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Preface

Every history has a history: this one is no exception. The idea for this book had its origin in a modest committee assignment. When Donna Card Charron chaired the Public Relations committee in 1979-80, she began to sort through AAPOR’s files to prepare an updated “What Is AAPOR” brochure. She came across a memoir on AAPOR’s earlier conferences, written by Paul Sheatsley in 1975, and she recognized the value that a fuller, more systematic recording of AAPOR’s past would have for the organization and its members. (An expanded version of Paul’s memoir serves as the introduction to this book.)

This led her to propose that an ad hoc committee be appointed to plan for an AAPOR history. President Jack Elinson and the Council approved the idea and a committee was appointed, chaired by Donna Charron (who continued in this role until the job was done), with Jean Converse, Jack Elinson, Albert E. Gollin, Paul B. Sheatsley, and David L. Sills as members. It held its first meeting on September 19, 1980, at the Social Science Research Council’s offices. The evident need to create an archive to fill in gaps in the records available at AAPOR’s secretariat in Princeton led the committee to broaden it mandate. The exploration of options lasted nearly two years before an agreement was made with the University of Chicago to establish and maintain an AAPOR Archive.

An executive board was formed in the interim, consisting of Paul Sheatsley, Richard Baxter, Jack Elinson, and Sidney Hollander, all former presidents and long-time AAPOR members, to develop an outline of chapters for the history. By 1983, as editor-in-chief and with the board’s approval, Paul had invited fourteen people to serve as authors and the job of preparing AAPOR’s history was finally under way.

Progress was hindered by the inaccessibility of documents and records until the summer of 1984, when Herb Abelson, Dick Baxter and Sid Hollander spent several days in Princeton, coding and photocopying a large assortment of materials for each of the chapter authors. After that, progress could be measured by the slowly growing pile of chapter drafts available for inspection at successive annual meetings of AAPOR. Several of those initially invited to write chapters had to be replaced, with further loss of momentum. But in 1986 and again in
1988, the Council voted approval of funds to meet the costs of manuscript preparation.

When Paul fell ill, a number of AAPOR members helped take up the slack and kept the project moving: Donna Charron, David Sills and Al Gollin. After his death, Philip Meyer and Stanley Presser lent a hand. Leo Bogart deserves thanks for a complete review of the manuscript with suggestions for the authors.

The final, weighty responsibility for pulling the project together, completing the editing, and getting the history published was assumed by Warren Mitofsky. Where possible, he tried to follow Paul’s direction. There was bound to be slippage in the final text between Paul’s intent and Warren’s delivery. For that too, Mitofsky, with the authors’ forbearance, assumes the responsibility.

It was decided not to update chapters to include events that happened after an author completed his or her chapter. Most chapters were completed at various times in the late 1980s as Paul’s health declined. Requesting updates from the authors could further postpone publication of this history, a project which has already spanned almost a quarter of the existence of AAPOR.

Suzanne Erfurth of NORC worked closely with Paul and then with Warren and the chapter authors to improve their clarity and writing style and to shape consistent format for the book. Her contributions, which went beyond technical editing, deserve special acknowledgement. Thanks also are due Laurie Hendrickson, Laurie Druse, Cassandra Britton, Patrick Bova and Jeffrey Hackett of NORC.

The final manuscript was prepared by Marci Waldman of Voter Research and Surveys. She relentlessly pursued authors for their chapters and collectors for photographs of our past for inclusion in the book. Thanks also are due Daniel Pitkin for his diligent proof reading and indexing of the manuscript.

Only those who took part in the protracted project can fully appreciate the keen intelligence and fierce devotion that Paul brought to the editorship of this history. Periods of illness slowed him down, but he kept on with the tasks of writing, editing, encouraging laggards, and challenging authors to improve successive drafts right up to his final hospitalization late in 1988. Paul embodied the ineffable spirit of AAPOR. It is fitting that this work is dedicated to his memory.

March, 1991
A Meeting Place

The History of
The American Association for Public Opinion Research
Introduction

Memory Lane: Conference Highlights and Lowlights
Paul B. Sheatsley

with additional recollections by
Albert E. Gollin, Burns Roper and Warren J. Mitofsky

1946. Central City, Colo. The Beginning. A call from Harry H. Field, Director of National Opinion Research Center, then at University of Denver, to leaders of the profession here and abroad to attend conference the last three days of July in Colorado ghost town. World War II over. Survey research on verge of taking off. Academic, commercial, government, political researchers unacquainted, suspicious of each other. Some 75 individuals respond, fearful of implied threat by Field that failure to appear means missing out on something big, competitors gaining advantage. Historic Teller House in this old mining town, picturesque site of original “Face on the Barroom Floor.” But only one bathroom to a floor, and most people sleeping two to a bed in 30–40 rooms available. Much singing around piano, poker playing till sunrise, mountain climbing, along with very serious discussion of research issues. General agreement: all practitioners of survey research have common problems, common opportunities. Should continue meetings and should organize.


1948. Eagles Mere, Pa. First experience in the Poconos. Largely geriatric clientele at the resort; they don’t appreciate our singing, drinking, late hours. Our view: if the place had a bar, we wouldn’t have to drink in our rooms. POQ adopted as official journal. Budd Wilson elected President. Standards Committee introduces draft “Code of Professional Practices.” Much debate.

1949. Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. Aftermath of the 1948 election poll fiasco. AAPOR crisis. Some academics, market research-
ers anxious to dissociate from temporarily discredited political polls. Others call for united front. The weather arranged by Harry Truman: three days of 98 degrees. Single slate nominations rejected by meeting, and Nominations Committee ordered to go back and provide contest for every office. A really all-star conference. Program (Jack Riley, Chair) replete with all the big names of social, market, and political research.

1950. Lake Forest, Ill. Another campus meeting, at Lake Forest College. The first AAPOR "Presidential Session," with Paul Lazarsfeld speaking on "The Obligations of the 1950 Pollster to the 1984 Historian." Elmo Roper's spoof of research gimmicks with his deadpan demonstration of the Roper Veracitator, an electronic truth machine which instantly analyzes, with flashing lights, the validity of the respondent's answer.


1953. Pocono Manor, Pa. A social disaster. They didn't like us (especially our minority group members); we didn't like them (no booze except at state store four miles down winding road). But excellent weather and good program. Meetings on campuses had been held in June, after schools closed; conventions now held in April or May when weather cooler. Julian L. Woodward Award established, in honor of late President, "for distinguished contributions to one or more branches of public opinion research." Pennsylvania Dutch wurst available to all in Gus Wiebe's room.

1954. Asbury Park, N.J. The ancient Berkeley-Carteret Hotel. And lots of rain on boardwalk. Helen Wiebe and Hope Klapper dragging their find of the year through lobby—a whale vertebra. AAPOR's first recognition of "motivation research" with round table on subject.
Stouffer’s presidential address on interdependence of science and practice, and role of AAPOR as a bridge between the two.

1955. Madison, Wis., Hotel Loraine. Tenth annual conference, and one of the most memorable (Bob Bower, Chair). Two sessions on motivation research (MR) but only one remembered today: Elmo Roper, faced with problem of selling breakfast cereal and researching it through MR. Donning white coat, he orders his sample of one wheeled in (young lady reclining on couch). Through skillful psychiatric interviewing (“What do you like for breakfast?” “A roll in bed with honey.” “If you were an egg, would you rather be fried or scrambled?” “I’d rather be cuddled.”), he develops proper marketing strategy, (Cereal Institute should create a square egg that would stack in refrigerator and would not roll off the kitchen counter). Presentation of first Woodward Award to Paul Lazarsfeld, and Paul’s affecting acceptance speech. The Stouffer session on civil liberties study, with Riesman, Sheatsley, Hyman. Project Directors Meet the Critic, with Berelson and Campbell defending respective voting studies against Shirley Star. “Public Opinion Research and the Cold War,” with Ray Bauer, Ralph White, Phill Davison. Gallup’s Presidential address. Deep concern in business meeting about impact of government security investigations on public opinion research and on AAPOR members.

1956. Buck Hill Falls, Pa., The Inn. One more try at the Poconos, and the last to date. Liquor now available at separate casino downhill from main inn. (After drinking, you have to walk uphill.) But elderly Pocono clientele still unconcerned of AAPOR presence. On complaint of one of these, two police enter AAPOR room at 2:30 a.m. and break up earnest sampling discussion. Another complaint of “nude couple running down hall” (early streaking?). When management identified them as AAPOR, Joe Klapper asks, “Where were they wearing their badges?” AAPOR then barred by Pocono Hotels trade group as undesirable. However, what some regard as single best AAPOR session ever, chaired by Gus Wiebe: four independent analyses of 20 qualitative interviews, using approaches of Freudian psychology, motivation research, sociology, and statistical analysis. And spontaneous outpouring of affection and approval, as second Woodward Award presented to Herb Hyman.

1957. Washington, D.C., Shoreham Hotel. First meeting in big-city context. Shared this huge hotel with meeting of large lumber trade association. (AAPOR a splinter group?) Some of us wound up at their parties; not bad. Last year’s successful Wiebe session repeated with Helen Dinerman presiding over four independent analyses of quanti-


1959. Lake George, N.Y. Sagamore. Another memorable conference (Paul Sheatsley, Chair, Ms. Mike McGarry at registration desk). Joe Klapper finally finds AAPOR a home at Hotel Sagamore. Beautiful setting, exclusive occupancy, cocktail party on house, abundant food (including midnight wienie roasts and “Chinese Smorgasbord”), ice carvings on display at Saturday buffet lunch, three-piece dance band playing until 1 a.m., then Charlie Raymond taking over piano and Herb Krugman the drums; playing cards cheerfully supplied for poker and bridge players; no restrictions on booze; kitchen help lined up to welcome us in to banquet applauding in time with music; and finally, parade of whole Sagamore staff at conclusion of dinner, to enthusiastic strains of “Anchors Aweigh,” with maitre’d carrying large American flag and dining room lights flashing, as we wildly applaud them. However, a few drawbacks: AAPOR the first guest of hotel’s new season, and youthful summer staff of waiters and bellmen inexperienced and subject to large error. Charles Siepman, invited guest, shaken by screams of young AAPORette when he entered bath they unwittingly shared. Also, temperatures in low 40s and heating system not working too well. In auditorium where Friday evening session held, guest speaker Hilde Himmelweit from England tells us about her research on TV effects on children between chattering teeth while bundled up in fur coat. Program highlights an anticlimax after all this. But many still remember Elmo Roper’s eloquent acceptance speech when presented with Woodward Award. And Dave Wallace’s presidential address, “A Tribute to the Second Sigma.”

1960. Atlantic City, N.J., Hotel Traymore. Back to reality. Interesting session on presidential election studies, with Stouffer presiding over panel of Samuel Lubell, Elmo Roper, and Lou Harris. This was the
year Harris worked for John Kennedy’s presidential campaign. It also was a first reunion of sorts between Roper and Harris following Lou’s split from the Roper Organization in 1956 to form his own company. Splendid party hosted by Les Frankel with son Marty serving drinks. Presentation of Woodward Award by President Hyman to Clyde Hart. Two really nice guys. Boardwalk auctioneers a popular side show.

1961. Berkeley, Calif., Claremont Hotel. First conference west of the Mississippi (not counting Central City). Usual problem of sharing hotel, this time with local John Birch Society meeting (Angus Campbell, other AAPORians infiltrate it for research purposes) and also with American Simian Society. This latter disconcerting: people wandering around lobby introducing their pet monkeys (usually attired in colorful costumes). Hal Mendelsohn vows never to drink again after being greeted in hotel elevator by monkey in sailor suit. Merv Field party at Roaring Twenties Club, with girl on swing and Dick Baxter making futile passes at her. The legendary Kid Ory’s Dixieland trombone in some dive near Fisherman’s Wharf. Memories of program, though ably put together by Don Cahalan, naturally pale in comparison, except for Bob Carlson’s presidential address, “High Noon in the Research Marketplace.”

1962. Lake George, N.Y., Sagamore. First time AAPOR returns to any previous conference site. Big welcome from Sagamore staff and many reminiscences. Everybody dressed in boots and furs this time and temperatures in high 80s. Entire conference dedicated to memory of late Sam Stouffer, and Friday night plenary session devoted to discussion of his work by Clyde Hart, Phil Hauser, and Herb Hyman. Woodward Award now known as AAPOR Award, reflecting wish to honor other distinguished members no longer with us. First AAPOR Award presented to Angus Campbell by President Jack Riley.

1963. Lake George, N.Y., Sagamore. Home again, where “The view is just like Switzerland” and they’re still offering Chinese Smorgasbord. It was fitting that Joe Klapper, the Sagamore’s finder (not founder), served as President this year. His address gave us some new thoughts about mass communication research. AAPOR Award for “exceptionally distinguished achievement” to George Gallup. And about time, many said. Persuaded by high priced-lawyers, business meeting okayed the idea of AAPOR becoming a corporation. Shades of Central City and Williamstown! Believe this the year when meeting distracted by two birds flying around hall, chirping loudly.

1964. Excelsior Springs, Mo., The Elms Hotel. This selected as one of AAPOR’s periodic non-Eastern convention sites, but it proved
practically inaccessible to everybody except our Kansas City member. It also chanced to be a year in which we met jointly with WAPOR, and some of our foreign colleagues found their way to Excelsior Springs from Oslo and Zagreb. And when we got there, the place was populated largely by Girl Scouts having their own convention. (But most members greatly preferred them to chimpanzees of 1961.) Effects of salubrious waters of Excelsior Springs fortunately washed away by martinis and scotch. Program marked by good session on Kennedy assassination research, Charlie Glock's presidential address on "Images of Man and Public Opinion," and lively discussion in business meeting about enforcing AAPOR's "Code of Professional Ethics and Practices."

1965. Groton, Conn., Hotel Griswold. This place shortly went out of business and most AAPOR members would say, "Good riddance"—not least Helen Crossley, who broke her leg on the doorstep gravel as she left. Good conference, though. It was the twentieth, with much nostalgia on display to interest the elderly. Thanks to Anne Zanes, photos from Central City and other memorabilia posted on walls. And it was fitting that Harry Field's daughter was on hand to accept posthumous AAPOR Award to her father from President Herb Krugman. One memorable session in which two wise men, Stuart Chase and Elmo Roper, looked back on changes in opinions and attitudes over the last two decades.

1966. Swampscott, Mass., New Ocean House. Don't know what happened to old Ocean house, but new one burned down shortly after we left. Was it Dan Yankelovich who voiced suspicion that they kept moving same old hotel from place to place for AAPOR conferences in New England? (When Hugh Parry told President Ray Bauer he had trouble finding this place, Ray said, "I don't understand that. Everybody knows Swampscott is right near Lynn.") Ray's presidential address on "Social Indicators and Sample Surveys," like so many AAPOR presidential addresses, very thoughtful and provocative. AAPOR Award (finally) bestowed on Hadley Cantril. Good sessions on privacy (Berelson, Chair), survey methodology (Elinson), and race riots (Biderman).

1967. Lake George, N.Y., Sagamore. Home again, after four years of wandering from resort to resort. Nothing much changed here, and everybody happy except those forced to "double up" or commute from outlying motels because of space problems. Another excellent presidential address, by Leo Bogart: "No Opinion, Don't Know, and Maybe No Answer." Sheatsley's introduction of him said to be hilarious, if not insulting. AAPOR Award to Hans Zeisel. Alvin Toffler ap-
peared on session here before he wrote “Future Shock.” Quality of papers seems to get better and better. Also, first student paper competition held this year.

1968. Santa Barbara, Calif., The Miramar. Back to the West coast, first time in seven years. Joint conference with WAPOR, and many Japanese visitors. (Sheatsley and Ford attend cocktail party to greet foreign guests. Japanese looks at Paul’s badge, says “Ah NORC, we read your reports,” looks at Bob’s badge: “Ah, ATT, who you work for?”). Santa Barbara beautiful location, but some problems with hotel: overflow housed elsewhere and poor shuttle bus service; mediocre food, and small problem of crossing railroad tracks to get to ocean front motel units and beach. Fortunately, everybody stays sober and no harm done. Experiment with luncheon round tables works out well and will probably be repeated. Posthumous AAPOR Award to Elmo C. “Budd” Wilson accepted by his son, Jay. Presidential address, “AAPOR Times 21,” presents expurgated history of Association.

1969. Lake George, N.Y., Sagamore. This conference originally scheduled for Hotel Traymore, Atlantic City, but they reneged on contract, offered us unacceptable dates instead. Sagamore took us in at last minute. This was year of President Ford (Bob, that is). POQ says conference “was held May 16 to 29,” but it may only have seemed that long to some. Big turnout for session on obscenity and pornography chaired by Charlie Winick. Krugman reports real progress on AAPOR internship program. Merv Field decides AAPOR must prove its professionalism by having radical confrontation, pickets banquet, and follows Sagamore kitchen parade with sympathizers bearing signs reading “Down with Computers” and “Back to Hollerith Cards.” A considerably shaken President Ford then delivers address on “The Obstinate Employee.”

1970. Lake George, N.Y., Sagamore. And again the Sagamore. Place always draws lots of children, lots of dogs. This year hotel put on contest in which children enter dogs. Twelve dogs entered, every one won a prize: Biggest, shortest, hairiest, oldest, noisiest, etc. Also, writer from Playboy turns up, goes away disappointed: “No story here at all.” AAPOR Award fittingly presented to Arch Crossley by President Bob Bower, whose presidential address turned our attention again to problems of ethics and standards. Untimely death of Mike McGarry mourned by many. Euthemia Matsoukas succeeds her at AAPOR Secretariat.

1971. Pasadena, Calif., Huntington-Sheraton Hotel. For California, an uneventful conference. AAPOR Award to Walter Lippman in
absentia; his brief written acceptance characteristically points to fundamental problem of public opinion research and democracy. Dick Baxter in presidential address (presented in afternoon!) takes another look at AAPOR and suggests "new goal." Good session chaired by Herb Abelson on impact of social research on government policy; e.g., studies of television, civil disorders, violence. Representatives of John Gardner's Common Cause on the scene, but AAPOR reactions mixed. Death of Elmo Roper mourned. Secretary Cahalan reports AAPOR finally settled suit against Hotel Traymore for breach of 1969 contract for $2,000.

1972. Atlantic City, N.J., Marlborough-Blenheim Hotel. Hugh Parry had just seen film "The King of Marvin Gardens" and was disconcerted to find "the same damn extras" from the movie sitting in the same chairs and lurking around dining area. Brass sign on door in lobby says, "Ladies' Retiring Room." However, we did have satisfaction of viewing ongoing demolition of Hotel Traymore. Weather cold and rainy as usual at Jersey resorts this time of year. Joint meeting with WAPOR, and Jean Stoetzel here from Paris to accept AAPOR Award. Phill Davison not only delivered presidential address on "Public Opinion Research as Communication," but also chaired session on "Public Opinion in Perspective" with fine paper by Harold Lasswell. Another program highlight: Stoetzel and Lazarsfeld discussing European origins of public opinion research.

1973. Asheville, N.C., Grove Park Inn. This unusual locale for an AAPOR conference surprisingly drew all-time high attendance: 430 persons registered, and almost all of them happy with place. Beautiful setting. Hominy grits for breakfast. Unquestionable highlight: Hal Mendelsohn's introductory monologue at banquet and stand-up comedy routine which had people literally falling off chairs if not rolling in aisles. Tough act for Sid Hollander to follow with his presidential address, but he succeeded admirably.

1974. Our seventh (and last) visit to the Sagamore, and nothing much changed since our first in 1959, except new man leading kitchen parade. It's sagging badly but still full of joyous memories. Al Biderman coordinated a bus connection for members to and from the Albany airport and didn't lose anyone. Big session on "stress and change" in American politics, plus others that examined the impacts of Watergate. Joint meeting with WAPOR and impressive foreign contingent here. Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann of Germany led innovation: open methodological discussion groups on secondary analysis, question wording,
etc. Another innovation, thanks to Co-Editors Bill Nicholls, Phil Harding: booklet of abstracts of papers on sale at registration desk in advance. Hal Mendelsohn’s presidential address introduced us to “Homo Mechanicus,” an obliging S-R creation of behaviorists. Barney Berelson got the AAPOR Award in absentia. Perfect weather; many enjoyed Saturday boattride on lake. Another attendance record set.

1975. Itasca, Ill. This time we’re at the golf resort of Carson Inn.
Nordic Hills. A year of organizational change, culminating in proposals for new procedures for investigating alleged AAPOR code violations and for a reorganized Council. AAPOR finally computerized its operations thanks to Ron Gatty. Al Biderman brought AAPOR into the audio-vidual era with a set of multi-media exhibits. POQ editorship passed from Bernie Roshco to Eleanor Singer. Herb Abelson’s presidential speech addressed a mixture of business and ethical issues. Ray Bauer got the AAPOR Award.

1976. A triumphant return to the ruggedly beautiful Grove Park Inn in Asheville, NC, in its spring glory with a splendid view of the Smokies in the hazy distance from a large veranda. The program ranged widely: from Gill Lindt’s review of the founding fathers’ public opinion conceptions to a wallowing-in-Watergate session on the fall of Richard Nixon. Joe Klapper got the AAPOR Award to great acclaim, and Dick Maisel’s presidential address took the profession to task with admirable brevity.

1977. Back at the Inn at Buck Hill Falls, Pa. for a second time. Pete Rossi’s lecture marked the passing of Paul Lazarsfeld; Shirley Star was also remembered with a special session. AAPOR’s ranks have swelled to 900, but its finances are getting shaky. Joe Belden distributed copies of the earliest known questionnaire, sponsored by the King of Spain in 1577, in honor of 400 years of survey research in the Americas. Leo Bogart got the AAPOR Award, and Irv Crespi spanned the micro and macro levels in his presidential address on attitude research and voting turnout.

1978. Hotel Roanoke, Va., a good meeting in an awful hotel! The plumbing and food were bad, the trains passing by were noisy, the manager faced down an angry bunch at the business meeting by threatening to sue AAPOR! What a way for Joe Klapper to bow out, after years of exemplary service as conference arranger. Lots of survey history at a session on “the early years,” with Paul Sheatsley, Don Cahalan, Joe Belden, and Sid Roslow telling us how it was. A program innovation: a second plenary session on Thursday night. Phill Davison
got the AAPOR Award, and our first woman president, Hope Klapper, delivered the shortest presidential address ever given, on children and television.

1979. Back at Buck Hill Falls and rainy weather (again). Why does the sun seem to appear only on Sunday morning? Membership crossed the 1,000 level, and finances were improving steadily. Merv Field got the AAPOR Award and Reuben Cohen’s presidential address dealt with the need for realistic standards and steady improvements in our methods. Big changes in AAPOR organization and in the code of ethics proposed.

1980. Kings Island Inn in Cincinnati, good weather and parachutists coming down into the theme park next door during our cocktail hour. A major session on opinion research pioneers with exceptional papers on polling in France, West Germany, and Great Britain. An ad hoc committee on the history of AAPOR was appointed, and the links between polls, media, and politics become even more prominent as program topics. Shirley Star got the AAPOR Award posthumously and Jack Elinson’s presidential talks regaled us with the story behind the 7-steps-to-longevity Alameda health prescriptions.

1981. Buck Hill Falls Inn for the fourth time: a popular choice despite bad weather (again). Not since 1948 have the pollsters been as wide of the mark as in 1980 presidential. Just like Louis Bean in days gone by, Reagan’s pollster, Dick Wirthlin, knew it all the time. Very surprising for a campaign where the numbers didn’t change until the weekend before the election. The number of papers and sessions keep growing, as does AAPOR’s savings account. Les Frankel won the AAPOR Award and Helen Kaufman urged heightened concern with research quality in her presidential speech.

1982. Tally ho! The Hunt Valley Inn in the Maryland countryside: a new departure, a modern resort hotel, no real place to sit and schmooze. Once again it rained. “AAPOR members aren’t getting any older” was the amazing conclusion drawn from an analysis of membership age data. The AAPOR Archive to be established at the University of Chicago Library. AAPOR finances have risen like a phoenix from the deficit days of 1974–75; over $100,000 surplus this year. Thirteen Princeton undergraduates in Mike Kagay’s politics class won the Student Award this year, and almost all of them showed up to claim it. Debbie Hensler generated a lot of controversy at her session on need for AAPOR code revisions. Al Gollin had to calm the crowd at a plenary session on Reagan’s policies affecting social research. The AAPOR Award went to Paul Sheatsley, the WAPOR Award to Stanley Payne.
Seymour Sudman underscored the power of polling in his presidential speech on presidents' uses of polls.

1983. Back at Buck Hill Falls for the fifth time in ten years. Alarm bells interrupted sessions held in a room rigged to protect valuable carpets and furniture. Sad to say, we've outgrown the capacity of the Inn to house AAPOR. Charles Tilly regaled his plenary session audience with historical examples of collective protest as public opinion. Bud Roper, saying he might be too inebriated by Saturday night, broke precedents all over the place, with a lunchtime presidential speech on the art-science of polling and presentation of three AAPOR Awards to four winners: Paul Perry, Wilbur Schramm, and Jack and Matilda Riley. Mystery guest, Harold Mendelsohn, topped his 1973 introduction of Sid Hollander. Again, we forgot to tape it.

1984. Lake Lawn Lodge, Delavan, Wis.: a maze of walkways between buildings proved useful. It rained there too! WAPOR had a full day of sessions ahead of AAPOR: another first. Ithiel Pool won the AAPOR Award posthumously, and Mark Abrams was given the Dinerman (WAPOR) Award. Laure Sharp's lunchtime presidential speech focused on the social bond between respondents and interviewers. A hot debate at a plenary on exit polls, chaired by Ron Milavsky, which was ultimately printed in POQ and sent to federal and state legislative leaders. AAPOR's shock and sense of loss over Joe Klapper's death were palpable throughout the conference.

1985. The Americana Great Gorge, McAfee, N.J.: a former Playboy hotel (ghosts of bunnies past) with cheerleaders and white haired ladies' groups meeting at the same time: what a zoo! George Gallup had died after the last AAPOR conference; he and Joe Klapper had plenaries dedicated to their memory. Arch Crossley's death also acknowledged. The old-timers still with us told tall tales at a 'back in the olden days' session, with Herb Hyman as discussant going first! Big changes: AAPOR now owns POQ outright and its publisher will be the University of Chicago Press; also a revised AAPOR code has been drafted by a 'constitutional convention,' chaired by Debbie Hensler. Al Gollin's presidential speech took up Lazarsfeld's theme on the uses of history in studying public opinion; Dan Katz's eloquent AAPOR Award acceptance speech was deeply moving. Eleanor Singer got a surprise award commemorating her eleven years as POQ editor.

1986. The Don CeSar, St. Petersburg, a perfect AAPOR hotel! Warm sunshine and WAPOR help swell attendance to a new high; we needed four overflow hotels. A session in tribute to Herb Hyman; another eminence has passed on. New TV measurement systems and me-
dia credibility were the star attractions at plenaries. The book exhibit and personal computer analytical services have become big-time accessories to the meeting. Howard Schuman’s lunchtime address took issue with stereotypical poll questions and reporting of “marginals.” Phil Converse got the AAPOR Award; Jean Stoetzel received the Dinerman (WAPOR) Award in absentia. A high point at the banquet was conference memoirs by AAPOR wits: Herb Krugman lamented the passing of the “good old days.” Translation: no sleep, lots of all-night poker and pool. Hal Mendelsohn and Dick Baxter told of almost swearing off post-banquet beverages. It seems that a chimp in a sailor suit got on their elevator alone. On the next floor, the door opened, and there was a woman in a matching sailor suit. Annoyed at the chimp, she reached in and pulled him out. Unknown to Hal and Dick, the Simian Society of America was meeting in the hotel.

1987. The Lodge, Hershey, Pa.: a modern resort with a convention center next to a theme park in splendid springtime weather. (We’ve come a long way from the Sagamore in the rain.) AAPOR’s affluence and membership continue to grow; six chapters now active. Ethical controversies were aired at a plenary matching Barbara Bailar and Al Gollin, with ethicist Deni Elliot as commentator. Media and politics dominated the program as usual, but drugs, AIDS, and other lively social issues got attention. One session gave a foretaste of the AAPOR history with talks by four chapter writers. Ron Melinisky’s presidential speech took media poll analysts to task; Seymour Sudman and Norman Bradburn jointly won the AAPOR Award. A “mellow” meeting, all in all.

1988. The Inn on the Park, Toronto: A first-ever at a non-US meeting site, and another fine resort-convention center. Concern was expressed that “AAPOR may be getting too large”; oh, for the marching-and-chowder days? A wired-up, “press-now” quick-polling technology evoked wild reaction and liberal bent by attendees at a plenary session. Shere Hite faced off against Tom Smith, and Jean Converse met her admirers at an author-critics session on her survey research history book. AIDS got a lot of program space, as did democratization, perestroika, and other foreign policy issues. Eleanor Singer told us how to stretch the limits of survey research in her presidential speech, and Bud Roper got the AAPOR Award (as did his father and the Roper Center before him). Louis Guttman was given the Dinerman (WAPOR) Award posthumously. Warren Mitofsky played cakemaster, celebrating POQ’s 50th anniversary issue.
1989. Back to the Don CeSar in St Pete, and a first-ever AAPOR T-shirt run ("If we want your opinion, we'll ask for it!"). Once again, AAPOR has difficulty with Republicans: a plenary on 1988’s Willie Horton and other political ads drew hisses from a few outraged folks. Lots of hot tubing under the stars and rum drinks in the sun. Media and methods dominated the program; a moving tribute was paid at a memorial session for Paul Sheatsley by his many friends. Warren Mitofsky spoke out forthrightly for new standards with meaningful disclosure spelling out the limits of methods in his presidential speech, Gladys and Kurt Lang were the very surprised, but delighted, winners of the AAPOR Award. Hal Mendelsohn did a star turn at the banquet.

1990. Lancaster, Pa., at a Sheraton resort and convention center in the Amish country. Quite a contrast: a time warp outside, everything up to date inside. Attendance records were set. WAPOR addressed the global crises of AIDS and the environment. A plenary on glasnost and perestroika brought three Soviet opinion researchers together: their frankness was an eye-opener for many. Media polling took its lumps at another plenary. Les Kish was roasted and toasted by his friends at a special session and responded with wit and wisdom. Chuck Cowan, the Joe Klapper of the 1980’s, announced his retirement as conference arranger. Phil Meyer delivered his presidential address on polling as science and as journalism without reference to written text: another first! Herb Krugman received the AAPOR Award.
Part One

How It All Began
The Imperfect, Durable Union
David Sills

I have borrowed this rather poetic description of AAPOR from Jean Converse, who also notes in her brilliant 1987 history of survey research, that AAPOR is a “successful effort to span the academic/commercial divide of survey research.” The word “divide” accounts for her use of the noun “union;” the adjective “imperfect” applies as well to all voluntary associations. AAPOR’s status as a voluntary association in this sense is the focus of this introduction.

It is obvious to the most casual observer that organizations and associations are essential to modern society, in fact, to any society larger or more complex than a face-to-face band of hunter-gatherers. For this reason, organizations have frequently been examined by social scientists, and as frequently criticized.

Max Weber viewed organizations in part as manifestations of the inexorable process of rationalization, a process that results in the construction of what he called an “iron cage” in which modern man is imprisoned, “perhaps until the last ton of fossilized coal is burnt.” He also saw organizations as social inventions essential to the functioning of a specialized society. Robert Michels, in his Political Parties (1911), promulgated what he called “the iron law of oligarchy,” which states that “it is organization which gives birth to the domination of the elected over the electors, of the mandataries over the mandators, of the delegates over the delegators.” “Who says organization,” Michels intoned, “says oligarchy.” More recently, the sociologist Philip Selznick has written of “the organizational paradox”: the tendency of organizations to defeat the very purposes for which they are established. Ever since the publication of The Organization Man (1956), by William H. Whyte, Jr., “pop” sociologists have been compelled to point out that large organizations are destroying individuality in America. And perhaps most pertinent to AAPOR, Mancur Olson, in The Logic of Collective Action (1965), maintained that it is logically impossible for one kind of organization, voluntary associations, to work the way they are supposed to work, since rational individuals will not voluntarily seek a collective good for a large group.
These are only a few of the observations that social scientists have made about what may be called the "dark side" of organizations—and particularly about voluntary associations, of which the American Association for Public Opinion Research is a prime example. These observations are all made by outsiders, looking down on voluntary associations from Olympian heights. The concrete reality, seen closer to the object of scrutiny, is of course quite different: brighter, more lively, looser in form, created by individuals we know personally rather than by impersonal societal processes.

It may be useful to sketch out a background against which the distinctive features of AAPOR can be more clearly seen. This book is the history of one voluntary association, AAPOR, told not by outsiders but by a selected group of insiders—members who have been more active than most (many are past presidents of AAPOR) and who have given a great deal of their time, willingly and joyfully, to AAPOR affairs. Although they cannot be described as "objective" historians, the stories they tell are both factual and interesting.

A voluntary association is generally defined as an organized group of persons formed in order to further some common interest of its members. Membership is voluntary, that is, neither imposed upon them nor acquired through birth, and the association exists independently of the state. Even this broad definition admits some exceptions. Membership in labor unions and professional societies may be a condition of employment or professional practice and thus may not be truly voluntary, and membership in a church may be "inherited" from one's parents and, in that sense, not voluntary. In spite of these marginal cases, however, the definition provides a framework for considering the distinctly sociological importance of voluntary associations such as AAPOR.

Recall Tocqueville's famous observation in Democracy in America, first published in 1835-1840: "In no country of the world has the principle of association been more successfully used or applied to a greater multitude of objects than in America." James Bryce echoed this fifty years later in 1888, in his The American Commonwealth: associations are "created, extended, and worked in the United States more quickly and effectively than in any other country." In 1911 Max Weber expressed the opinion, "What is, in qualitative terms, the association-land par excellence? Without doubt America."

AAPOR is only one among countless examples of American voluntary associations. Casual observation of what goes on in the hotel lobbies in downtown America on busy weekends reminds us that we are
indeed "a nation of joiners." What kind of an association do we AAPOR members belong to?

AAPOR may be described, in sociological language, as an interstitial or mediating association. In contrast to such "primary groups" as families and friendship cliques, voluntary associations are "secondary groups"; they mediate between primary groups and the wider society. Professional associations mediate between their members' interests and the actions of government, especially in such matters as licensing, research funding, and legislation. They also mediate between their members and the general public, through their programs of public relations and public information.

But AAPOR is an interstitial association in another sense as well: it mediates between quite different segments of a distinctive professional community. Public opinion is an interdisciplinary field of study, like demography, communications research, or urban studies. It is inhabited by commercial market researchers, by academic social scientists, and by government employees, all different constituencies with different goals and career paths. They meet through AAPOR and at AAPOR meetings and, without surrendering the identity provided by their training or place of employment, they take on an added, shared identity through AAPOR. To ensure that no constituent group takes over or dominates AAPOR, candidates for the president, for the conference chair, and for two councillors-at-large have for many years been drawn alternately from the "commercial" and the "noncommercial" sectors.

How does it happen that an organization with members drawn from so many different work settings, and with such a vague goal as an interest "in the methods and applications of public opinion and social research," has been so successful? One explanation is provided by a major function served for members taking part in AAPOR's activities: mutual intellectual enrichment, occasions for pollsters to learn about academic theories and for academics to give their theories some reality testing. AAPOR has from its inception been a fruitful meeting place, a crossroads for all manner of professional exchanges.

Another explanation is grounded in what the sociologist Mark Granovetter (1973) has called "the strength of weak ties." He asserts that our acquaintances (weak ties) are less likely to be socially involved with one another than are our close friends (strong ties). When we have some form of social contact with an acquaintance, we tap into his or her network of friends and acquaintances, all of whom are likely to be new to us. This is what is meant by the strength of weak ties: they enable ideas and influence to be disseminated widely and more rapidly
through a community than do strong ties. Participants at AAPOR meetings evidently like to make “new friends;” and it is these encounters that constitute the weak ties that in short order link them to others in a constantly widening set of overlapping circles.

Membership in a voluntary association is segmental and part-time, but, through the mechanism of weak ties, its ideas, its goals, and its activities become quickly known throughout the public opinion community. Since most members belong to different social networks, the results of a gathering attended by, say, a dozen people, may be disseminated among a dozen independent social networks. Voluntary associations often achieve their purposes, and get things done, precisely because their members are “only” acquaintances and thus can work together in a more focused, purposive way.

What has come to be called “networking” in contemporary society is clearly a major value of AAPOR for its members. But if we look beyond the membership to American society at large, what is the general, nonspecific function of AAPOR?

One answer is provided by the doctrine of pluralism, as a historical fact, as a political creed, and as a mode of analysis. The doctrine asserts that the power of the sovereign state must be balanced by the power of independent, dispersed associations.

In spite of all our shortcomings in America, it seems to me that we have largely validated the theory of pluralism. Across two centuries, we have escaped totalitarianism; centers of power are dispersed throughout the country; and the tensions between the federal and the state governments, between the state and interest groups, and among voluntary associations themselves enliven our national life, and both stir up and channel our passions. What AAPOR does, therefore, lies at the heart of the greater “imperfect, durable union” that is contemporary America.

Most scholars agree that two global social trends will continue into the next century: social and economic power will be gained by new classes of people and the power of central government and large organizations will increase. Only the Bourbons among us will challenge the first trend; only the utopians among us will question the second. The trick, of course, will be to avoid an Orwellian future by continually creating, then sustaining, new sources of power and authority in society. As Tocqueville presciently put the problem, based upon his observations in early 19th century America:

Among the laws that rule human societies there is one which seems to be more precise and clear than all others. If men are to remain civilized or
to become so, the art of associating together must grow and improve in the same ratio in which the equality of conditions is increased.

By stating the relation between power and equality in the form of a scientific law, Tocqueville earned the right to be called one of the first truly modern social scientists. And by calling for an improvement in “the art of associating together,” he set the basic agenda for an understanding of the relationship of voluntary associations to democratic governance.

AAPOR is by any standard a successful professional association: it has an active and devoted membership and it raises the intellectual, the professional, and the ethical standards of public opinion research. Nonetheless, it is intrinsically “imperfect,” for a wide range of reasons. The sectors of professional life that gave it birth can never be truly joined; participation in it is part-time and segmental, and each member’s loyalty must thus be conditional upon obligations to an employer or profession; its goal of elevating the technical standards of opinion research is made difficult by its limited didactic forum; because its attempts at enforcing high ethical and professional standards in the conduct of research are sometimes thwarted by a near-absence of police powers even over its own members; and its activities are somewhat tangential to those of the major institutions of American society: the government, the political parties, business, and industry, the media, and the universities. But to be both tangential and interstitial is also to be powerful—consider the mortar in a brick wall—and AAPOR proudly reigns as the major professional association for a central institution of American democracy: the scientific study of public opinion.
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Origins: The Central City Conference
Don Cahalan

We "Central City Survivors" agree that Harry Field, more than any other individual, was the key leader in the founding of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. It was Harry who master-minded the first national conference on survey research that led to the establishment of AAPOR a year later. Because of Harry’s leadership and style, this conference was very much a success despite the fact that it was held in the most improbable of places: Central City, Colorado, forty-two miles over winding mountain roads from Denver, which itself was more than eight long hours by plane from the eastern seaboard, where the survey research organizations were most heavily concentrated. And this was right after the end of World War II, when most research leaders were at their busiest in staffing up and finding the financing to reestablish themselves after five years of war.

Many of those who were around at the time have often said that only Harry could have carried off the conference in a style and spirit that set the foundations of AAPOR as a tolerant, low-keyed meeting ground to bring together the diverse and sometimes mutually antagonistic interest groups concerned with furthering the advancement of survey research. His background and personality were hand-tailored to making the conference a success. Harry, who died at forty-six in a plane crash only four weeks after the Central City conference, was a transplanted Englishman who admired the American spirit fully as much as Lord Bryce did several generations before him. He was educated in English “public” schools, and enlisted in the British Army at the outbreak of World War I, when he was only seventeen. Serving with distinction throughout the war and emerging with the rank of Captain at twenty-one, he became acquainted with Americans while on loan to the American Expeditionary Forces as a combat training officer during the last year of the war. He emigrated to the States soon thereafter to work in New York advertising agencies, where he became a friend of George Gallup when they worked together in the Young & Rubicam advertising agency.
In 1936, just after Gallup had founded the American Institute of Public Opinion, Harry went back to England for a short time to found and direct the affiliated British Institute of Public Opinion. Harry soon missed the broader scope that the United States offered to public opinion researchers, and so he returned to New York in 1939 to start an independent organization, People’s Research Corporation. In 1941, when Britain was being pounded by Hitler’s air raids and America was on the verge of joining the conflict, Harry’s concern about doing more to further the cause of democracy led to his founding the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Denver.

NORC was initially funded by a grant from the Field Foundation (Marshall Field was not a relative of Harry’s, but he liked his ideas). As NORC’s report on its first forty years summarizes Harry’s goals,

he was a man with a mission. That mission was to establish a nonprofit research center, affiliated with a university, that would conduct surveys in the public interest. It would not do market research or even forecast elections. Rather it would attempt to give the people a voice in its political, social and economic decision-making. It would also offer its survey services, on a cost basis, to non-profit organizations and to university social scientists and educators, and it would conduct methodological experiments to improve the art and science of measuring public opinion (NORC, 1982).

It was a mystery to some of Harry’s friends why he chose to launch NORC at the University of Denver, then a relatively small church-related private college without great financial resources. Some suspected that the key reason was that Harry thought Colorado’s climate might be helpful to his terminally ill wife. Harry had known Caleb Gates, chancellor of DU, at Princeton, and he especially admired Ben Cherrington, director of the Social Science Foundation at DU. The Social Science Foundation was an educational organization that promoted the goals of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which Cherrington had helped to found.

Harry soon found Denver a most hospitable town. He was warmly welcomed by the civic leaders, for his national survey press releases proved helpful in drawing attention to the city and to the University, where enrollment was to increase tenfold with the influx of veterans immediately after the war. But Pearl Harbor was bombed by the Japanese less than two months after NORC’s founding, and thus most of Harry’s energies for the next four years were devoted to conducting surveys for the government, particularly the Office of War Information,
Office of Price Administration, and the State Department. During those hectic years, he spent as much time in Washington and in NORC’s New York office (directed by Paul Sheatsley and primarily devoted to government surveys) as he did in Denver. As soon as the war was over, Harry set about fulfilling NORC’s delayed mission of providing training and a laboratory for improving survey research methods. He saw NORC’s sponsoring a national conference on survey research as a way to draw attention to the organization’s goals, and also as a chance to help improve communication and to impose professional standards among the diverse elements in the growing survey research field.

While Harry clearly had been planning the Central City conference for some time before he brought me to Denver in February 1946 to head up NORC’s training activities on a joint appointment with NORC and the University, I don’t recall his mentioning his plans to all of us on the staff until almost April. We all were immediately excited over the idea, but we saw many barriers to making it a success. For one thing, the staff members were already up to their ears in supervising the continuing training of a national staff of interviewers and in getting out reports; and I was very much taken up with organizing and teaching a full load of courses in research methods in the behavioral sciences. As I said to Harry, reluctantly: “A great idea, but who would come way out here, when they are all so busy, or broke, and it takes a whole day to get here from New York, and . . .”

“Not to worry,” Harry said, his eyes twinkling behind his thick lenses, “I have an intuition about it, and Marshall Field agrees with me that it would be a good way to spend his money.”

“But how can you get them to come? Sure, it would be great if you could get these people to talk to each other, but some of them go out of their way to avoid each other.”

“Not all that difficult,” he said. “Just use a little strategy. First I will get Ted [Gallup’s nickname] to agree to come. That will be easy, because he always says ‘Yes’ to my ideas until his people talk him out of it. As soon as he says ‘Yes,’ I’ll broadcast it to everybody and get them to thinking that if they don’t come, they might be talked about. Besides, they can combine it with a vacation, good trout fishing, splendid mountains, great air. How can we miss?”

Harry was a master at making difficult things work out well, as I had learned soon after arriving in Denver. For instance, one Saturday morning as I was discussing conference plans with Harry in his study, his visiting nephew, a shy, pale English lad who had been trying to mow the
lawn, came in with downcast eyes, saying, “Puddy [Harry’s jut-jawed, underslung English bulldog] keeps nipping me hinder!”

Harry patted the boy on the shoulder and said, “There, there, we’ll fix that. She just wants to do her part!” Whereupon Harry tied a stout cord to Puddy’s collar and the other end of the cord to the front of the lawnmower, and the bulldog proceeded to trudge a straight line down the lawn with the boy guiding the lawnmower in her wake.

We all soon shared Harry’s enthusiasm for sponsoring a national survey research conference, for the first postwar year was a time of infectious optimism throughout the country. The defeat of Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini, and the emergence of the United Nations, meant to us the triumph of democracy, and the Cold War was not yet upon us. The war had accelerated the growth of sample surveys, and it would be most timely to capitalize on the wartime cooperation between academics and survey practitioners by bringing them together again to reminisce and to discuss research issues in a relaxed, vacation-style setting.

We agreed with Harry that a conference would be a healthy way to bring about better cooperation and reduce tensions among various research camps on such issues as probability versus quota sampling and open-ended versus structured interviewing techniques. Harry also sensed that this time of optimism provided an opportunity to restructure people’s thinking about the importance of survey research to the country’s welfare. The universities were filling up with bright veterans on the GI Bill, and earnest professors were talking excitedly about the opportunities for breaking down the barriers between previously hidebound behavioral science departments. Also, infectious optimism about the usefulness of survey research had spread to government agencies and private business and foundations, thus raising our hopes that we could have more confidence in a bright future for surveys in general.

Many of us shared a missionary’s hope that surveys could provide a mechanism to reform some of the shortcomings of the reductionist behavioral science disciplines, which had largely ignored survey research methods before World War II. As can be inferred by reading between the lines of Link’s retrospections (1947) on psychologists’ role in pre-World War II marketing and advertising surveys, there had been a reductionist reliance on so-called “representative samples of typical undergraduates” in the 1920s and 1930s. And among sociologists in those days, many who considered themselves methodologically sophisticated thought that it was perfectly all right to study the interrelationships between variables in nonrepresentative samples with the assumption that the relationships would be similar to those found in truly
representative samples. Even the Division of Program Surveys within the Department of Agriculture, which became a front-runner in the advocacy of true "probability" samples in the closing days of World War II, had been using relatively crude quota or interviewer-judgment samples just two years earlier.

Prior to the war, there had been relatively little contact between the academic community and early market research and election polling organizations. As recounted by Archibald Crossley (1957), marketing surveys in the 1920s and 1930s were conducted primarily by people in subdepartments within advertising agencies, and their backgrounds were in business and journalism rather than in the social sciences. However, during World War II, people such as Gallup, Roper, and Crossley, who had just begun to publish the results of national surveys of social issues and election forecasts, found themselves joining forces with people from the universities in conducting surveys for the government on civilian and military morale, and on such issues as rationing and other wartime controls.

The spirit of cooperation between academicians and survey practitioners of the wartime years was now threatened by conflicts over methods, and competitiveness over government and foundation survey contracts and grants. Since Harry Field was widely acquainted with many academics and commercial survey people, he was in an excellent position to sponsor a conference that could bring about better understanding and mutual tolerance among the various interests.

**Engineering the Conference**

While I served as the general coordinator for the conference, and the other staff members (especially Gordon Connelly, Herbert Hyman, Paul Sheatsley, and Anne Schuetz Zanes) contributed many suggestions, most of the planning and delicate negotiations were engineered by Harry himself. It was amazing how quickly the whole thing was arranged, even though Harry was almost blind during the last two months before the conference because of a detached retina. (A painful operation restored his vision just a few days before the beginning of the conference in late July.)

Harry's planning for the conference was a tribute to his flair for showmanship; it was also based on familiar survey research techniques. On April 8, he sent a letter to eighty-seven persons prominent in the survey field, including academic and government researchers sug-
gested by the members of his advisory board. This board included Hadley Cantril of Princeton, and Gordon Allport and Samuel Stouffer of Harvard. Stouffer had been head of the War Department’s survey research branch during World War II. The letter included the names of all the addressees, and a questionnaire asking for preferences among a dozen topics for discussion, for additional suggestions on conference content, and for names of other persons who might wish to attend. As bait, it said glowing things about the Central City locale:

Late July—29th through 31st—seems like the time, and the Teller House, in Central City, Colorado, the place. This is the fabulous inn the mining millionaires built, where a pavement of silver blocks was laid for President Grant to walk on from stagecoach to hotel entrance. It has the original “Face on the Barroom Floor,” too.

Today, Central City is an hour’s drive from downtown Denver, and Denver is only eight hours by air from New York and four and a half hours from Los Angeles. The scenery and climate of the Mile-High State is unsurpassed in July and August.

Responses to the first letter helped to swell the final invitation list sent early that summer to 264 persons who represented a wide range of those potentially interested in such a conference. Those invited included the leaders of survey agencies and their clients, many academicians who had some acquaintance with surveys, and representatives of government agencies and of the press and radio. Such a list would seem small today, now that AAPOR’s membership has grown to more than a thousand; but the 264 who were urged to attend included everybody, down to the level of junior research analysts, whose names turned up through Harry’s dragnet inquiry.

A final follow-up letter was sent out from Denver on June 28, including a folder put out by the Central City Opera House Association, with Harry’s plea, “Don’t be alarmed by the prices mentioned in this brochure, as they are Opera Festival prices. During the conference, Teller House rooms will cost not more than $4.00 for a single and $6.00 for a double.” Only after arrival did the guests learn that there were no private baths, occasioning Robert Harvey’s famous crack that he wished there were “less history and more plumbing.”

Extraordinary efforts were exerted to make conferees feel welcome, including assigning each NORC staff member to seek out specific individuals, answer their questions, and tend to their wants (such as vacation arrangements after the conference). Each conference session was covered by one or two staff members, plus a stenographer who took
notes that were later used to write up the proceedings. At the beginning of the conference, Harry distributed detailed memos to the chairs of the eleven sessions. These memos noted that there would be only one session at a time so that everyone could attend all sessions; and also that sessions would be two hours in length with at least that much time in between, so that there could be at least thirty to forty-five minutes of discussion followed by a five-minute summary by the chairman (or his designate) of the sense of that meeting.

Most conference participants who came by plane or train were met by a staff member and driven to Central City in ample time before the beginning of the three-day meeting on July 29.

Harry helped to promote an informal conference atmosphere by encouraging several bits of “Western-hospitality” showmanship dreamed up by staff members. These included individual rustic wooden badges with the name of the conference participant burned into the wood in a cattle-brand script (by Jacqueline Pindell Wiseman, then NORC editorial assistant and now professor of sociology at the University of California at San Diego). Harry himself wore a vivid red plaid shirt and encouraged staff members to wear blue jeans and boots or moccasins. The pièce de résistance, though, was probably the doleful burro who was led and prodded up and down the street in front of the Teller House and Opera House by a couple of NORC staff women dressed in unaccustomed cowgirl blue jeans, boots, chaps, bandannas, Stetsons, and six-guns. The burro was a great hit with the Easterners at the conference, although he lost much of his following when he began leaving “calling-cards” on the street behind him.

As the NORC Sampler newsletter sent out to NORC interviewers and staff members a week after the conference reported, the keynote of the conference atmosphere was the friendly informality. [The] majority of pollsters had rooms in the Teller House, famous hotel of the 1860 boom town. The rich and elaborate, though old, furnishings compensated somewhat for the limited facilities in other lines. Conducive to getting to know one another were the lines that formed each morning at the restricted number of plumbing units . . . a bathroom for about every twenty-five rooms. Despite this aspect of “roughing it,” most of the men had their shaves before the morning panel meetings . . . The forty-two miles distance between Denver and Central City provided about a twenty degree difference in temperature. Mountain showers each afternoon added to the cool comfort of the conference scene. Open houses, tours to Mount Evans, Echo Lake, Idaho Springs and other nearby mountain resorts, hikes out of Central City, and walking tours of historical local spots were worked in between panel sessions.
But that newsletter failed to mention the sometimes night-long diversions the conferees managed for themselves, including poker sessions, and singing and whiskey-drinking soires in which holdover singers from the just-completed Central City opera season joined in the merrymaking. Forty years later, the “Central City Survivors” fondly reminisce about such scenes as Harry Field in his pajamas groping his nearsighted way at dawn into a room filled with smoke and card-players, grumbling, “Can’t anyone get any sleep around here?”; and on how Wilfrid Sanders (of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion) was ready to throw a chamber pot at late-night carollers beneath his window until they broke into a chorus of “Annie Laurie,” to which no good Scotsman could object.

A number of strangers were led to abandon their prejudices against each other in the course of such activities. For example, after Morris Hansen of the U.S. Census Bureau got at the piano and played rather good ragtime and boogie-woogie, and shared drinks with the singers, the commercial researchers came to perceive him as a regular guy instead of as someone who was threatening to push expensive probability sampling down their throats.

The Conference Participants

The conference proceedings published by NORC that fall enumerate seventy-three attendees, of whom thirty-six were formally listed as speaking on one or more of the eleven panels. The seventy-three fell into the following classifications as to principal or most recent occupation:

- Media (radio, newspapers, magazines; this was before the age of television) 19
- Academics (including a few graduate students) 18
- Commercial research 13
- Nonprofit research organizations (mostly NORC staff) 11
- Government employees 7
- Advertising agencies 3
- Others 2

Twenty-five were from the Denver area, including several representatives of local newspapers and radio stations (Harry saw to it that the conference got a lot of media coverage). Twenty-six were from the Eastern seaboard; fourteen came from between Denver and the Eastern seaboard; four were from west of Denver; and four were from foreign
countries (Laszlo Radvanyi, director of the Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion, from Mexico City; Wilfrid Sanders, director of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion; Stuart Dodd, professor of sociology at the American University, Beirut; and Arne Okkenhaug from the Norwegian State Broadcasting organization).

This attendance of 73 out of 264 invitees almost exceeded Harry Field’s optimistic hopes, considering the isolated locale of the conference with attendant expensive travel, and the fact that in that summer of 1946 so many potentially interested persons were extremely busy re-establishing their own businesses or university connections in the aftermath of the war. And survey research in those days had such a slender economic toehold that relatively few could really afford the expense of attending such a conference. True to his promise, George Gallup came and participated actively throughout, but several other leading directors of national survey organizations could not come, including Elmo Roper (though he sent Julian Woodward, his vice president) and Archibald Crossley (who reluctantly cancelled his reservations because his mother had died just before the conference). Nobody came from the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, which Rensis Likert was busy establishing that summer. Paul Lazarsfeld of Columbia, who had worked with Harry during the war, did not manage to get there, nor did the academic members of Harry’s Board of Trustees, perhaps because they did not think their institutions would consider a public opinion survey conference to be an appropriately academic activity on which to spend scarce travel funds.

After the Central City Conference Proceedings were circulated, it became evident to the social science and commercial research communities that a national survey research association would probably be formed at the meeting the next year in Williamstown. As is discussed in the next chapter, attendance at the Williamstown conference, at which AAPOR was founded, was substantially greater than attendance at Central City.

The Conference Sessions

There were eleven sessions at the Central City conference, and a closing general session. All sessions were reported in some detail in the 109-page report issued by NORC that fall, *Proceedings of the Central City Conference on Public Opinion Research* (1946), priced for participants at $10 for two copies, in lieu of a registration fee. These sessions are summarized below.
Public Opinion and International Affairs. George Gallup chaired the meeting, in which informal papers were presented by Henry David of Queens College, New York; Stuart Dodd of American University, Beirut; and Wilfrid Sanders, Director of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion. Topics included the contributions that research on international affairs could make to world peace, and the possible development of an International Barometer of Public Opinion. The tone of the meeting reflected the one-world idealism of the speakers and of the times; but there was some practical discussion of the need for some criteria regarding which types of international research would be most helpful and feasible.

