an annual mailing fee of \$3 was instituted.

Presidents of the chapter from its formalization through 1986 were Frank Bourne, Helen Crossley, John Martin, Hugh Parry, Tad Cantril, Ken Adler, Doris Northrup (Krug), John Robinson, Bernard Roshco, Betsy Martin, and Clyde Tucker.

Pacific (PAPOR). The major founder of the Pacific chapter of AAPOR was Dr. Charles Glock of the Survey Research Center at Berkeley, who notified the national council in the spring of 1959 that he wished to found a West Coast organization. Council promptly urged him to form a regional chapter and proceeded to formulate standards for chapter status. Later it contributed \$100 support money to help defray organizational costs.

Because of its geographic spread, covering the three coastal states and their closest neighbors, PAPOR's major meetings have usually been annual conferences of one or more days' duration, although local meetings have also been held. Conference sites and chief officers were traditionally alternated between representatives of southern California and northern members.

Chapter presidents since the 1970s have been (in alphabetical order): Mervin Field, Robert Heyer, Gene Levine, Dwaine Marvick, Glen Mellinger, Selma Monsky, Joan Moore, Bill Nicholls, Franco Nicosia, Will Pilcher, Rebecca Quarles, Hugh Swartz, and Serena Wade.

Midwest (MAPOR). Interest in the establishment of a midwestern AAPOR chapter was expressed to the national council as early as 1967, but it was 1975 before the chapter became active, after much work by an organizing committee including Donna Charron, George Bishop, Eugene Telser, Doris Graber, and several others. The chapter's geographic coverage ranges from Ohio to Colorado.

MAPOR held its first annual conference in Chicago on October 24 and 25, 1975, and had a champagne reception to mark its tenth anniversary conference in 1985. MAPOR conferences, held in November each year, provide both panel and didactic sessions for members and other interested practitioners. Many of the papers presented have been published in *Public Opinion Quarterly*.

MAPOR publishes a directory of its members, including an indication of each member's field of interest and electronic mail address, if available. Presidents since 1976 have been: Donna Charron, George Bishop, Eugene Telser, Sidney Kraus, Doris Graber, Andrew Morrison, Marijean Suelzle, Lee Becker, Barbara Bardes, Charles Whitney, and David Weaver.

Central New Jersey. The New Jersey chapter was provisionally recognized by Council in 1976 and granted full status in January 1977. Membership is concentrated in the Princeton-New Brunswick area, where there is a large amount of public opinion and market research survey activity. Chapter dinner meetings are usually held on weekday evenings on the Princeton University campus, with a social hour and a featured speaker. Summer contact is maintained with social events such as picnics or volleyball. The chapter also provides a job announcement service, sending vacancy notices to all members.

Future aspirations of the CNJ chapter include: more programs to help younger members with their careers, encouragement for local members to join national AAPOR, and more activities to promote interaction and interchange among members. Presidents of the chapter since its founding have been: Robert Bezilla, Michael Kagay, James Fouss, Stephen Salmore, Michael Rappeport, Diane Schrayer, Kenneth Kehrer, Susan Weisbrod, Ray Funkhouser, and Jennifer McLeod.

Metropolitan New York City. In the 1950s Manny Manfield set up a New York Chapter, which struggled for several years and then petered out. The leader of the coordinating group that set up the current reborn New York chapter was Mort David. The first meeting, held in September 1978, was attended by some 80 persons. In 1986 there were a total of 211 members, of whom 143 were national AAPOR members. The chapter also has an extensive mailing list, from which it hopes to draw more members into active participation in projects and committees.

Four evening meetings are usually held each year, with one or more speakers and time for refreshments and socializing. In addition, the chapter stages several "brown bag" lunch gatherings, a Christmas party, and a group party at the national AAPOR convention. A membership survey was initiated to determine how programming can be responsive to member needs, and a chapter brochure was designed to publicize the existence and activities of the chapter.

Chapter heads since rebirth have been Mort David, Lorna Opatow, David Sills, Walt Lindenmann, Eleanor Singer, Ronald Milavsky, Alan Meyer, and Roni Rosner.

Other chapters. A Southern chapter, organized by Charles Powers of Research Triangle Institute, was officially accepted by Council in January 1978 and held its first annual conference at Chapel Hill in November of that year. The chapter counted ninety members from nine states and held at least five annual conferences through 1982. As noted above, it has recently been reactivated.

In earlier years there was a Northwest chapter covering the Portland and Seattle areas, which has since died out. AAPOR also had a considerable number of members in Canada, where a group headed by B. Myron Rusk considered applying for chapter status but opted for a separate national organization. In the metropolitan Boston area Dr. Robert Smith was working toward setting up a chapter, but it has not yet been formally recognized.

Currently well over a third of AAPOR members are affiliated with a local chapter, although some major geographic gaps, such as Pennsylvania, still exist. The existing chapters generally appear healthy, and should be a source of strength and growth for AAPOR in the future.