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FOREWORD

The third international conference on public opinion research marked the establishment on a permanent basis of two professional societies, one domestic, one international, which had their inception at the first conference at Central City, Colorado, in the summer of 1946. This report of the proceedings of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, severely condensed though it be, documents the progress that has been made during the two years since the first of these meetings was held. Even more than Williamstown, Eagles Mere showed a responsibleness of mind in appraising problems, methods, and techniques, and in accepting the obligations of competence that rest upon professionals whether they are serving private clients or the public and whether they are interested in the development of abstract knowledge or in practical administrative service. Only such conferences in which theorists, technologists, and practitioners consider their problems with complete frankness and severely critical thoughtfulness will enable any one of these groups to make its maximum contribution.

CLYDE W. HART
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research, 1947-48

Editorial Note: The following reports represent a rather severe condensation, necessitated by budgetary considerations, of the full proceedings of the conference. All remarks have been compressed considerably, and it has unfortunately been necessary to leave out altogether many valuable comments from the floor. Thanks are due to the volunteer reporters who kept a record of the various sessions and in many cases wrote up the reports, and to the many others who assisted in the preparation of this record. For the most part, speakers' remarks are presented in direct discourse, rather than indirect, in order to save space. Whenever possible, participants have been asked to check over the remarks attributed to them, but this has not proved feasible in a few cases. The editors regret any inaccuracies which may have inadvertently crept in.
OPENING SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE
(Sunday, September 12, 1948)

Chairman: Clyde W. Hart, President of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).

Opening Remarks: Jean Stoetzel, President of the World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR).


Five-minute Statements on “Frontiers of Public Opinion Research,” by: Leif Holbæk-Hanssen, Norway; Louis Moss, England; Jorge Mendez Munevar, Colombia; Roy Morgan, Australia; Fred C. Danforth, U.S.A.; and Lawrence E. Benson, U.S.A.

The Chairman welcomed those present, especially participants from foreign countries, and expressed thanks to the Rockefeller Foundation, which had enabled many of the foreign delegates to attend. He then outlined the history of AAPOR and WAPOR, from the First International Conference on Public Opinion Research at Central City, Colorado, in 1946, through the Williamstown Conference of 1947, down to the present meeting. Following this, he introduced Dr. Jean Stoetzel, President of WAPOR, who, having been elected to this post in absentia, had been unable to attend the Williamstown meeting in the previous year.

Before proceeding to his opening remarks, Dr. Stoetzel pointed out that since the meeting included members from all countries, it would be necessary to decide on a working language, and to arrange for translations if necessary. After some discussion, it was agreed to use English at the present meeting, as only one member did not understand this language. Dr. Stoetzel emphasized, however, that this decision did not prejudice the rules regarding official and working languages for WAPOR, which might be taken up more formally at subsequent meetings of the world body. At the suggestion of Mr. Cohen, a personal translator was assigned to the member who did not follow the discussion in English. Dr. Stoetzel then proceeded with his remarks.

JEAN STOETZEL (French Institute of Public Opinion, Paris): The present meetings offer a rare opportunity for members of the opinion research profession all over the world to meet each other and to “talk shop”—to satisfy

1 At the Williamstown meeting in 1947 the name of the world body had been decided as World Congress for Public Opinion Research. At the present meeting the word “Congress” was changed to “Association,” and this designation will be used throughout in order to avoid confusion. A report of the meetings which took place under the auspices of the World Association at Eagles Mere will be published separately by WAPOR.

2 It should be repeated that the remarks attributed to speakers in these Proceedings represent condensations, not quotations. Direct discourse, rather than indirect, is used in the interest of saving space.
their curiosity regarding many points in the field. The informal discussions at Eagles Mere will certainly be as valuable as the formal discussions.

Public opinion research is now a truly international field of endeavor, and is being conducted in perhaps more than 20 countries, as well as by some international agencies, such as UNESCO. These studies in various countries have contributed to the awareness that there are certain common problems which must be faced by all those in the opinion research profession. In order to attack these problems effectively, however, further cooperation is needed on two fronts: there must be more and closer international cooperation in public opinion research, and there must be more interchange and cooperation among the various human sciences. Both the international barriers dividing human scientists and the lines preventing exchange between the various social studies must be broken down if opinion research is to help solve some of the world’s pressing problems. It is to be hoped that this conference will further both these objectives.