Technical and Ethical Standards in Public Opinion Research. This session was also led by Gallup, along with Clyde Hart (then in the U.S. Office of Price Administration, and soon to succeed Harry as Director of NORC), Julian Woodward of Elmo Roper, and Harry Field. There was a rather candid discussion of the need for self-regulation of standards by an association of survey researchers, some concern over whether it is ethical to withhold survey results that might be injurious to certain groups (Joe Belden told of his dilemma over whether to publish results from his Texas Poll revealing that gubernatorial candidate Rainey was especially popular with blacks), and the need to guard against the manipulation of surveys (as by politicians) to serve private ends. Woodward emphasized the need for survey researchers to set up a committee to promulgate standards; this was adopted as one of the recommendations in the closing session, and implemented (after some acrimony) the following year at the Williamstown meeting at which AAPOR was founded.

Interviewing Problems. Chaired by Donald Murphy of Wallace’s Farmer and Iowa Homestead the other participants being Jack Maloney of the Reader’s Digest, Paul Sheatsley of NORC, and Nancy Cooley of the Chicago Certified Interviewers Association. This was largely a bread-and-butter practical discussion of issues of selection, training, and supervision of field interviewers; problems of potential interview falsification or bias; and which modes of interviewer compensation were most effective. By the time of the Central City conference, most major survey organizations were already selecting and training their interviewers through in-person contact rather than by mail, but the discussion evidently contributed to a number of organizations’ intensifying their quality-control efforts in recruitment and supervision.

Local (City or State) Survey Problems. Chaired by Henry Kroeger of the Iowa Poll, joined by Joe Belden of the Texas Poll and Lloyd Borg
of the Minnesota Poll. Participants eventually concluded that while all of these local polling organizations were patterned after the Gallup Poll with respect to the ways in which they prepared newspaper releases on issues of the day—particularly political issues and election forecasts—they were in a much better position to influence public thinking and spark remedial action in their own areas than were most national polls.

Validity in Public Opinion Surveys. H. H. Remmers of the Purdue Opinion Poll for Young People chaired this section, and was joined by Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Denver Post, and Herbert Hyman of the New York office of NORC and Brooklyn College. Semantic problems (especially the need to avoid words loaded with surplus meaning) were discussed. So was the issue of how to overcome the impression that most survey research findings are ipso facto “validated” by virtue of the fact that it is possible to predict most presidential elections accurately. (This was two years before all of the major national polls mispredicted the outcome of the 1948 election.) While the discussion was a rather elementary one by latter-day standards, Hyman did stress the need for an emphasis on construct validity, or tests of the congruence of survey findings not only with overt behavior but with other relevant attitudes and values.

Sampling Problems. Chaired by Morris Hansen of the Bureau of the Census, with discussants including Norman Meier of the University of Iowa (technical consultant to the Iowa Poll and a long-time friend of Gallup’s from the latter’s graduate student days), Lucien Warner of Life magazine research, and Elmo C. Wilson, Director of Research for the Columbia Broadcasting System. This discussion came at a time when there was a heated controversy in survey circles over the issue of whether it was legitimate to recommend to one’s research clients the application of “quota sampling” (entailing the exercise of interviewer judgment of whom to interview in filling quotas in terms of age, sex, and socio-economic status), when “probability sampling” (random assignment of respondents within established strata) was being advocated by those responsible for statistical standards for the U.S. government. Since the primary users of the newer probability samples (including representatives of the Survey Research Center at Michigan) did not attend the conference, Hansen stood virtually alone when he marshalled the classic textbook arguments that no true statements of statistical reliability can be made if sample selection is not demonstrably random. Although the discussion was fairly polite, the speakers largely spoke past each other rather than reaching a meeting of minds. The lack of communication may have come about in part because most
survey organizations had not yet converted to the much more expensive probability methods, because they were afraid that their clients would be unwilling to pay the extra costs. However, the discussion was a useful one. It tweaked the consciences of some prominent researchers about their research standards. It also reminded the advocates of probability sampling that they could improve their ways of selling their concepts to other researchers, and could do a better job of simplifying probability sampling procedures so as to cut costs. As is reported in later chapters, within a few years after the Central City conference all major survey organizations had adopted probability sampling, thanks to the struggles over sampling within AAPOR during the next few years, and to the U.S. government’s imposition of sampling standards in grants and contracts.

Public Relations Research. Chaired by Dilman Smith of Opinion Research Corporation, joined by Lt. Comdr. Paul Berkman of the Navy’s Office of Public Information and Edward Whittlesey, director of public relations for the University of Denver. This panel discussed the problems of the public relations practitioner in establishing good two-way communications between his clients and the general public, and how the practitioner might avoid being caught in the middle.

Wording and Order of Questions. This panel was chaired by Floyd Ruch of the University of Southern California, whose primary discussants were Theodore Lenz of Washington University, St. Louis; Laszlo Radvanyi, director of the Scientific Institute of Mexican Publican Opinion; Jack Elinson of the Troop Attitude Research Branch of the War Department (now emeritus professor of Public Health at Columbia), who discussed the use of Guttman scales in minimizing question bias, and Valerie Tamulonis, graduate student at the University of Denver. This panel discussed a number of recent studies that had been conducted by NORC and others on the effects of such elements as loaded question wording, ambiguity, and the influence of order of questions or alternatives within a question. Much evidence was presented that careful attention to the wording and order of questions is crucial to the validity of survey results. There appears to be even less emphasis on wording and order in the professional journals of today than there was then, forty-odd years ago—perhaps because such issues common to the whole field of survey research are considered by some of the newer research analysts as less prestigious than issues specific to their own academic disciplines.

Use of Special Groups. Chaired by Elizabeth Herzog (later Mrs. Ralph White) of the Correspondence Panels of the Bureau of the
Budget, Dave Wallace of *Time*, and Robert Harvey of National Analysts Philadelphia. This discussion dealt with correspondence panels, mail questionnaires to magazine subscribers, and consumer panels. These non-probability-sample modes of research were in special vogue during World War II, when in-person interview surveys were more difficult to conduct. Such panels are still found useful, although they have not often been dealt with in recent AAPOR conferences.

**Radio Research.** Chaired by Hugh Terry of KLZ, Denver, joined by Allen Miller of the Rocky Mountain Radio Council, Jeanette Sayre Smith, a former researcher at Harvard and Columbia, and Elmo Wilson of CBS. The panel members placed much emphasis on the need for more socially responsible programming—a concern also not unknown in the field of television today.

**Newspaper Research.** Chaired by Joe Belden of The Texas Poll, with Ralph Nafziger of the University of Minnesota School of Journalism, and Donald Murphy, Editor of *Wallace’s Farmer and Iowa Homestead* as the major discussants. They dealt with examples of five types of newspaper research—readership and reader interest studies, readability of copy, content analyses, attitudes toward newspapers’ policies or services, and reinterviews of news sources to determine reactions to specific items. All agreed that in order for newspaper research to be most effective, these various types of research need to be closely coordinated.

Looking back at Central City ten years later, Clyde Hart and I noted (1957) that the later AAPOR conference programs put “more emphasis upon broad problems of method, and an equally great increase of emphasis on methods and techniques of analyzing data with, perhaps, less attention to sampling, interviewing, and other procedures involved in data collection. Correspondingly, AAPOR programs have given more and more attention to such basic problems as the determinants of political behavior and the formation of public opinion. At the same time, programs dealing with technical subjects have tended to move on a higher and higher level of sophistication.” It should also be noted that in the immediate postwar days of Central City, there was little interaction between the regular practitioners in survey research and academicians because the latter (with the exception of a few like Lazarsfeld and Stouffer) were just then beginning to get involved in testing behavioral science hypotheses through working with large-scale survey data. Thanks largely to the mediating influence of AAPOR conferences in the exchange of ideas and the reader interchange of the role of academic and practitioner in later generations of researchers, surveys have
come to play an essential role in helping us understand the complexities of human behavior in this latter part of the twentieth century.

**Closing General Session and Resolutions**

After discussion, the following five resolutions were approved unanimously by the conference participants:

1. It is the sentiment of this conference that a second conference on public opinion research be held in 1947, and that a Continuing Committee of five, elected by this conference, be empowered to make all arrangements for the 1947 meeting.¹

2. This conference favors the creation of a national association of public opinion research organizations, dedicated to the improvement of research standards and to the wider employment of opinion research techniques.

3. This conference delegates to the Committee on Standards, the responsibility of representing it in working with the nucleus committee.²

4. This conference favors the ultimate establishment of an international organization for the encouragement of opinion research on a world-wide scale. This conference expresses its hope that foundation subsidies can be obtained to aid in establishing this world organization. This conference further asks its Continuing Committee to appoint a committee to implement this resolution.

5. The participants in this conference hereby record their earnest appreciation for the pioneering vision of Harry H. Field in creating this first conference of workers in the field of public opinion research and for the effective way in which he and his staff of NORC have planned and carried through the conference program.

---

1. Harry Field, George Gallup, Julian Woodward, Clyde Hart, and Lloyd E. Borg were elected to serve on the Continuing Committee, which subsequently appointed Stuart Dodd and George Gallup as co-chairmen of a subcommittee to be concerned with international polling problems, particularly the development of a “Barometer of International Security” and the possibility of being of service to the United Nations.

2. Named to the Committee on Standards were: Morris Hansen, Henry David, and Elmo Wilson. The “nucleus committee” referred to consisted of George Gallup, Elmo Roper, and Archibald Crossley, who had announced plans for organizing an association of polling agencies.
Just before the close of the conference, Harry Field voiced a final word of appreciation for the cooperative spirit of all of the participants:

In my opening remarks I said I was awfully happy to see you. Little did I know how happy I was. Having you here has been a tremendous pleasure for me and all of NORC. You have seen for yourselves a team that works. This whole conference and the running of it would have been impossible without the tremendous cooperation that we had, first from members of NORC and then from you. I said at first that it was your conference, and I think it was you that made it a success and it was we who gave the time and place.

Then Julian Woodward adjourned the meeting with this concluding comment: “We all feel Harry has started something here, not for our field of activity alone, but for democracy itself. In passing the resolution of appreciation for his efforts, we did so with our hearts. It is far from the usually perfunctory gesture of thanks for making the conference arrangements and doing its housekeeping. We owe a real debt of gratitude to Harry and NORC for what they have done.”

After the Central City Conference

Only a month after the conference, Harry Field was dead. He was killed in an Air France crash at Le Bourget Field outside Paris while he was in Europe to further the creation of an international organization of survey researchers and to get UNESCO to incorporate provisions for public opinion polls in its charter. His close friend, Clyde Hart, took over as director of NORC.

Shocked and saddened by Harry’s death, the survey research community nevertheless moved with remarkable swiftness in establishing a national and international survey organization along the lines of Harry’s wishes. As related in the next chapter, the public opinion research meeting the following year, in Williamstown, saw the founding of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (with Clyde Hart serving as the first president) and also the World Association for Public Opinion Research. (WAAPOR and AAPOR have traditionally held joint conferences every other year.) Since that time, AAPOR has grown to more than a thousand members, and its yearly conferences draw huge numbers of researchers in comparison to the seventy-three at Central City. But over the years since Central City, the leadership of AAPOR has managed to preserve much of the spirit of informality and
openness to new ideas that characterized that first national meeting four decades ago.
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The Central City conference established a momentum. At 12:05 p.m. on July 31, 1946, immediately following the closing session of that conference and within an hour of their election as a Continuing Committee to plan for a second conference in 1947, the five committee members sat down in Central City's Opera House to begin their work. The group included Lloyd Borg, Harry Field, George Gallup, Clyde Hart, and Julian Woodward. Their first action was to elect Harry Field as Chair. The brief minutes of this meeting, signed by Field, reveal attention to the first resolution passed by the Central City group (to arrange for a second conference in 1947), and to the fourth resolution (to appoint a committee to facilitate "the ultimate establishment of an international organization for the encouragement of opinion research on a world-wide scale").

No reference is made in those minutes to the second resolution ("creation of a national association of public opinion research organizations") or to the third resolution, referring to a Committee on Standards. That committee, consisting of Budd Wilson, Henry David, and Morris Hansen, was to operate on a separate track in the service of these two objectives.

It is apparent that the Continuing Committee took very seriously its mandate to plan on an international scale. The minutes note that "It was unanimously agreed that this First Conference on Public Opinion Research (Central City), and all ensuing ones, be in fact and in name international," and the proposed 1947 conference under discussion was named the Second International Conference on Public Opinion Research. Inevitably, this was later abbreviated to SICPOR. Stuart Dodd, George Gallup, Rensis Likert, and Wilfrid Sanders were formally elected by the Continuing Committee to serve on the International Committee responsible for planning a world organization for public opinion research, with Dodd and Gallup as co-chairmen. Consideration of a possible site for SICPOR centered on Montreal, and Field was asked to discuss this point with Sanders, then editorial director of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion.
Field was also "delegated the responsibility of drafting a list of purposes for the Continuing Committee and for the International Committee" and asked to submit to both these committees suggestions for their future action. Finally, Field was asked to select a suitable date for the second meeting of the Continuing Committee.

The tragic and totally unexpected death of Harry Field in a plane crash in France little over one month later provided a severe setback to conference planning. Field, after all, had been the motivating force responsible for the success of the meeting at Central City, and it was he who was expected to provide leadership for SICPOR. It fell to Clyde Hart, who at the time of Central City was winding up his wartime work as special assistant to the administrator in the Office of Price Administration, to carry on the task. Hart had already been in touch with Field about a position with the National Opinion Research Center and he was the unanimous choice of the NORC Board of Trustees to succeed Field as director. Already a member of the Continuing Conference Committee, he also succeeded Field as chair of that group.

The committee, henceforth known as the SICPOR Executive Committee, held an informal meeting in New York on December 18, 1946, and then gathered for a third time at a luncheon meeting in the Hotel Roosevelt Grill in New York on January 28, 1947. At this meeting, Elmo (Budd) Wilson, research director for the Columbia Broadcasting System and formerly director of an overseas public opinion agency under the auspices of the Office of War Information, was appointed to the committee, and Paul Sheatsley, Eastern representative of NORC in New York, was designated as secretary. Both were in attendance at this third meeting.

In discussing the SICPOR conference location, Gallup quoted Wilfrid Sanders as reporting interest on the part of Laval University in Quebec, while Woodward reported on conversations he had had with Dartmouth and with Williams College. Woodward stated that President James Baxter of Williams was enthusiastic about having the conference in Williamstown, Massachusetts. Quebec offered the attractiveness of a foreign setting for the international conference, while Williamstown had the advantage of a cheaper cost and easier access. The secretary was asked to take an informal poll of probable conference attendees and to investigate the cost and availability of transportation to the two locales.

It had been proposed at the second meeting that NORC again act as host to the conference, but Hart noted that NORC had expended some $5,000 of its own funds on unreimbursed conference expenses and
said he would have to consult his board before accepting the invitation. He now confirmed his board's appreciation and acceptance of the offer, with the expectation that a major share of the expense could be recouped through contributions, registration fees, and sales of the conference proceedings. He proposed, however, that some system of cosponsorship be worked out, with organizations such as the American and Canadian Institutes of Public Opinion, Elmo Roper, CBS, and Time Inc. sharing the expenses, and this suggestion was approved.

It was also agreed that a Sponsoring Committee be named for the conference, to include half a dozen outstanding research workers in foreign countries and approximately fifteen Americans, with half of the latter representative of the academic field. Various names were proposed for further discussion at the next meeting.

Stuart Rice, then Assistant Director of Statistical Standards at the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, who was that year making arrangements for a meeting of the World Statistical Congress to be held in Washington September 13-20, had invited SICPOR to meet at the same time in Washington. The committee preferred to maintain the independence of the public opinion research conference, but agreed to schedule SICPOR, wherever held, early in September in order to allow foreign delegates to combine both meetings in a single trip to the U.S. The chair was instructed to inform Rice of this decision and also of the committee's plan "on the final day of the conference to give attention to public opinion research on an international scale, and to receive and act upon plans for an international organization now under preparation by our sub-committee." The latter reference is to the International Committee chaired by Dodd and Gallup.

The chair asked that the committee consult with associates in the field regarding program content for SICPOR. "It was suggested that somewhat more attention be given to findings from public opinion research than was the case at Central City without, however, taking the emphasis off research methods, procedures, and standards." Finally, the secretary was asked to prepare a list of potential invitees to SICPOR, and the following paragraph from the minutes is of interest, in view of the open membership later decided on for AAPOR and the subsequent rivalry between academic and commercial interests within the Association:

It was the sense of the committee that academic representation should be built up somewhat and made more nearly representative of the research now in progress in universities throughout the country. It was also de-
decided to restrict the invitations to those persons or agencies that are doing public opinion research, and not to include straight market research personnel. Attendance at the conference should be by invitation only, and invitations should be carefully weighed by the sub-committee.

A fourth meeting of the committee followed quickly on February 13, and the conference began to assume its final shape. The secretary’s informal poll of eighteen prospective attendees found preferences evenly divided between Williamstown and Quebec as the conference site, but Hart reported that his own inquiries of interested persons at federal agencies in Washington showed a unanimous preference for Williamstown because of expected difficulties in obtaining authorization for travel outside the United States. The committee then unanimously designated Williamstown as the conference location, and Budd Wilson was delegated to conduct final arrangements with President Baxter of Williams College.

Turning to conference dates, and the commitment to early September in order to oblige foreign delegates to the World Statistical Congress later that month, the committee decided to open proceedings Tuesday evening, September 2, and close at noon on Friday, September 5. September 1 was Labor Day in 1947 and it was noted that most transportation to Williamstown was scheduled for afternoon arrival; thus the Tuesday evening start. The Friday close was designed to allow the delegates a free weekend for their return home or for vacationing.

At this meeting, too, names of possible members of the proposed Sponsoring Committee were discussed and the following nominations were unanimously confirmed.

Rensis Likert       Hadley Cantril       Samuel Stouffer
Daniel Katz         Claude Robinson    Paul Lazarsfeld
Archibald Crossley  Elmo Roper        Arnold King
Frederick Stephan   Wilfrid Sanders   Stuart Dodd
Wahl Asmussen       Jean Stoetzel      Henry Durant
Guillaume Jacquemijns Roy Morgan        Stephen Taylor

Of these, Stouffer was later appointed to the Executive Committee and Taylor was unable to serve, resulting in a sixteen-member Sponsoring Committee, six of them from outside the United States.

Discussion then turned to the content of the program. Hart noted that eight periods were available for meetings: Tuesday evening, three on Wednesday, three on Thursday, and Friday morning. There was tentative agreement that the opening session should feature a “big-name” speaker, that conflict between sessions should be avoided by trying to
schedule only one meeting per time period, and that the final time slot should be devoted to a business meeting of the conference participants.

Early consensus was achieved on the topical areas to be examined in the six substantive sessions: sampling problems, interviewing problems, problems of questionnaire construction; problems of coding, analysis, and presentation of data; standards in opinion research, and one time period devoted to several smaller sessions of more specialized interest. Suggestions for the opening guest speaker centered on prominent scientific figures such as Albert Einstein, Arthur Compton, James Conant, or J. Robert Oppenheimer to discuss problems of methodology in the physical and social sciences, and on political leaders such as Trygve Lie, George Marshall, or Anthony Eden to speak about the role of public opinion in the postwar world. The committee designated its Chair, Clyde Hart, to consider in more detail the content of the conference program and the role of the guest speaker, and to report back at the next meeting.

**Development of Final Preparations**

Almost three months elapsed before the next meeting of the Executive Committee on May 9, 1947, when a quorum of Hart, Woodward, Wilson, and Sheatsley again gathered at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York. Work on the conference had been proceeding on a number of fronts, however, and a great deal of progress was reported. The time and place of the conference had been confirmed. President Baxter of Williams College would give an official welcome at the opening session on Tuesday evening, September 2, and he and Mrs. Baxter would host a reception for the participants at 5:30 the next afternoon. Professor David Truman of Williams was appointed to chair a committee on local arrangements.

The secretary reported that invitations had been sent to the eighteen persons nominated to the Sponsoring Committee and seventeen acceptances had been received. Simultaneous press releases had been issued from Denver and from Williams College on April 16, and conference letterheads were being printed in Denver. Samuel Stouffer was removed from the Sponsoring Committee and appointed to the Executive Committee to increase academic representation in the latter group.

Wilson reported on conversations he had had with Donald Young of the Rockefeller Foundation and expressed optimism that a grant of up
to $7,500 might be obtained for the purpose of paying the transportation expenses of foreign delegates who would otherwise be unable to attend. He also described negotiations with International Business Machines for a cash contribution to SICPOR in exchange for permission to exhibit IBM tabulating equipment at the conference. Wilson was then formally appointed to head a finance committee, assisted by Lloyd Borg and Lucien Warner of Life, to prepare a budget for the conference, and to continue to canvass possible sources of funds.

The committee formally decided that admission to the conference would be by invitation only, and Sheatsley was named chair of an invitations committee that also included Jerome Bruner of Harvard University and Cornelius DuBois of Life. This committee was directed to prepare a list of individuals to whom invitations would be sent. It was tentatively decided that all conference delegates would pay an advance registration fee of $10.

Hart had drafted a rough outline of a conference program toward the end of April. This outline was now turned over to Woodward, with instructions to convert it into a specific program schedule, with sessions identified by title and suggested speakers for each topic. Woodward and Wilson were also asked by the committee to invite Walter Lippmann to give the opening address. If he was not available, they were asked to invite Archibald MacLeish, William Benton, or Chester Bowles.

Starting with a list of 167 names compiled by Sheatsley from the Central City roster and other sources, the Invitations Committee finally identified 362 individuals worthy of invitation to SICPOR. The invitation list was conveniently divided into the following groups:

- Academics, university affiliated: 92
- U.S. government researchers: 28
- Public opinion polls: 49
- Advertising, market research, public relations: 56
- Newspapers, radio, magazines: 52
- Researchers outside U.S.: 57
- Misc.: foundations, interest groups: 28

Total: 362

Pre-conference activities proceeded apace throughout the summer of 1947. At NORC’s New York office, which served as the hub, a special SICPOR secretary, Emma Jane Krakauer, was hired to handle the conference mailings and correspondence. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, agreed to deliver the keynote address on “Public Opin-
ion and World Affairs” at the opening dinner of the conference on Tuesday evening, September 2. Invitations were sent out to the approved list with return postal cards enclosed on which to indicate intention to attend. Unsolicited inquiries from persons not on the list but who expressed a wish to attend were received favorably and no interested person was excluded. Woodward’s committee was busy translating the committee’s bare outline of program content into specific sessions with invited speakers. No further formal meetings of the Executive Committee were held until August 28, the week before the conference.

This final meeting of the committee was concerned mainly with such details as the order of events at the opening dinner, the agenda for the proposed Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning business meetings, and arrangements for press coverage and the reporting of meetings.

The Williamstown Setting and Program

Although considerably more accessible than Central City, the Second International Conference on Public Opinion Research carried on what would become an AAPOR tradition of meeting in out-of-the-way places. A mailing describing transportation, accommodations, and facilities informed the reader that Williamstown was a four-hour drive from New York and that there were two trains daily from New York to North Adams, Massachusetts, and three to Albany, New York, from which points taxis, buses, or another train (once a day) would provide transportation to Williamstown.

Once there, the visitor was instructed to proceed to Jesup Hall on the Williams College campus and register for a dormitory room. The prices, however, could not be beat. Room and meals on the American Plan were $7 per day: $2.50 for the room, $1 for breakfast, $1.50 for lunch, and $2 for dinner. For $21 per person at the time of registration, registrants were covered for their accommodations and meals from Tuesday afternoon through Friday lunch. A few rooms for the more well-to-do were available at the Williams Inn. Again anticipating an AAPOR tradition, dress was described as “strictly informal” and the college swimming pool, tennis courts, and privileges of the Faculty House were all available to participants at no extra charge.

Located in the scenic northwestern corner of Massachusetts, Williamstown was (and still is) a charming New England community of
about 5,000. The Williams College campus is located on both sides of Main Street, so that the amenities of town life are easily accessible. Plenary meetings of the conference were held in Adams Memorial Theatre; smaller sessions met in the theatre studio and in Jesup Hall.

The conference attracted 194 registered participants. (Central City had hosted 73.) The program arranged by Julian Woodward and his committee opened with a dinner in Currier Hall on Tuesday evening, September 2. Clyde Hart chaired the proceedings, which included a welcoming address by James Baxter, president of Williams College; introductions by Budd Wilson of the fifteen foreign participants (four from England; two each from Mexico, Canada, and Czechoslovakia; and one each from Australia, Puerto Rico, Cuba, West Germany, and Switzerland); and the address by William Benton, which received extensive press coverage in the New York Herald Tribune thanks to Paul Tobenkin, a staff correspondent who attended the conference.

Wednesday was devoted to “round tables,” two in the morning and two in the afternoon. The morning meetings were chaired by Rensis Likert of the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Center on “Problems of Polling in Different Countries” and by Ralph Nafziger of the University of Minnesota on “Problems of State and Local Polling.” Participating in the first round table were Herbert Hyman of NORC, R.J. Jessen of Iowa State College, and Jean Stoetzel of the French Institute of Public Opinion. The discussion of local polls was sparked by short papers by Alfred M. Lee of Wayne University, Jane Shepherd of The Washington Post, and Paul H. Tresco of the Philadelphia Bulletin. The afternoon meetings focused on “Measurements of Intensity and Information,” chaired by Claude Robinson of Opinion Research Corporation and featuring papers by Stevens Stock (Opinion Research Corporation), Jerome Bruner (Harvard University), and William A. Lydgate (American Institute of Public Opinion); and on “Psychological Errors in Polling,” chaired by Hadley Cantril of Princeton University and including papers by Daniel Katz (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan), Frederick Stephan (Princeton), and Don Cahalan (NORC).

At five o’clock there was a preliminary business meeting in Adams Memorial Theatre, followed at 5:30 by a reception by President and Mrs. Baxter at the Faculty House of the College. After dinner, the conference attended a session on “New Fields of Use for Public Opinion Research,” chaired by Samuel A. Stouffer of Harvard. Here Louis Harris, then with Elmo Roper, discussed the use of surveys in economic prediction; Douglas Williams of Fred Rudge, Inc., discussed their use
in labor relations; and Bernard Berelson of the University of Chicago addressed their use in measuring the efficiency of communications media. Marie Jahoda of the American Jewish Committee looked at research on minority group prejudice.

The whole of Thursday morning was given over to the Business Meeting, at which the Standards Committee was to submit its plan for a national opinion research organization. The afternoon was devoted to two panel discussions, one on “Coding Validity and Reliability” with Albert B. Blankenship of National Analysts (chair), Angus Campbell (SRC, University of Michigan), Richard Crutchfield (Swarthmore College), and Hans Zeisel (McCann-Erickson, Inc.); the other on “What Is the Effective Public Opinion Universe?” chaired by former Census Bureau Acting Director Philip M. Hauser and including Henry David (Queens College), David B. Truman (Williams College), Richardson Wood, and Julian L. Woodward (Elmo Roper). The plenary evening session, chaired by Stuart Chase, featured an “all-star” panel of Archibald Crossley, George Gallup, Paul Lazarsfeld, and Elmo Roper in a discussion of “Polling and the Political Process.”

The final day of the conference was concerned with international issues. At nine o’clock there was a discussion of “Surveys of World Opinion,” led by Wilson of CBS and including remarks by Mark Abrams (Research Services Ltd., England), Stuart C. Dodd (American University, Beirut, Lebanon), S. Shepard Jones (U.S. Department of State), and Karel Naprstek (United Nations). At eleven o’clock there was an organization meeting for an international association, chaired by Gallup, at which Stuart Dodd, co-chairman with Gallup of the Committee on International Organization appointed at Central City, presented the committee’s report. It was at this meeting that the “World Congress on Public Opinion Research” (subsequently changed to “World Association for Public Opinion Research,” or WAPOR) was voted into existence, with Jean Stoetzel as its first President. At the close of this meeting, at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, September 5, the Williamstown conference adjourned.

The Committee on Standards

To understand the genesis of the AAPOR constitution, its adoption at the Williamstown conference, and the ensuing tensions between academic and commercial constituents, one must go back to a historic panel at the 1946 Central City conference in which George Gallup, Ju-
lian Woodward, Clyde Hart (then Special Assistant to the Administrator, Office of Price Administration), and Harry Field discussed "Technical and Ethical Standards in Public Opinion Research." In a remarkably prescient presentation, Woodward outlined some of his expectations for the future of public opinion research. He foresaw an expansion in the role of polling in order to clarify public issues. Elections, he said, are infrequent and refer to candidates rather than issues. Polls will provide continuous feedback on public opinion concerning policy issues. He predicted a greatly increased level of polling by government agencies, as a result of the successful wartime use of public opinion research, and he foresaw an expansion of polling in the international field. Finally, he expected much greater use of polls on public knowledge in order to evaluate mass educational programs.

But parallel to this widespread expansion of polling activity, Woodward pointed out the increased dangers of misuse of public opinion surveys and survey results. Specifically, he warned of the possible manipulation of polling agencies to serve private ends and of the potential use of polling agencies results as a club over public servants ("This is what your constituents want. You must vote accordingly."). He expressed concern that pollsters might be satisfied with current technical standards, because improved techniques might add to survey costs, and he warned against "cut-throat" competition among private polls that would drive down their quality. In Woodward's opinion, polling was not a purely private activity, subject only to the laws of the marketplace, but partook of a "public utility," imbued with the public interest. Hence "polls must conduct themselves in such a way as to justify the responsibilities which will increasingly be theirs and to deserve the respect with which the public will regard them."

Woodward then referred to current attempts to formulate standards to meet these dangers and reported that "Gallup, Roper and Crossley have met and agreed to sponsor an association of public opinion reporters which would include agencies now engaged in reporting poll results through various media of communication." This association, he said, would include the nationwide polls, the state polls, and certain community polls. No articles for the association had yet been established, but he had some proposals for their consideration. Beyond working to extend the use of polling techniques and a public relations program to foster better understanding of the uses and limitations of polls, he urged the maintenance of high standards of technical competence and the promotion of research to this end.
Woodward gave special emphasis to the organization of a committee on standards that would ensure that no poll that did not live up to the standards agreed upon should have membership in the association. Such standards would include adequate sampling methods, competent interviewing staff, well-designed questionnaires, and the observance of certain ethical as well as technical standards. He called for a uniform reporting of poll results, including full disclosure of the dates of interviewing, the limits of precision of the statistics reported, the total number of interviews, and “the calculation of per cents only to whole numbers.” The committee and association should also foster methodological experiments on such matters as the use of scales and batteries of questions as compared with single questions.

Speaking as a user of public opinion research in his role at the Office of Price Administration, Hart indicated his strong agreement with Woodward’s conception of polls as a “public utility.” Consequently, he said, the polling industry must either impose standards on itself or must submit to the imposition of standards from outside the field. “Such standards are particularly needed in view of the increasing number of fly-by-night polls which can bring disrepute upon the entire industry.” Hart illustrated his point by citing two instances in which he said the status of OPA had been adversely affected by the reporting of invalid survey results based on biased samples and biased questions. Although their data were injected into public discussion, the polling organizations involved were unwilling to present their original sampling data and tabulations, which were needed to evaluate the results. Incidents of this type, in his view, would damage the entire research profession and “effective policing is imperative.” “Unless (a public opinion research organization) is set up and standards made explicit and amenable to enforcement, the polling industry will face a difficult future and will fail to make the contribution of which it is potentially capable.”

Gallup then reported “the suggestions made at the original sponsoring meeting for such an association, formed by himself, Roper, and Crossley, and including Harry Field of NORC, and the various state and city polls.” No final action had been taken, said Gallup, but an “auditing committee” had been recommended, with authority to investigate all the activities of organizations having membership. Among the duties of this auditing committee would be to evaluate the various election predictions “and determine the most accurate poll in order to eliminate the welter of confusing claims.” Gallup’s view was to limit
the association to public opinion organizations because "they have a greater responsibility to the public for the truth of their reports." Market research organizations, he said, might want to establish their own committee to serve their particular purposes.

Field offered additional suggestions. He favored a seal of approval by the association that would be carried on the press releases of all member polling organizations. Releases would be examined after publication and if they were not up to standard the polling agency would be warned. Repeated violations would be grounds for removing the stamp of approval. Field urged a public relations campaign to convince editors and the public of the meaning of the seal. He further suggested that the auditing committee include one or more well-known persons outside the field in order to provide additional prestige to the committee's findings. He asked finally that a tentative committee be established at the Central City Conference "to bring in a professional report on the suggestions by this panel."

In the following discussion, John Maloney (Reader's Digest) noted that polling agencies often did market research as well, that the two were associated in the public mind, and that "the aura of bad market research would spread to affect the well-being of polling organizations." He accordingly suggested that the proposed organization should include market research companies. Lucien Warner (Life) generally concurred with Maloney, but proposed that market research be included in the purview of the auditing committee only in instances in which the use of such results affected the public welfare. There followed some discussion of how the media could be prevented from distorting the findings of polls in their presentation. Gallup expressed a consensus that minimum reporting requirements should be established that would require at least the publication of the actual wording of the question and the type and size of sample.

It was in response to this panel discussion, in which four of the major participants at Central City unanimously called for a public opinion research organization that would formulate and enforce standards of research, that Resolutions 2 and 3 were adopted at the closing session of the conference. Resolution 2 favored "the creation of a national association of opinion research organizations, dedicated to the improvement of research standards and to the wider employment of opinion research techniques" and Resolution 3 said, "This conference delegates to the Committee on Standards the responsibility of representing it in working with the nucleus committee." A footnote to the proceedings of the Central City conference reads: "Named to the Committee on
Standards were Morris H. Hansen, Dr. Henry David, and Elmo C. Wilson. The nucleus committee referred to consists of Dr. Henry David, Elmo Roper, and Archibald Crossley, who have announced plans for organizing an association of polling agencies.”

One may wonder, in view of the many fundamental and specific issues involved in the setting and enforcement of research standards, why nobody rose at Central City to ask such questions as: Do we know enough to write specific standards for the various aspects of public opinion research? Might such standards not represent a minimum level of effort that would discourage more innovative or costly research? Do we seriously intend to establish a minimum sample size for every kind of survey? Will standards be imposed by majority votes of an unknown group of association members?

That no such questions were asked probably reflects the particular time and makeup of the Central City conference. It was a conference on public opinion research and there were very few private market research practitioners in attendance. Almost all of those in the audience were concerned with publicly reported polls and surveys, and not with confidential reports to private clients. It was clear that the postwar years would bring a rapid expansion of public opinion research and it was equally clear, as all four panel members emphasized, that the field should be subject to some sort of review in the public interest. The conference, too, did not come to grips with the difficult practical and philosophical problems of formulating specific standards, nor did it have to. It was merely expressing a general concern and taking some very general steps to meet that concern.

It was in such a climate that the Committee on Standards took up its task of “working with the nucleus committee” on “the creation of a national association of opinion research organizations.”

Drafting the AAPOR Constitution

The work of the Committee on Standards and its relations with the so-called “nucleus committee” are shrouded in some mystery. Henry David, later to have a distinguished career as director of the National Manpower Council at Columbia University, as president of the New School for Social Research, and as director of the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences at the National Academy of Sciences, was at the time adviser on American Affairs to the British Broadcasting Corporation and assistant professor of history at Queens College. Budd
Wilson, after his wartime years in research for the Office of War Information, was research director of the Columbia Broadcasting System. Morris Hansen was statistical assistant to the director of the Bureau of the Census. This was indeed a distinguished trio, but in retrospect it seems strange that the Central City conference did not appoint a larger and more representative committee to draft a constitution for the proposed association.

Although both Gallup and Woodward (representing Elmo Roper) had referred at Central City to a proposed association of public opinion reporting agencies, the AAPOR History Committee has failed to turn up any memory or any hard evidence of these plans. Indeed, in a telephone conversation in March 1984, Archibald Crossley (who did not attend Central City) denied any knowledge of a “nucleus committee” at that time. His first serious contacts with Gallup on this subject, he stated, did not take place until the late 1960s and these eventuated in the National Council on Public Polls. We may surmise that Gallup, Roper, Crossley, Field, Woodward and probably others may have had occasional informal discussions about forming an association, but the reference in the Central City minutes to “the original sponsoring meeting for such an association” appears to have been an exaggeration.

The Committee on Standards worked independently, and probably quite informally. It did not report to the Executive Committee and there is no record of any minutes or other account of its activities. We must assume that the Standards Committee members made efforts to contact the “nucleus committee” but that these came to naught. They probably discovered that there was no organized group or committee with whom they could work and that little or no help could be expected from that quarter in time to have a constitution ready for the 1947 conference. The definition and imposition of research standards would obviously have to be addressed by an organization operating under a constitution, so the three members of the Committee on Standards assumed as their major (and only) task the drafting of a proposed constitution for what would become AAPOR. It is known that David, the historian, took primary responsibility for this work. It may be assumed that he conferred with Wilson in New York from time to time and that Hansen in Washington was kept informed by telephone and mail. There exists a rough draft of a constitution for an “Association for Public Opinion Research” dated March 1947, probably drafted by David for review by his peers.

This draft, which consists of two and a half pages of single-spaced typing, is headed “ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RE-
SEARCH.” Section 1 is one line only: “Name: The Association for Public Opinion Research.” Section 2 is called “Purposes of the Organization” and lists five “basic purposes.” Section 3 on “Membership” includes twenty-two paragraphs that describe the criteria for membership, call for annual conferences, and provide for an Executive Council that shall meet at least twice a year. The Council would consist of an elected president, vice president, secretary-treasurer, editor, “the chairmen of the three Boards of the Association” (but only two are listed: the Conference Board and the Board on Standards), and two council members elected at large. The “elected Boards” are each to have seven members who will then designate their own chairman. The draft also mentions three standing committees, chosen by the council: a Committee on Publications, a Committee on By-Laws, and a Committee on Public Relations.

Perhaps the most striking thing about this first cut at a constitution is its flouting of the Central City resolution to “create a national association of public opinion organizations.” The first paragraph under “Membership” states unequivocally that “Membership in the Association for Public Opinion Research is open to all persons, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, who reside in the United States and its territorial possessions.” This fundamental change in the concept of the proposed organization, from an association of agencies to one of individuals, had vast implications for the future of AAPOR, but there is no documentation and we can only speculate about the reasons for the change.

It seems highly unlikely that Henry David made this decision on his own when he started to draft the constitution. It is more probable that the Committee on Standards, after attempting to make contact with the “nucleus committee” that was supposedly forming an association of polling organizations, began to question the feasibility and wisdom of this idea. Judging from the list of participants at the Central City conference, it is indeed difficult to understand just which “public opinion organizations” might have been enrolled in an incipient AAPOR. Aside from NORC and the three poll-takers, the only national research agencies that sent representatives to Central City were two highly regarded market research companies: Opinion Research Corporation and National Analysts. Three state polls and a number of local research companies were represented, but most participants were individuals who were sponsors, users, or teachers of public opinion research: research directors of corporate, government or non-profit agencies, university professors, and media representatives.
Something of this line of thought was conveyed in a letter from Clyde Hart to Rensis Likert in August 1947. Likert was a member of the Gallup-Dodd International Committee charged with planning a world organization for public opinion research, and Hart's letter urges Likert to press for an association of individuals rather than of agencies. He refers to "a ruling made by the Gallup (international) affiliates in their May meeting, which prohibits any one of the affiliates from joining an international organization (as agencies)" and continues, "Gallup himself is very much opposed to an international organization of agencies. Stuart Dodd, however, had just such an organization in mind, and has already prepared a suggested constitution, complete down to Article N, Section C, Paragraph J." Hart expresses pessimism that the competitive interests of research companies will permit them to function effectively in an association, but adds: "However, I do think that an international professional organization of individuals who are doing attitude and opinion research, whether academic or commercial, would be a very good thing."

Much the same reasoning must have taken place in the Committee on Standards, and agreement was reached no later than March that the association be composed of individuals rather than agencies. Succeeding drafts of the proposed constitution contained much the same language; there is nothing in the written files available to indicate any dissent, and nobody challenged the concept at the floor discussion of the constitution at the Williamstown conference.

An undated "Draft Constitution for the AAPOR" seems to be a revision of David's March draft. The original version has been closely edited and condensed, and some of the language "toned down." For example, whereas the first draft listed as a purpose of the association "to facilitate the dissemination and critical appraisal of opinion research methods, techniques and findings," the revision deleted the words "and critical appraisal." Another purpose, "to promote the proper utilization of public opinion research as an effective democratic policy-forming instrument," was changed to "to promote the utilization of public opinion research in democratic policy formulation." Other changes were also relatively minor. The third board, missing from the original draft, turns out to be a Nominations Board, charged with preparing a slate of nominations each year, and the Committee on By-Laws is dropped, leaving only two standing committees, on Publications and on Public Relations. A third council member at-large position was created, each of these serving for three years, with one elected
each year. This draft also divided David's original notes into nine articles of constitution, with appropriate sections within each.

At a preliminary business meeting held at five o'clock Wednesday afternoon and chaired by Clyde Hart, the Williamstown conference participants heard reports from Sheatsley on the work of the Executive Committee, from Wilson on the activities of the Committee on Standards, and from Dodd on the International Committee. Wilson announced that copies of a proposed constitution for a national association of individuals interested in public opinion research would be circulated to conference members that evening and, on his motion, it was voted that action on this constitution be made the first order of business at the regular business meeting on the following day. When it was observed from the floor that if the proposed constitution were adopted, some mechanism should be in place to provide nominations for the various offices required, the chair was authorized to appoint a five-person Nominating Committee. This committee was chaired by Cornelius DuBois and included Daniel Katz, William Lydgate, John Riley, and Henry Kroeger.

The History Committee has been unable to find a copy of the constitution that was circulated to the conference that evening, but the floor discussion next morning indicated few changes from the draft we described earlier. It is apparent that the name of the organization had been changed to American Association for Public Opinion Research, but other changes appear to have been minor.

The Founding of AAPOR

The entire conference, almost two hundred people, entered the Adams Memorial Theatre at nine o'clock Thursday morning, September 4, to attend the "Organization Meeting on a National Association of Individuals Interested in Public Opinion Research." Clyde Hart again chaired the meeting and the first order of business, as decided at the preliminary business meeting the preceding afternoon, was action on the constitution that had been distributed to conference participants the evening before. Henry David started the proceedings by moving adoption of the document and his motion was seconded by his colleague on the Committee on Standards, Budd Wilson.

It is noteworthy that no one at this point questioned the concept of an association for public opinion research and no one argued for an
association of public opinion research agencies rather than individuals. What debate occurred was focused on the issue of standards. Actually, the references to standards in the proposed constitution were as vague as they were benign. Article II listed as one of the five purposes of the association “to encourage the development of the highest professional standards in public opinion research.” Article VI, Section 4, in describing the proposed “Standards Board,” said merely that “it shall be concerned with fulfilling the declared purpose of the Association to contribute to the elevation of professional standards.” And that was all.

Though the protagonists in the debate generally represented commercial versus academic researchers, the lines were not fixed and the argument that proceeded was quite low key. Many in the academic camp were doubtful of the ability of any organization to formulate specific standards for survey research, while many market researchers would have welcomed the association’s help in curbing survey abuses. In general, the commercial researchers, who were at a numerical disadvantage, were on guard against any attempts by academics or others to restrict their research freedom.

Thus, as soon as David’s motion was seconded, Claude Robinson, president of Opinion Research Corporation, moved that it be tabled until there had been a thorough discussion of the proposed Board of Standards described in the constitution. His motion was promptly seconded by Albert Blankenship of National Analysts, Inc., but was defeated on a standing vote. Stuart Dodd then proposed that the question of standards be made the first point of discussion under David’s motion, and Robinson asked the Standards Committee to describe its thinking on the subject.

In response, David recalled that his committee had been established to meet the issue of standards and had merely set up a mechanism within the proposed organization to deal with the problem. He emphasized that under the proposed constitution the Standards Board itself would have no power to impose standards on members. Wilson concurred, adding that the Standards Board would simply provide an instrument for thorough discussion of the problem. Robinson replied that higher professional standards should come about through free debate and that the proposal for a Standards Board was “authoritarian” because it gave opportunity for a small group to assume authority for the associations’ total membership. He warned that attempts to impose standards upon members might cause disruption of the organization.
Alfred Watson of Curtis Publishing Co. requested clarification of what the Standards Board would do, and David replied that it would attempt to codify the underlying principles governing scientific method in opinion research and to submit these principles to the membership. Dodd said that some mechanism was needed to encourage debate on standards, Alfred Lee of Wayne University said some such agency was needed to “do the spadework” on the problem, and Julian Woodward of Elmo Roper and Herbert Stember of NORC expressed the belief that free debate could be achieved through the proposed board. Cornelius DuBois of Time Inc., however, pointed out that the American Marketing Association’s committee on standards could never agree, and Norman Meier of the University of Iowa and William Yoell of a New York market research agency both noted that the “underlying principles” of opinion research, mentioned by David, were still largely unknown and subject to investigation and experimentation.

William Lydgate of the Gallup Poll then moved that the entire Section 4 of Article VI of the proposed constitution, dealing with the Standards Board, be deleted, and his motion was seconded by Watson. John Riley of Rutgers University pointed out that Lydgate’s motion was a far-reaching one, that the question of standards was basic to the association’s declared purpose of encouraging the development of the field of public opinion research, and that a vote against the Standards Board would be tantamount to a vote against the entire association. Wilson concurred, stating that any omission of the question of standards would be a step backward. He emphasized that his committee had been constituted as a “Committee on Standards” and that to ignore the problem of standards would be to invite unfavorable reaction from critics of opinion research. On a standing vote, Lydgate’s motion was defeated.

And thus ended the debate on standards at AAPOR’s organization meeting. The outcome reflected the wisdom of David, Wilson, and Hansen in muting the divisive issue of standards in their draft of a constitution. Their primary aim was to get an organization established, drawing its membership from the widest possible range of individuals concerned with survey research, and thus to provide a broad-based forum for discussion of standards in years to come. Despite Robinson’s warnings of “authoritarianism,” very few of the conference participants could discern any possible threat to their activities in the mild language proposed by the committee, and the great majority applauded its purpose. Issues of survey standards have continued to con-
cern AAPOR all through the forty years that have passed since Williamstown, but these issues have been freely debated and the Association has always adopted a very cautious stance in dealing with them.

The meeting then proceeded to discuss the draft constitution item by item, with the chair calling for a vote on each article. The name of the organization in Article 1 had been changed to the "American Association for Public Opinion Research" and two motions proposed substitution of the word "International" and deletion of the word "American." Following assurances that an international association was to be formed the next morning, both motions were defeated. Article II, listing the five purposes of the organization, was adopted as written. These purposes were

to stimulate creative research and study in the public opinion field; to encourage the development of the highest professional standards in public opinion research; to facilitate the dissemination of opinion research methods, techniques and findings through annual conferences and an official journal and other publications; to promote the utilization of public opinion research in democratic policy formation; and to serve as a representative national organization in international opinion research meetings and associations.

The early drafts of Article III of the constitution, dealing with membership, declared that "all persons, without regard to race, color, creed or national origin, who reside in the United States and its possessions may become active members of the Association," and Section 3 of this article stated that persons not resident in the U.S. and its possessions may become members on invitation of the Executive Council and shall be exempt from dues. The draft circulated at the conference apparently had been changed to "all persons ... who reside in the United States ... and who are professionally engaged in the field of public opinion research may become active members ..." This article was now amended after floor discussion and vote. The reference to United States residence was deleted, as was Section 3 dealing with nonresidents. And the wording of Section 1 was changed to "all persons professionally engaged in the field of public opinion research or teaching in the field of public opinion ... may become active members of the Association."

It will be recalled that the draft constitution called for three "boards"—Nominations, Conference, and Standards—with elected membership, the chairman of each to serve on the Executive Council.
The draft also called for two Standing Committees, on Publications and on Public Relations, these to be appointed by the Executive Council, with no representation on the Council. Questioned about this distinction, David explained that his committee regarded Nominations, Conference, and Standards as potentially powerful groups who should be subject to election by the membership, while the two committees would simply execute policies set by the Executive Council.

DuBois, Chair of the Conference Nominating Committee appointed by Hart at the preliminary business meeting on Wednesday, said his group felt it was unduly cumbersome to have contested elections for five members of the Nominations Board, seven members of the Conference Board, and seven members of the Standards Board. He urged that only the chairs of the boards be elected by members, with the remainder of each board appointed by Council. There were also questions about the role of the editor, who was to be elected by the membership and hold a seat on the Council.

After much floor discussion, Articles IV and V, dealing with the officers and Executive Council of the Association, and Articles VI and VII, concerning the boards and standing committees, were amended as follows. All references to "boards" were changed to "committees" and Article VII was combined with Article VI to cover the "five standing committees of the Association." Chairmen of the Nominations, Conference, and Standards Committee were to be elected by the membership, with other members of these committees appointed by Council. All members of the Publications and Public Relations Committees, including the chairs, were to be appointed by Council. The Executive Council would include ten voting members: the president, vice president, and secretary-treasurer; the nominations, conference, and standards chairmen; the three Council members elected at large on staggered three-year terms; and the retiring president. It would also include three non-voting members: the editor and the chairmen of publications and public relations. The editor would be "elected" by Council rather than by the membership. The remaining articles of the draft constitution were adopted without change and the constitution as a whole was then adopted as amended.

DuBois, reporting for the Nominating Committee, then presented two nominees for each office except that of President. For the office of president the committee nominated only Clyde Hart and Hart was elected by acclamation. Voting then proceeded by secret ballot, with the following results:
Vice president
Secretary-treasurer
Chair, Nominations
Chair, Conference
Chair, Standards
At-large, three-year term
At-large, two-year term
At-large, one-year term

Elmo Wilson
Julian Woodward
Daniel Katz
Hadley Cantril
Philip Hauser
Rensis Likert
Paul Lazarsfeld
George Gallup

Lucien Warner of Life offered a resolution calling for the chair to appoint a committee to study personnel problems in the field of public opinion research. The resolution was carried and Warner was named chairman. The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Only a little over a year after Harry Field had invited persons concerned with public opinion research to attend a conference in Central City, AAPOR had become a reality. Before Central City, the event would have been difficult to foresee. That such a diverse assembly—college and university faculty members; federal government officials; public opinion “pollsters;” advertising, market research, and public relations people; media representatives from newspapers, radio, and magazines; foundation officials; and representatives of various public and private interest groups—would all recognize their common interest in public opinion research, and would be willing, even eager, to engage in formal discussions of their common or disparate concerns—this was as surprising as it was unprecedented. As the record shows, there were lingering doubts, rivalries, and mistrust, and indeed throughout its history AAPOR has had to be attentive to the diverse interests of its various membership in its nominations for office and in the content of the program at its annual conferences. The kinds of problems that AAPOR came to face and the nature of its response over the years provide the content of the chapters that follow.
Part Two

AAPOR and the World
The Central Issue: Standards as Authority

The Formative Stages

In the beginning there was controversy about standards. The announcement of a “Second International Conference on Public Opinion Research,” signed by Paul Sheatsley as secretary, summoned to Williamstown the pioneers who would found AAPOR there in 1947. The importance of standards is suggested by the inclusion of a Standards Committee as one of only four bodies designated on the letterhead.

The centrality of standards issues to the organization was further anticipated by the presence on the Standards Committee of Elmo Wilson, who was to become AAPOR’s second president. Indeed, a total of ten Standards Committee chairs are among the forty-four presidents of AAPOR through 1990-91, and one associate chair who was elevated to the presidency before he could chair the Committee. At least one Standards chair is known to have declined the presidential nomination. Six of these twelve individuals served (either as Committee chair or president) during the seven-year period from 1976-1983, when standards issues dominated much of AAPOR’s business.

It was the Standards Committee that had drafted a “proposed constitution for a national organization on public opinion research.” One of its members moved adoption and another provided the second, but “Claude Robinson suggested that before the constitution was adopted, there should be a thorough discussion of the proposed Board of Standards Described in the Constitution.” Robinson argued “that the proposal for a Standards Board was ‘authoritarian’ [and] offered opportunity for a small group of men to assume authority for the whole membership... Attempts to impose standards... might cause disruption of the organization.”

The Committee members argued that they “had been appointed to meet the issue of standards and had merely set up a mechanism... to
deal with the problem;” that their proposed constitution gave the Standards Board “no power to impose standards on members,” that it would be “an instrument for thorough discussion of the question.” It would “attempt to codify the underlying principles governing scientific method in this work and to submit them to the membership.... To ignore the problem completely would be to invite unfavorable reaction from critics of opinion research.”

Proponents carried the day, although with a change of name from “Standards Board” to Committee on Standards” with an elected chair but appointed membership, like other committees. The meeting then went on to consider less inflammatory provisions, beginning with a name for the organization. Before adjournment, Philip Hauser was elected Standards Committee chair, the first of thirty who have held the office to date.

“It has been observed that this general dispute over standards authority amplified a specific controversy between those (mostly academics) who advocated area probability sampling and their (mostly commercial) adversaries who defended quota samples.”

Four decades of experience suggest that both parties to the controversy over standards at Williamstown had gotten hold of an essential truth—that monitoring research quality would be disruptive. In this debate, John Riley of Rutgers University was surely correct in arguing “that the question of standards was basic to the Association’s declared purpose of encouraging the development of the field of opinion research.”1 Claude Robinson of Opinion Research Corporation was equally correct in arguing that attempts to impose authoritarian rules governing survey procedures would disrupt the Association. In fact, the standards of performance that Robinson feared never materialized. Standards of performance have seldom, if ever, been a major concern of the Standards Committees, whose chief activities over the years have involved research ethics rather than research techniques.

At that conference, “Norman Meier and William Yoell expressed the belief that the ‘underlying principles’ of opinion research” that the Standards Board aimed to codify “were still largely unknown and subject to experimentation.” Cornelius DuBois added a note of experience, as well as of prophecy, in pointing out that “the American Marketing Association’s committee on standards could never agree.” In 1947, neither those who advocated AAPOR’s role as authority nor

1. Unless otherwise noted, quotations in this chapter are from the minutes of AAPOR business or Council meetings.
those who were alarmed by the “authoritarian” potential of the standards proposal could anticipate the Committee’s evolving role in judging infractions of practice. The Standards battleground was to become one of conduct, not of technique; future committees would adjudicate ethics, not performance.

The incipience of this evolution, unplanned, unintended, and unrecognized, is apparent in the next year’s annual business meeting in September 1948. Philip Hauser, as Standards Committee chair, moved that AAPOR “commend” (not adopt) the proposed “Code of Professional Practice” and the “Standards of Practice To Be Used in the Reporting of Survey Results,” both of which had been prepared by a committee representing six private companies “engaged in survey research in marketing and public opinion.” Hauser’s report acknowledged that these two codes “consist largely of a statement of broad principles which only research, time and continued effort can convert into operational and procedural terms of an objective and definitive character.” The report also “recognized that implementation of these proposals is entirely dependent on . . . voluntary adherence, and the good faith and professional conduct of individual members.” It was also pointed out in the discussion surrounding these two declarations that they were developed specially for commercial organizations, and hence more appropriate for a trade association than for AAPOR as an association of individual members.

“Mindful of the basic importance of its constitutional assignment to AAPOR and to its members,” Hauser’s report said, the “Committee believes that with this action, the way will be paved for the development and adopting [of] a code of detailed standards of performance in the various aspects of public opinion research,” and goes on to list these as encompassing virtually the gamut of the survey research process: design and pretesting, sample design, methods of estimation and measures of precision, evaluation of validity, organization and supervision of field operations, and “analysis, interpretation and presentation of results.” The committee also urged that “the Association, through its Committee on Standards, keep abreast of methodological developments.” The motion was carried without dissent, but the years were to show that this never became the committee’s function.

If the scope of this assignment now seems naive as well as grandiose, it should be noted that the proposed Code of Professional Practice was modeled on marketing research and political polling, not on the wide range of topics and techniques AAPOR now embraces. The issue of standards in surveys had up to that time been almost entirely overlooked by academia and therefore it seemed a proper, if ambitious, undertaking for a new association dedicated to the practice of public opinion research.

The standards for reporting survey Results, would on the other hand, receive increasing emphasis in the future. Despite the urge to proclaim and disseminate in textbook fashion the evolving methodological bases for the newly developed art of survey research, it was increasingly recognized that no one could really prescribe what constituted acceptable practice across the range of varying uses and applications. Instead, AAPOR moved in the direction of disclosure: no rules for conducting surveys would be pronounced but, in the tradition of all science, survey researchers should be required to describe adequately just what they did so that their findings could be objectively evaluated.

"Continuing his report for the Standards Committee, Mr. Hauser then brought up the question of the increasing abuse of interviewing techniques by sales people in door-to-door selling. Mr. Hauser then moved . . . that the American Association for Public Opinion Research condemns the use of survey interviewing as a selling device and holds this practice to be a serious threat to the continued cooperation of the public in legitimate marketing and public opinion research." From the year of this first formal condemnation (1948), the phony survey, in varied manifestations, has plagued not only successive Standards Committees (as discussed later in this chapter) but all who practice survey research. Notwithstanding a few successful skirmishes, AAPOR and its sister associations have over the years been largely helpless in combatting these abuses of the survey method.

Two years after this initial manifesto, in December 1950, Standards chair Stevens Stock reported seven possible "areas of activity" to be considered by the committee, first among which was "specifications [of] standards . . . in which previous committees have worked looking toward setting down in some rigid rules what constitutes good and bad research. . . ." But "since previous committees have had considerable trouble in getting agreement in this area, I shall not push this as an activity of the present committee."
Instead, Stock proposed several other projects. Some of these, such as recommendations for conference programs and curbing survey abuse, were already familiar to the body and are discussed elsewhere in this chapter. Three others, however, seem to have been new departures: (1) proposing standards for membership (although “it probably is not feasible at this time to write rigid standards . . . in the sense that have often been proposed”); (2) collecting “folklore of opinion research . . . on some of the techniques often accepted as standard;” and (3) establishing standards for research contracts, a detailed code for which was subsequently drafted and published in *POQ*. By 1951, the issue of technical standards had reached a stalemate so that Standards chair number five, Herbert Hyman, told Council in November that he had no report to make because “the major problem of the Standards Committee in the past [was that] the report was always either innocuous or disapproved.”

In keeping with this sense of frustration, the report of Hyman’s committee for the year 1951-52 acknowledged that its “function this year [was] one of appraisal and examination rather than activity,” concluding that “we are little further along in the level of standards operating in the profession than we were five years ago.” The report urged wider dissemination of technical findings as well as of codes but, acknowledging the limitations of voluntary adherence, nevertheless rejected “the alternative—the imposition of sanctions.”

Pursuing the trend toward reassessment, the 1952-53 committee, co-chaired by Don Cahalan and Joseph Hochstim, circulated to the membership the 1948 code and standards of reporting as preliminary to possible revision, but the records provide no indication of progress toward that end. Similarly, in 1954 Standards chair Dean Manheimer “agreed to review all past Standards Committee reports to see what has been planned and what has been achieved.” There followed at a Council meeting “considerable discussion about the role of AAPOR as mediator or umpire” not only between consenting AAPOR members as provided in the (by now) revised constitution, but also where one party is not a member “the Standards Committee might serve in an unofficial role and merely ask the disputants to explain their procedures [acting] as a disinterested third party.” Reported in Council minutes (November, 1954) as apparent “consensus,” this discussion pursuant to a committee report presaged the steady trend toward adjudication that would culminate in formal procedures first adopted in the 1970s.
The First Cases

Abstract deliberation gave way to stark reality early in 1955 with a letter from Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers of America and of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), addressed to all AAPOR members. Reuther complained that a biased questionnaire was being used in a study conducted among General Motors employees by Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton. The matter was referred to the Standards Committee, which referred it back to Council for guidance. Building on deliberations of several meetings, the case was formally presented to the AAPOR membership in nearly two single-spaced pages of the committee report to the annual business meeting in Madison, April 1955. Some items significant for the present history:

- In keeping with positions taken by its predecessors, the Standards Committee declined to pass judgment but presented relevant material so that “each member of AAPOR is free to make his own evaluation. . . .”
- “The Standards Committee has long held the view that the final report is the basis for an appraisal.”
- Since “future disputes might involve . . . sample design, selection and testing of interviewers, the manner of coding and classifying responses,” etc., “there are no limits to which the Standards Committee might be called on to act if it saw itself functioning as a policing agent for the profession.” The committee’s function was to improve ethical and professional standards but the committee was not “intended to serve as an enforcement agency” and even if it wanted to do so “no machinery exists” for that purpose.
- “As with any other professional body . . . the normal standards for criticism are . . . professional journals and private discussions.”
- AAPOR’s constitution provides for voluntary arbitration of disputes between members by an ad hoc tribunal. “Although Mr. Reuther is not a member of AAPOR, a member of AAPOR, under the Article in question, could elect voluntarily to represent his point of view, if arbitration were agreeable to other parties.”

The report closed by welcoming the opportunity to clarify the committee’s position. If we must surmise that the response was less than satisfactory to Walter Reuther, it appears to have been the most explicit statement to that date of the committee’s “function with respect to specific disputes.” Indeed, when the chair, Dean Manheimer, requested
clarification of the committee’s function at the first meeting of the 1955-56 Council, he was referred to the statement to the membership presented in his absence two months earlier as “a model statement [that] can well serve as a committee charter.”

Model or not, less than two years after avoiding confrontation on Reuther’s challenge of biased question wording, Council took a more activist position at its meeting in February 1957 in response to Harry Alpert’s presentation of an “ethical dilemma that often arises when survey materials are used in legal situations” when “the researcher has an obligation to shield the identity of survey respondents [b]ut when he does, the survey evidence is subject to being judged as ‘hearsay’ only.” Alpert argued that “a responsible resolution, pointing out the researcher’s responsibility and . . . a summary of precedents and citations in past legal situations could be useful both to the researcher and the court.” The specific issue of respondent anonymity is discussed more fully below, but it is important to note here that it constituted the entering wedge for consideration of a comprehensive code of ethics. Council moved that Robert Ford, as Standards chair, be asked to draft the resolution, but when at a subsequent Council meeting he raised the question of a statement by AAPOR that would “bind members to protect the anonymity of survey respondents in legal situations,” a question was raised as to the power of AAPOR to enforce such a resolution, if accepted. Also, it was pointed out that a resolution on this point would lead, inevitably, to a code of ethics. Daniel Katz reported that the American Psychological Association had a code of ethics that was actively enforced.

“The Council recommended that the Standards Committee prepare two resolutions: a) a brief statement expressing AAPOR’s support for the protection of the anonymity of survey respondents to be presented at this year’s business meeting, and b) a more extensive code of ethics to be presented by mail to the entire AAPOR membership. Discussion of the code and its possible adoption will be scheduled for next year’s Conference.”

The resolution on respondent anonymity was unanimously passed by the 1957 annual business meeting of the membership, at which Ford stated that he intended it to become a part of “a complete Code of Professional Practices & Standards” that would be developed by the committee and circulated to the membership for comment and suggestions before the next business meeting. A decade after the controversy over possible standards of performance had provoked a floor battle at the time of AAPOR’s founding, no one seemed alarmed about the im-
position of technical standards because no one was arguing for them in these terms.

The question of enforcement was still lurking, however. Some favored it, some didn’t, but perhaps adopting a code seemed in itself so drastic that initially enforcement was not an issue. Committee member Ira Cisin, a persistent and conscientious objector over the years to any hint of enforcement, described the code as “appropriately pious and general.”

Indeed, this code, adopted by the membership at its 1958 annual business meeting in Chicago, consisted of one set of principles of scientific standards, one of improving standards of practice, and a third concerning obligations to “classes of people” including clients and sponsors, the public, and the Association itself. With its adoption, however, it was referred back to the membership and the committee for editorial changes.

Toward A Tougher Code

Meanwhile, Leo Bogart had succeeded to the Standards chair (1958) and, as he has written in a recent reminiscence, “we were faced with a growing number of complaints about malpractice” while the “original code was nothing more than a statement of good intentions.” The revised version was presented to the 1959 membership meeting at Lake George, this time with a resolution on implementation.

There was dissent from Cisin and from Shirley Star, another voice of conscience who frequently prodded AAPOR’s annual membership meetings, “who insisted that there was no one right way of doing things. . . . The debate went to the very heart of AAPOR’s function and character. Cisin honestly believed that AAPOR could never aspire to be a professional organization, because it set no criteria for membership other than ‘interest’ in the field. It was, to use his phrase, a ‘chowder and marching society.’ Some of the rest of us disagreed, and pointed to the code as a banner under which the organization could move to express its professionalism.”

The two points of view clashed with intensity like that of the initial 1947 debate, which it somewhat resembled, over whether the organization was to assume judgment of its members’ work. The question here was “whether the code was just to be an admonitory document framed and glaring down from the wall, or something with ‘teeth in it’ . . . a systematic procedure to review alleged infractions, and the possibility of real sanctions against organizations usually outside our own membership. This all came to a head when we faced our problems with
Gilbert, which began when I was still Standards chairman [1958-60]. . . . And his line with us was, 'I'm not breaking any law. Who designated you to say what's right and what's wrong?'" 3

Because the code had now become more controversial, the membership wanted time to consider these changes and the proposal was sent back for still further changes to "be circulated to the membership well in advance of the following year's conference." Finally, it was accepted by the 1960 annual membership meeting in Atlantic City, including a provision that implementation was declared to be "a responsibility of the Executive Council. The Standards Committee will review any charges of violation . . . and submit its recommendation to the Executive Council." This new code was published in the fall issue of POQ (without this implementation resolution) and, according to one account, became a model for codes adopted by the American Marketing Association and the Market Research Council.

With the new code in place and ready for implementation, the committee ran into a new problem. Seeking to confront the Gilbert Youth Organization, a research firm that was reportedly using its survey findings to compile lists of sales targets, Standards Chair Jack Elinson and a committee member were themselves threatened with a lawsuit in the 1962-63 business year. On advice of legal counsel, provided by President Joseph Klapper through the courtesy of his employer, CBS, Council was made aware of members' exposure to damage suits and at its April 1963 meeting voted unanimously to recommend the incorporation of AAPOR as a means of protection in case "the Association is ever to take any action or express any opinions concerning any problems facing public opinion research." With this protection secured, the membership at the annual business meeting in May, 1964, voted unanimously in favor of a "Resolution for Interpreting and Implementing the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices" requiring the Standards Committee to accept, investigate, and review all complaints alleging infractions of the code and within ninety days to make a report with recommendations to Council.

The resolution was redrafted by Council according to the membership business meeting's motion and was adopted by Council in October, 1964. In the Council meeting that followed, Standards chair Bruce Neal questioned the feasibility of following up all complaints, in particular those directed at nonmembers, and thought more emphasis

---

3. The preceding quotations are from Leo Bogart's review of this chapter. The Gilbert case is discussed below.
should be placed on achieving the objectives by publicity. However, other Council members pointed out that a membership poll had shown overwhelming support for action against pseudo-surveys, for instance, and other code violations by nonmembers that threatened to impair interviewer access to respondents.

With this, the initial controversy between standards activists and those who feared imposition of authoritarian standards seemed resolved at last: No standards were to be prescribed, but practitioners would be held responsible for their work. AAPOR had embarked on an affirmative course, although the nature of its anticipated actions was left unspecified, to be developed ad hoc. This activist course was facilitated by the development and adoption of AAPOR’s standards of disclosure, a list describing elements of any survey, for example, sample size, question wording, dates of interviewing, that some members believed were essential to evaluation and interpretation and should therefore accompany the release of any findings.

The standards of disclosure were apparently prompted by “An Open Memorandum to the Standards Committee” prepared by Edwin Parker, William Nichols II, and Michael Phillips, referred to as the Parker Memorandum. This was introduced March 22, 1967 by Standards Committee chair Irving Crespi, at a meeting of Council, which authorized him to act on it. A draft was presented to Council, discussed at the members’ advisory business meeting in May of that year, adopted by Council in September, and in 1969 distributed by the Public Relations Committee “to AAPOR members, selected editors of major newspapers, magazines and TV stations, U.S. senators and state governors.” The purpose of this dissemination was to encourage both news organizations that carried polls and political figures who used them to be more discriminating in evaluating poll results sent to them.

These guidelines were descended from the 1948 “Standards of Practice To Be Used in the Reporting of Survey Results” promulgated by the committee of six commercial researchers referred to at the beginning of this chapter. As adopted by Council, these standards had remained for many years as a statement of desirable practice but, unlike the code, did not require membership approval or commitment until both were incorporated into the code revision two decades later. Similar standards were adopted by the National Council on Public Polls, also founded during the late 1960s, largely by AAPOR members who specialized in polls conducted primarily for media publication or broadcast.
In 1970, Manuel N. Manfield, a member of the Standards Committee, submitted a “Proposal for Supplementing the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.” Also descended from the 1948 Code of Professional Practice, this supplement pertained to honest business dealings in marketing research, forbidding such buyer practices as seeking preferential scheduling or “pirating” interviewers. It was rejected by Council on the grounds that purely business dealings were not appropriate for AAPOR concern.

Feeling the Way

Cases make law, and according to available records it was not until 1969, five years after the membership had required the Standards Committee to investigate alleged infractions, that AAPOR’s brave new direction was put to a test with the almost simultaneous appearance of four complaints. All four complaints involved the release of data advocating points that were challenged by opponents:

- A pro-armament group published an advertisement citing figures from a national poll by Opinion Research Corporation in support of the anti-ballistic missile—a poll that ABM opponents claimed was biased.
- Another ORC poll conducted for a group of Princeton alumni opposing the admission of women was challenged as biased by the University’s administration.
- A New York Post columnist wrote a piece that was circulated to Council by an AAPOR member, taking issue with George Gallup’s appearance on a USIA film that cited Gallup findings.
- A poll conducted for a private citizen’s group by Chilton Research Service on the Haynsworth nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court was said to be biased.

The Standards Committee presented the allegations in each case to the organization responsible and received a response from each. This documentation was presented in transcript form as part of the committee’s report to AAPOR’s membership at the 1970 advisory business meeting. They were also distributed (in the face of a libel suit threatened verbally by one of the subject organizations) as illustrative material for a session at the same conference titled, “Toward Responsibility in Reporting Opinion Surveys,” which was organized and chaired by the Standards Committee Chair, Sidney Hollander.
The next case on file (May, 1973) concerned alleged bias in a political poll by Market Opinion Research (MOR) of Detroit, but this organization declined to respond to the complaint without knowing the identity of the complainants. Anonymity of the complaint’s source was an issue that had been continually debated as the Code developed. Although Council member Cisin said that concealing complainants’ identities makes the Standards Committee party to a “security action,” the Standards Committee took the position that once a claim is accepted the committee itself becomes the complainant, just as the state and not the victim becomes the plaintiff in criminal law. In any case, “the Committee needs guidelines, especially for non-researchers” and “a document is being prepared.” This case was discussed in successive Council meetings while it was being pursued by the Standards Committee, but the absence of guidelines became increasingly apparent.

There was at this same time a sense of pressure from outside the industry for discipline, as public attention was drawn to self-serving polls and conflicting results. Council minutes for 1973 show that one member of Council who had presented AAPOR’s position to the U.S. congressional committee on “truth in polling” reported that one congressman had characterized AAPOR’s existing procedures as “pitiful.” In early 1974, some Council members began exploring what legal liability the organization might incur if it were to adopt stronger measures. The legal advice obtained recommended explicit procedures that could be applied uniformly as a means of minimizing the possibility of retaliation by liability suits.

The MOR case was reported by Standards Chair Hope Klapper in the 1974 report of the Standards Committee to the annual business meeting, referring to “three complaints about a firm [not named] which has a number of AAPOR members,” concerning release of survey findings supporting the position of the Nixon administration in a policy dispute with Congress. MOR acknowledged that some of its questions had been biased for the purpose of testing Nixon’s influence, but it had released the results without qualification and without reference to the sponsorship of the survey by the Republican National Committee. An ad hoc subcommittee had been appointed that “found the firm had violated our Code and Standards of Reporting and the firm was [so] notified by Council.” MOR, in turn, claimed that AAPOR did not have established procedures for dealing with infractions, declared the action discriminatory, and threatened suit for damages against Council as individuals. Acknowledging the absence of a codified procedure, Council agreed to push the outcome no further.
Formalizing Procedures

But process abhors a vacuum, and the committee report went on to say that in this instance, “the firm, the Standards Committee and Council all agreed that there should be a formally adopted, written document stipulating procedures and spelling out the range of action AAPOR could take against those judged to have violated the Code and Standards of Reporting.” Accordingly, an ad hoc committee consisting of Standards Chair Klapper and two committee members (her subsequent successor, Mervin Field, and Burns Roper, who would later succeed to the chair), plus AAPOR President-Elect Herbert Abelson and a volunteer lawyer, developed a draft for submission to the membership.

This work was pursued vigorously in 1974-75 by Standards Chair Mervin Field, and the record shows six drafts produced and circulated to the committee and/or Council by the end of 1974. This took place at the same time that Council was revising AAPOR’s by-laws to include a revised code of ethics but not the companion standards of disclosure, although the latter could also be the subject of standards violations to be dealt with by means of the new procedures.

As portrayed in successive drafts and by specific criticism freely offered by Council members, the procedure was an elaborate series of some fourteen steps, at a minimum, before any kind of censure could be announced, if only to the concerned parties. The bodies involved, besides the complainant and the “respondent” (the term given to the alleged perpetrator of code violation), include at various points the chair of the Standards Committee, an ad hoc committee of the Standards Committee, Council, and an Investigating Committee also appointed by the Standards chair. The procedure is marked by promotion of fairness and elimination of self-interest; informing both complainant and respondent at several points and inviting their pleas; a final judgment made by the full Council; and protection of the respondent’s identity unless there is a final judgment of censure.

Criticisms noted in minutes and in extant memoranda reiterated the question whether the complainant has the option of remaining anonymous (decided in the affirmative); the burden of expense to both Council and the respondent; and whether decisions by Council and either of the specially-appointed committees can be made by mail or telephone canvass without exchange of views. Finally, at a Council meeting on March 21, 1975, Standards Chair Field presented the finished version, which was voted on section-by-section and passed with several amendments and deletions as Draft No.6, to be subsequently approved by the
membership. Thus, after nearly three decades the organization committed itself to a juridical if not a policing procedure. AAPOR would respond according to a stipulated procedure to complaints of dishonest or misleading presentation of surveys (or presumably any other opinion research), regardless of whether either the complainant or the respondent was an AAPOR member, and would publicly identify both the transgressor and perpetrator if fault was found.

The procedure did not wait long for application. Having no precedent in dealing with standards complaints, Council elected to put the new steps into use in April, even before their acceptance by AAPOR’s membership. A complaint had been received from a non-profit consumer organization, alleging that Opinion Research Corporation exhibited bias in a survey sponsored by a business group concerning the proposed establishment of a consumer advocacy agency in the federal government. The incident provided a showcase for the newly-minted regulations because the survey had earlier been presented to a U.S. Senate subcommittee that declared it “loaded to produce a predetermined conclusion.” One senator declared that it “involves questions of misrepresentation which should come within the ambit of...the Federal Trade Commission Act,” a type of scrutiny rarely, if ever, suggested for an opinion poll hitherto. After the issue had received some publicity, Harry O’Neill, Executive Vice President of the subject organization, “invited an AAPOR investigation and agreed to cooperate fully.”

The investigation, directed by Mervin Field, followed the prescribed steps, beginning with a three-person ad hoc Review Committee and culminating in a full review by a diversified panel of twelve AAPOR members. Nearly six months after receipt of the initial complaint, this Evaluation Committee issued a thirteen-page document that condoned some aspects of the criticized study but stated the questionnaire was “probably biased,” and found some “interpretations which do not appear to be supported by the data made public.” The committee report was submitted to Council, which accepted it with one abstention and subsequently issued a news release summarizing the findings, including that ORC was “in complete conformity with AAPOR’s standards of disclosure.” The release also stated that one committee member (Ithiel de Sola Pool) dissented, and his dissent, as well as a rebuttal to the findings by O’Neill, was issued with the full report. Pool’s dissent noted that any question reporting on public approval of a legislative act necessarily focuses on limited aspects of the measure, and so to find bias in singling out one aspect or another is a subjective rather than an ethical judgment.
This case is notable as the first to be submitted to the full procedure, and it was also the first in which a reprimand was issued based on perceived bias, even when full disclosure had been made. In justifying this unprecedented use of standards applied to performance, Field wrote (in a personal letter to Pool acknowledging and rebutting his dissent): “I enthusiastically support... your reservations about the tyranny of collective thought (in committee form) regarding methodological matters. However, I would hope this does not mean... that a practitioner can be shielded from criticism by his peers when they believe he has been intemperate in reporting his results to innocent audiences.”

In addition to reaching definitive conclusions concerning the adequacy of the subject survey, the Evaluation Committee advanced several fundamental and penetrating questions regarding the role of survey research in public policy issues, including the “absence of minimum methodological standards of practice.” It noted “a vast literature on every phase of survey research methodology, but this is scarcely acknowledged by the existing AAPOR Code... Standards of scientific competence are referred to... without further explication.” A code of ethics is inadequate, the committee reasoned, because “we suffer more from the work of incompetents than from the knowingly unethical” and “the Committee wishes that AAPOR had a better mechanism to handle the former.” Thus, even in the first full demonstration of its ability to deal with an alleged infraction of ethics, the investigating committee in an obiter dictum observation still sought standards in the sense initially conceived by some of AAPOR’s founding fathers, feared by others, and never seriously formulated by the organization’s governing body. Indeed, dissenters on the Evaluation Committee questioned the organization’s right to criticize and reject such research, short of outright falsification of data, so long as the entire procedure was adequately described. This position was later supported in a volunteered protest by Burns Roper, a committee member later to become a Standards chair and an AAPOR president.

Encompassed within the time span of the landmark ORC investigation was an example of a similar situation that took a different turn. In July of the same year (1975), a complaint was received regarding a publication of Planned Parenthood of America citing Gallup Poll data. A Preliminary Review Committee was appointed, which called the matter to the attention of both organizations and received a prompt apology from Planned Parenthood to Gallup for the error and a promise to revise the offending publication before reprinting it. In August, George
Gallup, Jr., in turn, acknowledged "certain errors in presentation of the data."

**Shortcomings and Second Looks**

Although these two contrasting examples could be taken as vindication of the procedures the committee had laboriously brought forth under Field's chairmanship, the smoke was still lingering on the battle-ground in January 1976 when the Council minutes report: "Field suggested that AAPOR review its stance on Standards," apparently due to fear of an overload of complaints. Field also reiterated the need for liability insurance. In these respects he anticipated later concerns: his successor, Reuben Cohen, cited liability risks as one of two major concerns in his annual committee report to the membership in May 1977; and later that year Council decided on a less than full procedural investigation of another complaint against Opinion Research Corporation, in part because of the anticipated work load. The liability risk was finally dealt with in 1980 when insurance coverage was obtained.

Another aspect of code development is that much of it took place simultaneously with a revision of AAPOR's by-laws, and the two were linked in a requirement that signed acceptance of the code be a qualification for AAPOR membership. This revived some protests of thought control and, more pointedly, provoked objection by Council member Albert D. Biderman, who chose to resign from AAPOR rather than sign, on the grounds that at least portions of the code did not apply or would obstruct some kinds of research activities that could not reasonably be regarded as unethical. As examples, he pointed to qualitative opinion research of elites whose opinions are singular and can be attributed; or the use of deliberately biased questions for experimental purposes, whose findings are not to be set forth as indicative of public opinion. Such objections led to some code modifications in the 1979-80 term under chairmanship of Donald Hughes, and also to a provision that permitted acceptance of the code with stipulated reservations.

Despite such accentuation of diversity among AAPOR members and their practices, the idea of performance standards continued to erupt. Early in 1978, Council considered and rejected the idea of "certification of practitioners." A few months later, "the sense of the Council was that the Standards Committee continue its investigation of technical guidelines."

While further revisions were considered off and on, complaints were received and processed under the existing procedure as reported in
March, 1981, and January and December of 1982. One of these complaints, directed at an AAPOR member, resulted in a new tactic in keeping with the times: the minutes of March 1983 record that the “accused has communicated with AAPOR through his law firm only; B. Bailar and E. Weinberg [Standards chair and AAPOR secretary-treasurer] have received threatening phone calls from the lawyers.”

A case in 1983, regarding a candidate poll by the Cambridge Survey Research organization, challenged the practice of drafting questionable statements about other candidates as measures of strength or vulnerability. One such statement used in the questionnaire was based on information supplied by the client about another candidate’s marital infidelity, which proved to be somewhat overstated although generally based on news items reported years before. According to CSR executives, the purpose of the questions was to ascertain how reminders of these incidents would affect the contest if a third candidate were to revive awareness of them. Those appointed to review the case were strongly divided. Some claimed that the deliberate recounting of sensational misbehavior, particularly when it was exaggerated, constituted unethical behavior even though it was disseminated to only a few hundred survey respondents. Others found no fault with setting up what was essentially a hypothetical situation for testing opinion, particularly when the entire procedure was made known according to AAPOR standards of disclosure.

The full investigation procedure was applied and the case was presented in late 1983 to Council, some of whose members favored a strong reprimand. Others did not, either because they thought adequate disclosure was all that mattered, because the case had dragged on too long, or because they wondered how AAPOR could defend itself if sued. In the face of a divided Council, it was decided to issue a full statement on the matter, without reprimand, and a minority dissent, which were eventually published in the AAPOR Newsletter.

Another complaint directed against CSR was submitted by environmentalists favoring a “bottle bill” in Maryland. The complainants objected to an opposition leaflet citing CSR research that failed to include the facts required by AAPOR’s standards of disclosure. However, the environmentalists’ case was eclipsed by the earlier, more sensational one, which had strained committee and Council energies and resources. Initial investigation by a subcommittee found grounds for pursuing the new complaint, but the research organization had meanwhile split into two independent components, delaying the committee’s attempts to deal with it. By the time communications had been restored,
the committee believed its case had been so weakened procedurally that it decided to drop the complaint rather than adjudicate on its merits.

As mentioned earlier, the amateur historian is struck with the tendency of Standards chairs and their committees to redefine the task with each new administration. This appears to be based on a mixture of accumulated experience, changing conditions, and ignorance of the past. Because of the Standards Committee’s ambiguous mission and its multiplicity of activities, some of which were not truly standards issues but were nonetheless assigned to the committee, this tendency is probably more pronounced for the Standards Committee than it is for any other AAPOR committee. Like many of her predecessors, Standards Chair Deborah Hensler took a fresh look when she succeeded to the office in May 1983, and “asked for direction from Council concerning the agenda for the Standards Committee in the coming year.” Hensler’s perspective was undoubtedly sharpened by her being the first to have served a preliminary year as associate chair under the new by-laws. Hensler observed that the Standards of Disclosure, while fundamental to the committee’s function, were not part of the code and that in their scope and origins they were applicable primarily to published polls rather than to what most AAPOR members do. She also noted that there was no code provision one could cite in opposition to abuse of surveys for fund-raising, which for many years had occupied much Standards Committee attention.

Council therefore encouraged Hensler’s suggestions for further code revision, so that these and similarly grounded suggestions led to a thorough editing, consolidation, and revision of the code. The culmination of this comprehensive undertaking occurred under the chairmanship of David Sills when, on January 17, 1986, Council certified that the new code had been overwhelmingly approved by a mail ballot of the membership.

Standards of Quality
Groping for Standards of Performance

The code, lately encompassing standards for reporting and the schedule of procedures for dealing with infractions, constitutes the core of the Standards task as it evolved over the years. The preceding section of this chapter has shown that the initial advocates of a standards committee apparently believed it would become an authority
and reference source for techniques in accomplishing each stage of the survey research process. Quite apart from the apprehensions of those who feared this would be "authoritarian," no committee ever undertook to "codify the underlying principles governing scientific method in this work." As we have seen, this was not done largely because no one really knew how to do it.

Nevertheless, the task of promoting (if not enforcing) standards of quality was not neglected by AAPOR, although it was not carried solely by standards committees. As this history has shown, the annual AAPOR conference was recognized early on, together with POQ, which is older still, as a means of advancing standards at a time when academia had little to offer in our field. Thus, at the 1948 business meeting, "the Committee arranged for a panel discussion on standards as part of the program for the annual meeting" and in 1949 began the "author-meets-critic" series that would constitute an important conference feature for many years.

Two decades later, the annual conference again became a vehicle for Standards concerns. In 1969, a consensus in the Standards Committee feared that the glamour of sophisticated analytical techniques was leading to neglect of the basic task of data collection in the field. Consequently, it planned "a working conference, chaired by Paul Sheatsley, on the day preceding the... Conference [as an] informal review of various field problems. Participating will be representatives of interested organizations such as the Market Research Trade Association, the Advertising Research Foundation, the American Marketing Association and the Manufacturers Research Association." And at the annual business meeting that year, "the Committee recommends that all future AAPOR Conference programs should include a session on field problems" as it was believed had been done in the past.

More recently, didactic sessions have been offered at the annual conferences, sometimes also in advance of the regular program sessions, and, though not customarily a responsibility of the Standards Committee, they seem closest to the founders' ideal of a body to promote the scientific aspects of survey research.

The 1951-52 report to the annual business meeting by the committee, prepared by its chair Herbert Hyman, appears to be the last one to consider a comprehensive program for the advancement of technical standards in addition to ethical ones. Besides recommendations for conference sessions, it proposed that "the Standards Committee exert some influence on editorial policy" of POQ, and that the Standards chair serve ex officio with the Program and Publications and Member-
ship Committees. It also recommended that the Standards Committee “engage in the collection and dissemination of materials that will improve technical skills of the membership, such as manuals for interviewers or coders, inventories of new techniques, and the like.”

In fact, this report’s expansionist goal did not stop at AAPOR’s borders; it noted that “other professional bodies are more and more entering into social research without necessarily having the required technical equipment... for example... clinicians and psychiatrists who are extending their horizons into social research. We recommend attempts to participate in the professional meetings of such groups and other interdisciplinary activities so that the general level of social research will be improved wherever it is undertaken.” In the same vein, “we also stress the desirability of a Standards Committee working with academic groups now formulating plans for formal training in social research.”

It is this last sentence that provides an explanation for what seems, from the perspective of the 1980s, to have been extravagantly ambitious empire-building for AAPOR itself, to say nothing of a single committee. The key is that academia was then only “formulating plans” for formal training of the kind we would now unhesitatingly say belongs to the university, not to a professional association. Acknowledgment of this transition is seen in a Standards Committee report to Council two years later in 1954. “At their first meeting, Mr. [Robert O.] Carlson [Committee member and subsequent AAPOR president] agreed to look into the problem of the integration of courses in research methodology in various colleges and universities.” We have no record of what, if anything, came of this attempt.

Otherwise, Standards Committees over the years appear to have dealt with performance standards sporadically, as occasions thrust them into view and not with the earlier zeal to become the technical/methodological arbiter of all survey research. For example, the 1950-51 committee “received and considered a ‘Standard breakdown for population data in media and market surveys,’ a joint recommendation of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the American Marketing Association and the Association of National Advertisers.” Far from any hint of an authority role, the committee decided merely to “call it to the attention of the membership” and tell them where they could obtain copies. (The same procedure was followed in 1968 when the Research Committee of the American Association of Advertising Agencies made a similar proposal for standardizing demographic data in population surveys.) There is no indication that the 1950-51 com-
mittee members or any other AAPOR members at that time took part in the inter-organizational formulation of the standard classification, or that the committee considered the proposed standards substantively. However, five years later, at a Council meeting in September, 1956, the minutes report that “Bureau of Census has invited AAPOR to participate in a Council of Population and Housing Users” and that President Wiebe appointed Ira Cisin, a member of the Standards Committee, to serve as AAPOR representative.

Conserving Our “Natural Resource”

A decade later, in March, 1967, Council considered a letter from Manuel Manfield “concerning the dangers of breakdown in interviewer access to the public [because] current field validation techniques are destroying the public’s good will towards opinion and market research.” Here, Council took initiative in sending copies to four other organizations as well as to every AAPOR member, and asked Manfield to present the subject to the next annual business meeting. Serving as “a one-man subcommittee of the Standards Committee,” he presented a “study of the problems related to validation of interviews” at the annual business meeting in May, 1968. This report was reproduced and distributed by the Market Research Trade Association (now Market Research Association) and after further consideration and revision by the committee was published by POQ in the winter issue, 1972, as a guide to standards in that aspect of data collection.

Interest in validation procedures was also spurred by the development at about this time of “FACT,” a service for interviewer quality control offered by the Advertising Research Foundation. This service was analyzed by the Standards Committee in 1968, and the Standards chair represented AAPOR in deliberations at ARF.

Although data collection is but one of several major steps in survey research, it is the one with which Standards Committees have been most concerned over the years. This is in large part because the interviewing process has important ethical aspects that have demanded Standards’ attention in several ways over the years and up to the present. Because respondent anonymity in field procedures was long a principal ethical (hence standards) issue, AAPOR has tended over the years to assign to its Standards Committees all field matters, such as those concerning administration or legislation. Thus, in the period 1969-71, the Standards Committee also responded to a concern for field work quality by requesting training materials from all members who conducted interviewing, with the aim of compiling a definitive manual.
Like most other attempts to establish performance standards, this one
foundered. The reasons appear to have been a low response (partly because
such information is often regarded as proprietary); differences of
opinion; and, as with all AAPOR attempts at establishing quality stan-
dards, the sheer volume of work required. Acknowledging in its 1970-
71 report that “this hope proved fatuous,” the committee offered to
serve as an exchange between those who wanted to see such material
and those willing to have it released. It appears that none did.

At the first Council meeting for 1971-72, the outgoing Standards
chair warned that “we are continuing to waste our natural resource of
public goodwill through abuse of the privilege of interviewing” and re-
layed a suggestion of Mervin Field that attempts be made to “compute
any trends in yields of probability samples.” This appears to have been
the first record of committee concern about yields, a topic to be ad-
dressed by AAPOR and other associations, jointly and severally, in the
ensuing years.

Not long afterwards, the American Statistical Association received a
grant from the National Science Foundation for an interdisciplinary
and inter-organizational study to improve response rates. Field repre-
sented AAPOR and he also attempted an informal exchange of yield
information from other survey organizations before his election as
Standards chair in 1974.

Pseudo-Surveys

Another data-collection issue that AAPOR addressed was the distin-
tinction between survey research and straw polls. From time to time
some AAPOR member has had occasion to say in an official capacity
that cut-out-and-mail-in ballots, subsequently dignified as “media-
based balloting,” do not constitute an acceptable technique any more
than they did in the Literary Digest poll of 1936. An electronic descen-
dant of the straw vote appeared in the early 1980s in the form of the
telephone company’s “900 numbers” as a medium by which the public
could express its opinions by calling (for a fee) to a broadcaster or
newspaper on one side of an issue or the other. This was brought up in
a Council meeting in December 1980, at which the subject was linked
to “Qube,” described as a “two-way interactive TV service in Ohio.”
The following October the Standards Committee, having met by con-
ference call, recommended that a letter be widely disseminated point-
ing out the difference between this activity and acceptable opinion
polls. In January 1982, Standards Chair Barbara Bailar reported that
the letter, revised in accordance with Council’s suggestions, was ready
to go. She also announced a new committee member, Gary Schmermund of AT&T, who had been recruited to help deal with the 900 issue. The subject was discussed in Council again in November 1983. No action was taken, but it was noted that the telephone company was promoting the technique as a valid survey procedure and would not likely be deterred by an AAPOR reprimand. Besides, "‘900 surveys’ do not violate any provision of the AAPOR Code of Ethics.”

Rejection of Technical Standards

Except for this continuing concern about methods of data collection, there appeared to be no concerted interest in improving the standards of practice from the 1950s until February 1978, when Council minutes show that “a technical standards subcommittee, headed by Walter McCullough, is investigating the feasibility of AAPOR’s establishing technical standards.” When the subject was brought back to Council’s final meeting of the year, in June, it was greeted with a cacophony of objection: that not enough is known about the basics like question wording, that the Advertising Research Foundation offered technical guidance, that AAPOR lacked the capabilities, that it was preferable for individuals rather than a committee to be free to offer opinions on technical matters. Perhaps the response was best summarized by AAPOR’s outgoing president, Hope Klaiber, who noted: “Council had never asked the Standards Committee to develop technical standards and . . . might not want them.” Although “the sense of the Council was that the Standards Committee [should] continue its investigation of technical guidelines,” the rebuff seems to have settled the question and the subject does not appear again in the records. Probably nothing better illustrates AAPOR’s aversion to issuing technical standards than its response to requests for them. In 1973 an academic-in-residence at the Federal Trade Commission asked AAPOR for guidance in evaluating the mounting number of surveys conducted by the commission, or by parties to a commission action, in such matters as restraint of trade (are specified commodities seen as interchangeable?) and consumer protection issues (what do consumers infer from a package or an advertisement?). He said that economists had arrived at a standard on the degree of permissible industry concentration in monopoly proceedings (that is, how much concentration constitutes a violation of the Antitrust Act), and so reasoned that survey researchers might do the same with respect to standards for sample size, method of selection, interviewing medium, and the like.
Again Council’s response was varied: decline to consider the request; find out how close the inquirer is to FTC policy-making; educate the FTC to AAPOR’s reliance on disclosure rather than performance; refer the inquirer to basic texts or reference works; join with other organizations in developing a response; urge that surveys be conducted directly for the court rather than by adversaries; respond in a “negative constructive” way to forestall “any arbitrary or unrealistic standards.” Council’s decision in this case was to 1) suggest “standard reference works;” 2) meet with the inquirer to help define the problem; 3) focus FTC procedures on “criteria and not standards.”

Coincidentally, in the same Council meeting (September, 1973) at which the FTC request was first presented, the Standards chair also asked for guidance in responding to a request (also sent to the National Council on Public Polls) from the Federal Fair Campaign Practices Committee “to help combat polling activities that are in violation of the spirit of the FEPC guidelines.” The suggestion was made at this Council meeting that a statement be developed, and added to other components of the Fair Campaign pledge that would “condemn the release of opinion poll results to the public unaccompanied by information about polling procedures” that would permit evaluation of the findings. This contrast between responses to two federal agencies neatly reaffirms AAPOR’s and its Standards Committee’s rejection of standards of practice in favor of standards of disclosure.

Standards as Advocate and Defender

Respondent Anonymity

This final section will consider several roles assumed by the Standards Committee over the years, some not strictly related to the ethics and standards functions described in the first two sections. Why, for example, should it have been this committee’s function to represent AAPOR’s opposition to spurious surveys whose real purpose is selling or fund-raising? The classification of field interviewers under wage-and-hour legislation? The admissibility of surveys as legal evidence?

4. It is worth noting that in 1976 the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) set 75 percent as an “expected response rate” in approving federal data-collection activities irrespective of the purpose or respondent universe. Expected rates of 50-75 percent would require “special justification” and “proposed statistical data collection activities having an expected response rate of less than 50 percent will be disapproved.”
The connecting link here, as in the preceding discussion of data collection procedures, seems to lie in Standards' ethical responsibility for respondents, most particularly with respect to respondent anonymity. It appears that once the respondent was placed under the protective wing of Standards, other fieldwork questions—even operational matters like interviewer wages and hours and local ordinances affecting doorbell ringing—seemed to incline in the same direction. For purposes of this history, however, the latter issues have been placed with governmental matters where they logically belong, and not with Standards, where they were conveniently assigned by successive Council deliberations.

Although some kinds of social research, such as experiments in social psychology, follow a patient model with the clinician in charge, survey researchers are more inclined toward a transactional model in which the respondent voluntarily provides opinions in exchange for a number of considerations variously described: the respect accorded to one's authority, the satisfaction of sounding off in non-threatening discourse, the opportunity of influencing events (a political or commercial outcome), or in some cases a material reward of product or cash.

AAPOR is not alone in its ethical concern for keeping intact the mutual exchange implicit in this relationship. All the major professional and trade associations dependent on the sample survey are on record for maintaining the confidential nature of the process and the need for preserving anonymity. As distinct from the common ethical values of honesty in scholarly pursuits and in contractual obligations, this mandate is the one that distinguishes survey research ethics as expressed in AAPOR's Code, and for good reason: apart from any moral considerations, it is considered necessary to deal respectfully and in good faith with respondents in order that the flow of opinion continue. To refer to Mervin Field's analogy cited above, the willingness of the public to respond to our questions is a natural resource that we deplete or pollute at our peril.

The AAPOR code, in common with others, has included a pledge of respondent anonymity and Standards Committees have been zealous in their protection of it. Indeed, as shown above, the 1957 impetus toward developing a comprehensive code derived from and was coupled with a resolution on respondent anonymity, and there is evidence that interest in one case that year was sufficiently widespread to have attracted the attention of the American Civil Liberties Union. The threats have generally come from two sources: first, the occasional disclosure of survey data to identify individuals as targets for sales or other solic-
ipation; and second, the incessant recurrence of sales activities that use the survey approach simply to gain access and initial attention by telephone or at the door before turning to a direct sales pitch. The first is found among research practitioners and when it occurs is regarded as a Code infraction, sometimes involving differences in Code interpretation; the second is usually perpetrated by those who have no interest in survey research, are impervious to AAPOR reprimand, and thus can generally be dealt with (if at all) only with the help of other organizations (including government agencies). Other abuses, including some variations of these two, have similarly occupied the Committee’s attentions over the years, beginning (as noted above) with the annual report of the first Standards Committee in 1948.

The initial six-organization “Code of Professional Practices,” which was “commended” by the 1948 conference, contained no reference to respondent protection. Nevertheless, to those of us who may have thought that abuse of the survey approach is a relatively recent phenomenon piggy-backing on growing recognition of the survey itself, it is a revelation to find that in his report to the annual business meeting (September, 1948), Philip Hauser, the first Standards Committee chair, “brought up the question of the increasing abuse of interviewing techniques by sales people in door-to-door selling.” He noted that the National Better Business Bureau had received many evidences of this and that a representative of the bureau was present to answer any questions that members of the audience might have about the nature of the abuses. The following resolution was then adopted:

Be it resolved that the American Association for Public Opinion Research condemns the use of survey interviewing as a selling device and holds this practice to be a serious threat to the continued cooperation of the public in legitimate marketing and public opinion research.

Further, the Association instructs the Standards Committee to keep abreast of developments in this area, to cooperate with the National Better Business Bureau and other organizations concerned with improving standards, and to call the need for corrective action to the attention of the Association members as necessary.

Pursuit of this aim by “encouraging the work of the Better Business Bureau and other such groups” was reiterated as an aim of the 1950-51 Standards Committee, which stated in its annual report:

The Committee continued the work of an earlier committee on ethical standards through cooperation with the Better Business Bureau’s program for curbing abuses of research. The Bureau reports that the elimi-
nation of the frequency [sic] of the survey-approach by door-to-door salesmen has been greatly reduced. The results have been so good that the Better Business Bureau plans to dissolve its division of research activities (the formation of which was backed by the AAPOR) at the end of the year, and to absorb this work into the general staff.

But the Better Business Bureau was concerned not only with abuse in data collection, but also with honesty of reporting results.

The Bureau had proposed to an earlier Association committee a plan for the curbing of abuses of research. The first 7 points of this program, which are concerned with salesmen posing as interviewers, were approved by the earlier committee. The last 3 points, which dealt with the use of the findings of research in advertising, were not agreed to by the committee. The argument was that the members of the American Association for Public Opinion Research would prefer not to have some other organization checking up on the use of research in advertising. . . . The problem of the misuse of research in advertising is receiving further attention from this committee.

The committee is also considering drafting a proposal to the Association which would ultimately contain an official statement to the effect that no research firm should turn over to a client the names and addresses of the people interviewed, except by permission of the respondent. The Bureau would like to quote such a statement verbatim, in an effort to stop the practice of follow-up for the purpose of selling.

At the next annual meeting (1952) the Committee report referred to “two new areas in which ethical considerations . . . begin to call for attention.” The first was violation of respondent anonymity, revealed in an instance that appears unique in the annals of survey research, and which one would like to believe could have taken place only in that McCarthy era:

An old and experienced interviewer . . . realized on the basis of his answers that a respondent in a survey was a Communist . . . and she informed the [research] agency that she had reported him to the police. The interviewer was discharged and the total staff was instructed on the problem. . . . We regard such practices not only as involving ethical norms, but also as patently unwise in relation to the continuation of effective research. The widespread occurrence of such practices would mean the end of respondent cooperation, our essential resource.

The second incipient area of attention for a Code of Ethics involves research practices which by their very nature may have injurious effects on respondents . . . merely by virtue of their participation in an interview. Insofar as public opinion research loses its superficiality and penetrates in the future into more significant and deeper layers of experience . . . we
shall be forced to take up the problem [as] has been the case with psychologists who seek to protect their experimental subjects from anxiety or injury created by the mere conditions of experiment.

What catapulted respondent anonymity into AAPOR’s Code, however, came neither from the vigilantism of an interviewer nor from “anxiety or injury” resulting from experiments, but from a new source: the use of surveys as legal evidence. First mention of this as a Standards concern is found in a report to Council in September, 1954 stating that Jack Elinson, a committee member (subsequently Standards chair and AAPOR president), was to pursue an offer by Hans Zeisel “to look into the problem of legal expectations” when survey data are used as legal evidence.

This is the initial mention of a subject that returns in changing form intermittently to the present. That it was not new even in 1954 is indicated by a parenthetical note in the minutes: “Mr. Zeisel agreed some time ago to follow this matter up.” Hans Zeisel, whose career led from opinion research to the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School, has long been regarded as an authority on this topic, both before 1954 and since.

The issue is whether anonymity can be preserved when surveys are used in legal proceedings. For years, survey research findings were barred in most courts under the rule of hearsay evidence, on the grounds that the opinions were presented at second hand through interviewers and survey analysts. This led to pressure to reveal identities so that the evidence could be introduced directly, which would have meant total abandonment of anonymity. Any survey respondent in such a case could be subpoenaed or deposed. This possibility was clearly untenable for research professionals who anticipated what the effects would be if it became known that replying to a questionnaire could earn one a summons to testify under oath.

As one example (from experience, if not in the records), a lawyer requested a commercial researcher to record replies to the questions he, not the researcher, had formulated, together with respondent names and addresses, in a bound notebook so that the court could see that any replies unfavorable to the case had not been removed. When the researcher demurred on ethical grounds, the lawyer expressed his intention to find someone more compliant, or if necessary, to hire interviewers himself.

As reported above, it was Harry Alpert as past president in 1957 who urged a “responsible resolution” on respondent anonymity, which
was then coupled in a Council resolution with “a more extensive code of ethics.” Alpert’s proposal may have been spurred by the case of AAPOR member Arthur Greenberg, who offered to face a contempt charge, if necessary, rather than reveal the names of those responding to a survey he presented as evidence in a Federal Communications Commission hearing.

In response to this charge, in the committee’s report to the 1957 annual business meeting, Ford presented the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted: “We will protect the anonymity of every respondent and hold as privileged and confidential all information which tends to identify the respondent, except when the respondent specifically authorizes disclosure of such information. We recommend that this resolution be printed in our official minutes.”

In discussion following the introduction of the committee’s resolution, “Several members from the floor reported incidents in which the anonymity of survey respondents had been supported in ... judicial proceedings. It was recommended that a record be made of these events which will serve as precedents in future legal situations.”

The subject remained an open one over the years, recurring in POQ articles and conference programs. Fifteen years later, the report of the Standards Committee to the 1972 annual business meeting replayed the scenario: “A judge was encountered last year who wanted all respondents’ names and responses. Hence the Standards inquiry on experience with surveys in evidence. Members sent helpful strategies, articles they have written, etc. Hans Zeisel has written much on this, including a useful bibliography.” Such “helpful strategies” have included destroying records of respondent identities as soon as the data have been validated and entered; further, Mervin Field subsequently wrote an article recommending that this procedure be used for all surveys, whether or not used for legal evidence, because it might be regarded as contempt if done only in litigative situations, and also because it further fulfills our commitment to anonymity for all respondents.

Other developments included an overture by the AAPOR president (Hollander) in 1973 to the American Bar Association in the hope of gaining acceptance by the legal profession of survey research ethics with respect to anonymity, but nothing came of this. In 1981, however, after another round of interest in this topic, Standards Chair Michael Rappeport told Council that he and Irving Crespi (former Standards chair and AAPOR president) were preparing an article conveying the concept of survey ethics to the legal profession via the authoritative
publication, Trademark Reporter. An even more hopeful sign was reported at the same Council meeting (January, 1973) by Ira Cisin, who noted that Selma Monsky has a current survey project which is being done for a court, in which the judge brought the opposing attorneys together to get them to stipulate in advance whether they would accept the survey findings. He [Cisin] pointed to this as the way to go.

While the court-ordered neutral survey, which is ideal from the researcher’s viewpoint if not the lawyer’s, has failed to find general acceptance, over the years respondent anonymity has come to be respected by legal precedent, and it is now embodied in the federal legal code. The judicial opinions most frequently cited no longer seek corroboration of survey evidence by direct validation of survey response, but with increasing sophistication take notice of such factors as sample universe and size, respondent selection, method and conditions of data collection, possible biases, and even reputation of the survey firm, as well as its independence of sponsor influence in the particular study. Further legal recognition of respondent anonymity in opinion surveys is found in federal legislation granting privileged status to replies given by respondents in studies of drug abuse.

While AAPOR’s expressed commitment to respondent anonymity was precipitated by the litigative challenge, it has been continued on other fronts. Early support from Better Business Bureaus, cited above, has been renewed intermittently over the years, augmented by efforts of other associations interested in survey research, by the Direct Mail/Marketing Association, by the Federal Trade Commission, and by other governmental units.

In March 1956, it was reported that “an organization calling itself American Business Research is using a survey-making approach in direct door-to-door selling in Washington, D.C.” Two AAPOR members in that area were “to investigate and report to the Council for possible protest,” but the records indicate nothing further. Again, minutes indicate that Shirley Star, “pointed out to the 1964 membership that the Better Business Bureaus were largely ineffective in combatting malpractices arising from ‘pseudo-surveys’ and moved that AAPOR Council take legal action against any such practices called to its attention.” Although “the motion was unanimously carried,” there is no indication that such action has ever been taken, and there is ample evidence elsewhere in this chapter to show the formidable obstacles to initiating such proceedings.

These difficulties were reiterated at the 1965 annual business meeting by Standards Chair Bruce Neal, who
drew a distinction between unethical activities engaged in by AAPOR members, which he said could usually be resolved without difficulty on an informal basis, and unethical activities by non-members. Outsiders who commit such practices, he said, do not subscribe to the AAPOR Code and they regard their activities as both legal and effective. The Standards Committee does not have the time, staff or funds to investigate every complaint. It is difficult for us to prove that our access is harmed or that people’s rights have been infringed. In his view, AAPOR should move very carefully in trying to police the field and should place more emphasis on explaining its point of view through informative articles in the mass media.

This view was challenged by several members who noted that in the recent self-survey, 79% of members answering said that the most important thing for AAPOR to do was to fight pseudo-surveys, and that a main reason for incorporation was to permit legal challenge of unethical practices. Others pointed to pending legislation which threatens telephone interviewing, to local ordinances restricting interviewing activity, and to an increasing outcry against abuses of the survey approach. It was variously urged that AAPOR go on record against practices which endanger access to the public, that particular test cases be selected for legal action, that Council retain permanent legal counsel for advisory purposes, and that AAPOR work with other interested associations and agencies such as the Better Business Bureaus, Federal Trade Commission, American Marketing Association, and Market Research Trade Association.

Neal was speaking with personal knowledge and feeling about difficulty in acting against non-members. During his chairmanship (1964-66) he found himself entangled in an unfortunate coincidence unparalleled in this organization’s history: his own employer, Ford Motor Co., sponsored a massive “survey” of automobile owners in major markets whose results were unabashedly used for sales solicitation. Rather than resign his chairmanship in the face of what appeared to be a clear conflict between his responsibilities to his employer and to AAPOR, Neal, according to one observer, upheld the principle of anonymity to the point where he “put his job on the line.” Ethics prevailed and he was eventually able to report that he had succeeded in having the practice discontinued. Although his predicament is not fully documented in the records at hand, minutes of a meeting in early 1967 tactfully report that “Council commended the Standards Committee on its handling of a request by the Ford Motor Truck Division of the Ford Motor Company, related to wording of a proposed sales canvass.”

In his report to the 1968 annual business meeting, Crespi reported that the Magazine Publishers’ Association had established “some kind
of code which purports to control use of the survey method for sales canvassing...[but with] inadequate assurance of preventing misuse” and “hopes that further contact can be developed between the AAPOR Standards Committee and the Magazine Publishers’ Association. He feels we must be sure that the magazine code is improved and enforced by the magazine industry.”

Survey Abuses

Later in the same year, the matter of survey abuses was brought to the attention of the federal government by means of a paper delivered in person by the Standards Chair (Hollander) at the Federal Trade Commission’s Consumer Protection Hearings. Council minutes report “the Commission’s interest in curbing survey abuses if a good case can be made for such control,” although subsequent feedback from some FTC staff revealed antagonism about the use of consumer protection resources to advance what some saw as a vocational interest. Meanwhile, in 1971 New York City enacted Consumer Protection Law Regulation 12, which made it a “deceptive practice” to solicit a purchase at a residence without informing the prospect “that the purpose of the contact is to effect a sale.” “Falsely representing that the salesman is taking a survey” is named as one of the deceptions prompting the need for Regulation 12, but there is no reference to AAPOR or other survey research advocacy in gaining consideration for it.

The committee’s report to the next advisory business meeting (1969) recommended that field interviewers requesting in-person interviews present identification cards modeled after the “Memo to the Public” slip developed some two decades earlier by the national Better Business Bureau, to acquaint prospective respondents with the difference between a legitimate survey and a sales pitch. Members were also requested to be vigilant about survey abuse in their own areas, especially in monitoring “local advertisements offering instruction in interviewing when, actually, sales canvassing is involved.”

In further action against survey abuse, the Standards Committee sent a request to all members to report instances in their own areas and to encourage their interviewing staffs (often the first to encounter such abuses) to report them. Minutes of a Council meeting in early 1970 show that only three such transgressions were returned to the Committee for follow-up. However, an inhouse survey of all Opinion Research Corporation interviewers “found that half of them report instances of such abuse” according to the committee’s report to the 1971 annual business meeting. And when a similar request went out to the
membership in 1971-72 it "got a good response." The 1971 Standards Committee report mentions abuses in six states, saying "we look into all, but in fact can't do much besides ask perpetrators to stop."