Benjamin A. Cohen (Assistant Secretary-General for Public Information, the United Nations). The United Nations is interested in public opinion from two aspects: it is an agency which helps mold public opinion, and at the same time it is vitally interested in what the peoples of various nations are thinking.

In order to play this dual role—of both leading and following public opinion, UN must start by seeing that people are adequately informed. This is particularly difficult at the present time, not only because of illiteracy and lack of media of communication, among other difficulties, but also because of cynicism regarding the work of international organizations and the tendency to emphasize the dramatic disagreements, rather than less sensational points of agreement. The UN therefore makes a special effort to disseminate objective and complete facts with regard to issues arising in it. Without these, a healthy public opinion is impossible.

Informational work, such as this, often comes very close to education. In order to understand current reports, people must also know something about the problem at hand. The UN therefore has frequent occasion to analyze the press, radio, books, college courses, etc., in various countries in order to find where special informational efforts are needed in order that the people concerned may form a national opinion on international issues.

Development of a national public opinion on these issues is important because it is mainly through their respective governments that people can have their desires implemented. Furthermore, there are cases where UN, by emphasizing the duty of every individual to share the responsibility for preserving peace, has helped to bring about an opinion favoring a change in national policy. Too often people have thought that peace is merely the absence of war, instead of a dynamic state.

International opinion has also developed which has been strong enough to influence the action of Great Powers. The settlement of the Soviet Union-Iran controversy, when expressions from almost every country indicated that the public would not countenance
a breach of peace, is a case in point. Other instances where international public opinion came into play involved the voluntary withdrawal of British and French troops from Syria and Lebanon, the truce in Palestine, and the Dutch-Indonesian conflict.

As public opinion can be the most powerful weapon for peace, UN spends considerable effort in analyzing it. It is the first international organization to arrange for regular opinion surveys. This analysis is carried out at headquarters in Lake Success and in the UN's Information Centers, which are located in Washington, Mexico City, Rio de Janeiro, London, Paris, Geneva, Prague, Copenhagen, Warsaw, Moscow, New Delhi, and Shanghai. Still other centers are being planned in Cairo, Buenos Aires and Teheran. These offices study representative newspapers, radio programs, books and other media in their respective areas and cable a summary to UN headquarters. The central office then arranges the information by topics and prepares a world opinion summary, which is issued daily when the Assembly is in session, and otherwise weekly. This survey was originally intended for the use of policy officials in the UN Secretariat only, but numerous requests from delegates of member nations, and from press correspondents and radio commentators, have increased the edition until now several thousand copies of every report are distributed.

Public opinion polls are used by UN in two connections: to check on its evaluation of world opinion through other sources, and to detect blind spots in people's knowledge, which either UN or one of its affiliated organizations should endeavor to correct. The usefulness of polls is limited, however, by the fact that some of the techniques applied in this country—such as filter questions used to test knowledge on a given subject—are not understood by respondents abroad.

The type of international poll which would be of most use to UN would be one on current issues, designed to determine how many people are concerned with the problem, and in what ways they think it could be resolved. In other words, to detect those imponderables in political thinking which are particularly decisive with regard to international issues.

In this and other ways public opinion research can help find a solution to some of the ills of mankind and can bring the world a little closer to the goal of peace.

LEIF HOLBAK-HANSEN (FAKTA, Oslo, Norway): In addition to technical problems, the polling profession must face certain ideological problems. If
it is to justify itself fully, opinion research must contribute toward making the life of the citizen a better one, as well as merely serving as an aid to current, established institutions. Some of the ways in which this contribution might be made are by: (1) Helping to identify the propaganda to which people are exposed; (2) Giving people a more direct part in government by allowing them to make opinions on issues known between elections; and (3) In general serving as an organic part of the political system. For instance, when a legislative body seems to rule against public opinion, some device should be found to clarify the issues and to reconcile the desires of the people and their representatives.

Public opinion research, in short, should never be allowed to serve the interests of the demagogue, but should serve the interests of the general population. It is to be hoped that this and future conferences will assist in bringing about this state of affairs.

Jorge Mendez Munevar (Bogotá): Public opinion research in Latin America is still in its early stages, but it can make an important contribution to democratic life in many of the American republics. Perhaps, most of all, it can help bridge the gap between the hitherto widely separated “masses” and “classes.” A real public opinion in many republics does not yet exist—public affairs being left almost exclusively in the hands of a small, highly-educated minority. Opinion research can assist in broadening the base of democracy by convincing ordinarily apathetic people that what they think really counts—that every citizen must concern himself with public questions.