One case singled out for special mention was that of World Field Research whose "abuse is not the conventional phony approach.... They use the research approach to collect fees from prospective interviewee-panelists to whom they hold out promise of payment for testing merchandise... For a while the Committee was receiving weekly complaints or questions about them..." But in the early 1970s the law caught up with them as both New York state authorities and the U.S. Post Office were charging them with fraud. Help was also sought from other organizations. According to the committee's report to the 1971 annual business meeting, "The Code of the Direct Selling Association [later renamed Direct Marketing/Mail Association] also explicitly condemns this abuse but their code, like ours, is voluntary.... They were helpful in one instance reported to us. The National Association of Better Business Bureaus is also responsive to our complaints. We also maintain close relationships with our opposite numbers in the American Marketing Association and the Market Research Association. But even as this mobilization was taking place, according to the same source, a new form of abuse was noted for the first time: "Several members submitted to us copies of a mail solicitation from the pro-military American Security Council which contained a straw vote ballot slanted toward greater armament expenditure. Recipients were asked to mark their opinions... and return it with a financial contribution." This practice of poll-and-solicit, apparently at first a tactic of right-wing organizations, has evidently been so successful that it is now used by the entire range of the political spectrum as well as for nonpolitical fundraising. It involves no misleading claims and is so blatantly self-serving that by now only the most unsophisticated person could regard it as an attempt to measure public opinion. AAPOR's objections, therefore, have been limited to a statement that the Association would challenge the results if such a straw vote were ever publicized as representative (so far, there is no record of any) and that use of the words "poll" or "survey" as part of a fund-raising appeal tends to diminish confidence in legitimate surveys—on which, incidentally, many of the offending organizations find indispensable in their work.

Successive committees have received similar complaints and responded with similar frustration. Thus, in his report to the advisory business meeting in May 1977, Standards Chair Reuben Cohen referred to "the usual mixture of 'phony surveys,' particularly, those sponsored
or endorsed by members of Congress.” In October, 1981, Standards chair Barbara Bailar, reported “a fair number of letters…from AAPOR members objecting to the kinds of surveys they receive in the mail. [She] replies with a letter and a copy of the Standards. It is difficult…[to determine] what they are doing that others are objecting to, that is covered by the standards….” And to the first Council meeting of 1983-84, chair Deborah Hensler added that “much of the work of the Standards Committee involves responding to complaints concerning polls used for fund-raising and other improper uses…. The AAPOR Code of Ethics does not address [this issue and so] appropriate revisions in the Code would provide a firmer basis for responding” to such complaints.

The record does show rare instances in which AAPOR’s importuning appeared to gain results: In late 1973 and 1974 the Standards Committee received four complaints about the use of a subscription solicitation by the Columbia Journalism Review accompanied by a questionnaire purportedly “trying to get the views of a representative group of intelligent people.” A letter from the Standards Chair (Hope Klapper) brought a telephone response from the editor. According to the Standards Committee report to the membership in May, 1974: “Phil Davison [faculty member of the Columbia School of Journalism and former AAPOR president] and I have not really convinced them they erred, but they have agreed to consult Phil on any future surveys.”

In 1978 a member of the Standards Committee informed Donald Hughes, as chair, that he had complained to the Union of Concerned Scientists in protest against the same type of solicitation. They ceased thereafter, but there was no word on whether the decision was in any way influenced by the AAPOR complaint. Similarly, an AAPOR member who is also a member of Public Citizen (more familiar as the Ralph Nader organization) made the same complaint to that body which, after due consideration, replied that it would cease using that misleading form of solicitation in order to uphold its own ethical standards.

Other interesting items on respondent protection are scattered through the record. In 1979 Donald Hughes, as Standards Chair, successfully sought to have the Direct Mail/Marketing Association add mail solicitation to its code which already declared it unethical to make telephone solicitations under the guise of a survey. “As an experiment” he also sent AAPOR’s Code to “action line” newspaper columns in nine major cities, offering AAPOR’s help in any survey-related complaints, but no returns were forthcoming. As Director of Market Research for Sears, Roebuck, Hughes used his membership in DM/MA
and in the Manufacturers Market Research Association to advocate ethical standards prohibiting abuse of the survey approach.

Over the years, abuse has proliferated, with more types of mail solicitation masking as surveys and with the growth of tele-marketing activity. AAPOR and the other organizations concerned with the problem continue to fight a rear-guard action, registering objections to some solicitors or occasionally referring a flagrant example to a Better Business Bureau or to postal authorities. On another front, some of these organizations and many AAPOR members support the “Your Opinion Counts” campaign, which publicizes the value of legitimate surveys and encourages public response to them. AAPOR was asked to join in supporting this effort when it was first organized in 1983-84, but declined because a majority of Council was not convinced of its effectiveness and feared that it could be used to protect surveys of questionable standards. The quest for AAPOR support was renewed in subsequent years and rejected each time, with commercial members generally favoring AAPOR participation while academic and government Council members opposed it.

What Is Anonymity?

Although AAPOR has been unwaveringly committed to respondent anonymity since 1957, in years following some attention was demanded of successive Standards Committees, as well as Council, to an operational determination of just what anonymity is. For example, at an Executive Council meeting in 1968, Burns Roper (later AAPOR president) raised a question about possible violation of respondent anonymity when a research firm provides respondent identities for purposes of validation. The same question was posed by “several members” in 1980 to Standards chair Donald Hughes, who described it as “who is ‘we’ ” when the Code pledges that “we shall protect the anonymity . . .”? In other words, if validation is conducted by a firm independent of the one that conducted the interview, requiring that respondent identity be transmitted, is anonymity still maintained? In his report to the membership in May, 1980, Hughes said he had “taken the broad interpretation” permitting the identities to be transferred under limited conditions and for specific purposes.

Perhaps the most penetrating consideration of this question was set forth by Mervin Field, then Standards Chair, and Peter Sherrill, vice-president of Field’s firm, in an article in the June, 1975 Marketing Review: “Are Survey Respondents Really Anonymous?” The article
points to five conditions under which "true respondent anonymity is being breached regularly by conscientious researchers."

1. Interviewer validation, requiring that identifying data are passed for another interviewer, sometimes another firm, sometimes the client, to permit validation or spot-checking.

2. Ad hoc panel studies, in which individuals with certain characteristics or offering certain replies are urged to provide further information in another interview (sometimes a focus group interview).

3. The sampling universe is so restricted that respondent characteristics will identify some individuals (as might happen, for instance, in an employee or an executive study).

4. Providing completed questionnaires (with identifying data) to a client group of researchers for further analysis.

5. Providing survey evidence in a court of law that might exercise subpoena.

The issue raised in item 4 became considerably more than academic in 1975 in a battle of media giants and two audience measurement services that evidently gave inconsistent results. In this instance Field, writing "as an individual research practitioner, and not in my capacity as Chairperson of the Standards Committee" strongly criticized both the measurement services and Time, Inc., as client of one, in two letters to the editor of Advertising Age. Referring to a report that Time "offered complete disclosure of all elements of the study to anyone interesting in proving...[including] the list of respondent names" he emphatically declared that respondent anonymity and privacy should take precedence over attempts to validate the findings for the purpose of showing which service's findings were more nearly correct.

Other Respondent Protection

Another aspect of the respondent protection issue was raised at a Council meeting in 1970 by the Standards chair (Hollander), who said that "our AAPOR Code...provides anonymity, but not much else" in the way of respondent protection. "He felt at least we should pledge ourselves not to lie to respondents." Noting that informing respondents of the entire purpose of a survey will often bias the response, he advocated a code provision requiring literal truth if not the whole truth. Two years later, the Standards Committee report referred to the honesty issue as "a continuing concern; suggestions welcomed." Three years after that, in February, 1975, an honesty provision was approved
by Council and took its place alongside a revised statement on anonymity. Both are included in the latest revision.

One more respondent protection incident flashed across the scene in late 1975 when the editor of the National Observer learned from an inquisitive reader, who had placed his questionnaire under ultraviolet light, that a survey sent to a sample of its subscribers by a prominent mail-survey firm had been coded in invisible ink, making it possible for the research firm to identify respondents. The Observer’s editor replied indignantly with an editorial disclaiming the practice as a “slick trick” and a Wall Street Journal columnist applauded this condemnation with an article that attracted much attention. In the public controversy that followed it became apparent that the practice was widespread and regarded as benign in the research community, since it was never used for any purpose other than to identify non-respondents for follow-up mailings. Ironically, the FTC, which had remained unmoved by earlier evidence from AAPOR and others of direct intrusion by salespersons posing as interviewers, took a sudden interest in the invisible ink tactic when it was used by researchers themselves.

The response of the Standards Committee, then in the throes of its first full-scale application of procedures for dealing with code violations, was decidedly restrained. Mervin Field, as Standards Chair, sent a memorandum to Council in January, 1976 saying that the practice was not uncommon and suggested the subject for inclusion in a membership poll under consideration to ascertain the extent of its use and member attitudes regarding it. But even this proposal was questioned on two grounds: first, because at least one Council member believed the Standards Committee should set policies and submit them for approval rather than develop standards by membership poll; and second, because it would result in unfavorable publicity to opinion surveys if it was found that many AAPOR members used and/or approved a practice then being widely criticized.

The emergence of this “invisible ink caper,” as it was termed by the National Observer editor, and the furor it aroused, seem to have reflected a mood in the profession as well. Although a proposed survey of AAPOR membership on standards issues was never carried out, Field’s successor, Reuben Cohen, appointed a subcommittee, chaired by Irving Rosswalb, to develop “guidelines on desirable practices for treatment of respondents and for the protection of research sources and data.” According to Cohen, “The high priority accorded this task stems from the increased sensitivity of the general public, social scientists, and government groups to problems related to personal data col-
lection and data storage. The Committee and other members have suggested that the AAPOR Code needs to be strengthened by a more extensive written discussion of the issues."

Unfinished Business

In June, 1977 Roschwalb produced a comprehensive and documented draft based on considerable secondary research that outlined the problems and alternative solutions in some detail, and called for a membership survey as mentioned above. This was discussed by Council in February, 1978 without action. Lack of funds was cited as one reason; "philosophical objections" were also mentioned. These were unexplained, but may have referred to the reservations expressed two years earlier concerning possible embarrassment if the use of invisible ink in mail surveys should turn out to be widespread. Enthusiasm was also diminished by the inevitable loss of momentum and change of emphasis under a new Standards Chair, and by a new ethics complaint to be dealt with.

This derailment may be compared to similar frustrations mentioned in the first two sections of this chapter. For example:

(1) In section I., "Standards as Authority," an Evaluation Committee noted the "absence of minimum methodological standards" in Mervin Field's laboriously crafted procedures for dealing with alleged code infractions, even though we have seen that every move toward establishing such standards from the very beginnings of the organization had been rejected on practical as well as philosophical grounds. Too, we have seen that action under the code has been discouraged, if not paralyzed, by pragmatic obstacles such as work overload and threatened legal retaliation, which did not loom as large under earlier and simpler conditions.

(2) Section II., "Standards of Quality," reveals similar frustration, including Council's summary rejection of the "Technical Standards Subcommittee" and also Council's reluctance to respond to government agencies' requests for practical assistance. Again, objections to action were both conceptual and pragmatic, the latter similarly due to existing or potential work overload required of member volunteers.

In summary, the history of the Standards Committee has been riddled with discontinuities and punctuated with tabula rasa appraisals—sometimes with indifference to, if not ignorance of, what has gone before. Consequently, we have sometimes been condemned to repeat our history. Such are the hazards of a membership organization dependent on volunteers, whose officers in charge of dealing with standards issues
are constantly changing with each election. Then, too, the world in which AAPOR members operate is not that of four decades ago, when the practice of opinion research was dominated by the same few conspicuous leaders who founded the organization. The practice of opinion research has proliferated and dispersed, and its practitioners are no longer a tightly-knit and collegial fraternity.

As for the Standards function, we have seen that the initial idea of a committee to promulgate, if not enforce, standards of practice has justified neither the hopes nor the apprehensions of those who first debated it. Since then, it has been tacitly recognized that no person or group is competent to prescribe methodology, particularly as the scope of our field has broadened and its related academic disciplines have flourished. AAPOR's contribution to method and performance has come not, as initially conceived, from a "Board of Standards," but from the POQ and our conferences. Indeed, as we have seen from the beginning, the committee has focused on standards of ethics, not of performance, and our principal canon has been that of disclosure.

In the wider world, AAPOR's major role in standards has been that of respondent protection. In this it has paralleled, and sometimes joined, the work of other organizations concerned with consumer protection and survey research. Together, we seem to have had great impact on professionals in our field, but have found no effective way to protect the public from the floods of inquiries made not for research but for sales exploitation. In these respects, as well as others referred to in this chapter, our influence has generally been brought to bear not by committee or organization action, but by the diffusion throughout the domain of opinion research and its sponsors of practitioners imbued with standards and ethics acquired from AAPOR.
Methodology Issues
Jack Elinson

Author’s note: This chapter presents selected highlights of survey research methodology as these highlights were displayed at AAPOR conferences. It is not intended as a scholarly historical overview of survey research methodology.

AAPOR members have indeed treated the history of survey research in a comprehensive manner. See, for example, the 1987 volume by Jean Converse of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan (Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890–1960, University of California Press.) Before his death in 1985, Herbert Hyman also had been engaged in a historical analysis of the development of survey research from another perspective. Completion of this work, which had been supported by the Russell Sage Foundation.

Centuries before public opinion research had ever been thought of, there were surveys. For example, in 1427 a survey was conducted of 60,000 households covering 260,000 people in the metropolitan area of Florence, Italy. The data, which are registered in 1,000 volumes, were tabulated by social class. Social differences are indicated by the possession of a family name. Sans sample survey methods, and sans computers, the world has waited five-and-a-half centuries for an analysis of the results (Herlihy and Klapisch-Zuber, 1984).

Ambitious as the Florentine survey was, there is no evidence that its designers worried about the methodological issues that have haunted survey researchers in the twentieth century and have been debated at AAPOR conferences since the organization was founded. Three methodological themes were struck at the opening meeting in Central City in 1946: quota versus area probability sampling, the assessment of validity, and the quality of the data collected. The controversies in methodology that raged in the social sciences in the aftermath of the Second World War were to reverberate at the annual meetings of the Association, in the pages of the Public Opinion Quarterly, and in the various publications used by AAPOR members for reports of their research. These three themes have persisted as problematic over the forty years
since the birth of AAPOR, testifying to the wisdom of the organizers of the Central City meeting in selecting fundamental issues underlying survey research for their agenda.

Quota versus Area Probability Sampling

Until the advent of probability sampling applied to population surveys in the decade just prior to the organization of AAPOR, quota sampling was the pollster’s choice in achieving representativeness. The sample selected was designed to be a miniature of the population to be studied and was thus designed to represent it in essential demographic distributions. Typically, these comprised sex, age, race, socioeconomic status, rural versus urban residence, and geographical region. Pollsters instructed interviewers to obtain respondents having certain characteristics, relying on Census data to create quotas.

During World War II, statisticians engaged in government sample surveys for the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Research Branch of the U.S. Army’s Information and Education Division adopted probability theory as a basis for population sampling. An advantage claimed for probability sampling was its capability of estimating sampling error. Because simple random sampling was not feasible for geographically dispersed populations, statisticians devised ingenious multistage area, designs that were both practical and in conformity with probability theory. But such ingenuity had its costs: for example, special enumerations of dwelling units had to be made first, as a basis for the subsequent sampling of these units. Even more costly was the recognition of the social phenomenon of nonresponse along with efforts to contain it. Quota sampling was free of the problem of nonresponse: if a potential respondent refused to be interviewed or was otherwise unavailable, the interviewer simply found someone else with the required characteristics in order to fill the quota. Nonresponse has become a persistent concern of probability sampling.

The first confrontation in AAPOR history between quota samplers and area probability samplers took place at the 1946 Central City meeting. Representing quota sampling was the distinguished social psychologist Norman Meier, director of the Bureau of Audience Research at the University of Iowa. Meier was a consultant to principal pollsters of the time and a productive researcher. He was later to report on empirical tests in Iowa City of the relative performance of quota and probability sampling in the same survey. (Meier and Cletus, 1947).
Representing probability sampling was the noted statistician Morris Hansen, a technical adviser to the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

At this first confrontation, Meier expressed doubts that area probability sampling was superior to quota sampling for opinion research. He was supported by Elmo Wilson, who felt that "opinion polls still had reason to hold to quota methods, given the problem of costs, the need for speed, and the lower level of accuracy they required." (Converse, 1987:231) Hansen argued that probability selection methods provided a theoretical basis for estimating sampling error and the yield of information, in statistical terms, per dollar spent.

The controversy between advocates of quota sampling and probability sampling was played out in the pages of the Public Opinion Quarterly in the ensuing several years. The articles by Norman Meier and by Philip Hauser (1950) are illustrative. Who won? It is clear that probability sampling of populations became dominant in surveys sponsored or conducted by the federal government, not the least of which were the sample surveys conducted by the Bureau of the Census itself. Governmental surveys required a degree of precision for policy purposes less demanded by soundings of public opinion.

**Assessment of Validity**

The second methodological theme struck at the Central City conference was that of the assessment of validity. It was first addressed by Herbert Hyman. Hyman (1944–1945), asking, "Do They Tell the Truth?", described empirical studies comparing respondents' replies to questions of fact, such as whether they had purchased war bonds, with independent records. He noted that persons with more schooling were not always more likely to tell the truth and that social class values operate in the reporting of facts: people with more schooling are more likely to overreport the possession of library cards while those with less schooling are more likely to overreport the possession of drivers' licenses. Hyman's studies would later be replicated by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in other contexts, using factual items such as home ownership, telephone ownership, library card possession, driver's license possession, voting registration, and the like (Parry and Crossley, 1950). The approach used by Hyman and later by NORC in assessing the reporting of facts was analogous to that of the courtroom, in which testimony is compared with other sources of evidence for the same facts in order to assess truthfulness. Some thirty years later, Al
Biderman (1981) was to lead a session at AAPOR introducing the work of cognitive psychologists in an effort to understand how people organize their memory in responding to factual questions.

In some instances, attempts to assess validity in the reporting of attitudes are assisted by the use of independent records. Not a new issue in psychology, this had been addressed almost a half century earlier by Terman, in intelligence testing when he correlated test scores with school grades and teacher ratings where a reasonable degree of association was to be expected. The notion of internal consistency had also been introduced by psychometrists (Kuder, Richardson, et al.), in which responses to parts of a set of items were correlated with other parts of that same set, odds with evens, for example. The argument was that if items of the same set correlated highly with each other they could be interpreted as measuring the same thing. These measures of internal consistency came to be called measures of reliability.

A few years before the Central City conference the work of Louis Guttman in the Armed Forces Morale Attitudes Research Branch had produced a new approach. Guttman (1944) provided a mathematical method for testing the hypothesis that a set of items purporting to measure a single, specified attitudinal dimension were drawn from the universe of items that theoretically populated that dimension. His formulation differed from that of the earlier psychometrists. A measure of the unidimensionality, or reproducibility, of a set of attitude items was proposed by Guttman. These notions of Guttman were elucidated at the Central City conference by Jack Elinson, a colleague of Guttman's in the Research Branch of the U.S. Army headed by Samuel Stouffer during World War II. Stouffer was to become one of the earliest presidents and award winners (Julian Woodward Award) of AAPOR.

These two approaches to validity, addressed at the Central City conference in 1946, persist forty years later, with variations, of course. The planners of the Central City conference got to the heart of the matter at the beginning.

Data Collection

The third methodological theme taken up at the inaugural Central City conference was that of data collection, more specifically, the quality of interviewing and interviewer training. At issue was the procedure of hiring and supervising by remote control (mail, telephone, and telegrams) from a single location (research headquarters), versus the di-
rect, face-to-face recruiting, training, and supervising of interviewers in the field. Again, as in the case of sampling, speed and cost were major issues. A not infrequent mode of carrying out a field survey was for the research director to engage or otherwise contract the services of social science professors in colleges around the country who would find the requisite number of students to do the interviewing. Thus, everyone would benefit, keeping costs and time spent per survey at a minimum.

In the early efforts to improve the quality of sample surveys there was no way to escape higher costs. Sampling theoreticians like Stevens Stock and Lester Frankel (1939) would argue that the efficiency of a sampling design could be measured by calculations of cost per unit of information obtained, a way of assessing costs that was not the same as out-of-pocket expenditures. Stock and Frankel argued from a statistical perspective that the appropriate question to answer in a sample survey was not simply “How much was spent per interview?,,” but rather, “How much did it cost to reduce the error variance?.”

For many years, one of the original Central City participants, Paul Sheatsley, contributed a great deal to the art and science of interviewing in survey research. His chapter (with Arthur Kornhauser) on “interviewing in social research,” the standard reference to the subject, appeared in successive editions of Research Methods in Social Relations, the textbook sponsored by the Society for Psychological Research on Social Issues (Kornhauser and Sheatsley, 1976). CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing), for all its vaunted economic advantages and efficiencies, still needs to confront the basic elements of the interviewer-respondent interaction first elucidated by Sheatsley. The art of questionnaire construction as enunciated by Sheatsley appeared as recently as 1983 as “Questionnaire Construction and Item Writing,” in Peter Rossi, James Wright, and Andy Anderson, editors, Handbook of Survey Research (Academic Press, New York, 1983).

Technological changes have made possible variations in data collection procedures by interviewing. The most important of these is the increased use of the telephone (Waksberg, 1978; Groves and Kahn, 1979). It is ironic that the famous 1936 Literary Digest poll failed primarily because it depended on a mail survey of telephone subscribers and automobile owners. The failure of the Literary Digest poll made way for the rise of the fathers of modern-day polling, Archibald Crossley, George Gallup, and Elmo Roper. These pioneer pollsters, devotees of quota sampling, eschewed telephones in favor of face-to-face interviewing. Today access to the public telephone is sufficiently universal to encourage the use of telephone interviewing for many kinds of sample
surveys. Indeed, access by telephone can be superior to face-to-face interviewing (in homes or at the doorstep), especially in the hazardous neighborhoods of large cities. Although some households protect their privacy with unlisted telephone numbers, this can be circumvented by random-digit dialing. Telephone surveys also came to be used in surveys of elite members of the population—for example, medical doctors.

Studies of interviewing were in great vogue in the years immediately following the establishment of AAPOR. Among the best known were those carried out by Herbert Hyman and his colleagues (Hyman, et al., 1954) at the National Opinion Research Center. At the Bureau of the Census, influential contributions were made by Eli Marks and others (Mauldin and Marks, 1950) in their demonstration that sample surveys conducted by relatively small numbers of well trained and supervised interviewers could be more accurate than censuses conducted by large numbers of less well trained and supervised enumerators. The post-enumeration sample surveys conducted by Marks and his colleagues at the Bureau of the Census were used as a check on the accuracy of the census. It was through these sample surveys that the disproportionate underenumeration of segments of the population, such as young black adult males, was discovered. This demonstration by government statisticians contributed greatly to the reputation of sample surveys.

Data Analysis

Methods of data analysis were hardly discussed at Central City. This was to be left for later years and blossomed with the advent of computers, which replaced electrically driven desk calculators and punch-card sorting and tabulating machines. The breakdown of poll results by demographic segments of the population was, however, early regarded as important for understanding and prediction. Demographic analysis produced a dramatic moment at Central City when Joe Belden raised an ethical issue: should he publish the results of his pre-election Texas poll that showed a high proportion of blacks in favor of the liberal candidate, when he feared that by so doing the liberal candidate might lose votes in the actual election?

Question-Wording

AAPOR members discussed problems of question-wording vigorously at annual conferences, in the pages of the Public Opinion Quar-
terly, in numerous scholarly articles in social science journals, and in some noteworthy books. Pollsters felt the pressure of social psychologists and sociologists disposed to use multiple questions and attitude scales. Seeking to get the most information with the fewest possible questions, Gallup (1947) proposed the "quintamensional design." Using only five questions, the q.d. attempted to get at respondents' knowledge about an issue, interest in it, attitude toward it, reasons for the attitude, and strength of opinion.

Bias in question-wording, often laid at the door of issue advocates, versus neutrality in question-wording, as striven for by pollsters, occasionally led to absurd positions, such as: a neutral question is one that divides the population 50%-50%! In contrast, based on the idea that any question was a sample question drawn from a universe of questions pertaining to a single dimension, Louis Guttman and Edward Suchman (Suchman and Guttman, 1947) proposed an empirical, objective, and invariant method of determining the most neutral item in an attitude scale. Applying the second component of attitude scale analysis in Guttman's schema, that is, "intensity," Guttman and Suchman suggested that the most neutral item or question was one that tapped an attitude scale position that was held, on average, with the lowest intensity. Efforts to frame neutral, unbiased questions still continue. The goal appears to be: what is the most unbiased way one can frame a question on an issue for the purpose of a public referendum?

The same issues of question-wording effect that were addressed by Stanley Payne, and earlier by AAPOR award winners Hadley Cantril (1947) and Daniel Katz (1944) continue to engage social scientists. Among the more recent examinations of this subject are Measurement of Subjective Phenomena, edited by Denis Johnston (Johnston, 1981), and Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context, by Howard Schuman (an AAPOR president from 1985 to 1986) and Stanley Presser (1981). Volumes intended to bring "the art of asking questions" up to date were produced by Patricia Labaw, author of Advanced Questionnaire Design (1980); by Seymour Sudman (AAPOR president from 1981 to 1982) and Norman Bradburn, authors of Asking Questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design (1982) and by Charles Turner and Elizabeth Martin, in Surveying Subjective Phenomena (1985).

In a debate organized by Harry Alpert (an AAPOR president), Samuel Stouffer (an AAPOR president) and Rensis Likert argued the relative merits of closed and open questions. This was such a serious methodological issue that Paul Lazarsfeld (an AAPOR president and award
winner) had offered to negotiate the matter in an often-quoted article in the *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1944). Furthermore, while Stouffer, Lazarsfeld, and Alpert all became presidents of AAPOR, Likert, not a frequent attender of AAPOR meetings, did not. Indeed, until relatively recently, the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan, founded and led by Likert for many years, maintained a somewhat aloof attitude toward AAPOR’s pollsters, its market researchers, and its advocates of closed-ended questions. (Likert, like Lazarsfeld and Stouffer before him, was nevertheless an AAPOR award winner.)

For a number of years, a highlight of an AAPOR conference was its exciting “author meets the critics” sessions. Not infrequently the critic was Shirley Star, a posthumous AAPOR award winner. Little published herself, Star often performed the role of caustic critic of acclaimed published works. Among the authors subjected to her devastating methodological criticism were AAPOR award winner Stanley Payne and his *The Art of Asking Questions* (1951); Angus Campbell and his *The Quality of American Life* (1976); and Howard Freeman and Ozzie Simmons and their prize-winning (Hogg Foundation) work, *The Mental Patient Comes Home* (1963). In one characteristically flamboyant display of scholarly chutzpah, Star selected a statistical table and claimed that her analysis would show that the data provided support for an opposite hypothesis!

While crosstabulations in data analysis have not been completely abandoned, we must acknowledge that the computerization of data processing has led AAPOR members to different, and higher, levels of methodological sophistication in this arena. The displays of computer machinery commonly seen at AAPOR’s latter-day conferences were initiated by Robert Lee (an active AAPOR member and holder of various Executive Council offices), who had had a long stint at IBM. The hardware and statistical software packages displays, occasionally accompanied by didactic sessions on their comparative advantages and disadvantages, are currently normal expectations of AAPOR conference attendees. Computer salespeople and their wares have provided AAPOR conferences with a distinctly commercial, as well as educational, aspect. The ease of applying standard statistical routines has led many an AAPOR member into the woods of multiple regression, analysis of variance, factor analysis and even LISREL, with a sometimes casual regard for the statistical assumptions implied in the application of these methods.
Methodology and the Mass Media

AAPOR can point with pride to its role in contributing to the methodological sophistication of the mass media in the reporting of polls and sample surveys, and through the media to the education of the public. Nonetheless, the level of reporting on methodology by the media remains lower than what some methodologists would like to see. For example, the media rarely report response rates.

The better newspapers now carry little boxes with their poll stories ritually detailing sample sizes and expected degrees of statistical confidence that should be attached to the reported results. The networks, particularly CBS News, always include the items of disclosure called for by the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices. Not infrequently the exact wording of questions used is also stated. The better newspapers and networks supply background reports to interested scholars and archive their polls at Michigan’s Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and Connecticut’s Roper Public Opinion Research Center.

In general, the relationship between journalists and pollsters has improved quite a bit. Reporters seem to be less threatened by pollsters than they used to be. Straw polls, that is, “unscientific polls,” are more likely not to be reported, and if they are, usually with disclaimers as to their scientific import.

Some poll reporters, like Adam Clymer of the New York Times and Barry Sussman, formerly of the Washington Post, became regular attenders, and even participants, at AAPOR conferences. Philip Meyer, a former journalist and currently Kenan Professor of Journalism at the University of North Carolina, was an AAPOR president, as was Warren Mitofsky of CBS News. While the little boxes carried by obedient newspapers may be a far cry from what Stuart Dodd had proposed to AAPOR as standards for sample survey reporting, they are half a loaf, or at least a few slices, of methodologically sound bread.

Methodology and Social Science

Many of AAPOR’s presidents have made major contributions to methodology that have affected social science research beyond sample surveys and polls. Among them are: Herbert Hyman (1954, 1955) on interviewing and analysis; Bernard Berelson (1952) on content analysis; Howard Schuman (1981) on question-wording; Warren Mitofsky
(1970) on the Mitofsky-Waksberg telephone sampling method; Samuel Stouffer (1950) on research design; and Paul Lazarsfeld (1938, 1950) on panel analysis and latent attribute analysis. Stouffer and Lazarsfeld were also recognized for their contributions to social science by also serving as presidents of the American Sociological Association. All, it is worth noting, while methodologically sophisticated, are equally well known for their contributions in substantive areas of social science.
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Great Expectations: Polling in the Postwar Era

At the Central City and Williamstown conferences, where AAPOR took shape, the power of opinion polling seemed clear to the founders. The national public opinion poll was a distinctly American invention, but its creators saw its international extension as well as its use within local communities.

During World War II, the morale of the American soldier and the civilian public had been monitored through sample surveys, and polling was introduced or resumed in the liberated countries of Western Europe and in Japan shortly after V-E and V-J days. Prominent in these activities were many of the same individuals who had made polling a fixture on the American scene during the previous ten years. In 1946, the Gallup Organization had ten affiliates outside the United States, and Roper had helped established International Research Associates. After the occupation of West Germany and then of Japan at the close of the war, the United States led the way in encouraging polling activities in these formerly totalitarian nations for the purpose of fostering democratic participation in postwar governments. These efforts too were led by many of the same individuals who had directed the wartime surveys carried on through the Office of War Information and the War Department’s Research Branch.

At the first panel at Central City, “Public Opinion and International Affairs,” Stuart Dodd, then professor of sociology at the American University in Beirut and formerly with the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Allied Force Headquarters in Sicily, predicted that “a few years from now, facilities will be available for reporting world opinion to the United Nations within a month’s time; such polls will provide a much more scientific basis for international action than the present
journalistic methods of coverage” (National Opinion Research Center, 1946:6). At the other end of the geographical spectrum, the fourth session at Central City was devoted to local polls, with participation by Lloyd Borg of the Minnesota Poll, Joe Belden of the Texas Poll, and Henry Kroeger of the Iowa Poll. Borg stressed the public service aspect of the Minnesota Poll, viewing the local poll as a device for community betterment. The services of the poll, said Borg, had been offered at no charge to various interest groups, including the Inter-Racial Committee on Housing. Other “service research” projects included a study of banking habits for a banking group, a survey on tuberculosis, and studies of nursing and health problems.

In both the local and international arenas, participants expected opinion polling to enlighten both the public and the decision makers on issues; consequently, many speakers focused their attention on the interaction between polls and government. For example, at the second session of the Central City conference, Julian Woodward of Elmo Roper foresaw the expansion of polling in several directions. Polling, he said, should be used to clarify public issues as “an adjunct to the ballot box, designed to make government more responsible to the electorate and consequently more democratic.” He continued, “The ballot box is inadequate—the privilege of voting is exercised only once every two or four years and then as much on men as on issues, whereas the poll is the continuing ballot box.” In addition, Woodward predicted that more polling would be done under governmental auspices, in the international area, and in relation to mass education programs. “As a result of their frequent contacts with results of surveys made for government agencies during the war, administrators and Congressmen have now become accustomed to polls,” Woodward stated. Clyde Hart of the National Opinion Research Center referred to polls as a “public utility,” citing the example of the Office of Price Administration, which used surveys to measure attitudes towards compliance and as a guide to a continuing program of public relations.

George Gallup, during a radio broadcast just before the conference, outlined an argument he had made many times before and would continue to make:

I believe the polls perform a great service in this country in revealing at all times what the people think about the important issues of the day. Elections only come at infrequent intervals . . . and there is need to know what the people think in between election times. As a matter of fact, elections themselves do not always indicate clearly the will of the people. Some of the greatest mistakes in the history of this country have been
made in trying to read the will of the people from election returns . . . [for example,] the 1928 elections, when Herbert Hoover believed that his great majority was a mandate to continue Prohibition, or 1920, when Harding assumed that his great majority was a mandate against the League of Nations.

However, the conference participants were also worried about the ethical and methodological problems that polls would confront. According to Hart, there was reason to worry. “Fly-by-night” polls that could bring “disrepute to the entire industry” were increasing. A self-policing association was needed to enforce technical and ethical standards in the polling industry.

Some envisioned that association as having wide-ranging responsibilities. Gallup suggested an auditing committee, “with the authority to investigate all the activities of organizations having membership” in the association. He suggested that this committee be given the election predictions of all polling organizations the night before elections. The committee would evaluate the various predictions and determine the most accurate poll, “in order to eliminate the welter of confusing claims” after the election. Its area of concern would be limited to public opinion polls, and would exclude market research organizations, since public opinion polls “have a greater responsibility to the public for the truth of their reports.” Harry Field also suggested that the association supply a “stamp of approval, which would be carried on all press releases.” If a polling organization did not adhere to the guidelines, the association would threaten to revoke its authority to use the seal.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the Central City meeting took place at a time when the founders of opinion polling were riding a crest of public support. A war had just been fought and won—a war in which polling mattered not just at home, but also in the formerly occupied countries and in those defeated nations that would now be ruled democratically. Political candidates began taking polls seriously and even commissioned their own. The American Political Science Association noted that the academics did not need to worry about the study of public opinion, as it was in the “capable hands of Cantril, Roper, Gallup, Stouffer, Likert, and their numerous fellow workers” (Pendleton, 1945:761). And while many pundits were looking forward to the polls’ first disaster, few would argue that polls could be, to put it simply, wrong.

Not even the founders seemed to consider that possibility. At the 1947 Williamstown conference, the participants looked outward across the globe and inward to the local community, as they had in
1946, but not to the potential vulnerability of pre-election polls. In his keynote address to the 1947 Williamstown conference, Assistant Secretary of State William Benton said the pollsters were capable of solving a problem that both Abraham Lincoln and Lord Bryce had highlighted in the preceding century: how to ascertain public opinion in a democracy between elections. "It is now possible," said Benton, "to find out what 'the public' thinks on any given issue or range of issues" (David, 1948). Julian Woodward characterized the polls he had conducted for Elmo Roper on taxes and schools on behalf of the city of Louisville as "an example of a city using polling techniques as a regular adjunct to city administration." One of the more substantial claims made for the public opinion poll was by Paul Trescott of the Philadelphia Bulletin, who stated that his poll of Philadelphians on the issue of establishing an upstate water source saved the city a half million dollars—the cost of a special election.

At the 1947 session on "Polling and the Political Process" (the last of its kind before the 1948 election), all participants paid tribute to the polls. Stuart Chase, who described himself as a layman among distinguished public opinion researchers, said these pollsters "proved the validity of political democracy by establishing that the people know best. History would give them a crown of laurel for demonstrating the essential wisdom of the people." Gallup could find ten major achievements of polls in the advancement of democracy. Crossley noted that the polls did a service by providing a substitute for "the smoke-filled room," and praised "the keen awareness of the pollsters of the responsibility attached to their work and their desire to do a good job." Elmo Roper proposed government-operated polls, run by people of "Supreme Court stature," in order to secure public confidence.

But participants at the 1947 conference did note some potential problems with pre-election polls. For Chase, these particular polls, now that they had established the validity of polling, were no more "than so much advance dope on a horse race—exciting and entertaining dope, perhaps, but nevertheless, completely meaningless." Though Roper noted that "the polls have validated themselves. Not just one poll was right, but all have been right over a period of three elections," he worried about the impact of polls on the best politicians, who might choose not to run because a poll suggested they would not win. He cited the example of a state's delegation to the 1944 Republican Convention, which voted for its second choice because "the Gallup Poll says Dewey can beat Roosevelt."
In all of this discussion, there was one lone voice, Louis Bean of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, who prophetically suggested that “1948 might offer a more challenging test of the ability of the speakers.”

The Presidential Election of 1948

The 1948 election did indeed provide that test. The three previous presidential elections, which were responsible for the aura of infallibility about the polls, had all involved a popular incumbent president, Franklin Delano Roosevelt—in 1936 during the recovery from the Depression, in 1940 with Western Europe occupied and England under siege by Hitler’s armed forces, and in 1944 with the U.S. itself involved in desperate conflict both in Europe and in the Pacific.

In 1948, Roosevelt’s successor, Harry Truman, faced an uphill campaign. Compared to the eloquent and charming Roosevelt, Truman was brusque and less than charismatic, and the polls had charted his declining popularity. The 1946 congressional elections had produced Republican majorities for the first time since 1932, effectively blocking Truman’s programs. The Republican nominee, Thomas Dewey, had an established reputation as a crime-busting district attorney, had successfully governed the state of New York, and had run a creditable campaign against Roosevelt in 1944. Still worse for Truman, he faced bitter dissension in his own party, and minority candidates on both the left and the right, Henry Wallace and Strom Thurmond, were running independent campaigns for the presidency that threatened to split the Democratic vote.

Early polls faithfully reflected this situation. Dewey had a comfortable 11-point lead over Truman, and Wallace was drawing 5 percent of the vote, almost entirely from the Democratic candidate. Dewey, not wishing to jeopardize his lead, ran a “safe” campaign, avoiding controversy, while Truman campaigned with extraordinary vigor, berating what he called the “do-nothing” Republican Congress. By fall, Truman’s efforts had achieved some progress. Dewey’s lead had narrowed to 6 points, while 8 percent remained undecided. But the pollsters, like most social scientists, had been impressed by a 1940 Erie County (Ohio) study (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, 1944) in which a panel of voters had been interviewed during the presidential campaign of that year. The findings were that most voting decisions were made
very early in the campaign, some even before the nominations; that the ensuing campaign changed very few minds; and that as Election Day neared, previously undecided voters tended to revert to their traditional party choice. No published analysis of this study (or any of the pollsters’ work) took account of the fact that after 1932, the Roosevelt elections were referenda on a well known incumbent, about whom opinions were firm and unlikely to be changed by a campaign. Opinions about Truman, as the popularity polls demonstrated, were far less stable.

None of the 1948 polls continued surveying during the closing days of the campaign. Roper, in fact, ceased polling on the election in September, assuming a Dewey victory a foregone conclusion and not wishing to continue calling the “horse race.” Though Truman was indeed closing the gap, a Dewey victory was almost unanimously expected by the experts. The final Gallup figures, based on interviews conducted between October 15 and October 25, gave Dewey a 5-point lead. Then, as the actual election returns began to come in and the Truman totals mounted, they provided a stunning surprise. Truman emerged with 49.8 percent of the vote, Dewey with 45.4 percent, while Thurmond and Wallace shared less than 5 percent between them.

The Aftermath of 1948

The polls’ failure to forecast the election correctly became one of the top news stories of 1948. Newspaper editorials, radio commentators, cartoonists, and comedians all joined in the ridicule. On November 4, 1948, the Washington Post, which had been the first newspaper to subscribe to the Gallup Poll, sent a conciliatory telegram to Truman, the text of which read:

You are hereby invited to attend a crow banquet to which this newspaper proposes to invite newspaper editorial writers, political reporters and editors, including our own, for the purpose of providing a repast appropriate to the appetite created by the late election.

The consequences of the 1948 debacle were viewed as potentially dire for survey research. According to Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology at Princeton University and Director of the Office of Public Opinion Research, “the man in the street, who had regarded forecasting by pollsters as a modern stunt, had built up a certain resentment against those self-appointed experts who were telling him in advance what he was going to do” (Cantril, 1948:310). An even more serious
threat lay in the consequences for marketing research, which was the basic business of all the pollsters. One large market research firm is said to have received some 100 phone calls from clients the day after the election, questioning the accuracy of the firm's surveys (Blankenship, 1948:326).

The general public, however, seems to have taken a more relaxed view. According to an NORC survey conducted in November 1948, after the election, a majority said the polls were "pretty nearly right most of the time in predicting elections" and only 23 percent said "their record is not very good" (Sheatsley, 1948:460).

Aside from public relations problems, the erroneous election forecasts raised serious methodological issues. What went wrong? Though the techniques and methods employed by the polls had received professional criticism in the past, it was hard to quarrel with a continuing record of success. There is no doubt that the pollsters were unable to conceive of possible problems. (Joe Belden, founder of the Texas Poll, was to illustrate this point with his claim to be the "first poll to go wrong." He miscalled a local election in 1946 and at the Central City conference he sought out those individuals he had learned his trade from to find out what he had done wrong. These experts examined his data and in effect, wrote his miscall off as a fluke. They had no answers.) It was now obvious that a great deal more attention had to be paid to sampling procedures, interviewer supervision and training, efforts to measure voter turnout, allocation of undecided voters, and timing of interviews.

AAPOR was ill-equipped to deal with these problems: as a professional organization with no paid staff, it lacked the resources to conduct any kind of investigation. Furthermore, its Executive Council and the membership itself included representatives of the very polls that would be the object of investigation. There was an alternative, however.

In 1945, the Social Science Research Council, in association with the National Research Council, had established a Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes and Consumer Wants. This committee had already initiated projects relating to sampling methods, interviewer effects in opinion surveys, and the use of panel methods in survey research. Now, concerned that "extended controversy regarding the pre-election polls might have extensive and unjustified repercussions upon all types of opinion and attitude studies and perhaps upon social science research generally," the SSRC appointed a Committee on Analysis of Pre-Election Polls and Forecasts. This committee, chaired by S. S. Wilks, professor of mathematical statistics at Princeton University, and
including nine highly respected social scientists, was appointed on November 10, eight days after the election, and held its first meeting three days after that. Financial support was obtained from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller Foundations. The AAPOR Council also met on November 10, with only seven of its twelve members in attendance. One of these, Samuel A. Stouffer, had been elected chair of the AAPOR Standards Committee earlier in the year, but had later resigned when he accepted appointment to the SSRC investigating committee. Another AAPOR Council member, Herbert H. Hyman, was to become an active member of the SSRC committee’s technical staff and would author an important chapter in the subsequent report.

At this meeting, AAPOR adopted a resolution endorsing the SSRC committee investigation and promising cooperation with it. “It is the sense of this motion that the Social Science Research Council’s committee will serve in the place of any committee which might otherwise have been appointed by AAPOR to serve a similar function.” The resolution further urged “all interested groups and individuals to offer similar endorsement and cooperation” with the SSRC committee. A press release drafted at the meeting pointed out that all three major polling organizations had agreed to open their records fully to the SSRC committee.

Working with unprecedented speed, the SSRC committee delivered its summary report before the end of the year, to be followed in the spring of 1949 by a book written under the direction of Frederick Mosteller of Harvard University and published by SSRC (Mosteller et al., 1949). The committee report was critical of the polls on a variety of counts:

The pollsters overreached the capabilities of the public opinion poll as a predictive device in attempting to pick, without qualification, the winner of the 1948 Presidential election... The failure of the polls was due to neglecting the possibility of a close election and the necessity of measuring preferences very accurately just before the election to determine whether a flat forecast could be made with confidence.

The pollsters could have foreseen the possibility of a close contest had they looked more carefully at their data and past errors... The evidence indicates that there were two major causes of error: (a) errors of sampling and interviewing and (b) errors of forecasting, involving failure to assess the future behavior of the undecided voters and to detect shifts of voting intention near the end of the campaign... These sources of error were not new.

The manner in which the pre-election polls were analyzed, presented and published for public consumption contributed materially to the...
widespread misinterpretation of the results of the polls and to the great public reaction to their failure to pick the winner . . . with the result that the public placed too much confidence in polls before the 1948 election and too much distrust in them afterwards.

The committee called for use of better techniques of sampling, interviewer training and supervision, and for more methodological research to improve survey methods, more basic research on voting behavior, greater efforts to educate the public about polls, more cooperation among research workers on common problems, and better training and opportunities for practical experience for students interested in entering the field. All of these recommendations quickly gained a place on the AAPOR agenda, as illustrated by the contents of the annual conference programs that followed.

At the 1948 Eagle's Mere opening session, just two months before the debacle of 1948, participants from a number of countries had expressed high hopes for public opinion research, and stressed its social and political importance, especially to democratic government. But at the 1949 opening session, the atmosphere was different. There were fewer lofty claims for the wonders that opinion research could perform. AAPOR President Elmo Wilson admitted "a setback, but by no means an eclipse," and the conference participants listened to exhortations to improve the tools of opinion research and to admissions that there was still a long way to go (Public Opinion Quarterly, 1949–1950:738).

The main evening session at the 1949 conference, entitled "Constructive Steps in the Measurement of Political Opinion," was chaired by Bernard Berelson of the University of Chicago. The speakers were Archibald Crossley, George Gallup, and Elmo Roper. At that session, the same pollsters who had claimed in 1947 that pre-election polls had proven themselves in three successive elections, and had therefore become unnecessary, now disclaimed the importance of election forecasting even more emphatically. Crossley suggested the most constructive step possible was to "stick to presentation of the facts and stop speculating, no matter how many editors and others ask us for forecasts." Roper said, "I see no social benefit resulting from election forecasting as such." Only Gallup indicated an intention to continue his forecasts.

All three participants in this session took harsh criticism from the floor. Speaking in the absence of Rensis Likert, director of the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, Angus Campbell asserted that the incorrect forecasts of the polls had vindicated Likert's earlier criticisms of polling methodology. Specifically, he noted that the fore-
casts had been based on small and evidently biased samples and that insufficient effort had been made to study the opinions of the undecided and those with weak preferences. His colleague Daniel Katz also criticized the quota sampling method that allowed interviewers to avoid people who were difficult to find and interview, and the failure of the polls to ask open-ended questions or to design experiments to help predict the behavior of people who said they hadn’t made up their minds.

Frederick Stephan of Princeton University emphasized that the SSRC report “reveals sources of error in every phase of polling, but they do not tell us which had only a negligible effect and how much each of the others contributed to the total error. Hence we should state the facts clearly so that the public will not be misled to think that the weaknesses have been corrected and that there is no further danger of erroneous prediction.”

Clinton Rossiter of Cornell University praised public opinion research’s ability to “debunk” claims of pressure groups and to determine areas of public ignorance; he also accused the researchers of “a tendency to claim far too much for your sub-discipline as a science and an oracle.” He specifically criticized “the presidential and other election polls, which you should abandon forthwith; your failure to educate the public in the manner of handling your results; and your refusal to make available to political science the complete facts about your methodology.”

The pollsters at the 1949 conference all indicated that the problems of 1948 would in fact result in new concerns—improving measures of probable turnout, coping with the difference between a unitary vote system and the electoral college, probing for intensity of opinions, continuing polling into the last days of the campaign, and improving public understanding of possible sources of errors in polls. Gallup said he would refine the filters he used to determine who is likely to vote, and would scrutinize the undecided voter more closely. All the pollsters agreed on the need to continue polling close to the election, aware now of the potential for last-minute switching.

While the participants at the 1949 conference did not have the starry-eyed view of polling’s capacity to change the world as they had in 1946 and 1947, there was still much interest in the possible uses of public opinion research at both the global and local levels. Stuart Dodd elaborated on a variety of United Nations intentions for using polling data. Paul Lazarsfeld, director of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University, chaired a session on regional polls, with some of the same participants as in the 1947 session. Participants from Colum-
bia University, the University of Miami, and the University of Minnesota joined the discussion. One academic described the use of his laboratory’s work by state and municipal officeholders, while one commercial researcher asked for help from academia, especially on methodological questions, and offered his facilities for their research.

Lazarsfeld, who assumed the AAPOR presidency at the 1949 conference, urged AAPOR’s newly formed Research Development Committee to sponsor an institute on regional polls prior to the next conference. As Lazarsfeld described it, the committee “should work with the regional poll people and advise them. The institute would be not only a clinic and a training center but might also be asked to focus data on some selected problem.” Although such an institute never came about on a formal basis, Lazarsfeld continued to work diligently to smooth over the conflicts of 1948 and bring the two groups of commercial and academic researchers together in AAPOR. At the 1950 presidential conference session (an innovation of his), he shared the spotlight with Elmo Roper, who detailed what the commercial and academic worlds should expect from and could give to one another. According to Roper, AAPOR itself was one of the greatest aids to understanding, with its single code of ethics and its annual conferences at which the two groups could get together.

The 1950s and 1960s:
What Is Appropriate for Polls?

The early 1950s were to see greater limitations in the claims made for the accuracy of pre-election polls. For example, the Gallup Poll reported Dwight Eisenhower’s lead in the 1952 election campaign in carefully qualified language, which allowed readers to speculate on the possibility of a Stevenson victory.

There was also less interest in polls at AAPOR conferences than there had been—academic and marketing interests were to dominate for awhile. However, at the same time, polling was being quietly expanded in politics. An AAPOR-sponsored survey of its members’ ongoing research in 1950 includes a listing for the Dade County (Florida) Pepper Campaign Committee for the re-election of Senator Claude Pepper. A study done by Ross Beiler of the University of Miami focused on opinions of the candidates, involvement in the campaign, demographic relationships to political support, and district breakdowns. The listing claims that “Senator Pepper took keen personal interest.
Study director submitted campaign propaganda analyses and suggestions and consulted on some state-wide broadcasts."

The AAPOR conference of 1952, the year of the first Eisenhower-Stevenson contest, brought out again some of the fundamental conflicts between academics and polling practitioners. Of the session entitled, "Studies of Political Behavior in 1952, Plans and Problems," at which Gallup, Crossley, Sidney Goldish of the Minnesota Poll, and Joe Belden of the Texas Poll were the participants, the rapporteur, David Wallace, observed:

It is truly to be hoped that "the pollsters" derive some sublime inner satisfaction from their work. For, despite occasional polite words from academicians and muted fascination from the man in the street, they appear to gain little else.... Not entirely undue to adroitness by [Chair Clyde Hart of NORC], the discussion resolved itself swiftly into a well bred but open debate between the practitioners of polling... on the one hand, and the members of the Social Science Research Council committee which examined the polls in 1948, on the other.

According to the rapporteur, Gallup, as opening speaker, perhaps to undercut and satirize the academic opposition, berated himself for operating without formulated hypotheses, for adding little to the sum of eternal knowledge, and above all for not verbalizing like a scientist. However, he said his poll would continue to provide reports on the 1952 election. Since 1948 he and his staff had gone far, he felt, in correcting the major sources of error pointed out by the SSRC committee. He was now planning a last-minute pre-election poll in which interviewers would phone in their results, to check on possible late shifts in voting intention. He had developed new lines of questioning to determine which way the undecided vote was "leaning" and to forecast actual voting turnout more accurately. He had demonstrated these new techniques in the 1950 congressional election when his results were within 1 percent of the final major party election vote, and he had fully reported this work in Public Opinion Quarterly. He strongly challenged his academic critics to conduct their own experimental studies and publish their findings.

At this time, there was continuing debate between the academics and the pollsters over the merits of quota versus probability sampling. Quota sampling brought opinion polls into public view in 1936 when it was employed by Gallup, Roper, and Crossley to forecast President Roosevelt’s reelection, in the face of the Literary Digest’s mail-in poll that predicted the election of Alfred Landon. Under quota sampling,
interviewers are assigned to a defined locality and asked to fill special quotas, usually defined in terms of sex, age, and economic status. This method of sampling, as practiced by the pollsters, was attacked by many statisticians and other government and academic social scientists on the grounds that interviewers were free to select only the most accessible and willing respondents, and that because the method did not produce a purely random selection, the usual formulas for calculating standard error did not apply. Critics of quota sampling urged a probability sampling method, such as that used by Rensis Likert in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and later by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, in which a sample of dwelling units, and then of individuals living in those dwelling units, is randomly selected from a frame of listings. Callbacks are required if the designated individual cannot be reached on the first visit, and no substitutions are permitted.

Gallup and Crossley both expressed serious reservations about the practicality of using probability sampling in election polls. Gallup asserted that probability sampling would lead to errors in predicting turnout. Crossley said, "No matter who does it, you rarely end up with more than 85 percent or so of your designated individuals—and these only after several call-backs. You are then faced with estimating the remainder either through additional sampling or through mathematical weighting. Both involve new orders of error." In addition, "If we were to use full probability, we would have to close our field [three weeks early] in order to instruct supervisors on additional interviews, or to apply weights, and then get our story to the papers on time."

Predictably, the academic reaction was negative. Frederick Stephan, a member of the 1948 SSRC committee, deplored the "same as before" attitude that had been expressed by Goldish and Belden, the state pollsters, as well as by Gallup and Crossley, and predicted that "unless something is done to overcome the present deficiencies of polls, their shortcomings will upset predictions again and again." His remarks were strongly seconded by Herbert Hyman and Philip McCarthy, who had also served on the SSRC committee.

There was at least one effort at compromise. Stouffer admired the pollsters who "were willing to stick their necks out again in 1952," and he strongly endorsed Gallup's entreaty that the academicians move up into the firing line and conduct experimental studies in their own cities and precincts: "Let experiment and publish be the campus byword." NORC's Clyde Hart seconded this suggestion.

This was to be the last of those combative sessions for awhile. Before the next conference, in 1953, a poll of AAPOR members was taken on
topics preferred for the program. The top vote-getter was Motivation Research, followed by Public Opinion and the Social Sciences, Progress in Projective Techniques, and Measuring Advertising Effectiveness. Molding Public Opinion in Presidential Elections was far down the list. There was no proposed panel on the 1952 election and its attendant polls. Two proposals that received fewer than twelve votes and were therefore dropped were Newspaper Polls, a popular subject of the past, and Sampling Techniques, which were the focus of the arguments in the 1952 election session the year before.

These changes in members’ preferences among program content reflected both a growing AAPOR membership and rapid developments in the field of public opinion research. It had been seven years since the gathering at Central City when survey researchers from widely differing settings first came together and overcame their mutual ignorance and suspicion. To avoid domination by one group or another, AAPOR developed a “tradition” of alternating “commercial” and “noncommercial” (i.e., academic, government, etc.) presidents; successive nominations committees sought to maintain a balance in the Executive Council; and the conference program chairmen carefully tried to arrange sessions that would appeal to both groups. The factions had lived together in AAPOR for quite a while now. Furthermore, the distinctions between the two were breaking down, as academicians ventured into the government and commercial worlds and as market researchers were more and more often teaching on university campuses.

Pre-election polls, once almost synonymous with public opinion research in the public mind, now represented only a small fraction of work in the field. Survey research had become a profession, and scores of topics competed for a place on the AAPOR program. Both the pre-election polls, as conducted by Gallup, Roper, and Crossley, and the complaints of their critics may have become a tired subject by 1953. AAPOR members, few of whom were engaged in election polling, were more interested in hearing about such glamorous innovations as “projective techniques” and “motivation research.”

With the pollsters now more cautious in their forecasts and more like the academics in their methods, it seemed an appropriate time for AAPOR to begin to take public positions on the use of polls, and perhaps to encourage the use of good polls by governments in formulating policy, and by the media in reporting public opinion. The early 1950s gave AAPOR with several opportunities to make public its concern with good polling methodology and to censure meaningless polls. But each time, the organization hesitated.
In 1951, Fulton Lewis Jr., a radio personality, conducted the Fulton Lewis Opinion Poll, which seemed to be nothing more than the solicitation of opinions from listeners. Council chose a “wait-and-see” response. Lewis seemed to have done it only once; the procedure resembled a “letters to the editor” column, which AAPOR had no interest in controlling; the final decision was to see if Lewis did it again. In the same year, a suggestion was made by Louis Harris, then of Elmo Roper, that AAPOR look into the possibility of networks presenting social science research findings on radio or television, but there is no indication that the proposal was actively pursued.

In 1953, Congressman Harold Hagen of Minnesota introduced a bill providing for the questioning of voters in each state to aid the federal government in the formulation of policy. At a later meeting, Council referred this matter to the Washington, D.C., chapter of AAPOR. The chapter was to establish personal contact with Hagen, express AAPOR’s appreciation for his interest, and discuss AAPOR’s reservations about it. In December of that year, however, Council determined that since the bill probably would never be reported out of committee, AAPOR should do nothing about the issue.

If AAPOR was reluctant to take an active role in pursuing government legislation or in castigating false polls, it could perhaps serve as a clearinghouse for research. In April 1954, Sidney Goldish of the Minnesota Poll and Joe Belden of the Texas Poll suggested that AAPOR establish a clearinghouse and repository for completed public opinion studies, including local and regional public opinion polls, and that the clearinghouse be the responsibility of the Research Development Committee for at least one year. Council responded favorably and asked the proposers to prepare a specific recommendation. That recommendation appeared in September and named specific organizations whose work should be maintained in the repository: the Washington (State) Public Opinion Laboratory, Texas Poll, Minnesota Poll, Iowa Poll, New Jersey Poll, New York Poll, Denver Post Poll, and the California Poll. With the exception of Washington, these were all commercial operations, either managed by a newspaper or conducted by private research firms for distribution to the press.

The proposed repository would contain an inventory of survey dates, questions asked, and published findings. It would also be a question-wording archive. It was envisioned that the AAPOR Executive Council would be the policy making body for the repository, determining which polls would be archived, and that foundations would provide the funding for the operation.
In April 1955, Seymour Martin Lipset, a Columbia University sociologist who was also a member of AAPOR, had obtained through the Columbia library school a small grant from the Ford Foundation to study the feasibility of establishing an archive for survey data. In April 1955 he approached the AAPOR Council, asking for the cooperation of AAPOR members in contributing to the proposed archive and offering Council the right to designate half the members of a proposed advisory committee. Council reacted favorably to this plan but in the belief that several members of AAPOR would be selected for the advisory committee in any case, it instead proposed to recommend the project and appeal for membership cooperation in its next mailing to members.

Lipset’s project never materialized, largely because the Behavioral Sciences Program of the Ford Foundation, which was interested in funding it, soon closed down. Meanwhile, the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, then housed at Williams College as an archive for the surveys conducted by the Elmo Roper organization, enlarged its operations to accept polls conducted by Gallup, NORC, and the various state polls, and thus to provide opportunities for scholars to conduct secondary analysis of the accumulated survey data that had been the aim of both the AAPOR group and the Lipset committee.

While AAPOR was becoming increasingly identified as a spokesman for the profession and as an organization committed to responsible polling, Council policy over the next decade was to avoid intervention in specific cases if possible, and to refrain from any attempt to enforce standards on delinquent polls. This caution by Council reflected a more realistic appreciation of AAPOR’s limited powers and resources. The Association could and did cite its Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, but it lacked any staff or budget to conduct investigations of questionable behavior. It had no authority to subpoena research materials or to compel testimony. Furthermore, there would be serious legal risks involved if AAPOR attempted to apply any sort of sanctions against offending individuals or agencies.

Thus, in June 1955, the Standards Chair reported receiving a letter from Norman Isaacs of the Louisville Courier-Journal asking AAPOR to undertake an objective study of newspaper reporting of elections. On advice of Council, the chair replied that such an evaluation would be beyond AAPOR’s purpose, but then suggested several individuals who might aid in the preparation of a study design.

In September 1962, Congressman Samuel Stratton sent a telegram to the Standards Chair that read: “In view of the fact that private public
opinion polls have featured prominently in the pre-convention campaign of the Democratic Party of New York and the results of these polls have been used to influence delegate votes. We urge your association in the interest of the integrity of your profession to investigate the scientific accuracy with the highest standards of your profession. We believe that any persons involved in conducting these polls have a solemn obligation to make all information . . . you acquire public and to cooperate with your association in whatever investigation you may decide to make.” Again, AAPOR decided that an “investigation” of private polls was beyond its resources and purpose. That same month, two complaints were received (one from a private citizen) about a poll conducted by the mayor of Englewood, New Jersey, at a time of debate over school integration. The poll was based on a sample selected from the telephone directory, with mailed ballots offering various proposals on combining schools at various levels.

One AAPOR member took it upon himself to write to the mayor and criticize the selection procedure as well as the questions themselves. The Standards Committee took no action. The problems the committee confronted are made clear by one member’s letter to the Standards chair, which characterized both issues as “part of the overall problem of research usage . . . This is like asking the atomic scientists to rule on the usage of atomic power in bombs. Perhaps ethically and morally we should exert influence in this regard. As a practical matter, I doubt whether it would do any good. In essence, I feel that each individual researcher is ultimately going to be responsible for not only his own activities but also for those of his client in the field of research.”

Council was willing to take action (although it was stressed that it was individual action on the part of Council members) when there was a direct threat to the ability of public opinion researchers to carry out their work. In 1963, the Texas legislature passed what became known as the “anti-Belden bill,” in reaction to surveys conducted before the 1962 state elections by Joe Belden of the Texas Poll. The bill provided for the filing with the state within seven days after publication of the data (the morning after, if within seven days of an election), information about the sponsor and the fees paid, and what might be regarded as proprietary information about the methodology of the poll. Fines for noncompliance were to range between $500 and $10,000. There were no hearings, because the legislature deemed the bill to be of an “emergency” nature. Council sent a letter, approved by all members present, to the speaker of the Texas House, urging him not to allow a vote on the bill until “further consideration has been devoted to its pro-
visions and possible consequences, and until members of our association shall have had an opportunity to present our views at a public hearing." Eventually, the House passed a bill that exempted newspapers, radio and television firms, and political parties from its provisions, leaving Belden as the sole individual to whom its terms applied. The bill did not take effect. The Governor of Texas, John Connally, vetoed the legislation. Belden's experience led him to produce a guide to public opinion research, to be distributed to legislators and members of the press.

Off and on in the ensuing years, Council confronted the difficulties of its ambiguous role vis-à-vis public polls. The 1965–66 Executive Council planned possible news articles about polls to counteract what it considered "adverse publicity to survey research." Concern about the implications of non-representative (and what it called "dubious") pre-election polls was dealt with by the unanimous passing of a resolution about pre-election polls, proposed by president-elect Leo Bogart, of the Newspaper Advertising Bureau. The resolution read:

Election forecasts may have political consequences both in the strategy of candidates and the response of the public. Pre-election polling is one of the most complex, difficult and hazardous tasks that can be set before even the most competent practitioner of opinion research. Yet candidates and public alike often fail to distinguish between polls which are conducted according to professional standards and those which are not. Valid polling does not rest on the number of interviews. It requires that meaningful questions be asked by well trained interviewers, and that samples be selected to be properly representative of the voting population. We strongly deplore the use of the term "pre-election poll" to encompass statistics resulting from street-corner interviews, mail ballots and other methods which are known to produce haphazard or biased results in election forecasting.

This resolution presents AAPOR in its best light in its handling of the polls. It could take general positions about desirable methods and appropriate analyses. It was less good at dealing with the merits and demerits of specific cases.

Council struggled with its specific roles over the next year. In 1966–67, it would admit an inability to serve as a volunteer clearinghouse for professional help on surveys of public interest, and would not pursue a proposal that AAPOR sponsor surveys on social values, but it would reconsider how to deal with congressional mail surveys. It was, however, to take a major step forward by beginning the consideration of standards of disclosure for public opinion polls.
AAPOR took this action at a time when the publicity accorded to public opinion polls was rising back toward pre-1948 levels, and outside of AAPOR George Gallup was beginning the effort to establish more industry self-policing activity. His activity would result eventually in the formation of the National Council on Public Polls. The AAPOR Standards Committee Chair, Irving Crespi, described to Council why his committee saw a need for standards in the reporting of polls. Crespi noted the general lack of methodological information in news releases of poll results, and the refusal of some polling organizations even to tell their clients the methodological details of political studies conducted (at presumably paid for) for them. The problems of newspaper non-reporting of polling methods were demonstrated clearly when Herbert Abelson reported on Opinion Research Corporation's clippings of news items reporting poll results. In a three-month period, there were an average of twenty stories a month in New York papers, none of which provided adequate disclosure of survey methods.

The proposed AAPOR Standards of Disclosure would require that releases report the sampling, interviewing, training, supervisory, and analytic procedures that were carried out in connection with reported surveys. The proposed standards were agreed to in principle by Council, and brought up at the general business meeting of the conference the next day. The business meeting authorized mailing each AAPOR member the relevant materials, and soliciting member comments before adoption of the Standards Committee proposals.

The Standards of Disclosure were officially adopted in September 1967. Formal promulgation to the membership and to the press took place at the 1968 conference. In addition to information about sample size, interviewing dates, question wording, sampling error, and type of interviewing, the standards required that the identity of the sponsor of the survey be published. Later Council meetings were to underscore the responsibility of the party releasing the study to ensure that the standards of disclosure were complied with.

The Late 1960s: Activism in an Activist Age

The late 1960s were a difficult time for AAPOR and the polls. In 1968, there even was a “scandal” that brought back memories of 1948. Although concerns about media polls did result in the active promulgation of standards of disclosure and the creation of the National Council on Public Polls (which would hold meetings concurrently with
AAPOR for a number of years), polling would be threatened both by government and by itself.

The governmental worry came from Congressman Lucien Nedzi, a Democrat representing the state of Michigan, who proposed legislation requiring “Truth in Polling”: full disclosure of how and when a poll was conducted, how many people were questioned, and other details. The legislation would apply only to published polls. While Nedzi said he had no evidence that Gallup and Lou Harris (who was then conducting and distributing the Harris Survey) had been “anything but totally on the up and up,” he felt the public was accepting the polls virtually on faith alone, and politicians were reacting to them as gospel, without any real assurance that they were as accurate as possible. Like the 1962 Texas bill, the Nedzi legislation would require the filing of information (this time within seventy-two hours of the release of the poll) on sponsorship, sample size, dates of interviewing, type of interview, question wording, and results. Nedzi called for hearings on the issue, and raised concerns about the impact of the polls, not just on the public, but especially on decision makers. He met with AAPOR officers in the ensuing months, and was eventually to participate in AAPOR’s 1970 conference, but his bill never passed.

Other politicians were to notice the polls’ potential partisan effect. John Marchi, 1969 Republican-Conservative candidate for mayor of New York City, introduced a bill in the New York State legislature to establish licensing requirements for pollsters, and set rules for disclosure of methods, including the filing of names and addresses of both interviewers and respondents. Marchi felt victimized by the publication of “inaccurate” poll results that he said had cost him votes and contributions. At issue were a New York Daily News poll that showed his opponent John Lindsay ahead by 21 points, and an NBC News poll that gave Lindsay a lead of 18 points. Charles Goodell, the Republican Senator from New York and 1970 candidate for reelection, also felt victimized by polls and introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate compelling release of poll procedures. Again, the offending poll was that of the Daily News, which showed Goodell far behind; Goodell lost in a three-way race. Neither Marchi’s proposal nor Goodell’s came to anything.

While such threats of legislation were of continuing concern to the organization, AAPOR confronted a more serious problem just before the Republican National Convention in 1968. Two major polls, conducted close to each other, gave contradictory information about the electability of the two major contenders for the nomination, Richard Nixon and Nelson Rockefeller. The Gallup Poll said that Rockefeller
would be the more electable Republican nominee; the Harris poll indicated little difference between the two contenders. At that time, the fight for the Republican nomination was being waged on the issue of electibility.

A joint press conference by Louis Harris and George Gallup Jr. did little to end the controversy. AAPOR was urged by its Pacific Chapter (PAPOR) to investigate the facts of the incident. Not only did PAPOR urge AAPOR to do something, but it held a symposium on polls and the news media for members of the California legislature and the press.

PAPOR proposed that AAPOR (rather than the National Council on Public Polls, of which both Harris and Gallup were members) conduct the investigation, to avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest. Gallup himself suggested the formation of an AAPOR-NCPP investigative committee, "not with the idea of reaching a judgment of which polling organization is doing the best job, but to record for the benefit of ourselves, the public, and any Congressional committee or other investigating body, the full details of the procedures used. . . . The committee should be free to look into anything it chooses, and particularly to examine methods and procedures that may shed light on the reasons for differences in results." In response, at its September meeting, the Executive Council voted to appoint a "special committee to investigate [the] apparent discrepancies."

AAPOR's Special Committee on Political Polls was formed within the month, although it was by then several months after the original problem. Peter H. Rossi, of the Johns Hopkins University, was named chair. Rossi hoped to extend the examination beyond the 1968 controversy, and to look both at the published polls and the private political polls. Council unanimously adopted a resolution that read as follows: "...AAPOR hereby establishes a Special Committee on Political Polls, especially those which are published, to investigate the methodology and public roles of such polls; and such Committee shall be authorized by the Executive Council of AAPOR to investigate such polls as it deems advisable and necessary."

Meanwhile, the California State Assembly called a hearing on polling and a representative of AAPOR, Don Cahalan, appeared before the committee. He reported the formation of the Special Committee, the willingness of George Gallup to participate fully in its investigation, and AAPOR's willingness to work with public bodies to help control possible misuses of polls. He (and AAPOR) hesitated, however, at the prospect of regulation. According to Cahalan, "AAPOR at this point is not taking a stand either for or against regulatory legislation; but it
is not taking a stand either for or against regulatory legislation; but it should be reported that there have been a number of attempts at such regulation, none of which has been passed; a major problem has been to legislate regarding polls without creating more problems than such legislation would solve—in the way of interfering with freedom of expression on the part of the media, and possibly even interfering with the conduct of sample censuses, health surveys, and even school testing programs.”

AAPOR was torn over whether or not to support regulatory legislation. Council tabled discussion of a proposed resolution to put the organization on record supporting legislation consistent with its Standards of Disclosure. And a problem that had haunted the AAPOR conference after the 1948 and 1952 elections was to emerge again: the conflict between academics and the public pollsters.

Rossi appointed, as members of his committee, Angus Campbell of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, a critic of the 1948 polls, and Jacob Feldman, formerly a methodological expert with NORC, then of the Harvard University Medical School. Rossi foresaw a broad mandate for his committee. His first memorandum outlined three goals. The first was to describe how polling is done, based on descriptions to be provided by NCPP's members. The second was to address technical considerations in interpreting and using poll results, by updating the relevant parts of the 1948 SSRC study. The third was to assess the place of polling in the political process.

Rossi was never able to meet those goals. In fact, forty days after he wrote his committee that memorandum, he resigned as chair of the committee. His AAPOR mandate came into conflict with the newly established NCPP, two members of which, Archibald Crossley and Fred Currier of Market Opinion Research, registered strong objections to the presence of Angus Campbell on the AAPOR committee. In his letter, Rossi claimed that there was little reason to believe that the NCPP would cooperate with the Special Committee.

In his letter of resignation, made with “some regret, much dismay, and even greater anger,” Rossi made the case that the NCPP wanted some say as to the scope of the AAPOR committee and veto power over the committee's report, and considered Angus Campbell and Rossi persona non grata. He drew this conclusion, he said, “from the fact that a large portion of the meeting [with NCPP] was devoted to questioning whether Campbell and I were sufficiently neutral.” He claimed that NCPP was “a protective association rather than a professional association,” and had been “perfectly willing to have a quickie white-
wash in the last month of the 1968 campaign, but now has second thoughts about whether they want anyone looking into the way in which the polls are conducted.” In conclusion, he warned AAPOR not to associate itself with NCPP, “lest AAPOR also become known as a protective organization. If there should be any looking into the polls, it should be done by some more powerful and authoritative body, e.g., SSRC, rather than AAPOR.”

Robert Ford, of AT&T, the AAPOR president in 1968–69, asked Council to consider the problem and decide whether to continue the investigation alone, or with NCPP, or to ask the SSRC to take it over. Was there really a threat to AAPOR members who were not involved in public polling?

AAPOR then set up a new committee, very different in scope from the first, and asked for SSRC’s help. The first of two resolutions required the AAPOR Executive Council to “create a Committee on Political Polls, advisory in nature, to serve at the pleasure of the council, for the purpose of doing two things: 1) recommending appropriate AAPOR actions or positions with respect to legislative hearings or investigations relating to political polling, and 2) being available, if desired, to serve as liaison with any organization undertaking an investigation or study of political opinion polling.” Robert Bower, of the Bureau of Social Science Research, then AAPOR’s vice-president and president-elect, accepted the chairmanship of the committee.

The second resolution read as follows: “The Executive Council of AAPOR, in its desire continually to stimulate improvement of political opinion polling, requests and encourages the Social Science Research Council to inquire into the methodology, analytic technique and reporting procedures used in the conduct and publication of published political polls, and to publish a report of its findings.” (It is worth noting that Council, at the time of this conflict, contained only one member who was affiliated with a member organization of NCPP—Burns Roper, of the Roper Poll.)

In 1968, AAPOR had made an effort, through the Rossi committee, to conduct a study of the polls, deciding that it had a responsibility to the profession to make sure that public presentations of polls were accurate and acceptable. But in the process, it seemed to reopen old wounds. Rossi took his charge as that of an investigator, and wanted to produce a definitive study of public polling methodology that would rival that of the SSRC in 1948. NCPP members clearly had more limited goals in mind. The situation may have been aggravated by the appointment of Angus Campbell, an early and well known critic of the
public polls. NCPP had been formed as an organization separate from AAPOR to carry out its own work. Many of the individuals involved in both associations remembered the academic-pollster hostility of 1948 and had no desire to see it revived. AAPOR was caught in the middle.

Eventually, Robert Bower, representing the AAPOR Special Committee on Political Polls, succeeded in interesting SSRC in carrying on a study of the role of polling in America’s political life, emphasizing methodology and using the 1948 SSRC study as a model. SSRC wanted a “non-controversial” study, and AAPOR, after the Rossi experience, simply wanted to avoid investigating polls. Bower advised the Executive Council that it should wait to see what SSRC would do before proceeding on its own. By the spring of 1969, and with the understanding of the Executive Council, Bower still had not appointed any members to the Special Committee. SSRC referred the matter to its Committee on Governmental and Public Affairs, chaired by Austin Ranney. That committee, however, would have had to raise the funds to conduct a study, and was not really interested in the original Gallup-Harris dispute that had set off the inquiry.

Bower said that the dispute should still be of concern to AAPOR, but two years after the fact Council was unwilling to spend the time and effort needed to resolve this matter. It was suggested that the Gallup-Harris controversy be the subject of a panel at the next annual conference. Later, members of Council decided that a panel might not be the best way to deal with such an issue, and in any case, Gallup would be out of the country at the time of the conference. As Allen Barton said, “The integrity of researchers should be the subject of thorough investigations rather than public-adversary situations at AAPOR conferences.” Accordingly, AAPOR substituted a general panel entitled “New Directions in Election Research.”

But the Gallup-Harris controversy wasn’t totally forgotten. That 1970 AAPOR conference contained a session called “Toward Responsibility in the Reporting of Opinion Surveys,” at which the misuse of survey information by newspapers, interest groups, and the U.S. government was discussed (Public Opinion Quarterly, 1970:451–52.) Robert Bower’s presidential address pointed out the increasing use of polls in adversarial situations, much as polls had been used to sell products years before (Bower, 1970). (The two worst abusers of polls, he said, were members of Congress and Encyclopedia Britannica salesmen). Mervin Field bemoaned the rise of a “new breed: the part-time pollster and part-time campaign manager.” As he put it, “The mixture
of these two roles will continue to cause problems... [as] the activities of pollsters are still often the widely publicized standard against which the whole research profession is judged. AAPOR members have a right to know more about what pollsters are doing and to set research standards; and they need to become more involved in the process. Pollsters will not be successful if they go off by themselves and insist solely on self-policing methods to cure abuses" (Field, 1970:453–54).

By 1968 polls were an essential ingredient of both Republican and Democratic presidential campaigns, and of state and local elections as well. These campaign polls had become a concern of AAPOR’s over the years because it was commonplace for results from these private polls to be selectively leaked to the press by campaign staffs and to be cited by the candidates in speeches and in press conferences. Lyndon Johnson had been only the first of many presidents who would refer frequently to private polls to support the popularity of his presidency and policies. The problem AAPOR saw in this was that nobody except the candidate and his pollsters (and sometimes not even the candidate) knew who had been sampled, or how many of them, or exactly what questions had been asked.

AAPOR had just gone through a difficult time with the NCPP and the Rossi committee and with at least one highly publicized case of conflicting poll results. It had been warned by Rossi, an influential outsider, and now by Field, a future (1974–75) Standards chair, that it could not allow itself to ignore the way private polls were being reported. AAPOR members had always known that the opinion research profession was intimately tied to the success or failure of the polls, and had to pay attention to what took place in the pollsters’ world.

### The 1970s and 1980s: Activism and Technology

In the late 1940s, with the end of World War II, pollsters were interested in promoting democracy through public opinion research. In 1970, with increasing public debate over the U.S. role in Vietnam, rebellion on many college campuses, and after years of struggle over civil rights, some pollsters again were interested in using their skills to solve global and national problems.

At its 1970 conference, AAPOR founded a new committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on Social Concerns, chaired by Barbara Lee. The one scheduled luncheon round-table on the subject “America in Crisis:
What Can We as Researchers Do?” turned into five. The possibility was raised that AAPOR could serve as a facilitator, aiding its members on issues of social concern. After two meetings, the committee reported to Council two major lines of activity: upgrading the reporting of publicly reported polls, and serving as a clearinghouse for research, keeping track of where specific types of research were being done.

At a Council meeting at which these concerns were raised, the chair of the Standards Committee, Sidney Hollander, noted that the Ad Hoc Committee’s suggestions called for a more positive, affirmative role for AAPOR vis-à-vis public polls, with the Ad Hoc Committee taking up where the Standards Committee left off. The Ad Hoc Committee on Social Concerns had several suggestions for doing just that:

- Improve the standards of reporting of surveys to go beyond the present simplistic single-narrow-issue press releases; AAPOR conference sessions on having a better balance of content of polls; a special issue of POQ on issues concerning social responsibilities; giving awards to research agencies and media which do a superior job of reporting survey findings; sponsorship of seminars for journalists on the implications of survey data; using the back portion of POQ to disseminate more intensive interpretations of poll results; stimulate more recruitment of Negroes and Puerto Ricans into research.

It is not surprising that the Ad Hoc Committee chose to concern itself with polling issues. It had always been the polls and their public presentation that were seen as the most important reflection of public opinion research. When changes were needed attention turned to them. Even a committee whose impetus was the new politics rather than mainstream politics focused on this enduring issue: the role and reporting of the polls.

As Sidney Hollander had reported at the hearings on the Nedzi bill, polls mattered to all survey researchers. He said:

Publicly released polls, the part of public opinion research which is covered by the Nedzi Bill, is a minor part of the work produced by our members. Most of what we do is used for policy setting and decision making by government, by business, by institutions. We study health and educational attitudes and practices; we analyze consumer behavior and test new products; we measure reading, viewing and listening habits and preferences; and we apply attitude and opinion research to innumerable situations and fields of human endeavor.

But the visible tip of the iceberg represented by published polls is by far the most conspicuous and best understood part of our work. There is probably no opinion researcher in this country who has not at some
time referred to the Gallup Poll in explaining his work to a client, employer, student body or lecture audience. We know that our work is best understood, and that our reputations tend to rise and fall, with the credibility of the published political polls.

That is not to say that AAPOR members saw no other way to deal with the politics of the late 1960s and early 1970s except by recourse to old methods and old tools. AAPOR was worried about its own relevance, and the Social Concerns Committee was one manifestation of this. Council members also worried about attracting younger members. So the 1971 conference had a distinct theme: “Public Opinion in a Society under Pressure.” An entire evening session was devoted to Common Cause: how it used research to determine its concerns, how the organization developed, and the content of the concerns of the movement.

But there were inherent limitations to AAPOR’s ability to handle social conflicts and schisms. Just as the 1948 debate could polarize membership between academic and commercial, the issues of the 1970s could polarize membership between liberal and conservative. In fact, Council minutes suggest that concern about this possibility put restrictions on what the Social Concerns Committee could do. A proposed membership questionnaire was rejected by Council on the grounds that it was ideologically unbalanced. Each time the work of the Social Concerns Committee came up for discussion, at least one Council member would express the fear that AAPOR would have difficulty taking action without appearing partisan.

By 1972 the Committee on Social Concerns had become less active, although it was not disbanded until July 1973. Regular standing committees were urged to take on some of its recommendations: POQ to have a special issue on the responsibilities of surveys; the Publications Committee to consider a research seminar for newsmen; the Public Relations Committee to consider an award for an outstanding research effort; and the Standards Committee to consider criticizing poorly worded and designed congressional mail surveys on social issues. Other interests of AAPOR members in social matters were to be coordinated with the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) committee on social concerns, although SPSSI admitted it would not be ready to work with AAPOR for a year or two.

The complexity of the situation in the 1970s can be understood by examining two items of business before the Executive Council in November 1973. Hope Klapper, Chair of the Standards Committee, reported receiving a call from the Associated Press asking for someone
to come and explain what the public should know in order to interpret polls correctly. When she referred the matter to the Public Relations Committee chair, she worried about the lack of AAPOR documents (pamphlets, primers), and AAPOR’s responsibilities in the face of such requests. Second, AAPOR president Harold Mendelsohn raised the potential problems of issue or “interest” polls conducted by organizations that wished to influence public policy by releasing those poll results to the media. Such polls, which would typically address a complex issue by asking a single one-sided question of a less than representative sample, were often treated as plebiscites by the media and reported without qualification. Council worried that such “quickie” polls, whether conducted in ignorance of proper methods or in their deliberate misuse, could lead to a backlash that would discredit all survey research.

The complexities of the 1970s turned AAPOR briefly outward. In line with the standards of disclosure it adopted in 1968, AAPOR cosponsored with NCPP a June 1976 conference on “Polls and the Presidential Election,” in order to educate people in the news media about polling. The conference brought AAPOR back once again to face the issues of 1948 and 1968.

Though political polling represented but a small fraction of the work of its members, poorly conducted or biased polls reflected unfavorably on the whole field of public opinion research. How should AAPOR respond to these polls? Members of Council hoped that this conference would strengthen AAPOR’s educative role. Fortunately for AAPOR’s treasury, its involvement was limited to sponsorship and advice, not money.

Educating the press became a popular (though often unrealized) goal, not just for AAPOR, but for AAPOR’s local chapters. MAPOR (the Midwest chapter) tried to hold a meeting for the press in 1978; but only three persons planned to attend, so it was canceled. AAPOR planned a “Washington event” for the press; not enough people expressed interest and it too was canceled. In the state of Washington and elsewhere, similar sessions were planned in conjunction with newspaper publishers, but documentation of these is lacking.

The 1980 election year raised new concerns about polling and elections. This time, call-in polls and exit polls joined the pre-election polls as targets. AAPOR’s behavior was by now predictable. In 1980, it sent a number of letters to polling organizations (mostly identified with the news media) commenting on poor techniques, especially the use of mail-in ballots by newspapers. Like AAPOR’s letters to organizations that used polls as solicitation devices, these letters (usually from the
Standards Committee chair) sometimes were effective but more often were not.

There was also a new type of poll that would engender concern, not just because it was unrepresentative, but because of its sponsor. It was conducted for a nationwide news organization—the 1980 presidential debate ABC News call-in. The call-in used a “900 number” device provided by AT&T to record the volume of phone calls made to either of two telephone numbers. One number indicated that the caller believed Ronald Reagan had won the debate; the other number was for callers who believed Jimmy Carter had done better. The call-in poll controversy opened up a discussion of pseudo-polls that has continued to the present. AAPOR was forced to react to the new technology, and found that the only institutionally appropriate way it could was through letters of complaint and general attempts at education.

Call-in polls and others like them were pseudo-polls, and could be roundly condemned as failing to meet probability sampling criteria. But technology also led to another type of poll that, while methodologically sound, created what was seen as a more general problem affecting democratic theory and principles. This was the exit poll.

In the 1980 election, at least one network used polls of voters leaving the polling place to report who won the presidential race in certain states, and to determine where to place those states’ electoral college votes. After the election, some people claimed that reporting of results based on exit polls affected turnout in Western states where voting was still in progress. AAPOR worried about this too. At its December, 1980 Council meeting, a motion was passed to have the Conference Committee give serious consideration to two round-tables on the subject of exit polling: one on the methodologies of using polls to call elections, the second on the issue of “what constitutes reasonable release and on the basis of what data.”

Exit polling was a topic at every annual conference through 1984, when a plenary session was held that included the chair of the House committee responsible for legislation on elections, a former president of CBS News, and a civil liberties lawyer who was at that time fighting a court case in Washington State (which he won) against an ordinance restricting the conduct of exit polls. That session was tape-recorded, published in Public Opinion Quarterly (1984), and distributed to AAPOR members and federal and state officials. Its publication was expected, in one councillor’s words, to “position AAPOR as a standard-setter in the industry and serve a public education function. Legislation focused on exit polling is a growing movement and as this issue gains
momentum it raises questions about the regulation of polls, the public release of poll information and the conduct of polls.”

The proliferation of polls in more recent years has both increased and decreased the pressures upon AAPOR to act. Although neither Gallup nor Harris predicted the magnitude of Ronald Reagan’s victory over Jimmy Carter in 1980, there was never any serious move to “investigate” the polls. In 1984, both of these national polls correctly foresaw a Reagan landslide over Walter Mondale. But the “polls” in the 1980s were no longer synonymous with Gallup-Roper-Crossley as they had been forty years earlier, nor with Gallup-Harris as in 1968. The advent of telephone interviewing, aided by random-digit dialing methods to ensure inclusion of unlisted numbers, had brought polling within the resources of almost any political candidate, partisan group, or communications medium, at the state, national, or local level. It was clearly impossible for AAPOR, or anyone else, to investigate every complaint that a poll was biased or poorly executed.

There was a flurry of concern following the 1982 elections, in which a considerable number of local and statewide polls were well off the mark. Both the Los Angeles Times poll and the California Poll showed Thomas Bradley with a 6 or 7 point lead over George Deukmejian in the California gubernatorial election, but Deukmejian won. Four New York state polls all pointed to a 10 point margin for Mario Cuomo, who won by 3 points. In Texas the polls indicated that William Clements led Mark White, but White won by 8 points. In Illinois the polls conceded Governor James Thompson a comfortable edge over Adlai Stevenson III, but the race was so close that it took weeks to confirm that Thompson had won. Burns Roper summarized these results in the Winter 1983 issue of AAPOR News with a lead article headed, “Election Poll Errors: A Problem for Us All.”

By this time, however, both the pollsters themselves and the students of polls were able to move quickly on their own to propose hypotheses about the misleading results and often to test them as causes for the polls’ failures. Scholarly articles in Public Opinion Quarterly analyzed the performance of the 1982 exit polls and the network polls and, both at AAPOR’s annual conferences and at meetings of local AAPOR chapters around the country, methodological issues were intensely discussed. As its name implies, the American Association for Public Opinion Research always has been concerned about polls on public issues that are released into the public domain or made available as part of the public policy process. How actively it has pursued those changes has varied.
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AAPOR members have been particularly concerned with two types of government activity: (1) regulations that limit or interfere with the available options for data collection; and (2) government activities—principally within the Bureau of the Census—that facilitate the practice of survey research. A third type of government activity, government regulation of research as a business, has been a higher priority of industry trade associations than it has been of AAPOR. This chapter discusses some of the more prominent and enduring local, state, and federal government activities and the AAPOR response to them.

A Rare Opportunity for AAPOR Action

Shortly before the 1973 annual conference, President Nixon had nominated as director of the Bureau of the Census Vincent Barabba, described by the press as “a Republican political pollster and press agent” and elsewhere in the same story as having “strong Republican political ties but no professional background” (New York Times, 5/15/73). The Senate had scheduled but had not yet begun confirmation hearings. Many at the conference feared for the integrity of the Census Bureau and saw a political appointee with no relevant experience to be a threat to public opinion research.

At the business meeting that year, Leo Bogart proposed as a resolution that AAPOR express its views on this matter publicly. Others at the business meeting agreed, and the next day, Council put the finishing touches on a letter that read in part:

The integrity and accuracy of Census data are vital to our political and economic systems, and to the practice of public opinion research. It is essential that the Bureau of the Census remain free of political influence

1. In this chapter, the term "government" may refer to local, state, or federal departments or agencies. The context should be clear from the text.
and that it should continue to attract professional personnel of the highest caliber. Its Director must be an individual who can command the respect and confidence of its staff and of users of the Census data...

(Executive Council Minutes, 1973)

Once Council had agreed on the text, members were not comfortable about where and how to disseminate the statement. Eventually, Harold Mendelsohn and Leo Bogart were appointed to distribute the resolution as they saw fit. At the September 1973 meeting of Council, Mendelsohn reported that the AAPOR statement had been read into the record of the confirmation hearings for Census Bureau director, along with statements from other professional organizations.

Despite AAPOR's protest, Barabba was confirmed. Still, the incident is of historical importance. It illustrates what has proved to be an uncommon occurrence: the opportunity for a large proportion of members to express themselves on an important and pressing issue. It also demonstrates how ineffectual AAPOR has been as an interest group in Washington. AAPOR has generally been more effective when taking the initiative itself, such as developing a code of standards and procedures for their implementation—and less effective when responding to government actions.

Barabba, it should be noted, was an effective Census Bureau director. He served from 1973 through 1976 and agreed to return to the Bureau for a second term from 1979 to 1981 to oversee the 1980 Decennial Census.

Professional Society
Compared with Trade Association

Regulation and oversight by local, state, and federal governments has been a reality for survey research almost from the start. However, industry trade associations—e.g., the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO), and the Marketing Research Association (MRA)—have spent more time and energy attempting to shape and monitor government regulation than has AAPOR. Partly because regulations are written to have an impact on companies rather than on individuals, industry trade groups—unlike AAPOR—support paid staffs, such as association managers and assistants, tax specialists, and attorneys on the staff or on retainer. These staffs make sure that members do not lose interest in pending legislation, and one of their main
purposes is to anticipate and respond to perceived regulatory threats. In an industry association, the staff is there to create a positive business climate for members, and a successful staff is one that can show members both vigilance and victories in dealing with governmental threats to their well-being. AAPOR has no such staff.

There has been relatively little government interference in survey research. As individuals, public opinion researchers have not been preoccupied with government regulation of their work. And for research organizations, government demands are certainly no more of a burden than what the government requires of other enterprises. (When researchers become managers, their main preoccupation with government becomes the same as that of managers of any other business or institution: taxes and conditions of employment.) Whether we are thinking of AAPOR or of a survey research industry association, the threat of regulation has been more compelling than the reality. Council minutes document that AAPOR’s response to perceived regulatory threat has often followed this pattern: an initial expression of concern, the appointment of a committee to investigate, and then a waning of interest, with renewed attention whenever the same potential threat again becomes salient.

From the first “Green River” ordinance of 1931 (discussed later in this chapter) to the “junk” phone call bills of 1988, the targets of government regulation have nearly always been some other and substantially different activities than public opinion research. However, the continuing need for overtures to strangers makes public opinion research vulnerable to any legislation intended to protect the privacy and security of individuals. Because public opinion researchers usually rely on a network of interviewers who work part-time and at a distance from company offices, they are effectively in the same category as the businesses that are the main targets of tax and labor law legislation. Thus, over the years, there has been proposed or enacted legislation at all levels of government that could limit the data collection options for public opinion researchers. The purpose of such legislation has principally been the protection of an individual’s right to privacy.

Public opinion research has typically collected data by interviews, most of them face-to-face until 1980, and lately more by telephone. Public opinion interviews almost always require interviewers and respondents to be persons who were not previously known to each other. Some prospective interviewees may regard the request for an interview or the content of an interview as unwelcome intrusions on their time or on their privacy.
In the context of survey research, the legal protection of an individual’s right to privacy has been expressed in several ways: for example, restrictions on visiting households, limits on telephone interviews, or setting the maximum interview duration. The author believes that regulation to protect the privacy of the individual has so far had little impact on the quality or the cost of research findings. Regulation to protect privacy has been, almost without exception, intended as a remedy for something other than the practice of public opinion research. In fact, by usually not being the main object of an executive order or a bill in a state legislature, the survey research industry is not likely to be among the first to learn of a potential threat to its well-being. (A principal industry trade association, CASRO, has paid special attention to what is happening in state legislatures in order to identify unwanted actions.) At the same time, such regulation is not welcome to public opinion researchers because it certainly offers no added benefits to research and occasionally may have been a deterrent to it.

Another area of government regulation is more of an industry issue than a professional one: the treatment of part-time interviewers, for tax and labor law purposes, as independent contractors rather than employees of the organization that engages them. The employment status of interviewers is discussed later in this chapter.

Regulation by Localities

Cities and towns were the first government entities to deny interviewers access to households. A now famous ordinance enacted by the town of Green River, Wyoming, in 1931 has become the basis for a genre of legislation. Between 1935 and 1939, Green River legislation was the model for similar restrictive acts in over 400 communities (Reynolds, 1983).

The original measure, and those that followed, specified criminal penalties for door-to-door peddling, or taking orders for merchandise, without the prior consent of the owners or occupants. The Green River text applied to “solicitors, peddlers, hawkers, [and] itinerant merchants.” Local authorities have stretched the language of the Green River type of bill to include survey research interviewers.  

2. In the private sector, a more recent development with the same consequences has been the increasing number of controlled-access apartment buildings. In a 1982 national survey, Response Analysis Corporation found that 7 percent of a national sample of households were living in a controlled-access building.
Although there continues to be a legal question about the validity of punishment for solicitation or for creating a "nuisance" (the two anchors for Green River type of legislation), Green River ordinances have been upheld many times and even in instances where local legislation has been contrary to state law. In localities that have blanket ordinances restricting solicitation, interviewing for public opinion research is permitted—if at all—as an exception to such ordinances. The courts in these communities have also made exceptions for some religious or veterans groups. A test seems to have been whether exceptions still leave intact the original intent of the legislation—to protect citizens from danger (Reynolds, 1983).

**AAPOR Concern and Initiatives Regarding Access to Survey Respondents**

From the start, AAPOR recognized that the prevention of restrictions on access to respondents was its proper business, and there has been no question at any time about AAPOR's point of view: there should always be unhindered opportunities for legitimate interviewing. This position has been justified as a professional and business concern, and also as a matter of civil liberties (minutes, 1971 annual business meeting).

Until the mid to late 1970s, face-to-face, in-home interviewing was the predominant source of data for public opinion research. Thus, any attempt to limit door-to-door interviewing has been a salient topic among AAPOR members. The first notice in Council minutes of such an initiative was in March 1956, when Robert Bower, Public Relations Chair, "reported on banning of survey interviewers in Rye, New York." Minutes of the 1966 business meeting show that Bruce Neal, in making his report as Standards chair, "called membership's attention to a proposed Oregon law which would require interviewers to explain the survey's purpose to respondents in thirty seconds." Three years later, the minutes from the business meeting in May 1969 note that "there was some discussion of the possible need for joint activity by the Market Research Trade Association [later renamed the Marketing Research Association], the American Marketing Association, and AAPOR, in determining the local restrictions on survey activity." Early the follow-

---

3. Much of the information in this section was supplied by Sidney Hollander during his research for the chapter in this book dealing with AAPOR and survey standards.
ing year at Council, "it was voted that Hollander [then Standards chair] prepare a draft of a memo to AAPOR members asking them to report on instances of ordinances restricting interviewing . . ."

Early in 1971, a member asked for AAPOR assistance in connection with a municipality imposing a restriction on interviewers. The Standards Committee included the following in its report to the membership at the 1971 conference:

An urgent and immediate instance arose a few months ago when a Pulse interviewer was arrested in Collingswood, New Jersey for violating a local ordinance restricting door-to-door activity which specifically includes survey interviewers along with salesmen and others who must be registered and their hours restricted. Sidney Roslow of Pulse has asked financial and legal help in carrying this to the Supreme Court if necessary and to this end his lawyer has agreed with the prosecutor on a set of stipulations under which the interviewer was found guilty by a local magistrate. We are awaiting further information from Pulse’s lawyer on the legal issues, but Council has not decided whether to accede to Roslow’s request for financial aid. It is clearly in our interest to have a test case presented most favorably, but there is a question whether AAPOR should use its treasury—meaning your dues—for this purpose. Your opinions are solicited.

The minutes of the 1971 business meeting also include an expression of hope that AAPOR would do more to fight local ordinances that hamper or prohibit interviewing. At that meeting, President Baxter said that AAPOR would be glad to file a friend-of-the-court brief in any such cases. (However, as far as the author can determine, AAPOR did not participate with Pulse in its protest.)

AAPOR records for the early 1970s indicate continuing attention to restrictions imposed on residential face-to-face interviewers. It is not clear whether such concerns were fueled by specific incidents or by AAPOR acting for the general good of its membership. In the spring of 1973, Hope Klapper, then chair of the Standards Committee, called a meeting of representatives of several organizations “to look into problems of access, and possibly broadening the scope to include restrictions caused by (1) ordinances and regulations; (2) fear, on the part of both interviewer and respondent; (3) abuse of the survey approach by salesmen.” Neither record nor recollection confirms that such a meeting was held. Again, early in 1973, AAPOR’s president, Sidney Hollander, obtained from the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers a copy of its "Model Ordinance on Peddlers," which provided a means
of licensing vendors while clearly excluding survey research interviewers.

**Consequences of Reduced Access: Lower Response Rates**

Council minutes and other records that reflect an increasing AAPOR concern over local restrictions on interviewing seem to parallel a continuing decline in response rates, first observed in the mid-1960s. At that time, interviewers were becoming progressively less willing to work in what they perceived as dangerous urban neighborhoods. There were also fewer and fewer daytime doorbells answered, as the proportion of working women continued to increase. By the mid-1970s, the facts of increased difficulty in gaining access to respondents had become institutionalized: decreasing response rates had become an accepted reality. Personal interviewer surveys conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan provide useful data. The National Election Studies and the Survey of Consumer Attitudes show an increase in nonresponse of 18 and 13 percentage points respectively from the early 1950s through the late 1970s (Steeh, 1981).

By 1975, the disappointing performance of interviewers (and the field services that supervised them) were often reported without apology or explanation, as though there were no possible remedies. As by James Davis has written, (1987): “Declining cooperation is a myth that functions as an alibi for complacency in field effort.” More and more research organizations accepted reduced access to respondents as irreversible. Private and academic organizations that utilized area probability sampling found that it was costing them more to achieve acceptable response rates. Often their solution was to maintain the rhetoric of area sampling, while actually doing sample implementation in creative—but less credible—ways. For example, sample locations continued to be specified (i.e., down to the block level) but interviewers were allowed substantial control over respondent selection. Some organizations began weighting those at home to compensate for the non-at-homes.

It took a federal government executive order in 1976, specifying a minimum response rate of 70 percent on many types of contracted surveys for the federal government, to demonstrate that when the need exists, research companies and field services are indeed capable of achieving higher response rates.
Overall Effects of Restrictive Ordinances on Survey Research

The Green River ordinance illustrates an earlier observation that regulating the practice of public opinion research has rarely been a primary objective of restrictive legislation. The “junk phone call” bills that are the Green Rivers of the 1970s and 1980s are likewise intended to regulate activities other than survey research. Thus, CASRO, and the law firm it retains, have been successful in some states where junk phone call legislation is pending, by contacting appropriate legislators in these states, explaining the potential unintended damage to the practice of survey research, and offering text for a bill that excludes survey research interviewers from the intent of the legislation.

It is impossible to estimate the effect on research reliability, findings, or costs of this fifty-year (or longer) attempt in some localities to restrict “solicitor” access to households. The logic that there must have been some observable damage is unaccompanied by information on the degree of success of such ordinances in impeding interviewers from completing their assignments. By and large, Green River ordinances have been inconvenient, but not deterrents to the satisfactory conduct of studies that depend on interviews.

Today, the protection of privacy from unwanted telephone calls has supplemented—but not replaced—earlier concerns about restricting interviewer access to households. Local ordinances had the earliest impact on public opinion research, and have continued through to the present. However, along with more emphasis on regulating solicitation by telephone, there has also been a shift away from local legislation and toward state and federal regulation. This is the subject of the next section.

State and Federal Regulation

States and the federal government have been increasingly active during the past fifteen years in protecting individuals from unwanted intrusion in the forms of telephone solicitation to households for goods,

4. See also Albert E. Gollin’s “A Review of Legal Initiatives Aimed at Restricting Research in the United States,” published by the New York chapter of AAPOR in 1985. (A full citation is provided in the reference list that concludes Gollin’s chapter in this history concerning AAPOR and the media).
services, charitable contributions, and the like; and from the "burden" of supplying information to government agencies. Research has been among the targets of federal government measures aimed at reducing respondent burden. The contract and grant programs of state and federal agencies account for millions of interviews annually, conducted by commercial, academic, and other nonprofit survey research organizations. Government-sponsored surveys usually exercise control over interviewers' behavior through "specifications" concerning the way that the work is accomplished. In addition, there are several aspects of research as business that are regulated by federal and state governments. Examples include classification of interviewers for tax and labor law purposes, and the requirement (sporadically enforced) that research companies be subject to state income tax in states where they conduct interviews.

In recent years, the survey research industry has been most concerned about one legislative issue at the state level: telephone calls for solicitation purposes, and their consequences for the conduct of legitimate surveys. In December 1986, Diane Bowers, executive director of CASRO, addressed a conference of the American Marketing Association on the topic, "Survey Research and Legislation: A Look Back and a Look Ahead." During the past eight years, Bowers has become an authority on the legislative problems that threaten the business of research. She reported the following activity in state legislatures during 1986:

- Thirteen bills were introduced that would regulate telephone solicitation for sales purposes. ⁵
- Sixteen bills were proposed to regulate unsolicited calls that use automatic dialing devices or recorded message players.
- Seven bills would restrict unsolicited calls to individuals who do not wish to receive them.

---

⁵ An example of this type of legislation is the Florida "asterisk law," which became effective in October of 1987. Telephone customers may have an asterisk beside their listing in the phone book. The asterisk means "No Solicitation Calls," and legally bars unsolicited sales calls to these numbers. The Florida law extends even to telephone customers who do not choose to use the asterisk to screen their calls: solicitors who call must identify themselves and their messages immediately, and must ask within thirty seconds if the recipient wants to continue to hear the sales presentation.

The CASRO attorney provided some text for the bill that should exempt telephone interviewers from the effects of the law. I am grateful to Ms. Bowers and the CASRO office for this and other information on legislation.
A final group of bills would restrict the calling time of day for unsolicited calls.

Some of these bills were not acted on and are no longer pending. Some of the others include language ("for sales purposes only") that indirectly exempts research, and in one state, Washington, a telephone solicitation bill was passed during 1986 that explicitly exempts survey research interviewing.\footnote{6}

As is illustrated by this account of the current regulatory climate for research practitioners, the "Green Rivers" will be with us in one form or another as long as there are privacy norms for social behavior; as long as the self-interest of particular groups—e.g., door-to-door salespersons—results in such norms being frequently disregarded; and as long as the practice of survey research appears to be another way in which such norms can be violated.

The Employment Status of Interviewers

Research organizations and government agencies (the Departments of Treasury and Labor) continue to disagree about the appropriate labor category and tax treatment of some interviewers. During the past decade, since telephone interviewing has become a principal method of data collection, the industry has found more justification for classifying its interviewers as company employees. Even now, however, there are substantial numbers of interviewers who do not report for work to a company facility and whose work day is not controlled by a company supervisor. It is those individuals whose employment and tax status is in dispute. The instances noted below of AAPOR attention to the employment status of interviewers: 1955, 1968, and 1975, occurred during a period characterized by face-to-face, in-home data collection, when interviewers typically worked part-time, may have interviewed for more than one research company during the same day, and adjusted their working hours to their convenience as well as to their responsibilities.

\footnote{6}{Subsequent correspondence with the CASRO office suggests that in recent years there has been even more concern about telephone solicitation in the state legislatures: In both 1987 and 1988, the CASRO office followed over 60 bills, CASRO monitored about 80 such bills. As of 1990, nearly two-thirds of the state legislatures have introduced bills to regulate telephone solicitation calls for sales purposes, some explicitly including provisions to limit the conduct of survey research. (Source: May 29, 1990 private correspondence from Diane Bowers, Executive Director of CASRO).}
Early in 1955, Robert Carlson reported to AAPOR Council, and later to the membership, that he had met several times with representatives of the New York State Employment Service. Carlson’s purpose was to “assist in formulating criteria for the selection and classification of persons seeking work as attitude and research interviewers” (minutes, annual business meeting of 1955). This report is the first recorded instance of AAPOR attention to the employment status of interviewers.

In 1968, when Sidney Hollander was Standards chair, he reported a request from an AAPOR member, Herbert Kay,

...that AAPOR write a letter to the Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor, stating that survey interviewers are...paid, independent contractors, not employees...Council authorized Hollander to write [such] a letter.

In 1975, the IRS ruled that for payroll and tax purposes, interviewers are classified as employees and not as independent contractors. In response to this ruling, interested organizations responded in different ways. The Market Research Association (MRA), most of whose members specialize in data collection, organized a task force and looked for support among other interested organizations, including AAPOR. At the AAPOR Council meeting, Vice-President Irving Crespi reported the MRA initiative and advised Council not to join in this activity, “since it is essentially a business and not a professional matter.” At the same meeting, Mervin Field moved that Council ask MRA “for clarification of what they wanted from AAPOR,” and the motion carried.

Later Council minutes do not include any further information about participating with MRA.

In response to the 1975 IRS ruling, the chair of the then recently founded CASRO, Sanford Cooper, appointed an ad hoc committee to review the history of the payroll status of interviewers, and recommend a policy for the organization. Cooper also engaged a labor law attorney to prepare a statement for CASRO members. The committee’s recommendation, when it came, took into account the “safe harbor” provisions of the IRS statement and recommended challenges to the ruling under specified conditions.

Of these three organizations, the more vigorous responses were from the two trade associations, MRA and CASRO, for whom the IRS ruling was a bread and butter issue because all members of both of these associations are businesses, whose costs are directly affected by the IRS classification of interviewers.

The issue of whether interviewers are employees or are contractors is no longer the concern that it once was. The issue was most salient as
long as most data collection called for interviewers to work away from their employers' facilities, on their own schedules, and with no direct supervision. These employment characteristics are associated primarily with "door-to-door" interviewing, which has been a steadily decreasing part of data collection during the past decade. The two interviewing modes that have accounted for an even larger part of data collection in the 1980s are interviews by telephone and central location interviewing. The latter are face-to-face interviews in shopping malls or other high-traffic areas. Typically, an interviewing company is located on the premises, and has an arrangement by which it is the only company permitted to interview in the area. In both telephone and central location interviewing, there is no question about interviewer status: interviewers are employees who work on company premises, whose schedule is controlled, and whose work is directly supervised.

Relations With the Federal Government

While restrictive laws enacted or proposed by state and local authorities have been seen to affect the practice and the business of public opinion research, a more complex relationship has evolved between survey research and the federal government: not just regulation, but reciprocity. Each party has valued the other as a resource: the government calling on the findings of public opinion research and the views of its practitioners to inform government policy and legislation; and public opinion research utilizing government-sponsored information to assist in the conduct and interpretation of surveys.

A second distinction between state/local and federal relationships to research is that state and local government initiatives, whether regulating employment, taxation, or marketing practices, have been positioned against companies who market through large numbers of sales representatives, paid on commission, who sell door-to-door or in group gatherings in households and through direct marketing by telephone. Research companies were and still are mostly unintended tar-

---

7. Although there has been a decreasing proportion of door-to-door interviews compared with the alternatives described in the next paragraph, there are still a substantial proportion of studies with federal government and other sponsors that require in-home interviews, with households and respondents selected by area probability sample designs. A number of research organizations, both private sector and university-based, continue to train and supervise staffs of interviewers for residential interviewing.
gets of such legislation. However, some of the most influential of federal government actions—establishing and monitoring performance standards—have been those directed specifically at the practice of survey research.

The role of the federal government as research monitor grew out of its role as a sponsor of enormous amounts of survey research. The federal government has become a principal source of support for survey research in academic settings, and a significant part of the revenues of some survey research companies.  

Before elaborating on the federal government as regulator, resource, and monitor, this account must acknowledge a prolonged episode of uncertainty and distrust between the federal government and its constituents, growing out of the anticommunist hysteria that followed World War II. At the time, AAPOR members were hardly alone in experiencing threats to individual security and intellectual freedom. But the effect on AAPOR members was profound.

Security and Intellectual Freedom

During the McCarthy era, AAPOR and its members were deeply concerned with issues of intellectual freedom. Some were active defendants against charges or innuendos of disloyalty, while others were sympathetic, outraged, and/or intimidated.

AAPOR’s first confrontation with security matters concerned a survey researcher named Laszlo Radvanyi. Radvanyi, Hungarian by birth and citizenship, was director of the Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion. As Herb Hyman remembered it, Radvanyi “came out of nowhere” to attended the 1946 conference in Central City, Colorado, at which AAPOR was founded, and became a member of the new association. He returned to Mexico, and in time published three volumes

8. Although various World War II federal agencies (the Office of War Information, Office of Price Administration, etc.) contracted for survey research services, Peggy Weidenhamer cites the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 as a basis for modern research sponsorship by the federal government. The Department of Agriculture made its first research awards in the late 1940s. There was enough federal government activity by the early 1950s to warrant an executive order establishing a mechanism for the review of sample designs and data collection plans for federal government contracts to research companies, implemented by the Bureau of the Budget (later OMB). A big boost to government-sponsored survey research came in the 1960s, with the evaluation studies that were a part of the Johnson administration Great Society programs in education, job training, health, and the delivery of economic and social services.

After AAPOR had invited Radvanyi to attend the 1949 conference, President Elmo (Budd) Wilson learned that the U.S. State Department would probably not grant him a visa, and that AAPOR would then have to decide whether to make an appeal in his behalf. The State Department informed Wilson that the rejection was “ideological” but refused further comment.

At Council in April 1949, Paul Sheatsley moved and Hyman seconded that Wilson first find out if Radvanyi intended to apply for a visa, and if so, that Wilson be empowered to enter an appeal if the visa were denied. Council approved “without dissent.” The minutes record Sheatsley’s observation that the ideological beliefs of a member have nothing to do with his competence or the contribution he was expected to make to a scientific meeting. As it happened, Radvanyi declined the invitation (Sheatsley, private communication).

Within a few years, the academic community felt the repressive impact of “McCarthyism,” and every AAPOR member during the 1950s was acquainted with colleagues whose careers, research interests, and personal wellbeing had been disrupted by charges of disloyalty to the government. The tardy, drawn-out discussion and the seeming reluctance of Council to take a stand on the issue of intellectual freedom—long after other organizations had publicly asserted themselves—is more than puzzling; it borders on the bizarre. Why was AAPOR unwilling to support the values of most of its members?

The record picks up again in April of 1954, when outgoing president Samuel Stouffer recommended that Council make a systematic inquiry into “present problems of research in government, including both the attitudes of high-level government officials toward research and the security and other problems faced by researchers themselves.”