Roy Morgan (Australian Public Opinion Polls, Melbourne): The opinion research profession should concentrate on pushing back several of the frontiers which it now faces.

The mathematical and technical frontier is one of the most exciting. With constantly improved methodology, the accuracy of predictions will be increased. Even more important is the possibility of measuring attitudes which do not as yet exist; i.e., of evaluating latent attitudes on important issues. Third, both public leaders and the media of information should be educated to the significance of public opinion. In this connection, adequate interpretation of survey findings by polling agencies is particularly important. Their significance should be made clear to newspaper editors who handle them, and to the public. Finally, the role which public opinion should play in connection with politicians should be carefully defined, since the process of
making democracy increasingly real depends in large measure on the nature of this relationship. (Dr. Hauser then announced, at the request of the Chairman, that the best applicable sampling methods had resulted in the selection of Fred C. Danforth and Lawrence E. Benson to represent the United States in this brief round-up of “Frontiers of Public Opinion Research.”)

FRED C. DANFORTH (Central Surveys, Shenandoah, Iowa): The development of more perfect methodology is admittedly a major problem facing public opinion research, but too often the client is lost sight of when poll results are reported. Clients frequently get little benefit from surveys because they do not understand them, and consequently are unable to act on the basis of the findings.

LAWRENCE E. BENSON (American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton): On the basis of the most recent opinion-testing methods it is apparent that the participants in this meeting are ready for adjournment, and I shall therefore keep my remarks for later.

(After official announcements by the Secretary-Treasurer, the meeting was adjourned by the Chairman.)

EXPERIENCES WITH PROBABILITY SAMPLING IN PRIVATE AGENCIES (I)*
(Monday, September 13, 1948)

Chairman: Philip McCarthy, Cornell University.


The Chairman: The objective of those working on the development of probability sampling is to devise a method whereby the judgment of opinion and market surveyors is eliminated as far as possible. This method of sampling has shown certain advantages and certain disadvantages to date; the usual criticism is that it’s too expensive. Our purpose this morning is to find out something about the experience private agencies have had in using this new tool.

Russell H. Colley: Instead of “probability sampling,” I prefer to use the term “precision sampling,” by which is understood: “A process of sampling in which each individual or unit in the universe has a known mathematical chance of being selected for the purpose of observation.”

The principal reason for using precision sampling is to rule out unforeseen sources of bias in the selection of respondents. On a quota sample certain biases are apt to creep in, even though the interviewer has religiously followed the quotas as to income, age, race, etc. These biases reflect human tendencies

* Reported by William A. Reynolds, National Broadcasting Company.
to which the interviewer may succumb if left to her own devices: tendencies to exclude the less personable, accessible, or articulate respondents. If the exclusion of such groups is apt to have a serious biasing effect on the subject under study, the researcher would do well to consider precision rather than quota sampling.

There cannot be any hard and fast rules as to when to use precision sampling, quota sampling, or some other method. I would consider the following criteria as conditions favorable to the use of precision sampling: (1) The lack of up-to-date, reliable information about the universe, (2) Universality of the phenomenon under study; certainly a precision sample would be more seriously considered on a survey of consumer opinion as to men's shirts, which are worn by 99 per cent of the men, than in a study of the attitude of television set owners, who represent about 1 per cent of United States families, (3) The complexity of the problem; the more complex the problem becomes, the greater is the need for precision sampling, (4) The degree of precision desired.

Once it has been decided to use precision sampling, two questions arise: How can a national precision sample be set up and administered, and can it be done within reasonable limits of time and cost?

I don't know of any one system which can be made to work in all types and sizes of cities and rural areas. In the last few years, A. S. Bennett Associates has used many different methods of precision sampling for a variety of problems in consumer and dealer survey work. We have found that precision sampling is expensive to set up. But once the basic sampling materials have been obtained and processed, the cost of administering precision sampling is little more than quota sampling. Therefore, we decided that we would make an investment in basic sampling materials and amortize that investment as future clients utilized the sample. I shall describe one such national sample used in surveying the shirt market.