To look into the feasibility of Stouffer’s recommendation, incoming President George Gallup was to ask Elmo Roper to chair a provisional committee to determine whether there should be such an inquiry. Herbert Hyman, Samuel Stouffer, and Jack Riley volunteered to serve as members.

Minutes of Council meetings in June and again in November of 1954 show that the same issue came up each time and that Gallup still had not appointed a provisional committee. In late January 1955, Council again discussed what the minutes now refer to as a “proposed committee on scientific freedom.” At that time, Council agreed that AA-
POR should issue a formal statement of its stand on academic freedom. Gallup agreed to ask Elmo Roper to chair an ad hoc committee, including Gallup and Stouffer, to prepare such a statement. The statement was to be presented for a membership vote at the annual conference three months later.

At the conference, in April 1955, events were different from what Council had approved in January. The committee was actually chaired by Archibald Crossley, not Roper. In Crossley’s lengthy report, he described himself as “a one-man ad hoc committee to obtain and report data about security investigations.” Crossley’s report was based on interviews with AAPOR members, and with government officials. Crossley said he had also assembled as much other information as time permitted. Among the conclusions to his report, Crossley suggested that the new Council, or a committee appointed by Council, “keep in touch with the situation, and recommend to the membership, if and when it sees fit, any appropriate action that should be taken by the Association.”

Crossley made no reference to a committee on academic freedom, nor to any statement of an AAPOR position being brought to a vote of the membership. Is this an instance of Council putting off the need to take a controversial position? Does this reflect an association badly divided over the issues? Or perhaps Gallup simply procrastinated, and it would be a mistake to read anything profound into his delays. At any rate, these academic freedom issues gave AAPOR a rare opportunity—a time of crises—to support the values of most of its members. Unfortunately, the Association did not “show up” when it was needed.

**AAPOR and Congress**

In their fascination with and intimidation by public opinion research, their appreciation of opinion research as a resource, and their vindictiveness over the published results of polls that may have unfavorably affected their election campaigns, many members of Congress—particularly in the House—have introduced legislation about public opinion research. None of this legislation was ever brought to a floor vote.

Following is a sample of such legislation that has concerned Council.

**Hagen: Polls for policy.** In April of 1953, Harry Alpert reported to Council that Congressman Harold Hagen of Minnesota had introduced a bill “providing for voluntary questioning of qualified voters of
each State to aid the federal government in the formulation of policy.” Alpert made the same report at the annual business meeting the following month. Council resolved that the AAPOR president appoint one or more members to meet with Congressman Hagen to discuss with him “alternative means of achieving his goal.” Ray Robinson of the Washington AAPOR chapter did meet with Mr. Hagen, and then advised Council that AAPOR should do nothing, since the bill would most likely die in committee. It did.

Nedzi: Truth-in-polling. Congressman Lucien Nedzi of Michigan introduced a bill in February 1971 providing that “whoever conducts a public opinion poll relating to any election for Federal office or to any political issue the results of which are intended to be disseminated to the public shall, no later than seventy-two hours after the first dissemination . . . file with the Librarian of Congress the following information . . .”

In an account of this legislation, Sidney Hollander points out that the text of the bill then cites eight items, most of them corresponding to the AAPOR code’s “Standards for Minimal Disclosure.” Hollander goes on, “Because of this close similarity, Council passed the following resolution at a subsequent meeting that year:

Be it resolved that AAPOR supports legislation consistent with AAPOR’s Standards of Disclosure.”

The motion passed. Hollander draws two conclusions from the incident: that Council did not object to legislation that regulated a part of the polling process, as long as it was consistent with AAPOR standards; and second, that Council did not want to pass judgment on Nedzi’s bill.

Leo Bogart recalls that Nedzi appeared at an AAPOR Conference to defend his proposed legislation, at the invitation of Sidney Hollander, Leo adds: “Sid Hollander invited him, picked him up at the airport, and treated him very well.”

Nedzi and AAPOR had more to do with each other than in AAPOR’s other brushes with Congress: the following year, Nedzi held hearings on his bill. Hollander, then AAPOR president, and Robert Bower, an AAPOR past president and at the time president of the National Council on Public Polls (NCP), both testified. The bill apparently was not reported out of committee.

Goodell: A “Polls Procedure Disclosure Act.” This bill would have enabled a candidate whose contest was the subject of a published
poll to require publication of the procedures used by the poll (Congressional Record, 1970). The bill was introduced the month after Senator Charles Goodell (New York) had lost his Senate seat, a circumstance forecast by the New York Daily News pre-election polls that fall. Goodell complained to AAPOR about the procedural weaknesses of the Daily News polls, but AAPOR took no action. Congress did not act on the bill.

**Murphy: A congressional office for polling.** In 1974, Congressman Morgan Murphy of Illinois introduced a “Voluntary Public Opinion Act.” The intent of this ambitious bill was not only to improve the quality of congressional polling of constituents, its main purpose, but also to make the procedures for such polls a standard for all political polling. Congressman Murphy sent a copy of the bill to AAPOR. At the August 1974 Council meeting, Standards Chair Mervin Field suggested that the motivation for much constituent polling is less a search for truth than a device for supporting a congressman’s position. In this light, the proposed legislation seemed a bit naive. In a reply to Congressman Murphy, President Herbert Abelson offered AAPOR’s assistance to strengthen the bill, and suggested convenient mechanisms for AAPOR participation. AAPOR heard no more about the bill. If its motives were genuine, its time had not come.

Several times over the years, Council minutes record discussions about assistance that AAPOR could be giving to legislators. For example, in January 1973, in connection with government action on social issues, Laure Sharp emphasized the need for Congress to have relevant survey findings available. Ira Cisin called on AAPOR to facilitate getting survey findings to legislators. Richard Baxter went further: he saw AAPOR as able to offer legislators names of experts in particular fields.

In 1973, Council approved a one-day workshop in Washington for congressional aides and candidates for office. A committee consisting of Robert Bower, Ira Cisin, Phill Davison, Reuben Cohen, and Herbert Abelson met in Princeton, organized the tasks, and went to work. (Leo Bogart was also due at the meeting in Princeton, but his new car broke down on the turnpike.) Bower at that time was president of the NCPP, which had been formed by AAPOR members who regularly conducted polls that were used by the media.

The workshop did not materialize. At Council late in 1973, Bower explained that legislative assistants could not afford the fee, and the National Science Foundation would not support the workshop. In fact,
the first successful workshop of this type was sponsored by the NCPP about ten years later. AAPOR had recognized the need, but at this time was not able to satisfy it.

**Statistical Resources for Research**

The federal government, principally through the Bureau of the Census, has been a source of information for sampling statisticians, and a pioneer in the development of survey research methods to improve sampling, analysis, and quality control of sample surveys. The Bureau periodically collects data on population characteristics, which are essential to many aspects of the design and conduct of public opinion research.

AAPOR has consistently supported initiatives to maintain and strengthen the Bureau of the Census as an independent and vital agency of the government. Among AAPOR activities:

- In 1957, AAPOR representation, through Cisin, on the National Council Planning the Decennial Census.
- In 1967, formal protest against the Betts Bill (HR10952), which would have limited the number of questions on the 1970 census. (At Council in 1969, Robert Bower reported that congressmen had introduced over fifty bills to limit some aspect of the 1970 Census.)
- President Raymond Bauer's appointment, in 1967, of Al Biderman as AAPOR representative on the U.S. Census Advisory Group, to assist in the planning of the decennial Census and interim studies.
- Since 1979, AAPOR participation in the Committee of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS), composed of delegates from a number of organizations whose members use federal statistics. President Cohen cited that COPAFS “plans to report activities of the Federal government related to statistical data collection and to appraise and assess federal statistics programs.”

**Federal Performance Standards**

Since 1952, the federal government has implemented standards of performance for survey research. Such standards apply to research con-
tracts of those agencies that operate within the Executive Office of the President. Only contracts (i.e., not research grants) are reviewed. At the June 1952 business meeting, Harry Alpert informed the membership that the Bureau of the Budget had published “Statistical Standards for Government Surveys,” available from the Government Printing Office. Since that time, the Bureau of the Budget (later reorganized as the Office of Management and Budget) has reviewed research designs and questionnaires of Federal government contractors prior to the start of data collection.

A White House Executive Order in 1976, derived from the Federal Reports Act of that year, enlarged on the OMB mandate. At Council in October of 1976, President Irving Crespi reported that the “White House has ordered a 10 percent cut in the number of forms that citizens are required to fill out... this includes government-supported surveys.” The new Executive Order added response rate requirements and other data quality standards to the OMB review process.

In her 1984 AAPOR presidential address, Laure Sharp suggested that “the Federal government has taken a number of actions in recent years which assumed that respondents needed to be protected from the survey takers.” After acknowledging the many factors that have increased the difficulty of achieving satisfactory response rates (e.g., fewer persons at home and available; interviewer fear of crime), Sharp observed that the federal government has strongly influenced the climate for conducting surveys in the 1980s by its emphasis on respondent burden.

Sharp saw the relatively new practice of paying respondents for their time as a symptom of this changing climate, and later explained:

But I think that the main reason why the research community has become defensive in its dealings with the public and no longer operates on the assumption that most Americans will voluntarily participate in surveys is the Federal government’s emphasis on reduction of respondent burden, defined only in terms of interview length.

Thus she suggests a new construct around surveys: researchers imposing a burdensome task on respondents, with interviewers as their agents. This author agrees with Ms. Sharp that “there is no supporting evidence for the... claim that the growing length of survey instru-

---

ments, proliferation of surveys, and too frequent requests for survey participation have led to greater unwillingness on the part of respondents to participate in surveys” (Sharp, 1984).

Discussion

An examination of four decades of minutes from Council and from annual conferences has shown that AAPOR interest in the climate of regulation has been high, but also shows that there has been a lot of talk and relatively little action. The AAPOR charter, its form of organization, and the priorities of its members determined from the start that AAPOR would address some issues better than others. The circumstances did not favor AAPOR effectiveness in dealing with government regulation.

The following explanations are suggested for the lack of activity in this area:

AAPOR is not organized to do much about government initiatives. The capacity to act on short notice, in a timely manner, and with appropriate information, is usually a requirement of effectiveness in influencing legislation. The limited number of Council meetings and the authority structure established by the by-laws are not conducive to an active AAPOR role in influencing proposed legislation or executive orders.

With an AAPOR central office whose activities are limited to membership mailing and dues collection; with all decision-making authority vested in the Council (and little in the officers or membership); and with Council meetings spaced throughout the year for convenience in handling the society’s business, there is no way that AAPOR could be particularly effective in influencing the actions of government.

AAPOR represents individuals, not organizations. AAPOR has always been a source of professional identity, and a forum for persons with common professional interests. AAPOR thus represents the interests of members as individuals. Most of the effects of government regulation are not as high a priority of individuals as they are of companies and institutions that manage contracts and grants.

The interests of AAPOR members overlap but are by no means identical. Different membership segments want AAPOR to utilize its resources in different ways. The common professional interests of members are largely the methodology and techniques and standards of public opinion research. And even within these areas of interest, there
are differences between members who conduct research and those who use research. When it comes to government regulation of research, we are hardly energized by the same things, and some of us are not energized at all. The segmented AAPOR membership gives AAPOR richness and diversity of views, but dissipates energy that in other circumstances could be mobilized to influence government.

Political action is specifically excluded from the AAPOR charter. The only formal reference to an interaction between AAPOR and the government is in the certificate of incorporation: “No substantial part of AAPOR’s activities shall be devoted to attempting to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise.”

Other voices. For many years AAPOR was the only spokesman for public opinion research. Currently, three other organizations—whose interests are generally consistent with AAPOR’s—monitor and attempt to influence government activities that affect survey research. These are CASRO, whose membership is composed of “full service research” companies; the NCPP, whose member organizations conduct polls for publication and for broadcasting; and the MRA, most of whose members specialize in data collection services. With respect to government regulation, these associations have overlapping interests with AAPOR, and in conducting their own business they satisfy many of the needs of AAPOR members. The very existence of these trade associations emphasizes the uniqueness of AAPOR as a professional society, and permits AAPOR to better attend to what it was established to do, and what it does well.

If AAPOR were to be organized now instead of some forty-plus years ago, would it provide mechanisms for surveillance and response to legislation that are more like those of trade associations? Probably not. The social and political issues that push the limits of survey research methodology, the increasing reliance on findings from public opinion studies in every sector of society, and the need for the profession to have a public identity, all continue to pose new challenges to AAPOR just as they did when it was founded.
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The linkages between public opinion research and the press have been close and continuous. The earliest political theorists and writers on public opinion invariably made the press a central element in their analyses as mirrors or shapers of elite or mass sentiments that had political importance. Decades before the “modern” era of opinion research began to take shape, newspapers and magazines often acted as largely uncritical channels for and sometime practitioners of what Frederick Stephan, a Princeton University social scientist and past president of AAPOR, once termed “primitive opinion surveys,” because of their presumed human-interest appeal to readers. “Man in the street” interviews and horse race reporting based on straw polls supplemented the then-conventional sources of political wisdom: party officials, pundits, and local editors.

Press treatment of subsequent political and opinion polls built upon these early practices. The pioneering work over several decades by the Literary Digest (prior to its disastrously wrong 1936 election prediction), the Fortune polls by Elmo Roper, and the Gallup syndicated newspaper polls (initiated in 1935) illustrate the key sponsorship role played by the press in the evolution of polling prior to World War II (Converse, 1987).

When AAPOR was first organized, therefore, it was hardly accidental that pollsters and market researchers working for or in media (print and broadcast) organizations were among its founding members. At Central City, for example, in addition to those who did news polls or market and media research for the national media (e.g., Life, Reader’s Digest, CBS, and NBC), there were directors of three state polls sponsored by local newspapers, as well as others with news polling or public relations responsibilities. Three of the conference’s panels dealt with issues in press-polling relationships: one on technical and ethical standards (it called for “good polling practices and high standards of reporting” to the public); one on local survey problems (with reports by directors of the Iowa, Texas, and Minnesota polls); and one on news-
paper research (with a focus on survey applications to readership issues). Thus, whether one considers the long history of public opinion studies or the narrower time span covered by AAPOR's existence as a professional association, the mass media have always played a central role.

Reporting the Polls: The Struggle for Disclosure Standards

One thread that winds through the history of AAPOR's efforts to promote professionalism in the conduct of surveys and greater public understanding of opinion research is the struggle to achieve reporting of poll results that is full, accurate, and readily understood. This objective was only one aspect of the broader goal of promoting high standards of professional conduct, both ethically and technically. But its scope was constrained by the fact that in the early years of polling the data were mostly proprietary. Dissemination of survey results was the prerogative of the press or other private research sponsors. Yet, as the Central City pioneers clearly recognized, the future status of public opinion research (including market research) was going to be significantly affected by how polling and survey data were treated by the media. Gallup, for example, asked subscribers to his syndicated polling feature to print it verbatim. But editorial discretion was widely exercised in handling poll results. Not surprisingly, then, the topic of how to set "disclosure" standards that would improve reporting became a staple of professional dialogues in AAPOR and other survey research-based associations.

The media's role in sponsoring or publicizing polls expanded over the ensuing decades. A new, discordant note was increasingly struck in the press in the wake of the 1948 polling debacle and the publication of Lindsay Rogers' The Pollsters (1949). Criticisms of polling as a pseudoscience were further fed by political columnists' and reporters' concerns over the threat of usurpation. Press hostility toward polls typically was epitomized at election times by articles on "how the polls got it wrong," a practice observable in day-after election stories.

This was part of a larger sea change in the political process that became apparent in the 1960 campaign. The political parties were losing their authority over electoral politics, the print news media were being challenged by TV coverage (and politicians' zealous pursuit of TV cameras), and polling was being integrated into election campaign plan-
ning at all levels. Polling, initially a media-sponsored or media-dependent activity, had by the 1960s become a technology useful to individual candidates in gaining and retaining political office and in governing. For a time the media were ill-equipped to compete with this flowering of political uses (Mendelsohn and Crespi, 1970; Gollin, 1980b; Roll and Cantril, 1980).

Set against this background, the “disclosure” issue can be seen as a struggle about control over the release of public opinion data to the public as well as about how to educate the press and public concerning the hallmarks of a professionally conducted survey. Once adopted, minimum standards for reporting (disclosing) results could have the effect of putting poll sponsors and public pollsters in the uncomfortable position of self-indictment if they were seen to have departed from the use of sound methodology.

It should not be forgotten that from the earliest days of survey research, those with professional training and scruples were forced to contend with fly-by-night pollsters, fast-buck purveyors of rubbish, and manipulators of the press who leaked partial or false results for partisan gain. The fear of Gresham’s law applying to their own commercial polling activities was a lively one for this infant industry’s pioneers. Academic researchers shared commercial pollsters’ desire to elevate standards of reporting, especially as they became aware of the fact that media accounts of their attitude and opinion research would inevitably be colored by the treatment of poll results.

First Steps: The Early Years

At the time of the 1946 Central City conference, reports to commercial clients typically were fairly sparse in their treatment of survey methodology. Neither the press nor sponsors of proprietary studies had much of a background for evaluating critically what was a still-evolving set of survey research procedures for sampling, interviewing, and analyzing and interpreting data. Given these ambiguous circumstances, the call within AAPOR for standards of disclosure had a dual purpose: of educating survey practitioners, sponsors, and reporters as to the key dimensions affecting the quality of any poll or opinion survey, and of elevating expectations about good reporting.

Julian Woodward, an associate of Roper, led off a Central City panel on standards by noting that George Gallup, Archibald Crossley, and Elmo Roper had been talking for some time about forming an association of “public opinion reporters . . . agencies now reporting poll results through the media of communications.” He expanded on this
idea by identifying a series of issues that a committee on standards of such an association might wish to address. Another idea was for an “auditing committee” that would actively monitor and pass judgments on all pre-election polls. One of the duties of the latter, Gallup provocatively noted during the panel discussion, might be “to determine the most accurate poll, in each election, in order to eliminate the welter of confusing claims” (National Opinion Research Center, 1946). He never relinquished this idea; some twenty years later it was a prominent element of his plan for a new standards-setting group.

Some market researchers expressed opposition to any broad “auditing” function, preferring that it be restricted to polls affecting the public welfare. A lively discussion ensued on how such standards might be used to “prevent newspapers and other media from distorting the findings of polls in publication.” Stuart Dodd noted that a public education effort could help create a public able to “demand the highest standards of newspapers reporting poll findings.” George Gallup summarized the discussion by defining a “minimum reporting requirement” for newspapers, consisting of three elements: “at least the question wording and type and size of the sample.”

The momentum achieved by the Central City conference carried over to the Williamstown meeting of opinion researchers in 1947. But the initiative that had been launched to draft a set of standards for research organizations, following the Gallup-Woodward lead, was subordinated to the work that led to the creation of both AAPOR and WAPOR. After some debate, both were founded as associations with individuals (rather than firms or organizations) as their members. Julian Woodward noted some years later that having firms as members would have confounded the relationship between commercial and academic members. That decision had implications for the shaping of reporting standards, making it harder to locate the responsibility for compliance inasmuch as individual members might not have the final say in media or corporate decisions about what or how to report.

At Williamstown, the debate was also joined over performance versus ethical conduct as alternative bases for standard-setting. Many felt that technical performance standards were impossible to codify; others felt that ethical standards alone would be meaningless. (As Daniel Katz was to note in a 1950 Standards Committee report, “The former would have required setting down in some rigid terms what constitutes good and bad research,” adding diplomatically that “previous committees have had considerable trouble in getting agreement in this area.”) In contrast with either of these two, reporting/disclosure requirements
proved to be a relatively uncontroversial issue and further work was undertaken to expand the list of three elements that Gallup had proposed at Central City.

When members of the newly constituted AAPOR met again in 1948 at Eagles Mere to ratify their draft constitution, they were confronted with two sets of standards proposals that had been prepared in the interim by Archibald Crossley and representatives of five other market research firms. These proposals were an outgrowth of an independent standards-setting effort by two established groups: the Market Research Council and the New York chapter of the American Marketing Association. The overlapping memberships among these marketing professionals and the Central City and Williamstown AAPOR activists made it a natural step for these standards proposals to be put before AAPOR’s members for possible adoption.

The first set, a draft “code of professional practices” for market research organizations, provoked much debate as to their substance, enforceability, and their relevance to individuals. By way of contrast, the second set, “standards of practice to be used in the reporting of survey results,” simply made reference to “every report of a survey” and “the main body of every report.” (Using the passive voice finessed the issue of whether the injunctions applied to individuals or to organizations.) It is instructive to review the list of seven points covered in that 1948 disclosure standards draft, because almost all of them survived in successive drafts over the years. Included were the purpose of the survey; for whom and by whom it was conducted; the universe covered; size and nature of the sample and any weighting methods; time of field work; personal or mail interviews; field staff and control methods. The draft concluded, “The report also should contain the full questionnaire and findings, bases of percentages, and the distribution of interviews.”

The only action taken with respect to these proposals, after lengthy discussion of a motion offered by Philip Hauser, AAPOR’s first Standards Committee chair, was simply to “commend” the two documents to the membership “as an initial step in the development of standards” (AAPOR, 1948). But it was clearly recognized that at some point AAPOR would have to move beyond this temporizing, ambivalent stance.

In June 1949 AAPOR met again, in Ithaca, this time in the wake of the 1948 pre-election polling debacle. On the same day that a postmortem session was held (with Crossley, Gallup, and Roper as speakers), a session chaired by AAPOR’s Standards Committee chairman, Daniel Katz, once again confronted the dilemmas posed by a code of professional ethics and practices. A formal paper read by Alfred McClung
Lee, a Standards Committee member, was accompanied by the informal but no less sagacious remarks of a panel of discussants. Lee’s paper (1949) reviewed earlier efforts to develop and adopt a code, and then analyzed some requirements for implementing codes of professional conduct. During the discussion Paul Lazarsfeld suggested the use of a slower, more inductive approach: “I feel that standards are best developed in the discussion of concrete cases. The Standards Committee should have cases submitted to it, examine them, and then express an opinion which will tend to become law” (AAPOR, 1949). At another point Daniel Katz noted that “there was no problem in setting up standards for public reporting. The problem was what we should do in addition to this.”

Notwithstanding their seemingly uncontroversial status, the fate of the previously “commended” reporting standards remained hostage to the adoption of a broader code of professional conduct by AAPOR. The struggle to define and gain acceptance for a code of conduct and for standards to be used in reporting survey data proceeded fitfully from those first critical years right through the 1950s, with much doubling back as a result of organizational amnesia and frequent changes of players. (See Sidney Hollander’s chapter on AAPOR standards.) But a strong sensitivity to the media’s growing use and frequent abuse of polls continued to manifest itself in the annual programs of AAPOR and in the minutes of successive Council meetings. In a sense, these concerns were deliberately built into the associational life of AAPOR. Its constitution defined Public Relations and Standards as two of only five standing committees that were initially established.

The interrelated need to build public understanding and to improve media treatment of polls was reflected in various proposals made to AAPOR Council over the years. For example, in 1951 Julian Woodward suggested that AAPOR call a conference of free-lance writers and scientific editors with the idea of “feeding” social science materials to them, to gain greater publicity for public opinion research. A few months later, in 1952, Louis Harris (chairman of the Publications Committee and Woodward’s colleague at Elmo Roper’s firm) proposed that AAPOR sponsor an annual conference of editors, publishers, and media people. He also pressed for an exploration of television as a medium for publicizing social science (polling) data. These were the germs of an “educational outreach” role for AAPOR, resurrected unsuccessfully from time to time, that finally became a key rationale for the National Council on Public Polls more than a decade later. The summer training programs for journalists developed subsequently at several
colleges and university survey research centers (e.g., Williams, Michigan, Ohio State, Connecticut) might also be seen to have had their origins in those early AAPOR program proposals.

Pressures to formalize and adopt a code continued to build throughout the 1950s, especially in relation to respondent anonymity safeguards. By 1958 a draft “Code of Professional Ethics and Practices,” patterned on the first of the two codes devised by the Crossley committee, which had been “commended” to the members ten years earlier, was presented to Council for adoption by Robert Ford, Chairman of the Standards Committee, and then proposed to the membership. The draft version produced few reactions; some amendments were subsequently made “from the standpoint of editorial style and structure,” as Leo Bogart (then chairing the Standards Committee) put it. The revised code was circulated for a full year before winning adoption by the membership at AAPOR’s meeting in Atlantic City in May 1960. Once an initial review of alleged violations by the Standards Committee had been conducted, the job of enforcing AAPOR’s first code was left to the discretion of Council. No explicit procedures existed to guide the deliberations of either body. Moreover, the second of the two codes drafted by Crossley’s committee, which had defined reporting (disclosure) requirements, was not part of the new AAPOR code. But the first step had finally been taken, and others were to follow later in the decade.

AAPOR and NCPP: Disclosure Standards and Educational Efforts

The rising tide of political polls in the 1960s generated further demands for the improvement of poll reporting in the media. Several blatant cases of contradictory or self-serving polls added fuel to the reformist fires. In 1965, Rome Arnold, who chaired the Public Relations Committee, drew the Council’s attention to adverse publicity about survey research appearing in the mass media, which he feared might reduce respondent cooperation. Helen Dinerman, Publications Committee chair, also called attention to the need for a booklet to explain public opinion research to state and local legislators.

The strong ties being forged among polls, politics, and the mass media forced the Council to confront the problem of pseudopolls that were appearing in the media. For example, in 1965 it passed a resolution deploring the use of the term “pre-election poll” as a means of characterizing street-corner interviews and other straw-balloting de-
vices used by the news media. This action was followed in 1966 by another resolution deploring "the serious and prominent attention given by the mass media" to such so-called polls. Both actions had been heavily influenced by a misguided *New York Herald Tribune* straw poll.

The urge to extend the scope of AAPOR's professional standards by exerting greater control over poll reporting came to a climax of sorts in 1967, in response to two main sources of pressure. One was a memorandum to the Standards Committee by AAPOR members Edwin Parker, William Nichols II, and Michael Phillips, calling for a "minimum set of standards for reporting the methods of publicly released opinion polls which should prove of benefit to reputable polling agencies, to decision makers in the mass media, and to the public at large." It was generated by outrage over a highly-publicized case involving two conflicting California election polls. The Parker memo used the public's interest as consumers of poll data as a basis for their proposals, which included a set of reporting requirements and guarantees of public access to data and methods on demand that went well beyond anything that had been suggested in earlier draft codes. It suggested further that if the Standards Committee felt that AAPOR was not "an appropriate sponsoring agency" it should explore the possibility of setting up an "independent association of public opinion polling agencies willing to subscribe to such a code."

This veiled threat was all too real at the time to Irving Crespi, AAPOR's Standards Committee Chairman. He advised his committee members in April 1967, and the Council a month later, of a plan that George Gallup was then actively pursuing to create a "national standards group for polling." Gallup's professed concern was with the strong possibility of governmental regulation in the absence of effective self-regulation by the profession. "AAPOR is in no position to take punitive action against those who fail to live up to standards," Gallup wrote in April 1967 to prospective organizational members of this new association. The disclosure standards he was proposing were meant to govern "polling organizations whose findings regularly appear in print or on the air... also [those] that make private or public surveys for candidates and whose findings are released to the public." It was clear from his prospectus that the prestige of membership (with all that it implied for credentialling) was thought to be sufficient to recruit public polling agencies, while the threat of punitive sanctions (ranging from a reprimand to expulsion) would reinforce their adherence to its disclosure standards.
Gallup's proposed reporting requirements could have surprised no one familiar with the twenty-year history of efforts to devise a code. They included the elements proposed by the Crossley committee back in 1947: the name of the polling organization; population covered; sampling procedures and interview methods; area surveyed; exact question wording; sponsor of the survey; and time of interviewing. But this time implementation and enforcement procedures were sketched out in considerable detail. Also included were some requirements for fuller disclosure of methods when necessary to adjudicate a complaint. Among these was the following: "Any other technical details that would help explain why polling results of one organization do not agree with those of another, when they differ." Gallup was thus restating his concern with the issue he had raised at Central City, a concern heightened by the proliferation of polling agencies in the intervening years, of a "welter of confusing claims."

For some time Gallup had been speaking out about the need to find a way of exerting some kind of peer pressure or exercising discipline over pollsters who misused the method or who leaked partial or incorrect results in order to gain advantage for some political candidate-client. As his private correspondence file makes clear, he was taking aim at a few pollsters in particular, hoping to draw them into a group that could then exert peer influence over their activities. Those he had initially invited to join were categorized as "white hats," "grey hats," or "black hats" in his private listing. He proposed an initial meeting to consider his proposal at AAPOR's annual meeting at Lake George in May 1967, but settled for a meeting at the Princeton Club in New York City just prior to the meeting.

For its part, AAPOR had not been idle in this period. Irv Crespi led the Standards Committee in drafting "standards of disclosure concerning public opinion polls." They represented an amalgam of the Parker memo and Gallup proposals, constrained by the fact that AAPOR's membership was composed of individuals and not public polling agencies, and further that as a matter of settled policy AAPOR membership could not be cited as proof of professional competence. The latter was a benefit implied in the 1967 Gallup proposal and affirmed in actual practice once the new association was formed.

As a senior staff member of the Gallup Organization, Crespi was in a unique position to act as a broker of ideas about standards and to assess the applicability of these parallel proposals to various segments of the polling profession. He brought a draft proposal to Council,
meeting at the Sagamore Hotel on Lake George, where it was anxiously debated in the full knowledge of Gallup's continuing efforts to found a group with the aim of establishing and enforcing a set of standards for the public release of survey or poll information.

After considerable discussion the Council adopted in principle the draft "Standards of Disclosure." It was promptly presented to the membership for discussion, revised, and finally adopted by the Council at a meeting in September 1967 and issued to the membership at the 1968 annual conference in Santa Barbara. (Since this was a purely advisory statement, and thus not a part of the AAPOR code or by-laws, Council ruled that it did not need to be submitted to the membership for a formal vote.) As the second item on that Council meeting's agenda, President Leo Bogart directed that the minutes note "that the Council discussed [the Gallup proposal for a new self-policing group] with considerable concern."

In September 1968 AAPOR was drawn into a related attempt made by Gallup to investigate "current differences in published poll results on the presidential race" between Harris and Sindlinger polls compared with those of his own firm. This was the so-called Rossi Committee on Political Polls, appointed at Gallup's suggestion by AAPOR's president Robert Ford, but which dissolved several months after it had been formed. (This committee and its history are discussed in greater detail in Kathleen Frankovic's chapter on AAPOR and the polls.) But AAPOR's rapid action had once again put it at the forefront as a pro-mulgator of codes. Its new disclosure standards ultimately became a prime source for those adopted by the "National Committee on Published Polls" once this committee was formally constituted in June 1968 with Arch Crossley as its first executive secretary. NCPP was reorganized and renamed the National Council on Public Polls (NCPP) in May 1969.

Since then, AAPOR and NCPP have undertaken a number of campaigns and activities designed to educate the press, politicians, and the public as to the hallmarks of professionally conducted polls. These activities have been both proactive and reactive. Various bills were introduced in Congress, beginning with a "truth in polling" act proposed by Congressman Lucien Nedzi of Michigan in 1968—by his account the first federal attempt to "regulate" polls since a bill proposed in 1943 by Senator Gerald Nye that would have required pollsters to disclose the size of their sample and preserve all records for two years (Nedzi, 1971). Representatives of the two associations were invited many times to testify before congressional committees, to argue
against efforts such as Nedzi’s in 1968 and again late in 1971 (Committee on House Administration, 1973), or to oppose other regulatory bills, such as the one introduced by New York’s Senator Charles Goodell after his defeat in a senatorial election in 1970 in which a Daily News straw poll allegedly played a role. (Other polls released at the time showed different horse race results.) Goodell’s draft bill would, among other things, have required full disclosure of procedures when a poll was challenged during an election campaign.

Press releases on AAPOR’s “Standards for Reporting Public Opinion Polls” and on NCPP’s “Principles of Disclosure” were reissued periodically and sent to legislators and editors, usually when new situations arose that called for a response by the opinion research profession. As adopted, the AAPOR statement (which defined minimal disclosure standards) continued to be directed toward “all survey research organizations,” rather than to its own members. The pronouncements issued by AAPOR from time to time were mainly hortatory. They urged the news media to request and publicize the items called for by its standards for minimal disclosure, or recommended other actions that the media or survey organizations could take that would result (as the Parker memo had suggested) in broader public access to survey materials. But unlike NCPP, AAPOR did not initially develop a set of procedures that could result in sanctioning violators of its reporting standards. That came about only in 1984 (see below), when AAPOR undertook to revise its code, and transformed those disclosure standards into a set of professional obligations binding upon individual AAPOR members—thus reconnecting the two components of the professional standards issue that had been debated during AAPOR’s earliest days.

The uncertain sway of AAPOR’s 1968 disclosure standards was reflected in commentaries made about them at the time and subsequently. At AAPOR’s annual meeting in 1970, for example, Nedzi, Mervin Field, and Philip Meyer all took note of certain newly-adopted standards. In introducing the PQ segment containing the three sets of remarks, President-elect Sidney Hollander (1971) noted that the session at which the three had spoken had been specially requested by Council after it had been confronted with four cases of alleged code infractions in one year. He pointed to two recent actions by AAPOR that were responsive to such problems. One was the adoption of disclosure standards “which require the poller to present designated facts . . . necessary for evaluating the results.” A second action “places affirmative responsibility on the researcher for accurate reporting of his findings,
even for retraction or correction in case of misleading presentation by
client or press.”

Mervin Field (1971) gave a slightly different account of the new AA-
POR disclosure standards, defining them as a “significant addition to
its Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.” Both of these veterans
of code debates knew that AAPOR did not accord the same status to
the two codes (of ethical conduct and minimal disclosure), nor did it
then have reliable procedures in place for enforcing either of them. Un-
certain interpretations of the status of the same documents such as
these may have been a byproduct of the succession of actions taken by
AAPOR in a brief time span, under the spur of necessity and competi-
tive pressures.

The second action noted by Hollander constituted an amendment to
the AAPOR Code (not to its disclosure standards), which had been fi-
nally approved in June 1970. It had been stimulated by an incident in
1967 involving deliberately-leaked Crossley poll results purportedly
making President Lyndon Johnson look stronger against various Re-
publican challengers (see Bogart, 1985 and Altschuler, 1986), as well
as other flagrant cases of partial release of poll results designed to mis-
lead press, politicians, and the general public at strategic points during
a political campaign. In his AAPOR speech, reporter Phil Meyer (1971)
had identified the leaked political poll as the problem case par ex-
cellence for journalist and pollster alike, and pointed out that “strictly in-
terpreted, the new AAPOR disclosure rule requires the researcher to
set such a distortion straight.” This might require him or her to breach
client confidentiality, another requirement of the code, thereby setting
up an intolerable ethical conflict.

That 1970 addition to the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and
Practices had a curious fate subsequently. It was modified over the next
fifteen years by successive code revisions, becoming first less and then
more precise in its language in response to the changing nature of cases
of abuse of survey and poll data in politics and elsewhere, and to the
problems (cited by Meyer and others) that the standard posed for polls-
ters working as hired hands in partisan contexts. But what was appar-
ent throughout this period was the fact that AAPOR was moving stead-
ily to strengthen and elevate its expectations of professional conduct,
especially in cases when poll data entered the public domain.

During the 1970s suggestions were made and plans proposed to con-
vene seminars for journalists or to prepare a primer on what people
ought to know in order to interpret polls properly. These often came
about in response to requests emanating from media sources. In 1973,
for example, Robert Bower (then both an AAPOR Council member and president of NCPP) expressed interest in the idea of a primer on polling on behalf of NCPP. The seminar idea, sporadically pursued but never carried out by AAPOR, was finally realized in May 1976, when NCPP (under Albert Cantril’s leadership) convened a well-attended day-long seminar on “Polls about Politics” at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. It was, in fact, cosponsored by AAPOR, and ten of the twelve speakers were prominent AAPOR members. The videotaped speeches given at the seminar were used on college campuses for some time to teach students about survey research. Another NCPP-organized seminar, devoted to “Polling on the Issues,” was held in November 1979 at the Washington Post. Once again, AAPOR members played prominent roles as speakers (see Cantril, 1980). The fact that both organizations numbered most of the same leading opinion researchers among their officers and membership ranks made for a natural and highly fruitful division of labor. NCPP, with its close ties to Washington-area press and political institutions at the time, was in a better position to organize such efforts. Smaller seminars on press-polling issues were organized by NCPP in 1983, 1984, and 1987. Although unsuccessful attempts have been made by NCPP on other occasions to organize seminars, it remains as a key educational outreach program, aimed primarily at journalists and congressional staff members.

Reporting standards took on an independent life as they continued to be disseminated to the news media and, through AAPOR membership, to academic textbook writers on survey research and others who wrote books and articles on polling. Slowly but surely a consensus had formed that shaped norms governing the proper handling and reporting of poll and survey data. AAPOR’s standards were frequently cited in ethically oriented discussions in research organizations and in articles on good and poor reporting written for the guidance of the news media (e.g., Wilhoit and Weaver, 1980). Perhaps the most obvious sign of influence was the nearly universal adoption of the hybrid (and debated) concept of “margin of error” in news media reporting of poll results.

AAPOR and the Media in the 1980s

The considerable gains in polling sophistication by research professionals and the media alike were displayed in a special symposium issue of *POQ* devoted to “Polls and the News Media,” which appeared
at the start of the 1980s. The lead article, written by its guest editor (Gollin, 1980a) examined the "liaison" between polling and the press, a term chosen to symbolize the intimate, seductive, and potentially dangerous relationships that had developed over the decades. As the symposium's articles made clear, the millennium in poll reporting had hardly been reached, despite the diffusion of knowledge about polling and survey methods and the slow growth of poll reporting as a sometime journalistic specialty.

The institutionalization of news media polling was clearly observable in the steady expansion of polling done by the TV networks and by newspapers in major markets, in some cases as combined operations, for example, the CBS News/New York Times Poll (Gollin, 1987). From its earliest days AAPOR had news media pollsters as members—for example, Joe Belden of the Texas Poll, Jane Shepherd of the Washington Post's Survey, Sid Goldish of the Minnesota Poll, Paul Trescott of the Philadelphia Inquirer, and Henry Kroeger of the Iowa Poll. But by the 1980s the volume of polling accounted for by the major news media (and many minor-league media operations) and above all their visibility made news media pollsters among the most strategically placed of all AAPOR members in the continuing struggle to elevate standards of reporting and to improve public understanding of opinion research. Pollsters such as Warren Mitofsky and Kathleen Frankovic of CBS News, Barry Sussman, then at the Washington Post, I.A. "Bud" Lewis of the Los Angeles Times, Glenn Roberts of the Iowa Poll, and Michael Kagay of the New York Times knew better than most how much room for improvement existed in most news polling operations, and they took an active part in AAPOR sessions and activities that further clarified the issues.

Poll data gathered by the news media and analyses of their polling practices provided a growing share of the program content at AAPOR's annual meetings. In 1980, for example, plenary sessions were devoted to each of these topics. What soon emerged as the new issue of the 1980s, "exit polls," was in fact a special case of an older concern with the bandwagon or underdog effects of publicized pre-election polls on prospective voters. But this time the effects to be examined were confined mainly to Western states' voters, who might have heard TV news reports about the votes already registered in polls conducted in the populous and electoral vote-heavy Eastern and Midwestern states.

The exit polling controversy was amplified by the national reach of the TV networks' polls and the copycat influence they exerted on news
media at the state and local level. Predictions and projections of voting outcomes filled the nation’s TV screens, augmenting the pre-election poll reports in the pages of daily papers and newsweeklies. “Horserace journalism,” an old criticism of the media’s favored slant on campaigns and elections, was given renewed force as poll data replaced the informed guesses of local political knowledgeable and pundits. The stream of poll results during the campaign turned into a flood on election night. Polls of sampled voters leaving their voting places gave the TV networks’ election-night coverage, and the press’s next-day stories, an immediacy and analytical power they had lacked in the days when the only basis for reporting was the actual count of votes cast, available only after delays that stretched the reporting period into the early hours of the morning or even days after the election.

But was exit polling good or bad for democracy, considered from the standpoint of its effects on voters’ motivations to turn out and vote? This issue soon became the basis for court challenges in several states and draft legislation at the federal level, reawakening an old anxiety in the minds of opinion researchers. AAPOR confronted this issue in a series of internal Council debates, culminating in a plenary session at its 1984 annual meeting, organized by Ronald Milavsky. A full house heard Congressman Alvin Swift of Washington, pollster and AAPOR stalwart Burns Roper, news executive Richard Salant, and civil liberties lawyer Floyd Abrams debate the issue and reveal its complexities. The proceedings of that session were eventually edited and published in POQ (Milavsky et al., 1985). With Council’s approval, 5,000 reprints were subsequently mailed to key legislators and officials at all levels of government as well as to newspaper editors, political columnists, and TV news producers.

One thing was new about the exit polling issue. Unlike the controversies surrounding poll reporting standards issues raised in earlier periods, the exit poll controversy assumed that the results being reported were accurate forecasts of voting outcomes, at least at the statewide level. (Some exit poll-based projections or “characterizations” do have to be revised in light of actual vote counts on election night.) The issue confronting the TV networks, therefore, is whether the poll results should be reported prior to the closing of all voting places. Despite an accommodating stance on their part, the TV networks still have the availability of hot news that they spent a lot of their money to gather, and competitive pressures, as dual incentives to make early use of exit poll data. As there is little likelihood of legal regulation of exit polling or of reporting of results, given the First Amendment’s protective
reach, the issue is likely to persist. (A standardized period of voting across time zones could remove the issue from controversy, but that seems to be hard to achieve.) To the extent that research on the effects of early reporting can clarify the issue or suggest other remedies, it is likely that AAPOR members will play a crucial role in gathering the data and assessing their implications.

Other media-related issues have assumed growing prominence at AAPOR’s annual meetings. New technology was a popular theme of program sessions in the late 1970s and early 1980s, as the computer led the way into an era of information explosion and glut, with wide-ranging effects on existing news and information media. A more conservative political climate led to a surge of interest in the issue of media credibility, and it was the topic of a plenary session at AAPOR in 1986. Media reporting of social science data (not only poll reporting) was another topic that found a receptive audience at AAPOR conferences (Weiss and Singer, 1987), and the AIDS epidemic brought renewed interest in information campaign effectiveness and the role of the mass media in shaping public opinion and social behavior relating to AIDS. In all these cases it has been the news media’s own polls that have provided much of the substance for the analysis of these issues at AAPOR conferences. And by depositing their polls at the Roper Center and other survey data repositories, the media have contributed greatly to scholarship on public opinion and politics as well. One further indicator of the close ties that exist between AAPOR and the media is the growing frequency with which members working in media organizations or at schools of journalism and mass communications have been selected to run for AAPOR Council posts.

Closing the Ring: AAPOR Revises Its Code

Another action taken by AAPOR in the 1980s finally brought about a rapprochement between the two largely parallel efforts to develop codes of professional conduct outlined in this chapter and in the one dealing with AAPOR’s standards. The earliest codes mainly reflected the concerns of AAPOR members from the commercial side, for whom public polling was not a compelling issue at the time. But the balance of concerns within AAPOR shifted over the years, helped in no small part by the correlated standard-setting efforts of other associations composed primarily of market researchers, for example, the American
Marketing Association, the Advertising Research Foundation, the Market Research Council, and the Council of American Survey Research Organizations. A growing number of cases sent for review by AAPOR’s Standards Committee involved political polls. The complaints often involved a combination of methodological issues and publicity actions on the part of either the polling agency or its client.

Such cases proved to be difficult to resolve within the code implementation framework available to AAPOR. Its reporting standards were hortatory, not part of the AAPOR Code around which formal enforcement procedures were organized. As had been foreseen in earlier debates, a polling firm risked being held liable for disclosure activities over which it may not have had full control. Other factors limited fuller disclosure. News media pollsters, for example, were hostages to the space or time constraints imposed by their media upon the reporting of poll data. Their reporting roles were subordinated to the judgments of the editors or news producers who made the final decisions. As it stood in the early 1980s, the AAPOR Code did not directly address such dilemmas.

As had been true at earlier junctures, the push to revise the Code depended chiefly on a serendipitous factor: the unusually long tenure of office of Barbara Bailar and Deborah Hensler as Standards Committee chair and associate chair. Their cumulative experience with standards cases over three or more years and their active role in stimulating discussions in Council and at annual meetings made it easier for them to identify gaps in the code and problems of application caused by outdated or carelessly worded provisions. Al Gollin’s periods of service on AAPOR Council overlapped with theirs, and as president he sought to help them deal directly with these issues, especially with the anomalous status of the disclosure standards. He convened a “constitutional convention” in November 1984 at which a diverse group of nearly twenty AAPOR members, under Debby Hensler’s leadership, spent a full day reviewing the codes of other research associations and vigorously debating the need to revise the scope and substance of AAPOR’s code.

The most significant recommendation adopted by the group was to incorporate the disclosure standards into the code. At the same time, various infelicities of style or ambiguities in the old code were removed, and the draft revision was sent to Council for review and approval early in 1985. Council adopted a phased strategy of membership review and approval, stretching the process of detailed, line-by-line review of the new code across the life of two successive Councils (1984-
85 and 1985-86). The membership was finally asked for a formal vote of approval of this change in AAPOR’s by-laws, and gave it an overwhelmingly favorable verdict late in 1985.

With this vote the two distinct standards elements that had been defined four decades earlier as indispensable hallmarks by which public opinion research could begin to be adjudged a self-regulating profession were rejoined. This action only set the stage for the emergence of new issues and controversies that will make it necessary for additional steps to be taken by AAPOR: to enunciate and enforce standards; to educate the media, other strategic groups, and the general public as to proper polling and reporting practices; and to adapt to changes in survey technologies and in modes of diffusing survey findings to the wider society, as its members continue to pioneer in the systematic study of public opinion.

References

The author wishes to express his gratitude to the Estate of George Gallup, to Bud Roper, and to Tad Cantril for making available documents and correspondence files on the founding of the National Council on Public Polls.

The Central City Conference Report, the Proceedings of annual AAPOR meetings (printed in Public Opinion Quarterly for AAPOR’s early years), and the Minutes of AAPOR Council meetings have been invaluable sources. The following publications were cited or contain additional source materials on the topics covered in this chapter.


Part Three

What Is AAPOR?
9

The Culture of AAPOR
Richard Baxter

Wherein are related a thousand trifling matters as inconsequential as they are necessary to the proper understanding of this great history.

Miguel de Cervantes, Don Quixote, preamble to Chapter 9, Volume 2

AAPOR has a “culture” all its own. It’s an organization of people whose professional lives are spent asking other people questions. In its early days it took pride in being something of a “marching and chowder society,” but it has always had a serious purpose and its programs have seriously addressed that purpose.

AAPOR brings together a mix of individuals from many and varying disciplines, with the intellectual stimulation that this implies. Its members come from academia, business, government, and nonprofit institutions, representing a wide spectrum of research needs and applications. Among its perhaps many identities, AAPOR can be considered a social science association. But an extraordinary attribute of the organization is its blend of members from commercial and from non-profit affiliations. This sets it apart from other associations.

The annual AAPOR conference is the major focus of this culture, and renews it from year to year. At this conference, the “newer members” get to meet the “well-knowns”—AAPOR’s public figures in opinion and market research—to everyone’s advantage. Songfests, room parties, cardplaying (sometimes characterized as “late evening probability seminars”), and visits to points of interest are all on unofficial conference agendas. Members’ families are welcome and constitute a highly visible and valuable percentage of conference attendees.

But despite the social revelry, opportunities to chat with old friends, and the magnetism of tennis courts, pools, and nature paths at conference sites, conference sessions are well-attended, even on Sunday mornings.
The Annual Conference—Exemplar of The Culture

"When is AAPOR?" has been a traditional query of members since AAPOR's founding in 1947. For many years, before regional chapters existed, before the organization's newsletter kept members in touch, and before AAPOR was involved with other like-minded groups in pursuing common causes, the annual conference virtually was "AAPOR."

AAPOR's antecedent was a meeting held after Harry Field's call to users and practitioners of opinion research in 1946 to attend a meeting in the Colorado mountains at Central City. It was the first of the annual conferences. The following year, the constitution of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, adopted at Williamstown, Massachusetts, on September 4, called for the establishment of a Conference Committee that "shall be responsible for planning and organizing the Annual Conference of the Association." Thus, as members began to look ahead on their calendars, "When is AAPOR?" became an important date to mark down.

A long-time and significant feature of AAPOR conference is the scheduling of joint meetings with WAPOR, the World Association for Public Opinion Research. WAPOR also was founded at the 1947 Williamstown meeting (as the "World Congress of Public Opinion Research.") It shared with AAPOR the next year's conference at Eagles Mere, and the every-other-year joint meeting has been continuous since that time.

This symbiotic relationship clearly has been mutually fruitful for members of the organizations, many of whom are members of both. WAPOR's own program sessions have been integrated with AAPOR's and appear in the joint printed program, providing a broader-scope series of papers and discussions than would have been the case in separate conferences. Not only have international contacts benefitted attendees, but the greater political sciences thrust of WAPOR sessions have enhanced the total shared-conference programs.

During the Association's early years, criteria for the selection of a site for the annual conference began to appear in Executive Council minutes. One of the earliest mentions of these criteria appears in the minutes of June 1951: "Some considerations in making the site selection: Meetings should not be held too often in the same geographic area (unfair to members living in other geographical regions); meetings should not be held in big-city hotels where participants are subjected to
a host of distractions; meetings should be held at college campuses (summer resorts too expensive for many members); meetings should be held at a campus which offers dormitories and dining places large enough to accommodate all participants. (This offers greater opportunities for informal discussion.)”

Geographical Location of AAPOR Conferences

The first criterion named in these 1951 Council minutes dealt with geographical location. An ongoing problem has been the “East-West” or “California-East” or “Midwest-East” pushes and pulls in deciding where conferences should be held. For example, the September 1949 Council minutes open with a discussion of Lake Forest College (in the Chicago suburb) as a possible 1950 location. “The location fits into the policy of holding annual meetings in the Midwest every other year.” However, there was to be some slippage from this policy of alternate year scheduling of Midwestern conferences: by 1954, the Council “agreed to recommend to the incoming Council that the 1955 conference be held in the Midwest, since the last four have been in the eastern area.”

A review of the 1960s and 1970s reveals countless discussions of the pros and cons of holding conferences in various geographical regions. Beliefs were expressed that a national organization must meet in the Far West, as well as in the Midwest and East. But such “moral commitments” to all segments of a (nominally) national membership were offset by pressures to meet near where most members actually lived.

For example, in October 1965, the Council discussed the 1967 conference “which by tradition would be held in the West. [The vice president] urged that the tradition be abandoned because only a small proportion of AAPOR members, who are predominantly in the East, are able to attend Western meetings.” A locale in Wisconsin was suggested ”as a compromise between the East and the West Coast. Attention was called to a letter from the Pacific Chapter expressing the view that a tri-annual West Coast meeting is a simple obligation of AAPOR to its members in that part of the country.” At this October 1965 Council session, a motion carried for a West Coast site for 1967.

In January of the next year, 1966, the Council “reaffirmed its desire to meet in the Far West in 1967 if a suitable site can be found.” This decision was short-lived, however, because at a meeting two months
later, there was “much discussion of various places to meet, one or two in the Far West, more in the Midwest. It was finally moved and voted that the Site Committee should feel completely free to make the best recommendation that it saw fit regardless of past conditions or traditions of geographical preference.” (Lake George, New York became the 1967 site, but Santa Barbara in California achieved AAPOR stardom in 1968.) Clearly there has been much Council ambivalence about site selection over the years.

At a 1971 Council meeting the complaint of some Midwestern members was noted that AAPOR “hadn’t met in their area for ten years.” In view of this criticism, the Chicago and neighboring area was considered: “Choices have boiled down to the Playboy Club in Geneva, Wisconsin and Arlington Park, site of a race track near Chicago.” A spoilsport Council member felt “the Playboy Club rooms were dark and the bunny atmosphere depressing during the daylight hours,” and it was dropped from further consideration, thus happily preventing perhaps the development of yet another AAPOR “tradition.”

The “California policy” apparently was abandoned in the mid-1970s. Council was informed in its September 1976 meeting by the vice president (and member of the Site Selection Committee) that “…because of poor attendance even by West Coast members, there is no longer a policy to hold every ‘nfh’ meeting on the West Coast.” In fact, AAPOR did not meet west of the Mississippi between 1971 and 1991.

Twenty-seven of the forty annual conferences held from 1948 through 1989 were in Eastern locales, seven in the Midwest, three in California, and five in the South (defined as south of Washington, D.C.).

**Selection of Conference Dates**

The Central City conference was held in midsummer; the founding conference at Williamstown in September. The 1948 conference at Eagles Mere in the Pocono Mountains of Pennsylvania also took place in September. The absence of many members on summer vacations, coupled with intense heat at many otherwise desirable locations in the days before universal air conditioning, led successive conference committees

---

1. Actually this wasn’t true, as the 1964 conference was held in Excelsior Springs, Missouri. Perhaps this was a case of selective forgetting because of members’ grumbling about its inaccessibility.
to avoid scheduling in July and August. September was also avoided after 1948 because of conflicts with other professional meetings and the demands of school openings and post-Labor Day business activities. Winter months were subject to travel difficulties, while April-May were busy weeks for those in academic settings.

The sum of all these various pressures led to a general practice of scheduling the annual AAPOR conference in late May or early June, and this gradually became "traditional." The practice was confirmed by the results of a membership poll conducted in 1962. In response to a question about the preferred month of meeting, the survey found that "if the 'No Preference' group is excluded, exactly half the membership prefers May to any other month. June is second, so that May-June together amount to 53 percent of the total vote and two-thirds of those with any preference in the matter. No other month received more than 4 percent of the vote."

The survey report went on to say: "May is almost equally popular with commercial and academic members. Forty-four percent of the business group and 38 percent of the university group name it as their choice. If May-June are considered together, these two months account for 57 percent of the commercial group and 55 percent of the academic group. About a third of those preferring May mention the weather at that time of year as the main reason for their choice. The next most frequent reasons are: it doesn't conflict with other meetings, it doesn't conflict with vacations, it's a slack time in the office or teaching."

As AAPOR's larger membership increased the need for advance site selection and conference planning, it became customary to seek reservations for the conference to be held during the week preceding the Memorial Day weekend.

**Selection of Conference Sites**

Selection of the first two conference sites was largely fortuitous. Harry Field selected Central City, Colorado (1946), because of its proximity to his own Denver location, its isolation from commercial distractions, and its picturesque ambience. AAPOR's founding conference took place at Williams College (1947) largely because of the active interest of its president, James Baxter, who was a friend of Elmo Roper and of the profession of opinion research. The factors governing the selection of a resort hotel in Eagles Mere, Pennsylvania, for the 1948 conference, AAPOR's first, are undocumented, but the next four confer-
ences (1949-1952) all took place on college campuses at Cornell in New York, Lake Forest in Illinois, Princeton in New Jersey, and Vassar in New York.

The preference for college campuses in those years derived in part from the desire of AAPOR members to avoid big city hotels and to meet communally in a quiet location. Perhaps even more importantly, it reflected the wish for inexpensive accommodations, in contrast to those offered by resort hotels. It may also be supposed that various influential AAPOR members, such as Julian Woodward (then at Elmo Roper but formerly of Cornell) and Hadley Cantril (Princeton), persuaded their universities to offer facilities. Finally, the size of the gatherings, usually not much more than 100, made them appropriate for a college or university to host.

Certainly the campus sites were inexpensive. The letter of invitation to the 1947 Williamstown conference noted that “Comfortable accommodations in the dormitories of Williams College are still available… Prices, including both room and meals, will run about $7 a day per person.” The 1949 notice of the conference at Cornell stated that “The rates per person are $2 a day for the room; meals at cafeteria prices.” Even in those days resort hotels were charging $25 a day or more. It may not be supposed, however, that all AAPOR members took advantage of these low rates. Most of AAPOR’s leaders and all members with more liberal expense accounts usually opted for the air-conditioned comfort of rooms at a nearby inn or hotel and dinners at a good restaurant, rather than the dormitory room and cafeteria line. Such arrangements of course conflicted with the goal of AAPOR unity and seemed to encourage a two-tier membership.

This development, along with the increasing attendance at AAPOR conventions, led to abandonment of the campus as a conference site. Except for 1957 and 1958, when AAPOR met successively at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington and the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago, almost all conventions since 1952 have been held at resort hotels, usually remote from big cities but sometimes in smaller metropolitan areas such as Madison, Wisconsin, Atlantic City and Asbury Park, New Jersey, Roanoke, Virginia and Santa Barbara, California.

Members’ preferences for resort hotels were expressed in the same survey cited earlier regarding preferred dates of meeting. In total, half the membership (49 percent) voted for a resort hotel and 21 percent for a big city hotel. Only 12 percent preferred a university setting, while the remainder had no preference or gave another answer. Although about one-fourth of the business or commercial members of AAPOR voted
for a big city hotel and the same proportion of university, nonprofit, and government members voted for a university setting, sizable majorities of both groups with a preference opted for a resort hotel. (For a complete list of conference sites see appendix E.)

Picking a Resort Hotel

In response to the survey, members cited a variety of advantages to the choice of a resort hotel. Most frequently mentioned was the gemütlich setting: friendly, relaxed, informal; and, in most cases, the exclusive occupancy of the site—in sharp contrast to the bustle and crowds of a big-city hotel. In a similar vein were references to the lack of competing big-city attractions that distract members from convention activities, and the increased feelings of unity that developed in a more isolated place. A third big attraction of resorts was that they are a place to bring the family for recreation and relaxation.

But while “resort hotel” is a good generic description of the type of place required for an AAPOR conference, selection of an actual site has often in fact been quite difficult because of AAPOR’s other demands. The dates in May, for example, tend to rule out many northern resorts that do not open until June. Exclusive glamorous resorts are ruled out because of cost. The site should be reasonably accessible; it should not require a three- or four-hour bus ride or drive. It should be large enough to accommodate the AAPOR attendance comfortably (with single rooms available for those who prefer them), but not so large that AAPOR members are lost among vacationers or other conventions. The food should be decent, if not epicurean, and the dining hall should be large enough to accommodate the Saturday night banquet and to serve all in one sitting. There must be enough meeting rooms for concurrent sessions, and suitable lounges or other public areas where members may congregate to talk.

AAPOR’s successive site selection committees were presided over for some twenty years by the beloved Joe Klapper, usually assisted by his wife Hope. While the task of checking out resort hotels and being entertained as a potential client may seem like something of a plum, no one can count the number of bad meals and wasted weekends that Joe and Hope endured in their eternal quest for the perfect AAPOR site. As one of the earliest members of AAPOR, a former president, long-time Council member, and active participant in and organizer of the Association’s activities, Joe was ever mindful of his constituency’s interests.
He drove a hard bargain in his negotiations with hotel management, and always maintained his sharp wit and warm humor. In recent years, Joe's role has fallen to Charles (Chuck) Cowan, who gives every sign of continuing the AAPOR tradition.

For many years AAPOR seemed to have found a "home" at the Sagamore Inn, Lake George, New York. Starting in 1959, and until 1974, AAPOR conventions were held at that site on seven occasions. It was hard to get to. It was either a long drive from New York City, or a charter bus ride, or the Albany airport. But it had charm: a rambling inn set right on the sparkling lake. AAPOR was always the first tenant of the summer season. A new staff was being broken in. The plumbing was antiquated, and the heating unreliable or nonexistent on cold evenings (one distinguished speaker in 1959 addressed her audience wearing a fur coat for warmth). But both management and staff were extremely eager to please and no reasonable request was denied. Management provided on-the-house late evening "weenie roasts" and "Chinese smorgasbords." An annual highlight was the parade of the kitchen staff through the dining room at the Saturday night banquet, carrying American flags to the strains of a band playing the "Stars and Stripes Forever," while AAPOR members loudly applauded their efforts.

The Buck Hill Falls resort in the Pennsylvania Poconos was also "home" for a while, following the closing of the Sagamore. AAPOR had met there in 1956 at a time when it was a Quaker "temperance hotel," thus creating great inconvenience to a majority of AAPOR members. Starting in 1977, however, AAPOR met there four times in seven years. Though it too was somewhat out of the way, it was a lovely location and provided excellent service and facilities.

Problems of accessibility are, of course, a necessary consequence of the desire of AAPOR members for a resort hotel that can provide largely exclusive occupancy, far away from urban distractions. Such facilities are not usually found at airports or at convenient bus stops. There were regular complaints about the need for long drives in order to reach Lake George or the Poconos, and scarcely any other site was immune from similar criticism. The Grove Park Inn in Asheville, North Carolina, which hosted two AAPOR conferences in the 1970s, was widely criticized because it was four hours by car from Raleigh-Durham and at that time only two flights a day were landing in Asheville. And as noted earlier, travel to facilities in other parts of the country, outside of the New England and Mid-Atlantic areas, was often seen as
a burden on the great majority of the membership, which was located in just those regions.

It is more than nostalgia, however, that has made such attractive resorts as the Sagamore and Buck Hill Falls, so ideally suited to AAPOR, increasingly hard to find in recent years. The Sagamore remained closed for some years and only recently (1987) was remodeled by a large chain as a luxury resort. Buck Hill Falls added condominiums and developed its property in a similar direction. Even in 1977, Klapper reported to the AAPOR Council that “the type of location traditionally considered suitable is increasingly rare, as new construction hotel-type.”

The needs of AAPOR have of course also changed over the years. Most notably, during the last twenty years, conference attendance has increased from 200 or so to about 500 at recent conventions, so the cozy little inns are no longer suitable. Costs have so increased that poor food and poor service are not tolerated and more and more special facilities are needed. But AAPOR members retain their desire for exclusive occupancy where possible, in a country setting with all the amenities, and with all attendees sheltered under one roof, so the search goes on. The Don CeSar hotel in St. Petersburg (used in 1986 and 1989) seems to have quickly gained an affection that is analogous to the feeling evoked by the Sagamore in the breasts of AAPOR members.

Attracting Younger Members to Conferences

The founders of AAPOR, who were individually invited to attend a conference on public opinion research in Colorado, and who met subsequently at Williamstown to adopt a constitution and establish an organization, consisted largely of leaders of the field. Almost all of them had their own businesses, had taught or conducted research at universities, or had occupied important positions in government or corporate activities. But AAPOR was not designed as an old boys club. Membership has been open to anyone interested in public opinion research and, from the outset, efforts were made to reach out to new and younger members, women and men.

AAPOR dues have generally been modest; but for many years, before the emergence of local and regional chapters and before regular publi-
cation of a newsletter, the annual conference was almost the only opportunity AAPOR members had to meet and talk with their peers, and attending it could be expensive.

A special subgroup that AAPOR has tried to attract to its conferences are the graduate students. Student memberships, with reduced annual dues, were introduced during the 1950s in order to encourage interest in the field, and successive Councils have endeavored to make it easier for them to attend the annual conference. Criticisms are voiced almost every year that the cost or lack of accessibility of the conference site makes it difficult for students to attend. In 1976, almost thirty years after AAPOR’s founding and in spite of Council’s best efforts, the Nominations and Membership chairman complained that “the annual conference, the dues and travel expenses are too costly to attract students or beginning professionals, except on a one-time (attendance) basis for residents of towns and cities near the conference host site.” The May 1983 Council minutes stress the desirability of “student discount rates and special family rates” in choosing the 1986 facility.

The introduction of a Student Awards competition and its subsequent vigorous promotion by a succession of influential academic members have attracted a small but respectable number of entries each year and have increased AAPOR’s visibility among students of public opinion research. Award winners are invited to the conference as guests of AAPOR, and other students, made aware of the conference, may respond to the opportunity to meet a wide representation of the profession among the AAPOR membership. One of the reasons given for the selection of Swampscott, Massachusetts as the site for the 1966 conference was its proximity to the large number of educational institutions in the Greater Boston area, but no records exist of how many students responded to this opportunity. [A list of student award winners appears in appendix D.]

**Resisting Discriminatory Practices**

As social scientists and researchers, AAPOR members have generally tended to favor “liberal” causes and to protest against prejudice and discrimination. From the beginning, the AAPOR constitution encouraged membership “without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.” Gender was not mentioned in this list, but in a profession that has been hospitable to them, women have always constituted a large proportion of the AAPOR membership and have been well represented on the Executive Council and among the officers.
One of the early criteria for conference site selection was the rule, “All members of AAPOR must be welcome.” This was adopted in an era when it was quite common for certain resort hotels and for other facilities in particular cities, states, or regions to discriminate against minority groups and/or unescorted women. Happily, this criterion has less relevance today than it did in the early years. In a 1952 discussion, the minutes show that “the Council felt that the South should be eliminated (as a 1953 locale), since holding the meeting there might cause discomfort to Negro members of the organization.” At the actual 1953 conference in the Pennsylvania Poconos, it is recalled that until a room was suddenly “found” for a black member whose reservation had been denied, the hotel management was notified by AAPOR that the conference would be canceled. Only in 1976, more than twenty years later, did the chairman of Nominations and Membership report to Council that “since discrimination against Blacks is presumably no longer a problem, Florida should be considered (as a conference site).”

A related concern was voiced at a 1978 Council meeting when it was agreed “that Council instruct the Site Selection Committee not to schedule meetings in non-ERA states, and that when investigating possible hotels the Committee ask the hotel management the position of the state.” The Site chairman noted that he would write to a candidate state’s Chamber of Commerce, asking for recommendations for hotels, and that AAPOR policy would be stated in the letter. This policy barred reuse of the Grove Park Inn in Asheville, which was on other grounds a prototypical AAPOR conference site.

Maintaining an Open Conference

Assuming some degree of success in attracting younger members, less affluent members, and minority group members to the annual conference, a further question arises: How can AAPOR make them feel comfortable there? Growing as it did from a small band of “pioneers” and early adherents to a new profession of public opinion research, AAPOR in its early years was inevitably marked by a certain clannishness. With conference attendances not much over 100 persons and a preponderance of familiar faces, it was only natural for old friends and colleagues to gravitate together and for newcomers to find it difficult to achieve the status of an “in-group” member. An early membership survey that drew 146 mailed responses found that the biggest criticism of the conferences was that “long-term members tend to be too cliquish,”
and that new members did not feel welcome unless they had an attentive sponsor to introduce them around.

Though this was recognized as a potential problem for many years, it was not until 1971 that Council took specific steps to welcome newcomers and help them feel at home. At the conference in Pasadena that year, AAPOR inaugurated an annual reception for new members and first-time participants. Council members, wearing marked badges, joined with other long-time AAPOR members in mixing with the newcomers at this reception, answering their questions and providing any help or advice requested. The newcomers were also provided with badges bearing a stripe to mark their status, so that they could easily be recognized in the course of the conference and special efforts made to assure them of a welcome.

Another innovation at this same 1971 conference further helped to reduce the atmosphere of the conference as the gathering of a private clique. This was extension of the “President’s Party” to an AAPOR “open house.” Private parties, hosted by research companies or by groups from a particular city or region, had long been part of the AAPOR scene, and the president’s party following the annual banquet on Saturday night represented the culmination of this activity. Paid for by the president (or more usually, the president’s employer), this was an invitational affair that was normally restricted to the president’s colleagues and friends. Although “party-crashing” was the AAPOR rule rather than the exception (“What’s the room number tonight?”), newcomers were deterred not only by the in-group atmosphere but by the extremely limited size of the president’s hotel room or suite.

In Pasadena, the president invited all conference attendees to his party, and two years later in 1973 Council voted to make this an open party, held in a public area of the hotel and paid for by AAPOR funds. This largesse followed the institution of a conference registration fee in 1972, which lessened pressure on the AAPOR treasury. The result, however, provided another occasion in which newcomers could mix socially with old-time members and, combined with the reception for first-time participants, helped further to dispel the impression that the AAPOR conference was run by a tight group of insiders. The spirit of inclusiveness has led other members to make a special effort, at meals, in meetings, or corridors and bars, to integrate new members into the culture.
Typically, the annual conference has been composed of (1) formal presentations of titled papers; (2) informal presentations and discussions on a wide range of public and professional issues; (3) an address by the current AAPOR president; (4) a plenary session on broad topics of general interest to conference audiences; and (5) miscellaneous demonstrations, book reviews, "author-meets-the critics" dialogues, student presentations, didactic presentations, and the like.

Table 1 shows that roughly 437 individual formal sessions, in which some 1,329 titled papers were read, were assembled at AAPOR conferences from 1950 (when conference programs were actually formalized) through 1983.\(^1\)

Additionally, some 339 conference-arranged informal discussions took place during the same period. Totally, conference program chairs have planned, arranged for, and managed no less than 776 separate meetings within the AAPOR conferences that have been held over the past three-plus decades.

---

1. At best, this reflects a qualitative impressionistic examination of topics listed by title in the official programs and abstracts of the AAPOR annual conferences that took place between 1948 and 1983. Altogether, five programs of the total had not been recovered at the time of writing and consequently are omitted from the analysis.

Although a number of frequencies are reported here, they are to be considered estimates rather than absolutes. The reasons for this are many—the most obvious being that titles often do not precisely reflect the actual contents of a particular paper or "round table" discussion. No effort was made to actually read the more than 1,300 titled papers reported in AAPOR conference programs, nor were any reliability checks made regarding the classifications the author used for analyzing the data presented in this paper.

Finally, the reader is reminded that many factors enter into whether a given topic or theme will be presented at a given annual conference. The particular interests and tastes of particular program chairs; the availability of specific presenters; the amount of attention certain issues have been receiving in the press; the sheer availability of time and even physical space in which to assemble—all play a part in influencing the appearance of given subjects at the annual conference.
Table 1
Estimated Titled Formal and Informal
AAPOR Conference Sessions, 1950-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Sessions</th>
<th>Number of Papers Read</th>
<th>Informal Sessions (Round Tables, Panels, Didactics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1983</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates a steady growth in the number of formal sessions in which titled papers have been featured. As illustration, note that the mean number of papers read at the conferences during the decade of the 1970s rose to 50 over a mean of 31 that were presented during the 1950s. Exactly what this growth in formal presentations reflects is difficult to tell, given all the factors—both subjective and objective—that enter into conference programming decisions. One of the more promising hypotheses that offers itself here suggests that as public opinion research matured and grew in sophistication, more and more quality primary research was being funded and carried out. Thus, an increase in both researchers and formal research output was first reflected in the 1960s in a notable decline in informal discussions, accompanied by a moderate increase in the number of titled papers presented. The latter increase was followed by a roughly two-fold growth in both the formal and informal components of 1970s conferences. In other words, by the 1970s, conference participants seemingly had so much to report upon and discuss that the number of formal and informal meetings needed to accommodate them had to be doubled over the previous decade.

Books and Exhibits at the Conference

At recent conferences AAPOR members have enjoyed the opportunity to observe different computer hardware and software capabilities and to note book titles of interest to the researcher. It wasn’t always so. There was a time when books and other displays were not universally welcome at annual conferences.
The earliest located reference to book displays appears in the March 1952 Council minutes, in which it is stated that “many publishers who had exhibited books at the 1951 conference had not received orders placed by participants at the conference. It was agreed that (the Secretary-Treasurer) would hire one or two persons to properly handle the book exhibit at the 1952 conference.” This more direct AAPOR supervision seems to have been successful for the next ten years, as publishers’ booklists were displayed and orders taken and subsequently executed.

In 1962 there was some controversy over the proposal of direct sales of books at the conference. By this time a regular feature of conference programs was an “Author Meets the Critics” session and occasional other meetings in which new and relevant publications formed the main topic of discussion. Because of widespread interest in these new books, it was proposed that Council approve one or more tables for the display and actual sale of these books at the conference. Council minutes then record objections that “this would set a precedent, that previous requests for book tables had been refused, and that if some books were chosen for exhibit it would be hard to avoid the sale of others as well. Others felt that in view of the importance of these books to the present program, their sale at the conference would provide a welcome service.” The Council then voted to provide no special facilities for sales, though publishers would be asked to provide “two copies for reference.”

The climate for exhibits was considerably warmer in 1970. A Council member at the January meeting “asked whether a firm with which he is acquainted might have the privilege of setting up a special display of psychophysiological measurement devices which may be adapted to response measurement, the understanding being that the firm would be glad to pay both the hotel and AAPOR for the cost of the space.” Council voted against allowing such displays for pay this particular year, on such short notice, but voiced the sentiment that “we should encourage display of useful research devices as part of our regular programs, if possible. (Another Councillor) will look into whether a special meeting or display of devices could be arranged for this year; if so, AAPOR would not charge the exhibitors this year.” By March 1973 the suggestion was made at a Council meeting that “…our Newsletter should mention that any authors who are members of AAPOR or who are on our program may exhibit two books at the conference.”

The issue of opening up AAPOR conferences to outside promotion and sales was not restricted to books and other products. The New
York State Employment Service requested space at the 1962 conference at Lake George, New York for a "professional placement center." The request was refused because it "would set a precedent and perhaps alter the atmosphere of the meetings." Instead, the Council voted to ask the service to describe its services in a five-minute period during the conference's annual business meeting.

The September 1973 Council was asked by the president-elect "about the possibility of organizing exhibits at our conferences." Space rental, insurance, and security problems were raised, but the proponent said that "even so they might make money if we set up space to sell and did it through a regular display company on contract." One Council member suggested that voluntary displays "might be easier," but nothing came of this proposal.

In the early 1980s, Bob Lee was given permission to invite firms to exhibit at the conference, having made the case for considering microcomputer, word processor, and software offerings. Such displays and exhibitor personnel make a welcome contribution today, and most members are probably unaware that earlier Councils had been divided as to the appropriateness of exhibits.

Recreational Activities

As befits a relatively small conference, meeting for only three days in a resort setting, the crowded conference program (with sessions scheduled morning, afternoon, and night from Thursday evening until Sunday noon) nevertheless manages to provide numerous opportunities for recreation, if not for sleep. Some early birds are on the golf course or tennis courts or in the swimming pool at 6 a.m., bars tend to fill up shortly after they open, meals are social occasions for small groups, members may take mornings or afternoons off for long walks or other excursions, and there are music, dancing, and "private" parties at night.

Two traditions, which extend all the way back to the first conference at Central City, are card-playing and group singing. Following the Saturday night program and banquet and a drink at the "president's party," a small group usually adjourns to a card room where two poker tables have been set up and other tables made available for bridge foursomes. The poker players usually comprise a few perennials and a mixture of newcomers and other long-time members. The players generally rotate, some arriving late, others retiring early. By 3 a.m. the game has
dwindled to a hard core of four or five at one table, who may continue playing all night.

At the same time, another group gathers to exercise their voices in song, usually well remembered popular tunes from all eras. Like the poker players, the singers include a few perennials and a mixture of newcomers and other long-time members. It was during the early 1960s, when AAPOR frequently met at the Sagamore on Lake George, that David Wallace, a Central City “pioneer” and president of the Association in 1958-1959, penned new lyrics to several popular songs. The first of these, “AAPOR Lament,” deplored the Association’s lengthy corporate name; the second, “AAPOR Adoration,” was a tongue-in-cheek reference to the rewards of an AAPOR conference (“With lots of psychology and sociology, Gee, they are things we adore”); and the third, “AAPOR Togetherness,” celebrated the Sagamore’s new policy of restricting single-room occupancy. (See appendix G, AAPOR songs.) These songs quickly became a part of the singing group’s standard repertoire, though in more recent years they have been largely forgotten.

A series of vignettes of the first thirty AAPOR conferences, written in 1975 by Paul Sheatsley on the basis of his own and collective memories, is shown in the introduction to this book, and conveys some of the flavor of AAPOR’s early days. Though AAPOR membership continues to expand, though the times keep changing and what was once a new and innovative practice has become a recognized profession, the annual conferences of AAPOR continue to be anticipated and enjoyed by all those who are interested in public opinion research.
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*

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

*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
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
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 nonprofit 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Commercial Research Agency</td>
<td>(384)</td>
<td>(325)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Research Component of Commercial Firm</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Research Agency or Component</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Staff, Faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, none</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong>*</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Academic Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fields:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology, Social Work, Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications, Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polit. Science, Government, Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health, Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Including administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Research Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
Membership Distribution by Sex, 1947–1986*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1986*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Two-thirds of AAPOR’s commercial members surveyed in 1959 also belonged to the American Marketing Association (AMA). For noncom-

TABLE 7
Membership Distribution by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1965 Survey</th>
<th>1971 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 and under</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
Highest Degree Earned (1959 Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Job</th>
<th>Commercial (200)</th>
<th>Noncommercial (129)</th>
<th>Total (329)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or LL.D.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. or B.S.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No College Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commercial 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAPOR Functions</th>
<th>Commercial Research Co (87)</th>
<th>Commercial Department (102)</th>
<th>Non-Profit (62)</th>
<th>College/University (102)</th>
<th>Total (384)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is an instrument for providing identity and dignity for the profession</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is generally intellectually stimulating</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a pleasant social occasion</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an instrument for upholding standards and ethics of the profession</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affords opportunity for informal discussions of professional problems</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me keep up with new research techniques</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me keep up with recent research in my fields of major interest</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me initiate or maintain contact with people who are potential employees, employers, clients, contractors, etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me keep up with recent research outside my major fields of interest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Pacific (PAPOR)</th>
<th>Midwest (MAPOR)</th>
<th>Central New Jersey</th>
<th>Metropolitan New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership, (paid voting)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>6–8 lunches</td>
<td>3 plus conference</td>
<td>2–day conference</td>
<td>3 dinners</td>
<td>4 evenings plus lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>Occasional social</td>
<td>Directory announcement</td>
<td>Job service</td>
<td>Christmas party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Suezlze, 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 Bezilda, 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.
The original constitution of the Association, adopted September 4, 1947, provides that AAPOR shall “facilitate the dissemination of opinion research methods, techniques and findings through annual conferences and an official journal and other publications.” The constitution specified further that one of AAPOR’s five standing committees should be a committee on publications. This was to consist of five members appointed by the Executive Council; its duties would be to advise and assist the editor, who was to be elected by the Executive Council for a three-year term. The editor was to be responsible, with the advice of the Committee on Publications, for preparing and issuing the official journal of the Association and its other publications.

In fact, the Association did not acquire a journal of its own until 1985, when it received title to the Public Opinion Quarterly from Columbia University. Nor, until many years had passed, did it directly publish and disseminate opinion research methods and findings, except in its annual conference proceedings. It did, however, publish a substantial number of items during its first thirty-eight years. Most of these fell into two categories: those concerned with the development of the opinion research profession and the conduct of the Association itself, and those that were in the nature of tools, such as indexes, that facilitated research in the field of public opinion. The Committee on Publications and the editor were responsible for some of AAPOR’s publishing activities, but many were undertaken by other committees or individuals, or were joint projects. It was the financial stringency AAPOR confronted in its early years that made it necessary to modify the publishing activities envisaged in the constitution. At the 1948 meeting of the Association, the treasurer reported that a choice might have to be made between paying for a subscription to an official journal for each member and having the conference proceedings printed.

At the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Publications, Cornelius DuBois, a compromise was adopted that allowed for both a publication and for printed proceedings. The Public Opinion Quar-
Finally had been started in 1937 by Harwood Childs of the Princeton Politics Department, and from its first issue had taken an interest in public opinion research. This journal was designated as the official organ of the Association, and POQ agreed to publish the AAPOR conference proceedings as a supplement to its 1949-50 Winter issue for a fee of $500. Members of the Association were to receive subscriptions to POQ at a special rate of $3.75 per annum (instead of the usual rate of $5.00), and Phillips Davison, editor of POQ, was elected by the Executive Council to serve as the Association’s editor also.

In the meantime, the proceedings of the 1947 founding conference at Williamstown had been printed and distributed by the National Opinion Research Center as a separate volume. Although not an official AAPOR publication, this 187-page book provides an invaluable account of AAPOR’s origins and intentions. It was edited by Henry David, then at Queens College, and was entitled Second International Conference on Public Opinion Research, the very first such conference having been at Central City, Colorado, in the summer of 1946. The Central City conference proceedings were compiled and distributed by NORC in the form of a mimeographed report.

At the 1949 business meeting of AAPOR, in Ithaca, New York, it was decided to continue arrangements for publication of the conference proceedings made at the 1948 meeting: namely, they would be published as a supplement to the POQ. Other publications at this time included only the annual conference program.

At the 1951 business meeting, during the conference in Princeton, Chairman William Lydgate of the Publications Committee reported that a new method to prepare the proceedings for publication in POQ had been adopted. An analyst had been appointed for each session to do a “book review” of it, rather than a summary presentation of each paper. This new method appears to have been a response to an Executive Council request that the annual proceedings should provide a better record of what had gone on, but at a lower cost. The response of Lydgate’s committee illustrates an important characteristic of AAPOR officials: their cheerful willingness to attempt the impossible. Nevertheless, no proceedings at all were published for the 1952 conference at Vassar. Some “book reviews” came in late and some sessions were not covered at all. A partial record of the 1952 proceedings was, however, compiled by Robert Bower of the Bureau of Social Science Research and distributed in mimeographed form.

More problems for the Publications Committee lay ahead. At the 1954 annual business meeting, Chairman Louis Harris reported that
the POQ was experiencing financial difficulties, because the Princeton University Press had stopped underwriting its publication costs. Furthermore, AAPOR was not providing any support to the journal, since the special subscription rate given AAPOR members was lower than the costs of production. Harris therefore proposed that an ad hoc committee be organized to solicit funds from AAPOR members and others to ensure continuation of the journal. The meeting agreed that AAPOR had a definite interest in the continuance of the POQ, and the recommendation that an ad hoc fund-raising committee be formed was referred to the Executive Council.

A year later, at the 1955 business meeting, Publications Chairman Archibald Crossley reported that the Executive Council was working with a Princeton University faculty committee to assist POQ in clearing up a manuscript backlog and straightening out its subscription list, which had become disorganized because of the lack of clerical help. Those present at the meeting voted that the amount AAPOR paid for an individual subscription be increased from $3.75 to $4.50. Meanwhile, the fund-raising committee proposed in 1954 had been created under the chairmanship of Paul Lazarsfeld. Known as “the committee for the POQ,” this body had no official connection with AAPOR. Nevertheless, almost all members of the committee were AAPOR members, one exception being Marion Harper, then of the McCann Er-ickson Advertising Agency, who agreed to serve as co-chair.

The committee persuaded some twenty-five organizations interested in public opinion research to become “sustaining subscribers” to the POQ at a rate, initially, of $100 a year. The journal’s financial problems were by no means over, but from that time on there was no doubt about its regular appearance. Some of the sustaining subscribers enrolled by the committee for the POQ continued their support until the Quarterly reached the break-even point twenty years later. In 1968, when the POQ editorial office was moved from Princeton to Columbia, largely because Princeton no longer had a senior faculty member working in the field, AAPOR contributed $2,000 toward the costs of this relocation.

The annual conference proceedings continued to be one of AAPOR’s most important publications through 1975. Various AAPOR editors adopted various approaches toward adapting the proceedings for publication, but a standard format developed during the 1950s and remained in fairly constant use. Authors of individual papers were asked to prepare abstracts; in the case of round-tables or symposia the chair-
men prepared summaries. The AAPOR editor then put all the material together in a form suitable for publication in the *POQ*.

This practice continued until 1976, at which point the AAPOR editor for that year, Matt Hauck, announced tersely: "Budgetary constraints prohibit the publication of the abstracts in the *POQ*." At the same time, however, the abstracts were collected in duplicated form and were made available for purchase at the annual conference. The conference program and a report on the annual business meeting continued to appear in the *POQ*.

As the published conference proceedings were being phased out, an AAPOR newsletter was being phased in. From the beginning of the organization, various presidents and secretary-treasurers had, from time to time, sent communications to the membership with news about AAPOR itself and information about professional matters. Helen Crossley, who held the secretary-treasurer post during the 1973-75 period, was particularly active in this regard, and issued two newsletters during her term of office.

A more formal newsletter of twelve pages appeared in March, 1974. In a page one editorial, signed by Harold Kassarjian, Editor, and Patricia Riley, Associate Editor, it was announced:

Because of the urging and high pressure tactics of our Publications Chairman, Franco Nicosia, the AAPOR Newsletter is to be published on a more regular basis. The task was no easy one, but with the delicate use of mildly veiled threats . . . Nicosia managed to convince your new editor that a newsletter was essential to his health . . .

The editorial went on to appeal for news and information from AAPOR members. This appeal was apparently successful, because a sixteen-page newsletter, identified as Volume 2, No. 1, appeared in November 1974. Included in the publication was Association news, including news from regional chapters of AAPOR, letters to the editor, job openings, notices of publications of interest to members, and a "president's column."

The newsletter, now titled *AAPOR News*, has continued under a succession of hard-working editors, sometimes with many pages and sometimes with fewer, on a customary schedule of three times a year. It has come to be relied upon by AAPOR members as a highly readable assemblage of useful information. Following Kassarjian and Riley, the publication’s editors have included Alan Andreasen, Mary Spaeth, Michael Rappeport, Roger Green, Peggy Gaboury, Donald Albert, Barbara Lee, Philip Meyer, Donald DeLuca, Barry Sussman, and James Beniger.
Another publishing venture started about the same time as the newsletter. Together with ten other professional organizations, AAPOR sponsored a new *Journal of Consumer Research*. This was a quarterly publication whose first two issues appeared in 1974. The policy board and editorial board of the new publication both included representatives from AAPOR. The Journal has made a distinguished place for itself, and continues to appear.

Meanwhile, the Association was issuing a number of publications that served its own organizational requirements. These included the annual conference program and the directory of members, as well as a leaflet (revised several times) entitled, "What Is AAPOR?" The last-named was used in answering queries and recruiting new members. Another widely-distributed statement briefly described careers in public opinion research. The AAPOR "Code of Professional Ethics and Practices" appeared in the *POQ* (Fall 1960), and copies of this (and subsequent revisions) were distributed to all members and to many others. A booklet entitled "Agencies and Organizations Represented in AAPOR Membership" was first published in 1975, in response to requests from job applicants and research users for the names of agencies involved in various types of research, and subsequently was revised and reissued on an annual basis. The Association's revised certificate of incorporation and by-laws were included in a handsome booklet that was distributed to members in 1982.

One of AAPOR's principal efforts at public education came in 1985, when 5,000 copies of an article from the Spring *POQ*, "Early Calls on Election Results and Exit Polls: Pros, Cons, and Constitutional Considerations" were reprinted and distributed as a contribution to the continuing debate about possible regulation of early election night forecasts. The article, based on a session at the 1984 AAPOR conference that had been organized and chaired by Ronald Milavsky, was mailed to state and federal officials, media executives, leading journalists, and others who were concerned with the debate.

Research tools sponsored by AAPOR have consisted primarily of two cumulative indexes to *POQ*. One of these, covering the journal's first twenty years, was edited by Norma Gilbertson, librarian of the School of Journalism of the University of Minnesota, and published by the Columbia University Press. Council authorized an expenditure of $4,100 for printing this index, an amount that was somewhat more than repaid by the time the publication sold out. The second cumulative index, 266 pages in length, was edited by Philip Meyer and Mary Spaeth of the Publications and Information Committee. (The new
name for the committee was adopted in a revision of the original by-laws.) This index was published for AAPOR by the Elsevier Science Publishing Company in 1984, and covered the years 1937 through 1982. The editors noted in a foreword that its content was incorporated in a computer database to facilitate the preparation of future editions.

A widely used anthology, not an official AAPOR publication but one that would not have appeared without AAPOR’s assistance, was published in 1975. Edited by Robert Carlson and entitled “Communications and Public Opinion,” the 632-page volume assembled thirty-six notable articles from the Public Opinion Quarterly, starting with “Toward A Science of Public Opinion,” by Floyd Allport, from Volume 1, No. 1. Editor Carlson wrote a general introduction as well as briefer introductions to the four sections, and Herbert Abelson, then AAPOR president, contributed a foreword.

AAPOR acquired title to the POQ from Columbia University in 1985, although the university continued to provide editorial services for the journal until June 1986. By this time, the Quarterly generated enough income from subscriptions to cover nearly all costs of publication. The transfer agreement was negotiated primarily by Eleanor Singer, who had already established a record for editorial longevity by remaining at the journal’s helm for more than ten years, and by Albert Gollin, AAPOR’s 1984-85 President. As of 1986, Howard Schuman, Director of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, was named POQ editor by the AAPOR Executive Council, and the University of Chicago Press was designated as the Quarterly’s new publisher.

Under the Association’s management, the POQ is supervised by a seven-member Advisory Committee consisting of two AAPOR councillors-at-large, the journal’s editor, and four AAPOR members who are appointed by the Executive Council to serve staggered four-year terms. The committee provides continuing oversight of administrative, financial, and editorial policy matters. It also nominates candidates for editor to the Executive Council. The editor serves not more than two four-year terms, and is assisted by an editorial board, whose members review manuscripts and advise on editorial content. Board members serve for not more than two terms of three years each.

Transfer of the POQ title to AAPOR brought a sigh of relief from the journal’s friends, who by 1985 were many. After thirty-one years at Princeton and eighteen at Columbia, it appeared that no university could have assured it a permanent home. The transfer also made AA-
POR a major publisher of research on public opinion and communication, as envisaged in the by-laws adopted in 1947.

The principal reasons for AAPOR’s relatively modest activity in the publication of scientific information during its first thirty-eight years probably had to do with financial weakness, at least during the initial two decades, and with the multiple professional affiliations of its members. The Publications Committee formulated a number of ambitious plans to produce monographs (for example, a guide to public opinion research for legislators and journalists), and book series on other specialized subjects, but none of these projects came to fruition. It proved impossible to find members with time to carry them out.

Nevertheless, AAPOR has certainly been effective in promoting the growth of knowledge about public opinion. Its major contributions have been facilitative in character: bringing together those interested in the subject for annual conferences, rescuing the POQ from almost certain financial disaster, keeping its members in touch with each other through AAPOR News, and assisting in the genesis of the Journal of Consumer Research and the Carlson anthology. Had AAPOR not existed, many books and articles would never have been written, nor would the refinement of opinion research tools have proceeded at such a rapid pace. AAPOR helped to build a hospitable environment.
AAPOR’s governance is based on the principles and rules that were enunciated at the time AAPOR was founded in 1947. AAPOR is a voluntary, professional association, governed by an Executive Council elected by the membership and financed primarily by membership contributions through the payment of annual dues. The bulk of the association’s professional and administrative activities are performed by the Executive Council, by various committees, and by individual members who carry out specific tasks assigned by Council.

All work performed by members, through service on the Executive Council or in other roles, is unpaid. The association owns no buildings, and does not own or rent a space where regular meetings are held. Only purely administrative or clerical functions, such as the maintenance of membership lists, mail communications to the membership, dues collection, and the like, are carried out by a paid secretarial staff. Even this concession to organizational practice was slow to be accepted by an association fiercely dedicated to the notion of voluntarism.

However, with the growth of the association, both governance and financial management have become streamlined over the years. In this chapter, this evolution will be discussed, together with some of the issues related to the governing process and financial status that have surfaced from time to time at membership and Executive Council meetings.


The Base Document

At the second annual conference of public opinion researchers, which was held at Williamstown, Massachusetts, in September 1947, AAPOR was formally founded and a constitution adopted (David, 1947). This document specified the name and purposes of the associa-
tion, as well as membership criteria (all persons professionally engaged in the field of public opinion research or teaching in the field of public opinion) and dues ($10 per year).

The constitution designated four officers (a president, a vice-president, a secretary-treasurer, and an editor) and their functions and terms of office (one, one, two, and three years respectively). Several committees were also specified by the constitution: Nominations, Conference, Standards, Publications, and Public Relations. The governing arm of the association was to be its Executive Council, which consisted of the four officers, the chairs of the five standing committees, the retiring president, and three other members (at large). However, the editor and the chairs of the Publications and Public Relations Committees were designated as nonvoting members of the Executive Council.

The procedures by which officers, committee chairs, and committee members were to be nominated and elected or appointed were quite complex, perhaps reflecting the idiosyncratic beliefs and concerns of the small group of founding members. Candidates for president, vice-president, and secretary-treasurer, as well as elected Council members and standing committee chairs, were selected by a committee on nominations after members had had an opportunity to propose nominees. This slate of nominees was to be mailed to the membership prior to the annual business meeting, and elections were held at the business meeting. Additional nominees for any office could be submitted by any member, provided these were endorsed by twenty active members of the association. The editor was to be elected by the Executive Council and could receive “such remuneration as the Executive Council authorizes.”

The number of members of each standing committee varied from three to seven; all members had to be appointed by the Executive Council. The president and secretary-treasurer were to be two of the seven Conference Committee members. It was also stipulated in the constitution that the Executive Council should hold no fewer than two meetings annually, and that an annual business meeting should be held on the next-to-last day of the annual conference. The holding of the conference itself was not separately specified in the constitution, although it was implied in the function of the Conference Committee, which was to be responsible “for planning and organizing the annual conference of the association.” Finally, article VII of the constitution provided for constitutional amendments by a majority vote of the membership, after proposed amendments had been approved by a majority of those present at the annual business meeting.
The basic structure incorporated in the 1947 constitution has been preserved, albeit in modified form, to the present day. Over the years, there have been a number of formal amendments, and a series of informal interpretations and traditions that have shaped the actual governance of the association. Amendments and interpretations were to some extent motivated by the practical need for streamlining and providing continuity of operations for a growing organization. Often, the underlying concern was to ensure equitable representation for the two AAPOR constituencies—those in the commercial and those in the not-for-profit (most often academic) sectors. Another important concern was to accommodate divergent views on the need to codify guidelines and enforcement mechanisms for standards of professional practice to which members of the association would be expected to adhere.

The Early Years: 1949–1963

Only two years after adoption of the AAPOR constitution, at the time of the 1949 conference, the first proposals to amend the constitution were introduced at the business meeting. First, it was proposed that the vice-president be deemed president-elect for the succeeding year. Proposals for changes in the election procedure were also introduced. In particular, the Nominations Committee was to suggest two candidates for the office of vice-president and for the office of secretary-treasurer; for the balance of the slate, the selection of one or two members was left to the discretion of the Nominations Committee. In explanation of the proposed amendment, the Nominations Committee discussed the desirability of alternating the presidency between members of the academic and business sectors. While a provision for alternate representation of the two groups was not incorporated in the proposed amendment, the Nominations Committee “hoped that it would become an understood policy of the association” (AAPOR, 1949). Other amendments introduced at that meeting called for the addition of a new standing committee (Research Development), whose chair would serve ex-officio on the Executive Council, and the establishment of local chapters.

It is not clear from the available documentation which of the many constitutional changes discussed between 1949 and 1963 were actually adopted and incorporated in formally revised documents, given AAPOR’s informal structure as an unincorporated organization. A revised constitution was published in 1951; it differed from the original (1947) document only in the following respects: the vice-president would automatically become president in the succeeding year, and a
sixth standing committee, the Committee on Research Development, was included in article VI. As before, the chair of this committee, as well as the chairs of the Publications and Public Relations Committees, were nonvoting members of the Executive Council, as was the editor.

In the ensuing years, further constitutional revisions were proposed and adopted. The most fundamental change followed a recommendation by Matilda Riley, then outgoing secretary-treasurer, who suggested at that meeting that future elections be carried out by mail ballot, rather than by those attending the annual business meeting, to ensure better participation by the membership. This suggestion was referred to future Council action. There was evidently considerable controversy, with supporters of election by mail stressing the democratic nature of the proposed change while opponents felt that the current system had worked well and that “the present nominations machinery assures that the men who are nominated are of high caliber, and that too, it is perfectly appropriate that only those who are interested enough in the organization to attend the business meeting should select the officers” (AAPOR, 1952). The upshot of the discussion was to submit to the 1953 annual business meeting a motion that future elections be conducted by mail, and at that meeting, the motion was voted (56 to 49). However, the constitution required a vote by the majority of the membership for a constitutional amendment. As a majority was not present at the business meeting, a mail vote by the entire membership had to be carried out; it approved the amendment.

Another constitutional amendment approved at the 1953 meeting had to do with the creation of a new membership class: a joint husband/wife membership (with a single POQ subscription). Evidently, there were by that time a sufficient number of AAPOR couples that this matter had become an issue.

A committee on the constitution, under the chairmanship of Hans Zeisel, was appointed in 1953 and drafted a revised constitution, incorporating procedures for elections by mail, changes in membership requirements (involving nomination of new members by two current members), local chapters, and some changes in the committee and Executive Council structure. This constitution was approved by a mail vote of the membership in June 1954, 171 to 4. Almost immediately thereafter, new amendments were proposed; these were apparently incorporated in subsequent years. The available documentation is sketchy with respect to developments between 1955 and 1963, but it appears that controversy centered on the pros and cons of greater organizational uniformity, a more systematic approach to the nomina-
tions process, better provisions for dealing with the day-by-day management of an ongoing organization, and, especially, the matter of members' pledging adherence to the AAPOR code. After considerable discussion, a much more legalistic and sophisticated document was prepared with the assistance of legal counsel when AAPOR incorporated in 1963.

Incorporation and New By-Laws (1963–1967)

The issue of incorporation had become salient by 1962, largely as a result of requests for action involving the Standards Committee. The Executive Council was reluctant to act on standards issues because of the possibility of retaliatory legal action against individual AAPOR officers by the offending parties. During 1962 and 1963, the Executive Council sought legal advice on these matters and was strongly advised to incorporate. At the 1963 business meeting, AAPOR's lawyer (Charles Moerdler, of Cravath, Swaine and Moore) explained that as members of an unincorporated association, all members might be considered to be partners and hence each liable for other members' actions on behalf of AAPOR. He strongly urged incorporation to enable officers to act without fear of personal liability, and recommended incorporation in Delaware as being least complicated and costly.

At the business meeting, some concerns were raised that incorporation might lead to further centralization of power in the hands of a minority of the membership (a perennial concern of some vocal members at the annual membership meeting), but those present were overwhelmingly in favor of incorporation, and a subsequent mail ballot to the membership approved incorporation by a vote of 306 to 2.

AAPOR was officially incorporated as of November 1, 1963. In the words of Paul Sheatsley, AAPOR's Secretary-Treasurer in 1963–64, "The action (incorporation) has had no substantial effect upon our long-standing traditions and procedures, but as a corporate organization we are now set up to act more effectively in behalf of any policies we intend to pursue" (AAPOR, 1964).

At the time of incorporation, AAPOR's by-laws were formally adopted. These by-laws were considerably more elaborate than earlier versions, and incorporated many of the amendments considered and/or approved by earlier Councils. There were by now three classes of members (student, regular, and honorary life). The joint husband-wife category had been dropped as a separate category, although reduced joint dues were established. (The joint membership category reappeared only in the 1980s, when it was redefined to cover an individual
living in the same household as a regular member, in recognition of the
diversity of shared household arrangements). Voting procedures,
Council membership, and committee structure remained generally
identical with those that prevailed in earlier years. The main change
was a tidying up of loose ends on the one hand (dealing with such mat-
ters as quorums required for Council action, and resignation or death
of Council members), and elimination of overspecific requirements on
the other (such as the number of committee members and their terms
of service, and the specification of dues, which had been demonstrated
to be best left to Council action).

Most important, perhaps, was the clear emphasis on the Code of
Ethics and Professional Practices, which was made a part of the by-laws
as article IX. Furthermore, article II of the by-laws, which specified
conditions of membership, required applicants for membership to ac-
knowledge in writing that they had read the code. (In later revisions,
this was changed to “read and subscribe to the code.”) Provision was
also made for terminating the membership of a member for reasons
other than nonpayment of dues “with or without cause,” a provision
designed to meet the possibility of a member’s being found in violation
of the code. The by-laws were slightly amended between the time of
incorporation in 1963 and the publication of the printed version in
1967.

Modern Times: The By-Law Revisions of 1976 and
1986

Between 1967 and 1976, a number of constitutional amendments
were proposed, but most were not adopted by AAPOR’s Executive
Council. A recurring concern had to do with the competitive nature of
AAPOR’s election process, in particular the fact that two distinguished
members were being nominated for the future presidency. Periodic pro-
posals to correct this situation, which some members felt resulted in a
loss of good leaders for a small organization, would have a single can-
didate after a more elaborate nominations procedure, or the automatic
election to Council (as member-at-large) of the defeated vice-presiden-
tial candidate. However, neither of these proposals was adopted as an
amendment. Only one change (which turned out to be temporary) was
adopted in 1969: instead of the one editor, two editors were to be
elected so that one of them could “participate in the editing of POQ”
while the other would handle the AAPOR conference proceedings.

Other issues also called for amendments. By 1975, Richard Maisel
had been put in charge of preparing by-law revisions. The role of the
editor was under discussion, as were responsibilities for AAPOR’s publications, proposals to separate the two functions of the secretary-treasurer, and—perhaps most important—a tightening of procedures for ensuring adherence to the code of ethics and for dealing with violations. Some of the proposed revisions were adopted in April 1976 and published in 1977. These revisions formalized the procedures for making acceptance of the code a precondition of membership in AAPOR, clarified and streamlined some of AAPOR’s rules for elections and membership termination, and introduced some changes in the functioning and structure of AAPOR’s standing committees.

Changes in the composition of the Executive Council were also made. The committee on nominations and membership was changed to a committee on membership, with responsibility for nominations given to the past president; the number of editors was again reduced from two to one; and an associate conference chair who was to become chair the following year was added to the Council. Thus, the conference chairmanship became in effect a two-year office for two individuals; during any given year, the chair would be in his or her second year, while the associate would be newly elected. Because the job of planning the increasingly complex conferences had become a very time-consuming one, the need for two persons to carry out this task had become apparent. Furthermore, AAPOR’s perennial concern about adequate representation for the commercial and academic sectors of the membership resulted in an informal understanding that at any given time the conference chair and co-chair would be from different sectors. The co-editor job was abolished because the 1967 rationale for a second editor (more involvement by AAPOR in the development of articles for the \textit{Public Opinion Quarterly}) had not turned out to be a realistic assignment, in the opinion of the incumbents.

The 1977 by-laws also incorporated some slight code revisions, in particular a new provision for avoiding deceptive practices vis-à-vis respondents and to protect their anonymity and the confidentiality of information received. For the first time, AAPOR’s standards for reporting public opinion polls were incorporated in the code, but because successive councils had not come to full agreement about the wording of these standards, they were not included in the printed version of the by-laws until 1986.

Although the 1976 by-law changes had remedied some of AAPOR’s most pressing needs for constitutional revision, subsequent councils felt that they had not gone far enough and that a basic reexamination of AAPOR’s governance and by-laws was needed. In the fall of 1977,
President Hope Klapper appointed a task force that consisted of two executive councillors at large (Jack Elinson and Laure Sharp) to work on a set of proposals for new by-law revisions. The task force brought in a first set of recommendations that was discussed at several meetings of the Executive Council in 1978. Because the task force’s recommendations called for more drastic changes in AAPOR’s governing structure than had been considered in the past, they were debated at great length and underwent several revisions. However, on January 16, 1979, the Executive Council agreed unanimously to far-reaching changes in the composition of the Executive Council, which were presented for a vote to the AAPOR membership in April 1979 and were overwhelmingly approved.

Table 1 summarizes the changes in the structure of the Executive Council that were adopted in 1979 and reflected in the by-laws published in 1982. The objectives that guided the Council in adopting the task force proposal were mainly:

- To ensure continuity and coverage for every office on the Executive Council; and to facilitate the transition from one Council to the next.
- To attend to functions not specifically assigned to a Council activity, such as local chapters, and to eliminate committees that had not developed a clear mission or sphere of activity over the years (such as the Research and Development Committee).
- To increase opportunities for Council participation by newer AAPOR members; as they would be brought in as associate chairs, lack of prior AAPOR experience would not be a problem.
- To keep the total membership of the Council to its previous number (15).

Under the revised by-laws, in addition to the Nominations Committee chaired by the past president during his or her one-year term, only four standing committees remained, each with a chair and associate chair. The functions of some of these committees were enlarged to handle activities previously delegated to the committees and positions that had been eliminated. In particular:

- The committee on publications and information was to handle all AAPOR publicity, including some previously the responsibility of the Public Relations Committee.
- The Conference Committee was to handle all matters related to the conference, including the competition for student papers (previously handled by the Research Development Committee) and preparation of the abstracts (previously handled by the editor).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1977 by-laws</th>
<th>1982 by-laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice president</td>
<td>Vice president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past president*</td>
<td>Past president*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-treasurer</td>
<td>Secretary-treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate secretary-treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Standards Committee</td>
<td>Chair, Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate chair, Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Conference Committee</td>
<td>Chair, Conference committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate chair, Conference</td>
<td>Associate chair, Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Publications Committee</td>
<td>Chair, Publications and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Chair, Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Information Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Membership Committee</td>
<td>Chair, Membership and Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate chair, Membership and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Research Development</td>
<td>Committee eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Public Relations Committee</td>
<td>Committee eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three councillors-at-large (N = 15)</td>
<td>Two councillors-at-large (N = 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The past president is also the chairperson of the Nominations Committee.
• The Membership and Chapter Relations Committee was to handle all matters pertaining to membership and to chapters, for which there was no previous committee assignment.

Another goal of the revision was to standardize the terms of office of all AAPOR councillors. Only the AAPOR presidency continued to have a three-year term for the incumbent, who serves as vice-president during the first year, president the second year, and past president the third year. All other AAPOR offices involve a two-year term for the incumbent. The secretary-treasurer and committee chairs were to serve in the associate capacity during the first year and take the title of secretary-treasurer or committee chair during the second year in office. Councillors-at-large were to serve two-year terms.

By reducing the number of councillors-at-large from three to two, the total number of Council members was kept at fifteen under the proposed reorganization.

The by-laws do not specify how chairs and associate chairs were to divide up their activities; this was left up to the individuals concerned. Of course, both the chair and associate chairs were to be regular Council members and were expected to attend Council meetings during their entire term of office.

The restructuring of the Council was the most important change of the 1979 revision, but a few other changes were also proposed and adopted. The provision that new members had to be nominated by two regular members and approved by the Membership Committee before they could join the organization was eliminated. Instead, it was merely stipulated that any person who subscribes to the AAPOR code in writing is eligible for membership. The earlier provision was little more than a formality, and had discouraged applications by potential members. The joint member category, which was still in use but had been cut out in earlier by-law versions because of the increasingly complex task of defining this category, was formally restored to cover persons living in the same household who would pay for one POQ subscription.

Finally, Council began to worry about the graying of the organization and the impending heavy demand for honorary life memberships. Eligibility was restricted to persons who had reached the age of sixty-five, had relinquished full-time employment, and had held membership in AAPOR for twenty years (rather than ten years as specified under the previous by-laws).

The 1979 revision was not published until March 1982 because in the process of registering the by-law changes, it was discovered that
AAPOR's certificate of incorporation also needed to be amended. AAPOR's lawyer alerted the Council to the need to buy liability insurance for the officers of the corporation. Until that time, no AAPOR Council member was aware that with the changing legal climate, incorporation no longer provided adequate protection against liability suits. Individual corporate officers were increasingly held liable for their actions on behalf of corporations, especially in connection with actions taken by the Standards Committee. Such actions might well be brought against AAPOR Council members.

Finally, by 1982, all was settled. The certificate of incorporation had been revised so that AAPOR officers could be insured; insurance was purchased. The new by-laws were proofread one more time and the new version was printed, although continuing debate about revising the code and incorporating standards for minimal disclosure made it likely that this would not be the last revision.

And indeed it was not. In 1986, what was then officially the fourth edition of the by-laws was published. It differed from the 1982 version primarily because of the adoption of the revised code, but there was also a new provision in article VI, which deals with standing committees: an advisory committee on the Public Opinion Quarterly was added, whose composition and membership are determined by the Executive Council, and whose function is the recommendation of candidates for appointment to editorship of the journal, as well as the appointment of members of POQ's editorial board. This by-law revision was prompted by the move of POQ from Columbia University, where this function had previously resided. (See the chapter titled "AAPOR and the Printed Word."

It is likely that future Councils will want to revise the by-laws many more times. AAPOR is a growing organization operating in a field where technological innovations have immediate impacts. Hence, its structure must remain flexible. But the experience of AAPOR's first forty years is very encouraging. Time and again, the leadership and the membership have demonstrated the capacity to make the changes that were called for without impairing either the democratic or the voluntary nature of the organization.
TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AAPOR officers, Council, and committee chairman, compiled by the AAPOR secretary.

The Executive Council: Members, Meetings, Issues

Length of Service of Council Members

From the founding of AAPOR in 1947 through the year 1985–86, a total of 157 persons have been elected or nominated (when vacancies occurred through resignations or death) to serve on Council one or more times. As Table 2 shows, the median years of service falls between two and three years. A relatively small number of individuals (twenty-seven) have served for more than five years; the record (fifteen years) was held by Paul Sheatsley, who was chair of the Publications Committee in 1948–49 and councillor-at-large in 1982–83, having held in between almost every other AAPOR office (including the presidency in 1967–68).

Over the years, the issue of a self-perpetuating “clique” that was said to control the organization was occasionally raised, as well as concerns about the lack of participation on Council by younger or newer members. In fact, the figures in Table 2 suggest that a large proportion of the membership did participate in AAPOR’s governance. Over the forty-
year period of AAPOR’s existence, the membership grew from fewer than 300 to approximately 1,200; thus, it is likely that over the years, 10 to 15 percent of the members served on Council, a much higher proportion than in larger organizations. Furthermore, Sheatsley’s case was unique, reflecting his exceptional role in the life of the organization. More typically, even those Council members who served more than two or three years tended to be on Council over a span of a decade or less.

Council Meetings

In the early years of the organization, Council meetings were held in New York City, except for the last meeting of each Council, which was held at the place of the annual conference. This last meeting involved the preparation of the agenda for the annual business meeting, which also took place during the conference, and the transition from the outgoing to the incoming Council. New York City was the natural place to hold all other meetings—the majority of Council members lived and worked in New York City or in nearby New Jersey and Connecticut, and the few Council members who lived elsewhere were often able to combine other New York business with attendance at AAPOR meetings. Since the constitution did not prescribe a fixed number of Council meetings, each Council decided its meeting times from one meeting to the next.

In the early years, meetings were frequent and tended to be quite informal. The councillors usually met in the late afternoon over drinks in a quiet restaurant, and the meeting continued through dinner and into the night, with much spirited conversation about methodological and policy issues that affected the profession and the association.