In theory, the cities to be used in such a survey should be selected by probability alone. Actually, we found that considerable judgment had to be used. A sample representing New England, for example, must include the city of Boston.

The principal question we ran into then was the method of selecting families or individuals within cities. I don't know of any one method that can be applied to all cities, and in our own work we evolve a variety of methods to suit varying conditions. In cities over 50,000 the Bureau of Census has designated each block with a number and shows each block on a map. The sampling process is to make a random selection of these designated blocks. In large metropolitan areas a minor variation was used. Instead of a straight systematic selection of blocks, a random selection was first made of census tracts. Blocks were then selected within these census tracts. In cities under 50,000 it was necessary to do much of the basic groundwork which the Bureau of Census had done for us in larger cities. This meant obtaining an up-to-date street map of the city and designating each and every block with a number.

The next step was to send interviewers to the selected blocks to make a precoun of the dwelling units. This
The count was given in the last census, but the data are now close to ten years old. Then we secured, in as many cases as possible, the actual name and address of each householder who was to be interviewed. This allowed no question or confusion in the interviewer’s mind as to which family to select for an interview.

The next problem to face was that of call-backs. Are the people found at home sufficiently different from the not-at-homes to have a biasing effect on your survey? This depends on the subject matter. On some studies it might be very serious; on others, not so serious. We followed the practice that no alternate family could be substituted until an evening or Saturday callback had been made. A dozen callbacks during the day on a working wife would not find her in, but if an evening or Saturday callback failed to find the original family at home, the interviewer was permitted to take the house next door.

Rural sampling is another problem. Too many practitioners have slighted rural interviews because of inconvenience and cost. But area sampling has made rural interviewing practical, precise, and, many people are discovering, not so costly as they thought.

A word about how our rural sample was set up. Some 3000 non-metropolitan counties were stratified by the 8 major types of farming areas. Then, about 50 counties were selected at random within the strata, and county highway maps showing the actual location of farm and rural non-farm dwellings were obtained. Each county was divided into thousands of tiny areas, every area was designated and a random selection was made of the areas.

Finally, interviewers were given copies of maps and directions showing exactly where interviews were to be taken.

I have a lot of confidence in precision sampling, built up over a period of many years in which I have seen the results check out time and time again, almost perfectly, with known data. At the same time, I don’t necessarily believe this type of sampling should be used to the exclusion of other methods. We have too much talk of quota sampling versus precision sampling. This smells of cultism. It seems to me that, as professional research men, we should decide when to use a shovel and when to use a hoe. Let’s pick our tools for the job to be done.

RAYMOND FRANZEN: The following remarks are based on an observed tendency among private agencies to change their sampling methods—not because of demonstrable faults in the previous methods, but because of demonstrable benefits from the new methods. In the recently completed Magazine Readership Survey, for example, the probability and quota samples gave similar results, but the probability sample showed additional advantages which made it the more desirable.

What are some of these advantages? In the first place, in the probability sampling we know the mathematical variance, and hence can tell how much confidence to place in trend lines.

An even greater reason for using probability sampling is that it facilitates obtaining an accurate economic cross-section. When we use “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D” economic groups we know that there are many cases of misclassification and borderline instances. With
a probability sample we know that we have the correct economic distribution.

Third, this method helps take the burden of proof of validity away from the agency and puts it where it should be—on the interviewer. Once correct instructions have been issued, it is up to the interviewer to follow them.

Fourth, use of probability samples tends to increase the integrity of interviewers. Since they are assigned definite homes or persons to visit, they don’t have to tour the city looking for an individual to fill up a quota. Field personnel should be expert interviewers—not expert hunters.

Fifth, probability sampling makes it easier to locate bias. If, for example, we are selecting members for a panel and encounter a number of refusals in the original sample, we can then compare known characteristics of those who refuse with the characteristics of those who participate.

Finally, probability sampling can yield a mathematical regression which can be used for predictive purposes, even outside of the material studied in the survey.

On the other hand, we must not ignore certain difficulties and unsolved problems presented by probability sampling. We don’t know to what extent clustering of interviews can be accomplished. How many blocks in one tract can be used? On this point we will have to experiment and see how much clustering can be done and still yield accurate results. We are also uncertain of the best procedures for selecting the actual individuals to be interviewed. One practice which has yielded good results is to select households at the time the initial inventory of the area is made, and then specify individuals within households. A cheaper method is simply to tell the interviewer to talk to the male head of the household in one sub-sample and to the female head in another sub-sample, etc. Finally, we must experiment with other than geographical factors as a basis for stratifying (while, of course, keeping selection random within cells). Stratification by education, type of building, etc. may make it possible to conduct a survey with a smaller number of cases.