In later years, meetings became less frequent but longer. An occasional meeting was held in a place other than New York, often in Washington or in Chicago, reflecting the greater geographic diversity of the Council and the fact that for some Council members, Washington had become an important center for professional activities. Meeting dates were set at the beginning of the Council year; usually four or five meetings (in addition to the final meeting at the annual conference) were scheduled. The meeting places shifted from restaurants to private clubs (such as the Columbia faculty club or the Williams Club in New York), and to the conference rooms of organizations (such as the Social Science Research Council) or to corporate facilities, depending on the ability of individual Council members to make arrangements for conference rooms.
AAPOR’s changing financial situation, which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, also influenced the character of the meetings. In earlier years, with most of the Council members living in New York or combining attendance at Council meetings with reimbursed business trips, reimbursement for Council travel was seldom an issue, and the AAPOR treasury only had to pick up the tab for the restaurant or club dinner bill. In later years, and especially during the financial crunch in the seventies, Council expenses were usually the first item to be sacrificed for cost-cutting purposes. Members (or their employers) were asked to pay for their dinner expenses, and longer and fewer meetings were instituted. At the same time, the matter of reimbursing those Council members who had to travel to meetings and were not reimbursed by their employers became a salient issue, since it was felt that in the absence of some reimbursement by AAPOR, younger and less affluent AAPOR members might not be able to serve on Council or to attend many meetings. There was much discussion of these issues, and depending on the state of AAPOR’s treasury, some travel reimbursements were introduced, ranging (in the lean years) from airfare to one Council meeting a year, to travel and other expenses being reimbursed as often as needed (during the more recent era of AAPOR’s prosperity). The one consistent policy was that no Council member could be reimbursed for attending the meeting held in conjunction with the annual conference.

Meetings also began to be held during the day, rather than in the late afternoon, and featured a long agenda that was only briefly interrupted by a modest lunch served around the conference table. But while the AAPOR Council meetings had become more streamlined and businesslike, their fundamental character did not change. The exchanges were spirited and witty; the intellectual level of the discourse was high; fundamental issues affecting the profession—and in particular the enforcement of high professional and ethical standards, and concerns about the quality and relevance of the annual conference program—dominated Council meetings.

Salient Issues

Governance issues that took up much of the Council’s time from the beginning of AAPOR had to do primarily with the nominations and elections process; they have already been identified in the discussion of the history of AAPOR’s by-laws. The debate about the nominations process was a recurrent one, with one camp accusing the organization of undemocratic procedures and the other expressing concern that
competitive slates were detrimental for a small organization. As recently as 1984, Burns Roper made a strong case for broadening the nominations procedures and the ultimate presentation of a single slate, which was rebutted by other Council members and was overwhelmingly opposed by those present at the annual business meeting in 1984. A related suggestion, discussed in 1967, was rejected after long debate. It was, that the same individuals be named for vice-president and one councillor-at-large position, with the result that the losing vice-presidential candidate would be named executive councillor.

One of the arguments of those who oppose contested elections is that defeated candidates will turn down later requests to become candidates. In fact, there seems to be little need for concern. Although such refusals have undoubtedly occurred, many AAPOR presidents elected in recent years have been defeated on one or two previous occasions for this and other offices, and the same is true of other office-holders.

The names of nominated but not elected candidates have been tabulated by the AAPOR secretariat only for the period since 1979. Between 1979 and 1989, seventy-one persons were nominated but not elected; of these, forty-one held office in AAPOR (either before or after the election in which they lost); only thirty-one of them had never served on Council by 1985.

The current system, which with minor modifications has been in operation since AAPOR introduced elections by mail in 1954, calls for the preparation of the slate by the chair of the committee on nominations (who is the past president), with the help of a committee that the chair selects and the Executive Council approves. The chair then solicits nominations by the membership, and prepares a slate for Council approval. While the chair is theoretically free to structure the process of drawing up the slate, he or she is bound by the growing tradition of alternating persons from the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors for the presidency, as well as for conference chair (since the 1960s) and for councillor-at-large (since the 1980s). When nominations are solicited from the membership, the sector from which candidates for each of these positions are to be restricted is specified in the request for nominations. Nominees from the “wrong” sector are eliminated from consideration.

In practice, the nominations process is strongly influenced by the membership’s suggestions, despite the fact that the number of nomi-

---

1. The single slate was also an important issue for his father, Elmo Roper, who was never AAPOR president because he refused to accept the indignity of running for an office he felt should have been offered to him.
nations is usually quite small. For example, in 1984–85, the Nominations Committee consisted of ten members, and a total of twenty-eight members, including some but not all committee members, suggested candidates for the seven offices that were to be filled that year. The chair and the committee prepared the slate that was largely based on these candidates and a few additional late suggestions by the committee; however, at the Council meeting when final approval of the slate was discussed, new names were introduced and the slate brought in by the committee was modified. This procedure is always subject to change because without specific procedures being part of the by-laws, each Council is free to proceed as it sees fit.

After the final slate is approved, the Chair of the Nominations Committee contacts the proposed candidates in the order approved by the Council. Thus, there are usually four or five names available for each office, to be used in case of refusals. In fact, in most years, almost all those ranked one and two have agreed to run. A candidate does not learn the name of his or her opponent until after the slate has been completed. Traditionally, AAPOR does not disclose the actual number of votes received by a given winner or loser, although candidates can request this information about the offices for which they ran.

AAPOR Councils have voted over the years to maintain what they felt was the most democratic system—or as was said by some, the system retaining the greatest appearance of openness. Attempts to decrease the authority of the Council to make the final selection of candidates, unbound by the recommendations of the Nominations Committee, were resisted by each Council faced with this question. There is a procedure for introducing additional nominees after the proposed slate of nominees is mailed to the membership. However, it is cumbersome and thus unlikely to be used. A group of twenty-five members or more must submit additional names within twenty days after the proposed list of candidates has been mailed to the membership.

In contrast to the lack of participation in the nominations process, participation in the actual voting is quite high; it has been in the 40–50 percent range in recent years. Although not all voters vote for all offices, there has never been a problem with the constitutional requirement that at least 25 percent of active members must vote for each office.

AAPOR has long been concerned about adequate representation among the membership and on the Council of persons traditionally underrepresented in professional associations: those who are young, female, or nonwhite. The problem of recruiting young members and of-
Office-holders is a fairly recent one, as the founders and early Council members were a young group. Over the past twenty years, however, the search for suitable young Council candidates has been of concern to Council members and Nominations Committees and, traditionally, some of the candidates for offices other than those of vice-president and councillor-at-large have been younger AAPOR members.

Women have been active in AAPOR since the early days, although prior to 1960 they seldom served on Council except in the role of secretary-treasurer or councillor-at-large. It was not until the 1970s that the proportion of women on Council became more substantial. Because some Council members saw the need to break precedent and elect a woman president of AAPOR, the slate for 1976–77 listed two women as presidential candidates. Hope Klapper became AAPOR’s first woman President in 1977–78. Since that time, three other women won the presidency against male candidates, and in most years about half of all Council members have been women.

Black membership in AAPOR has always been very low, despite energetic recruitment efforts. There seem to be very few black researchers in the commercial or academic world whose professional interests overlap with those of the AAPOR membership. The AAPOR Council had its first black member, Lawrence Bobo, Conference Committee Associate Chair, in 1989.

Most of the other issues that consumed the time and energy of AAPOR Council members over the years had to do with AAPOR’s finances and with the substantive concerns of the Conference, Standards, Publications, and Membership Committees. One other issue brought up from time to time concerned the performance of an explicit mission of AAPOR: “to stimulate research and study in the field of public opinion and social behavior” (AAPOR, 1967 and 1981). The Committee on Research and Development, which was set up in 1951 and functioned until its abolition in 1981, was established to serve this objective, but the 1954 constitution specified that its purpose was to advise and assist members in the planning and conduct of research projects, not to initiate or support its own projects. Periodic suggestions for the initiation of AAPOR-sponsored or AAPOR-conducted research, with or without outside (usually foundation) support, were turned down by the Executive Councils. The idea of AAPOR sponsoring “crisis research” when sudden, unexpected events occur, such as the assassination of a president of the United States, generated a good deal of interest and discussion but was not followed through. As recently as 1983, fears were expressed at a Council meeting that involv-
ing AAPOR in research endeavors would invariably lead to the need for paid professional staff, and would result in a change in AAPOR’s essentially collegiate and non-bureaucratic character. This character was seen as its main attraction for many members who also belonged to other, more formally structured, professional organizations. It was partly because these concerns were so prevalent over the years that the research and development committee was seldom presented with a set of meaningful activities. Its abolition had been recommended by some Council members as early as 1962.

Just as AAPOR Councils found it impossible to reconcile the organization’s operating style with the role of research initiator and performer, they were reluctant to take on other missions that were occasionally suggested by members and Councillors with more action-oriented interests. A committee on social action was formed at the 1970 conference and chaired by Barbara Lee, but it could not define an agenda that could be implemented. Periodically, there were suggestions for “a presence” in Washington or the organization of a meeting or conference for Washington policymakers to acquaint them with relevant public opinion and social science data. None of these plans materialized. Joining other organizations that had these objectives proved easier to carry out. For several years, AAPOR participated in a Washington activity sponsored by the American Psychological Association and by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), which sought to influence congressional action in the fields of health and human resources, but this endeavor eventually collapsed.

More recently, AAPOR has joined the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) and the Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS), both of which are supported by the major social science and statistical associations, and which attend to the interests of social scientists and of users of federal statistics who are affected by the operations of federal agencies. Both associations have full-time professional staffs and perform some of the functions that some AAPOR members had hoped AAPOR would take on as part of its mission. Perhaps, continuing its contributions of funds to these two associations is the most practical solution to AAPOR’s dilemma.

The AAPOR Secretariat

During the early years of AAPOR’s existence, those who ran the affairs of the organization did not acknowledge the need for a formal
support structure for AAPOR. Initially, of course, the membership was fairly small, and the secretary-treasurer was expected to handle such matters as keeping a list of members, collecting dues, and mailing out informational materials as needed. The association operated on the assumption that free or low-cost services could be obtained from the organizations that employed those who served on the AAPOR Council, since holding office in a prestigious professional association was encouraged by some employing organizations.

However, as AAPOR grew and the secretarial and clerical tasks needed for its functioning became more complex and time consuming, the need for more substantial support, and especially the need for continuity, became apparent. NORC, which had been so deeply involved in AAPOR’s founding, acted as AAPOR’s secretariat through its New York office, at subsidized cost. By 1966, however, Council recognized the need for a more formal and businesslike arrangement. After acknowledging that for many years, General Electric, CBS (under Joseph Klapper’s terms as secretary-treasurer), and NORC (under Sheatsley’s terms) absorbed a large part of the cost of the AAPOR secretariat, Council pointed to the need for a new arrangement:

Now that funds are available from our increase in dues we think we are agreed that the time has come for AAPOR to pay the full costs of the secretary’s office. The urgency of the situation is only increased by the fact that Baxter’s secretary has family responsibilities and cannot be expected to put in the time that Sheatsley’s secretary, Michael McGarry, has done. (Bogart, Sheatsley, and Baxter, 1966.)

Arrangements were made with Ms. McGarry to take on the job of handling all of AAPOR’s secretarial tasks, including responding to mail and telephone inquiries, and maintaining the membership directory, files, and records of the association at the cost of $2,000 per year. The arrangement was shifted to NORC in 1971, after Mike McGarry’s death in 1970, and Euthemia Matsoukas was in charge of the secretariat. Costs increased as a result of increasing demands generated by the AAPOR account and pressure from NORC for a more realistic rate for the services performed. Between 1968 and 1973, costs escalated from $2,500 to $10,000, partly as a result of some unusual expenditures. A number of Council members with knowledge of commercial secretarial support services available to other professional organizations argued for a change in AAPOR’s secretarial arrangements, and in December 1975 arrangements were made to switch the AAPOR administrative support contract to a private management firm, Lenbrook Management Inc.
After two years, AAPOR decided to switch contractors again, chiefly because of continuous cost escalation by Lenbrook Management. At that time, the firm of Freedman and Druker, located in Princeton, New Jersey, was selected. It has continued to provide secretarial and accounting services for the AAPOR account until 1990. The AAPOR administrator, Diana Druker, has shown the kind of personal devotion and interest that characterized the work of AAPOR’s earlier administrators and that had enabled the organization to function smoothly for so many years, despite its minimal bureaucratic structure.

AAPOR Finances

When AAPOR was founded in 1947, the financing of the new organization was not a matter of great concern. The original constitution specified dues of $10 per year, actually a fairly hefty amount in those days. With most of AAPOR’s expenses being absorbed by Council members, revenues were adequate to meet the demands, most of which involved expenses in connection with POQ subscriptions for members, the annual conference (programs, proceedings, and some secretarial travel and expenses), and such items as stationery, telephone, and postage.

With the growth of the organization, the need for year-round secretarial support, the introduction of new activities and publications, and rising costs of Council meetings, AAPOR’s income sources and financial status began to absorb more and more time and energy from those who were responsible for the affairs of the organization. The matter of raising more revenue through dues increases, conference registration fees, and various devices for obtaining additional funds (including listings of organizations in the survey research field in a special publication, and listings of “ads” in the AAPOR conference program) were discussed in Council meetings at great length. Even more lengthy were discussions about reducing AAPOR’s expenditures, discussions that centered primarily on finding more economical ways of handling the year-round secretariat and of cutting back on the expenses associated with Council meetings by reducing the number of meetings.

The discussions about AAPOR’s financial status were long handicapped by the lack of good systematic information about the organization’s true balance sheets. For a long time, the secretary-treasurer and Council were primarily interested in cash flow and cash balances. Organizational accounting procedures, with set budgets and consist-
ent budget categories from one year to the next, were introduced only in the 1970s. But more often than not, until the early 1970s, AAPOR had led a hand-to-mouth existence. This was a matter of no great concern to the leadership, which found the existence of an occasional surplus rather embarrassing and felt that such surpluses should be spent for the furtherance of AAPOR’s scholarly and professional mission, rather than for building up organizational assets.

Only after AAPOR had weathered a serious financial crisis in the 1970s was there interest in ensuring the economic stability of the organization. By 1982, AAPOR had a net worth in excess of $100,000, a situation, even allowing for inflation, that many old-timers found totally unbelievable. Table 3 summarizes the financial history of AAPOR from the earliest years through 1987; for the period prior to 1976, data are incomplete and many of the figures are approximations developed from often inconsistent records. In the remainder of this section, the sources of income and expenditures will be examined, along with the factors that led to AAPOR’s seeming affluence.

Dues and Other Sources of Income

AAPOR dues of $10 per year remained basically unchanged until 1965, when the first increase was introduced. Prior to that time, a few adjustments were made: the joint category was introduced in 1953, with fees set at $14. Two new categories, student members (with $5 dues) and emeritus (no dues), were added in 1963. The 1965 increase raised dues to $20 for regular members, $25 for joint members, and $10 for student members. As can be seen in Table 3, this increase had a dramatic effect on the AAPOR treasury, but beginning in 1969, the financial situation again became precarious.

Suggestions for further dues increases were met with considerable resistance on the part of many Council members, who feared the loss of members and sought instead to correct AAPOR’s financial problems by reduction in expenditures and a search for other sources of income. For example, in the 1969 Treasurer’s Annual Report, Dick Baxter wrote, “Obviously this (financial) situation is very different from that existing in recent years . . . now our problem is to hold down expenditures and not raise dues.” His proposal was for reducing the extent to which student award winners would be reimbursed for travel expenses at the annual conference, and for reducing the number of Executive Council meetings. In a 1972 newsletter, the efforts to reduce expenses were detailed: “AAPOR’s financial bind is being dealt with by spartan economies such as requiring Council members who have expense accounts
### TABLE 3
AAPOR’s Income Expenditures, and Fund Balance 1948–1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Fund Balance$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,300$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957–62</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>no data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–65</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>no data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,120</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973$^c$</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>NDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>NDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>8,900$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>35,400</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>55,600</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>53,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>59,100</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>73,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>70,700</td>
<td>47,400</td>
<td>92,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>70,700</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>104,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>103,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>88,100</td>
<td>88,600</td>
<td>95,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>100,196</td>
<td>85,816</td>
<td>113,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986$^e$</td>
<td>132,341</td>
<td>127,016</td>
<td>134,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987$^e$</td>
<td>141,485</td>
<td>140,551</td>
<td>135,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Yearly changes in the fund balance do not always reflect annual differences between revenues and expenditures, because during a given fiscal year, additional items (incurred during earlier fiscal years) affect the fund balance figure.

$^b$ Presumably includes some carryover from 1947; no 1947 data available.

$^c$ Fiscal year was changed from January 1 - December 31 to July 1 - June 30.

$^d$ From 1976 on, figures are based on balance sheet prepared by accounting firm.

$^e$ The large increases in income and expenditure in 1986 and 1987 are attributable to the inclusion of POQ’s operations in AAPOR’s budget.
to pay for their dinners at Council meetings; limiting the number of free drinks at the presidential party at the next annual conference, and reducing the number of pages in the *POQ* devoted to conference proceedings" (AAPOR, 1972).

Obviously, those spartan measures were not enough, and the distasteful dues issue had to be faced. A 1972 dues raise was a very modest one ($5) for all categories and did little to solve AAPOR's problems. However, a new dues increase was strongly resisted. Instead, efforts were made to find a way of seeking corporate contributions or memberships, or to find a way of increasing dues only for those members whose companies paid for their membership, which was the case for a number of members in the commercial sector. Thus in 1973, the employer-paid category, with fees set at $50, was created; revenues increased considerably from this change, but there were frequent objections to the existence of this category and its abolition was periodically proposed. However, upon examination it became clear that attempts to eliminate this category would have had serious consequences unless other dues categories were increased or new sources of income found.

In 1977, AAPOR followed the example of many professional organizations that had begun to introduce differential dues based on members' income. AAPOR introduced a new dues structure, which entailed a small increase for all members and asked those whose income exceeded $25,000 to pay $40 instead of $30 per year. The 1973 structure was maintained until 1984 and, as can be seen in Table 3, no doubt contributed to AAPOR's growing affluence. However, in 1983, Council began to be concerned about the recurrence of annual deficits and the resulting leveling-off of AAPOR's net worth, and felt that another small dues increase would be acceptable to the membership. Experience with minimal membership losses and greatly enhanced financial health after each dues increase had at last persuaded the Council that such increases were a reasonable practice for a professional organization. The 1983–84 Council agonized considerably less over these matters than earlier generations of Council members who had grown up in a different economic environment. The dues for 1984 were set as follows:
TABLE 4
AAPOR Membership Summary
May 1984 and May 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewals (old rate)</th>
<th>May 1984</th>
<th>May 1985 (new rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50 ($40) Individual A</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 ($30) Individual B</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 ($50) Company paid</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 ($15) Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 ($20) Joint</td>
<td></td>
<td>2420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary life</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50 ($40) Individual A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 ($30) Individual B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 ($50) Company paid</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 ($15) Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>2114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 ($20) Joint</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary life</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employer paid                      $60
Individual paid, option A
(annual income in excess of $25,000)      50
Individual paid, option B
(annual income below $25,000)            40
Student                                   20
Joint member—an additional               15

While the decision by individual members to elect option A is a purely voluntary one, it appears that most members opt for the higher amount, and that the 1984 increase did not affect the split, as shown in Table 4.

Dues are AAPOR’s main income source. Currently, AAPOR also derives income from conference registration fees, the list of organizations that is published annually and in which organizations performing survey research are listed for a fee, the membership directory (which is free to members but sold to nonmembers), rental of its computerized mail-
ing list, and interest and gain on the sale of securities held in AAPOR's account. These additional sources of income have been developed only gradually.

Although the idea of charging a registration fee at the annual conference was suggested as early as 1951, the notion then and in later years was to limit the fee to non-members. Such a fee was first charged in 1954. More than ten years later, at the 1964 annual meeting, the idea of charging a registration fee for members was again brought up in connection with AAPOR's need for funds and reluctance to raise dues, but the issue was tabled for later discussion.

In September 1971, a proposal by Don Cahalan was before the Council, recommending a $5 registration fee. The argument was made that most organizations charge registration fees and that it is more equitable to put the burden of conference expenses on those who benefit from the conference. The counter-argument was "that it is a chintzy thing to do, and that it might lead to lower registration at our conferences in order to avoid the fee" (Cahalan, 1971). However, with increasing financial difficulties in the 1970s, a registration fee was introduced; by 1976 it had been raised (to $20 for AAPOR members and $30 for nonmembers); by 1978, the numbers were $30 and $40.

As was the case with the dues schedule, it turned out that increasing the registration fee time and again had no effect on participation, but generated revenue. In 1984, for preregistered participants the registration fee was $40 for members and $65 for nonmembers; onsite fees were $50 and $75 respectively. That year, 280 persons registered for the conference; registration fees yielded $12,300.

It was during the same years when conference fees were introduced and raised that AAPOR also developed additional income through the publication of the "blue book" and through the listing of sponsors in other AAPOR publications, the membership directory, and the conference program. Some members found the pressure AAPOR was putting on corporations with large survey research staffs unseemly; and objections were raised whenever paid advertisements in AAPOR publications and other such commercial strategies were suggested.

Currently, AAPOR will list sponsors or contributors (for a fee) but does not sell advertising space in the association's publication. (POQ accepts ads from publishers and others, and that policy was not changed when AAPOR acquired the journal.)

One other source of income for AAPOR has been earned interest and income from the sale of securities. Whenever the organization was relatively affluent, or had cash on hand for some period of time between
the collection of dues and the payment of obligations, money was invested, usually in savings accounts or government bonds. Thus, in 1967 the organization earned $250 from its investment in a $10,000 savings certificate, which had been held for part of the year. But significant investment income was reported for the first time in the 1980s when interest rates were high and AAPOR was able to invest sizable sums in government securities. The changes in the sources of AAPOR’s revenues since 1948 are illustrated in Table 5, which shows that AAPOR’s reliance on dues has diminished considerably, from nearly 100 percent in the 1950s and 60s to between 60 and 70 percent in the 1980s. Income generated by AAPOR’s other fund-raising activities—conference registration fees, blue book listings, etc.—accounts for close to one-quarter of revenues since the late 1970s. Investment income (interest and capital gains) probably peaked in 1982 and 1983 when interest rates reached historic highs and AAPOR experienced gains on the sale of government securities.

Expenditures

AAPOR’s major costs have been the subscriptions to POQ that every member receives as a membership benefit, the cost of providing secretarial services, printing costs, and costs associated with the annual conference. While other costs were low because individual Council members absorbed many of the administrative and secretarial expenses, the relative proportion of costs attributable to the POQ was high; for example, in 1954, out of total expenditures of $3,700, POQ accounted for over $1,100. As secretarial costs increased, they became a more sizable item, but even as late as 1967, they absorbed a smaller proportion of costs than the POQ subscriptions. By 1971, administrative expenses—which included the secretariat, postage and office supplies—came to $7,500. This overtook the costs of POQ subscriptions ($5,300) and printing expenses, the largest component of which was the printing of the conference proceedings in the POQ. Including the proceedings printing costs, total conference expenses amounted to $4,600 in that year.

Other items, including the much-debated costs of Executive Council meetings, and conference costs including reimbursements for travel and lodging to student award winners, were relatively small. As the AAPOR budget grew, the distribution of expenses remained much the same, with the costs of POQ and the secretariat running neck and neck. Until 1980, these two items usually accounted for half or more of AAPOR’s costs. From time to time, unusual expenses are authorized
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>% from Dues</th>
<th>POQ</th>
<th>Percent from Conference, Registration listings, etc.</th>
<th>Percent from Investment income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>87,700</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>139,060</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and incurred. These have included, for example, the printing of a special POQ index, legal fees in connection with incorporation or standards cases, and the setting up of AAPOR archives.

**Affluence: Its Origins and Consequences**

The material in this section suggests that AAPOR’s affluence is of recent vintage and occurred as a result of the convergence of two factors. Sizable dues increases and other income-generating activities led to larger cash income in recent years. AAPOR treasurers took advantage of this cash flow to invest in high-yielding government securities in a favorable economic climate. In this connection, special credit should be given to Raymond Funkhouser, who was Secretary-Treasurer in 1979–1981 and started AAPOR’s profitable investment activities. No doubt the high interest income in 1981–83 helped to increase AAPOR’s net worth. But it was first and foremost the AAPOR membership and the corporations that made small but consistent contributions through listings and employer-paid dues that brought about this prosperity. Membership growth was steady but very modest; the growth in income came largely from the fact that many AAPOR members or their employers contribute around $100 per year (dues and conference fee) to the organization.

How comfortable is the present generation of AAPOR councillors with the relatively large assets of the organization? Of course, $100,000 seems impressive to those who were around when AAPOR’s net worth was $5,000, and who thought that Mervin Field’s proposal in 1976 that AAPOR should set an annual income goal of $50,000 was pretty wild, but it is really not a great deal of money for an organization whose annual budget is of the same order.

When AAPOR showed signs of affluence in the past—which was really only true for a few years following the first dues increase in 1965—councillors were primarily concerned with disposing of the surplus funds in professionally useful ways. In his annual report in May 1966, Paul Sheatsley had the following closing comment:

> All of us should start giving some hard thought to just what we want to do with these funds. AAPOR is not in business to pile up surpluses from the dues we charge. We now seem to be in a financial position in which we can afford to spend money in order to achieve some of our purposes. The Council, I am sure, will welcome your ideas.

In May 1967, Dick Baxter, in his annual report as Secretary-Treasurer, quoted this recommendation after stating that AAPOR’s fiscal
situation was shockingly solvent, "particularly when we remember that in fiscal 1964, prior to the dues change, we had a deficit of $2,300." In this 1967 report, Baxter again urged the AAPOR membership to consider ways of putting surplus funds to good use, in the cause of public opinion research as a professional field. Shortly thereafter, however, and before some of the suggestions for professional activities funded by AAPOR's treasury had been adopted, the situation changed abruptly. By the time of the 1969 annual report, the surplus had been seriously eroded as a result of cost increases and legal fees, mostly related to POQ.

As previously discussed, and shown in Table 3, affluence did not become a problem again until 1978. With the memory of recent financial difficulties still very much in the minds of many Council members, concern about AAPOR's unseemly accumulation of wealth did not surface immediately. However, by 1979, with a growing fund balance, some demands for professionally useful expenditures were raised, as they had been during a similar but short-lived period of affluence in 1965–67. At a Council meeting in January of 1981, the possibility of funding the AAPOR archive project was discussed, as was a new supplementary index for POQ, since none had been published since the 1960s. Beginning in 1982, AAPOR also voted to contribute to COSSA and COPAFS.

AAPOR frequently attempted to set up a mechanism for developing longer-term financial planning and guidelines. Ad hoc committees charged with this task were appointed with increasing frequency as financial concerns became more and more salient. These committees have been useful in assisting the treasurer during those years when major decisions had to be made in dealing with a financial crisis. Recently, the committees also have been useful in giving investment advice as AAPOR has become concerned with maintaining high interest income at a time of declining returns on government securities and money market funds. However, as is true in other spheres of AAPOR activities, ad hoc committees composed of busy professionals cannot be relied upon to guide the association on a regular basis in the conduct of its affairs. In the end, financial responsibility remains with the Council and with the secretary-treasurer who, in turn, must rely on professional support services, and especially the accounting firm with which the AAPOR treasurer has worked closely in recent years. Reluctantly, the new generation of councillors has come to manage the fiscal affairs of AAPOR with the help and advice of professionals. It has been fortunate in the caliber and integrity of those who provide this help.
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Appendix A

Code of Professional Ethics and Practices

We, the members of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, subscribe to the principles expressed in the following code. Our goals are to support sound and ethical practice in the conduct of public opinion research and in the use of such research for policy and decision-making in the public and private sectors, as well as to improve public understanding of opinion research methods and the proper use of opinion research results.

We pledge ourselves to maintain high standards of scientific competence and integrity in conducting, analyzing, and reporting our work in our relations with survey respondents, with our clients, with those who eventually use the research for decision-making purposes, and with the general public. We further pledge ourselves to reject all tasks or assignments that would require activities inconsistent with the principles of this code.

The Code

I. Principles of Professional Practice in the Conduct of Our Work
   A. We shall exercise due care in developing research designs and survey instruments, and in collecting, processing, and analyzing data, taking all reasonable steps to assure the reliability and validity of results.
      1. We shall recommend and employ only those tools and methods of analysis which, in our professional judgment, are well suited to the research problem at hand.
      2. We shall not select research tools and methods of analysis because of their capacity to yield misleading conclusions.
      3. We shall not knowingly make interpretations of research results, nor shall we tacitly permit interpretations that are inconsistent with the data available.
      4. We shall not knowingly imply that interpretations should be accorded greater confidence than the data actually warrant.
   B. We shall describe our methods and findings accurately and in appropriate detail in all research reports, adhering to the standards for minimal disclosure specified in Section III.
   C. If any of our work becomes the subject of a formal investigation of an alleged violation of this Code, undertaken with the approval of the AAPOR Executive Council, we shall provide additional information on the survey in such detail that a fellow survey practitioner would be able to conduct a professional evaluation of the survey.

II. Principles of Professional Responsibility in Our Dealings With People
   A. The Public:
      1. If we become aware of the appearance in public of serious distortions of our research, we shall publicly disclose what is required to correct these distortions, including, as appropriate, a statement to the public media, legislative
body, regulatory agency, or other appropriate group, in or before which the
distorted findings were presented.

B. Clients or Sponsors:
   1. When undertaking work for a private client, we shall hold confidential all
      proprietary information obtained about the client and about the conduct
      and findings of the research undertaken for the client, except when the dis-
      semination of the information is expressly authorized by the client, or when
disclosure becomes necessary under terms of Section I-C or II-A of this
Code.
   2. We shall be mindful of the limitations of our techniques and capabilities
      and shall accept only those research assignments which we can reasonably
expect to accomplish within these limitations.

C. The Profession:
   1. We recognize our responsibility to contribute to the science of public opin-
      ion research and to disseminate as freely as possible the ideas and findings
which emerge from our research.
   2. We shall not cite our membership in the Association as evidence of profes-
      sional competence, since the Association does not so certify any persons or
organizations.

D. The Respondent:
   1. We shall strive to avoid the use of practices or methods that may harm, hu-
miliate, or seriously mislead survey respondents.
   2. Unless the respondent waives confidentiality for specified uses, we shall
hold as privileged and confidential all information that might identify a re-
   spondent with his or her responses. We shall also not disclose or use the
   names of respondents for non-research purposes unless the respondents
grant us permission to do so.

III. Standard for Minimal Disclosure
Good professional practice imposes the obligation upon all public opinion re-
searchers to include, in any report of research results, or to make available when
that report is released, certain essential information about how the research was
conducted. At a minimum, the following items should be disclosed:
   1. Who sponsored the survey, and who conducted it.
   2. The exact wording of questions asked, including the text of any preceding
      instruction or explanation to the interviewer or respondents that might rea-
      sonably be expected to affect the response.
   3. A definition of the population under study, and a description of the sam-
      pling frame used to identify this population.
   4. A description of the sample selection procedure, giving a clear indication
      of the method by which the respondents were selected by the researcher, or
whether the respondents were entirely self-selected.
   5. Size of samples and, if applicable, completion rates and information on el-
      igibility criteria and screening procedures.
   6. A discussion of the precision of the findings, including, if appropriate, es-
      timates of sampling error, and a description of any weighting or estimating
      procedures used.
   7. Which results are based on parts of the sample, rather than on the total
sample.
   8. Method, location, and dates of data collection.
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AAPOR Presidents

1947-48 Clyde W. Hart
1948-49 Elmo C. Wilson
1949-50 Paul F. Lazarsfeld
1950-51 Julian L. Woodward
1951-52 Bernard Berelson
1952-53 Archibald M. Crossley
1953-54 Samuel A. Stouffer
1954-55 George H. Gallup
1955-56 Harry Alpert
1956-57 Gerhard D. Wiebe
1957-58 Frederick F. Stephan
1958-59 David Wallace
1959-60 Herbert H. Hyman
1960-61 Robert O. Carlson
1962-63 Joseph T. Klapper
1963-64 Charles Y. Glock
1964-65 Herbert E. Krugman
1965-66 Raymond A. Bauer
1966-67 Leo Bogart
1967-68 Paul B. Sheatsley
1969-70 Robert T. Bower
1970-71 Richard H. Baxter
1971-72 W. Phillips Davison
1972-73 Sidney Hollander
1973-74 Harold Mendelsohn
1974-75 Herbert I. Abelson
1975-76 Richard Maisel
1976-77 Irving Crespi
1977-78 Hope Lumin Klapper
1978-79 Reuben Cohen
1979-80 Jack Elinson
1980-81 Helen J. Kaufman
1981-82 Seymour Sudman
1982-83 Burns W. Roper
1983-84 Laure M. Sharp
1984-85 Albert E. Gollin
1985-86 Howard Schuman
1986-87 J. Ronald Milavsky
1987-88 Eleanor Singer
1988-89 Warren J. Mitofsky
1989-90 Philip Meyer
1990-91 Joan S. Black
1991-92 Norman M. Bradburn
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Julian Woodward Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Paul F. Lazarsfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Herbert H. Hyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td><em>Public Opinion Quarterly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Samuel A. Stouffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Elmo Roper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Clyde W. Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Fund for the Republic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAPOR Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Angus Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>George H. Gallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Harold D. Lasswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Harry H. Field (Posthumous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Hadley Cantril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Hans Zeisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Elmo C. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Roper Public Opinion Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Archibald M. Crossley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Walter Lippmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Jean Stoetzel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Rensis Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Bernard Berelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Raymond A. Bauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Mervin D. Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Shirley A. Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Lester R. Frankel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Paul K. Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Matilda White Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>John R. Riley, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Wilbur Schramm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Ithiel De Sola Pool (Posthumous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Daniel Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Philip Converse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Norman Bradburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Seymour Sudman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Gladys Engel Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Kurt Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Paper Competition
Award Winners

1967

First
Kay K. Deaux, University of Texas
Second
G. Ray Funkhouser, Stanford University
Thomas D. Cook, Stanford University
Paul Hirsch, University of Michigan
John A. Michael, Columbia University
Sanci Michael, Columbia University

1968

First
Lawrence W. Green, University of California, Berkeley
Second
John S. Reed, Jr., Columbia University
Third
Marshall Childs, Columbia University
Honorable Mention
Jonathan Kelley, University of California, Berkeley
Richard Young, Stanford University

1969

First
David Knok, University of Michigan
Second
Charles Atkin, University of Wisconsin
Drury Sherrod, Stanford University
Honorable Mention
Douglas Hall, Stanford University
Kent Anderson, Stanford University
Jonathan Kelley, University of California, Berkeley

1970

First
Charles K. Atkin, University of Wisconsin
Second
Gary A. Mauser, University of California, Irvine
Third
Philip Palmgreen, University of Kentucky

1971

First
Marcus Felson, University of Michigan

1972

First
Gwen Bellisfield, New York University

1973

First
Paul J. Placek, Vanderbilt

1974

First
D. Garth Taylor, University of Chicago

1975

First
James R. Beniger, University of California, Berkeley
Second
Martin L. Horn, University of Connecticut
Third
Victoria L. Swigert, State University of New York, Albany
Honorable Mention
Bonnie J. Kay, Northwestern University

1976

First
Robert Navazio, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Honorable Mention
Stanley Presser, University of Michigan
Kevin Lang, Oxford University
Alicia J. Welch, University of Massachusetts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First (Helen S. Dinnerman Prize)</th>
<th>First Honorable Mention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Twila Foster, University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Michael Goldstein, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trudy Martin, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark J. Rogers, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention</strong></td>
<td>Josephine Holz, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claire B. McCullough, University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael J. O’Neil, Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td><strong>First (Helen S. Dinnerman Prize)</strong></td>
<td>Marie Crane, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Second</strong></td>
<td>Michael Carozza, University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention</strong></td>
<td>Jeff Sobal, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>Erick R. A. N. Smith, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention</strong></td>
<td>Marianne Berry, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>Lawrence D. Bobo, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>Richard Bagger, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lynda Clarizio, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Earl Cook, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Curtis, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Giuffra, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keating Holland, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Huebner, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claire Laporte, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warren Lazarow, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demetria Martinez, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burns Stanfield, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terri Steinhaus, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michele Warman, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>John Zaller, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention</strong></td>
<td>Cynthia Fletcher, Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John G. Geer, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jon A. Krosnick, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Peterson, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>Robert W. Kubey, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention</strong></td>
<td>Jon A. Krosnick, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis M. Endreny, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carrol J. Glynn, University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Zeglaraski, Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>Donald Philip Green, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention</strong></td>
<td>Gerald M. Kosicki, University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary R. Petvey, University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Gilens, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>First Honorable Mention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Dorothy Watson, University of Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackie Scott, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Dautrich, Eagleton Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Jacqueline Scott, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Ayidiya, University of Akron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Campanelli, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>James Dearing, University of Southern California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Axinn, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Dempsey, University of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Wasserman, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## AAPOR Conference Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Williamstown, MA, Williams College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eagles Mere, PA, Lake Side Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Ithaca, NY, Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Lake Forest, IL, Lake Forest College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Princeton, NJ, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Poughkeepsie, NY, Vassar College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Pocono Manor, PA, Pocono Manor Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Asbury Park, NJ, Berkeley-Carteret Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Madison, WI, Hotel Loraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Buck Hill Falls, PA, The Buck Hill Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Washington, D.C., Shoreham Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Chicago, IL, Edgewater Beach Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ, Hotel Traymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA, Claremont Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Excelsior Springs, MO, The Elms Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Groton, CT, Hotel Griswold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Swampscott, MA, New Ocean House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA, The Miramar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Pasadena, CA, Huntington-Sheraton Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ, Marlborough-Blenheim Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Asheville, NC, Grove Park Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Lake George, NY, Hotel Sagamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Itasca, IL, Carson Inn-Nordic Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Asheville, NC, Grove Park Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Buck Hill Falls, PA, The Buck Hill Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Roanoke, VA, Hotel Roanoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Buck Hill Falls, PA, The Buck Hill Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Kings Island, OH, Kings Island Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Buck Hill Falls, PA, The Buck Hill Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Hunt Valley, MD, Hunt Valley Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Buck Hill Falls, PA, The Buck Hill Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Lake Delavan, WI, Lake Lawn Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>McAfee, NJ, Americana, Great Gorge Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL, Don CeSar Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Hershey, PA, Hershey Lodge &amp; Convention Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Inn On The Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL, Don CeSar Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Lancaster, PA, Sheraton Gold Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ, The Pointe-Squaw Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOR Officers, Council and Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Clyde W. Hart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Elmo C. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Paul Lazarsfeld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Julian Woodward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice President</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Elmo C. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Herbert H. Hyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Julian Woodward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Bernard Berelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary-Treasurer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Julian Woodward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Julian Woodward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Matilda White Riley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Matilda White Riley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Daniel Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Cornelius DuBois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Herbert H. Hyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Hadley Cantril, Lucien Warner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - John Riley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Clyde W. Hart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Philip M. Hauser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Samuel Stouffer, Daniel Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Daniel Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - J. Stevens Stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Rensis Likert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Archibald Crossley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Paul Stewart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Hans Zeisel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Paul Lazarsfeld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Rensis Likert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Archibald Crossley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Paul Stewart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - George Gallup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Rensis Likert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Rensis Likert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Archibald Crossley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Robert Bower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Harry Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - William A. Lydgate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Cornelius DuBois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - David Wallace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Lloyd Berg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - Paul Tescott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-'48 - Lucien Warner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-'49 - —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-'50 - —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-'51 - Bernard Berelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1951-'52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Bernard Berelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Archibald Crossley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>J. Stevens Tock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Herbert H. Hyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members</td>
<td>William A. Lydgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Zeisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Robert Bower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Louis Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>M. Starr Northrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Paul Lazarsfeld</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resigned
***Appointed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>1955-'56</th>
<th>1956-'57</th>
<th>1957-'58</th>
<th>1958-'59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Harry Alpert</td>
<td>Gerhart D. Wiebe</td>
<td>Frederick F. Stephen</td>
<td>David Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Gerhart D. Wiebe</td>
<td>Frederick F. Stephen</td>
<td>David Wallace</td>
<td>Herbert Hyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>David Wallace</td>
<td>David Wallace</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>Clyde Hart</td>
<td>Elmo C. Wilson</td>
<td>Paul F. Lazarsfeld</td>
<td>Harry Alpert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>Daniel Katz</td>
<td>Charles Y. Glock</td>
<td>Paul Sheatsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Dean Manheimer</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members</td>
<td>Marjorie Fiske</td>
<td>Marjorie Fiske</td>
<td>Herta Herzog</td>
<td>Herta Herzog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert H. Hyman</td>
<td>Herta Herzog</td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Robert Carlson</td>
<td>Robert Carlson</td>
<td>Herbert H. Hyman</td>
<td>Herbert H. Hyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Robert Bower</td>
<td>Nancy Cooley</td>
<td>Harris Huey</td>
<td>Ithiel De Sola Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Leo Lowenthal</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>Robert Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1959-'60</td>
<td>1960-'61</td>
<td>1961-'62</td>
<td>1962-'63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Herbert Hyman</td>
<td>Robert O. Carlson</td>
<td>John W. Riley, Jr.</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Robert O. Carlson</td>
<td>John W. Riley, Jr.</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Charles Y. Glock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>Gerhart D. Wiebe</td>
<td>Frederick T. Stephan</td>
<td>Herbert Hyman</td>
<td>Bernard Berelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>William Lydgate</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
<td>Matilda W. Riley</td>
<td>Raymond A. Bauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>David L. Sills</td>
<td>David L. Sills</td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members at Large</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
<td>Clyde W. Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td>Clyde W. Hart</td>
<td>Mervin D. Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td>Richard H. Baxter</td>
<td>Patricia Kendall</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td>Mervin D. Field</td>
<td>Phillips K. Hastings</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Sidney S. Goldish</td>
<td>Shirley A. Star</td>
<td>Shirley A. Star</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Robert Carlson</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1963-'64</td>
<td>1964-'65</td>
<td>1965-'66</td>
<td>1966-'67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Charles Y. Glock</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
<td>Raymond A. Bauer</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Herbert E. Krugman</td>
<td>Raymond A. Bauer</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>Robert O. Carlson</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Charles Y. Glock</td>
<td>Mervin Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Dean Manheimer</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
<td>Robert T. Bower</td>
<td>Richard Maisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
<td>Bruce Neal</td>
<td>Bruce Neal</td>
<td>Irving Crespi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members at Large</td>
<td>Mervin D. Field</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
<td>Herbert Abelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
<td>Peter H. Rossi*</td>
<td>Herbert I. Abelson</td>
<td>Robert O. Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter H. Rossi</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
<td>Robert O. Carlson</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
<td>Babette Kass</td>
<td>Reuben Cohen</td>
<td>Hazel Gaudet Erskine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Philip K. Hastings</td>
<td>Philip K. Hastings</td>
<td>Helen S. Dinerman</td>
<td>Helen S. Dinerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>Marjorie Fiske</td>
<td>Marjorie Fiske</td>
<td>Nathan Maccoby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resigned
***Appointed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td>Robert Bower</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Robert N. Ford</td>
<td>Robert Bower</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Richard H. Baxter</td>
<td>Richard H. Baxter</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations and</td>
<td>Shirley A. Star</td>
<td>Raymond A. Bauer</td>
<td>Leo Bogart</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Herbert I. Abelson</td>
<td>Gladys Engel Lang</td>
<td>Irving Crespi</td>
<td>Daniel Yankelovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Irving Crespi</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members at Large</td>
<td>Robert O. Carlson</td>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td>Helen Crossley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
<td>John F. Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Robert S. Lee</td>
<td>Raymond Fink</td>
<td>Ronald Gatty</td>
<td>Ronald Gatty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Charles K. Ramond</td>
<td>Babette Kass</td>
<td>Babette Kass</td>
<td>John S. Coulson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Nathan Maccoby</td>
<td>Allen H. Barton</td>
<td>Allen H. Barton</td>
<td>Donald L. Kanter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1971-'72</td>
<td>1972-'73</td>
<td>1973-'74</td>
<td>1974-'75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>W. Phillips Davison</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
<td>Herbert Abelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
<td>Herbert Abelson</td>
<td>Richard Maisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
<td>Don Cahalan</td>
<td>Helen Crossley</td>
<td>Helen Crossley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations and Membership</td>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Richard Baxter</td>
<td>Robert Brower</td>
<td>Sidney Hollander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Ronald Gatty</td>
<td>Thomas Coffin</td>
<td>John P. Robinson</td>
<td>Albert Biderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Hope Klapper</td>
<td>Hope Klapper</td>
<td>Hope Klapper</td>
<td>Mervin Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert S. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members at Large</td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
<td>Helen Dinerman</td>
<td>Hope Klapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Crossley</td>
<td>Ira Cisin</td>
<td>Ira Cisin</td>
<td>Ira Cisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Maloney</td>
<td>John Maloney</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>John P. Robinson</td>
<td>Kurt W. Back</td>
<td>Philip A. Harding</td>
<td>William L. Nicholls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurt W. Back</td>
<td>Philip A. Harding</td>
<td>William L. Nicholls</td>
<td>Naomi Rothwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Laure Sharp</td>
<td>Laure Sharp</td>
<td>Francesco Nicosia</td>
<td>Francesco Nicosia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>John Coulson</td>
<td>Ann Brunswick</td>
<td>Ann Brunswick</td>
<td>Ann Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Donald Kanter</td>
<td>Eugene Hartley</td>
<td>Eugene Hartley</td>
<td>Kurt Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1975-'76</td>
<td>1976-'77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Richard Maisel</td>
<td>Irving Crespi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Irving Crespi</td>
<td>Hope Lunin Klapper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Joan S. Black</td>
<td>Joan S. Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations and Membership</td>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
<td>Richard H. Baxter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>James A. Davis</td>
<td>Howard E. Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Mervin A. Field</td>
<td>Reuben Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>Helen J. Kaufmann</td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope Lunin Klapper</td>
<td>Mervin D. Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
<td>Helen J. Kaufmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Naomi D. Rothwell</td>
<td>Matthew Hauck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Hauck</td>
<td>Michael Rappeport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Francesco M. Nicosia</td>
<td>Francesco M. Nicosia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Ann F. Brunswick</td>
<td>Helen R. Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td>Kurt Lang</td>
<td>Nelson Foote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>Herbert I. Abelson</td>
<td>Richard Maisel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1977-'78</td>
<td>1978-'79</td>
<td>1979-'80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hope Lunin Klapper</td>
<td>Reuben Cohen</td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Reuben Cohen</td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
<td>Helen J. Kauffmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Margaret Weidenhamer</td>
<td>Margaret Weidenhamer</td>
<td>Robert B. Cunningham**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Ray Funkhouser***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>Irving Crespi</td>
<td>Hope Lunin Klapper</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>George Bishop</td>
<td>William C. Eckerman</td>
<td>Gloria Shaw Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deceased
***Appointed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Helen J. Kauffmann</td>
<td>Seymour Sudman</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
<td>Laure M. Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Seymour Sudman</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
<td>Laure M. Sharp</td>
<td>Albert E. Gollin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>G. Ray Funkhouser</td>
<td>Albert E. Gollin</td>
<td>Eve Weinberg</td>
<td>Kenneth P. Adler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Albert E. Gollin</td>
<td>Eve Weinberg</td>
<td>Kenneth P. Adler</td>
<td>Robert M. Groves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>Jack Elinson</td>
<td>Helen J. Kaufmann</td>
<td>Seymour Sudman</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>John S. Coulson</td>
<td>Naomi D. Rothwell</td>
<td>Paul B. Sheatsley</td>
<td>Warren J. Mitofsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Fred H. Goldner</td>
<td>Warren J. Mitofsky</td>
<td>Howard Schuman</td>
<td>J. Ronald Milavsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>Warren J. Mitofsky</td>
<td>Howard Schuman</td>
<td>J. Ronald Milavsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and Chapter Relations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Joan S. Black</td>
<td>Robert S. Lee</td>
<td>Pearl Zinner</td>
<td>Selma F. Monsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>Robert S. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selma Monsky</td>
<td>Doris R. Northrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>June R. Christ</td>
<td>John P. Robinson</td>
<td>Mary A. Spaeth</td>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>John R. Robinson</td>
<td>Mary A. Spaeth</td>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Michael Rappeport</td>
<td>Barbara A. Bailar</td>
<td>Barbara A. Bailar</td>
<td>Deborah R. Hensler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>Burns W. Roper</td>
<td>Deborah R. Hensler</td>
<td>Deborah R. Hensler</td>
<td>Norman M. Bradburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Albert E. Gollin</td>
<td>Howard Schuman</td>
<td>J. Ronald Milavsky</td>
<td>Eleanor Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Howard Schuman</td>
<td>J. Ronald Milavsky</td>
<td>Eleanor Singer</td>
<td>Warren J. Mitofsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Robert M. Groves</td>
<td>Charles D. Cowan</td>
<td>Barbara Lee</td>
<td>Tom W. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Charles D. Cowan</td>
<td>Barbara Lee</td>
<td>Tom W. Smith</td>
<td>Stanley Presser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past president</td>
<td>Laure M. Sharp</td>
<td>Albert E. Gollin</td>
<td>Howard Schuman</td>
<td>J. Ronald Milavsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>Andrew Kohut</td>
<td>Andrew Kohut</td>
<td>Herbert I. Abelson</td>
<td>Herbert I. Abelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference:</td>
<td>Barbara A. Bailar</td>
<td>Eleanor Singer</td>
<td>Norman M. Bradburn</td>
<td>Gladys Engel Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Eleanor Singer</td>
<td>Joan S. Black</td>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
<td>Kathleen A. Frankovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>Joan S. Black</td>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
<td>Kathleen A. Frankovic</td>
<td>Robert M. Groves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and Chapter Relations:</td>
<td>Doris R. Northrup</td>
<td>Diane W. Schrayer</td>
<td>Susan A. Weisbrod</td>
<td>Elizabeth Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Diane W. Schrayer</td>
<td>Susan A. Weisbrod</td>
<td>Elizabeth Martin</td>
<td>Donna Card Charron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>Barbara Lee</td>
<td>Donald R. DeLuca</td>
<td>Barry Sussman</td>
<td>James R. Beniger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Information:</td>
<td>Donald R. DeLuca</td>
<td>Barry Sussman</td>
<td>James R. Beniger</td>
<td>G. Ray Funkhouser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Resigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***Appointed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1988-'89</td>
<td>1989-'90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Warren J. Mitofsky</td>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
<td>Joan S. Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Stanley Presser</td>
<td>James R. Beniger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>James R. Beniger</td>
<td>Michael Traugott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>Eleanor Singer</td>
<td>Warren J. Mitofsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>Gladys Engel Lang</td>
<td>Norman Bradburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Robert M. Groves</td>
<td>Michael Kagay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>Michael Kagay</td>
<td>Lawrence Bobo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and Chapter Relations:</td>
<td>Donna Card Charron</td>
<td>Theresa Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Theresa Rogers</td>
<td>Nancy A. Mathiowetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Information:</td>
<td>G. Ray Funkhouser</td>
<td>Janice Ballou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Janice Ballou</td>
<td>Theresa Demaio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards:</td>
<td>Peter V. Miller</td>
<td>Martin R. Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Martin R. Frankel</td>
<td>Tom W. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nominated (Not Elected) to AAPOR Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979-'80</th>
<th>1980-'81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Yankelovich</td>
<td>Kurt W. Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ray Funkhouser*</td>
<td>Corine Kirchner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>Chair, Membership and Chapter Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas E. Coffin</td>
<td>Gloria Shaw Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Associate Chair, Membership and Chapter Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Gollin</td>
<td>Eve Weinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Chair, Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Wippich Green</td>
<td>Walter K. Lindenman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Opatow</td>
<td>Barbara Bailar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrinne Kirchner</td>
<td>William D. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary A. Spaeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-'82</td>
<td>1982-'83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice President</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vice President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald A. Hughes</td>
<td>Fred H. Goldner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane W. Schrayer</td>
<td>Diane W. Schrayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Membership &amp; Chapter Relations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Membership &amp; Chapter Relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah R. Hensler</td>
<td>Dorothy Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William C. Eckerman</td>
<td>Daniel G. Horvitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton A. David</td>
<td>Donald G. Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Meyer</td>
<td>Bernard Roshco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillors-at-Large</strong></td>
<td><strong>Councillors-at-Large</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard H. Baxter</td>
<td>Herbert Abelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Mendelsohn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1983-'84</th>
<th>1984-'85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice President</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vice President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald A. Hughes</td>
<td>Fred H. Goldner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane W. Schrayer</td>
<td>Bernard Roscho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Membership &amp; Chapter Relations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Membership &amp; Chapter Relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton A. David</td>
<td>Theresa Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel G. Horvitz</td>
<td>Michael Traugott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee B. Becker</td>
<td>Kathleen A. Frankovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlyn Keene</td>
<td>Karlyn Keene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillors-at-Large</strong></td>
<td><strong>Councillors-at-Large</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph T. Klapper</td>
<td>Melvin Goldberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1985-'86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Andrew Kohut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Diane Colasanto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Membership &amp; Chapter Relations</td>
<td>Cliff Zukin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</td>
<td>Bernard Roshco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</td>
<td>James R. Beniger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</td>
<td>G. Ray Funkhouser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>Seymour Sudman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1988-'89</th>
<th>1989-'90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Barbara Bailar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Corinne Kirchner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Membership &amp; Chapter Relations</td>
<td>Roni Rosner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Standards Committee</td>
<td>Lawrence Bobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Conference Committee</td>
<td>Diane Colasanto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair, Publications and Information Committee</td>
<td>Peter Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors-at-Large</td>
<td>William S. Rubens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

AAPOR Songs

AAPOR Adoration
*Sung to “The Band Played On”*

1
All through the year, dear, our dreams
are of you,
Je vous aime, AAPOR!
We pass others by when your meetings
draw nigh,
Je vous aime, AAPOR!
With lots of psychology and sociology—
gee, they are things we adore!
We soar to cloud eight as we pontificate,
Je vous aime, AAPOR!

2
And—As a P.S. we might also confess,
Je vous aime, AAPOR!
The three days away from our work can
be play,
Je vous aime, AAPOR!
So we skip the psychology &
sociology—sometimes those things
are a bore
When they interfere with our social life,
dear,
Je vous aime, AAPOR!

AAPOR Togetherness
*Sung to “Tannenbaum”*

1
O Sagamore, O Sagamore,
In memory most gracious.
With single rooms in short supply,
The man requests that we comply
And double-up.
And double-up.
The man requests we double.

2
Morality occasionally
Must yield to circumstances.
It’s worth it for our learned lore,
The lake, the trees, the Smorgasbord.
So double-up.
So double-up. Don’t be an anti-double.

3
It’s seldom opportunity
Conjoins with inner impulse.
And if it lames fidelity
It pays off in propinquity.
So double-up. So double-up.
Oh how we love to double.

4
O Sagamore, O Sagamore,
We cased your space beforehand.
So let us now accommodate
What careful plans legitimate.
So double-up.
So double-up. That’s why we’re here—to double.
AAPOR Lament
Sung to "A Wonderful Guy"

1
Years ago we all banded together,
Pledged ourselves to the usual aims,
Drew up some by-laws & formed a
committee
To find us a suitable name.
Pre-disposed to the pol-y-syllabic,
Why use a short word when six long will
do?
We dubbed ourselves with a beaut of a
term
That in retrospect seems more like two.
Though we take on most questions and
some indiscretions to set up a rapport,
We admit we get weary when we hear the
query, "what's AAPOR stand for?"
Years ago we all banded together,
Hell bent to advance the opinion cause,
But we got framed with a ten-dollar
name that won't rhyme, that won't
sign,
that won't fit on a line
(and shortened, it's worse),
Amer. Ass-n. For Pub-lic O-pin-ion
Re-search!

2
Central city to Sagamore's encore,
Once a gleam, we are now pretty staid,
With an enrollment to give us
consolement
Of eight hundred more or less paid.
Academically somewhat established
And with a Quarterly free with our dues.
It seems absurd now that no one
demurred
When they dumped all those words in
our stew.
Though we blithely deny it we've read up
on diets and say more and more,
We will gladly elect one if you can
confect one for shrinking AAPOR.
Central City to Sagamore's encore,
Semi-secure and with cash in the bank,
But we got framed with a ten-dollar
name that won't rhyme, that won't
sign, that won't fit on a line
(and shortened, it's worse),
Am-er. Ass-n. for Pub-lic O-pin-ion
Re-search.
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