Rob Goodman: When an organization has decided to use probability sampling it presumably has already recognized that a somewhat costly survey operation is involved. Recognition of the costs of probability sampling means that these costs must be studied in order that as much as possible may be secured for the funds expended.

There are, of course, two ways to get the “most for the money.” One way is to limit costs by the use of efficient procedures; the second is to secure a maximum product, that is, in the case of surveys to secure a maximum amount of information from the study.

The key to an efficient survey operation with probability sampling is flexibility. The design should permit the use of essentially the same interviewing staff on a wide variety of surveys. Since for most surveys costs are lower when interviewers are employed locally, the sample design would also be such that essentially the same sample points can be used several times.

The usual procedure in selecting sample points is to establish strata containing primary areas which are as much alike as possible. The primary areas may consist of counties, groups of counties or parts of one or more
counties. There are numerous criteria by which the primary areas may be grouped into strata. For example, primary areas may be classified according to the size of the largest center. Then strata may be established in which each primary area contains a city of over 200,000 population; other strata containing cities of 100,000 to 200,000; 40,000 to 100,000; and so on. In addition, sub-groupings may be made on the basis of geographic location, per cent native white, or other variables. Moreover, studies of different methods of stratification have indicated that there are usually a number of methods, any one of which will yield substantially whatever gains there are to be derived by a stratification procedure.

Fortunately, the use of geographical location together with size of largest center seems to offer a satisfactory system of stratification for a wide variety of surveys. It is therefore possible to select a set of sample points (primary areas) which can be used in several studies. Such a design has considerable flexibility also. Suppose, for example, that a particular survey is planned in which interviews are to be obtained only in cities of over 5,000. Quite obviously, all sample points containing no such cities would be dropped out for this survey. In addition a portion of the sample points containing cities of 5,000 to perhaps 15,000 would probably be dropped because the use of a uniform sampling rate would yield too few interviews for efficient operation in every one of them. By combining two strata containing relatively small proportions of city dwellers, and selecting one of the sample points at random to represent both strata, the sampling rate within the selected sample area can be doubled. Hence the expected number of inter-
views in the selected sample point is doubled also. By use of a technique of this kind the sample points will consist of a sub-set of those used on other surveys and the usual efficient field operation can be maintained at each locality included in the survey.

This notion of flexibility is readily extended to sampling within the selected localities. Towns and villages are selected within each, sample blocks are chosen, and listing sheets are drawn up for each selected block. The listing sheets show all of the addresses of dwelling units within each block, listed in a prescribed sequence. Blocks are defined in such a way that a relatively small proportion of the addresses in any block is used on any one survey. The listing sheets are kept on file in the office and sample addresses can readily be selected for subsequent surveys. By applying a number of statistical devices to these listing sheets, it is possible to continue using the same blocks until a high percentage of the addresses have been used up, since avoidance of addresses first selected at random need not detract from the randomness of later selections.

The second principal means for ensuring economy is to extract maximum information from the survey. If probability sampling is employed, it may be found possible to study inter-relationships and cross-tabulated data about which information is urgently needed. In other words, the use of probability sampling permits an intricate survey operation. Furthermore, the use of probability sampling presupposes employment of a properly designed questionnaire and well-trained interviewers. By the combination of these factors a near maximum amount of reliable in-
As a matter of fact, when highly objective techniques are used, costs of analysis are ordinarily increased as much as—or more than—the interviewing costs. For example, cost data of the Survey Research Center show that direct field costs vary from one-fourth to one-third total survey costs, and total sampling and supervisory costs, including permanent staff, rarely amount to as much as one-half of the total cost of a survey. This is in contrast with many survey organizations in which field costs constitute a large percentage of total costs.

The trend toward the use of highly developed survey techniques seems to parallel the increasing demand for intricate findings of a known degree of reliability. If either field costs or costs of analysis are boosted out of proportion to each other, the total amount of information obtained for a dollar spent is likely to suffer. If advanced field techniques are utilized, extensive analysis is required if full advantage is to be taken of the great amount of information obtained. At the same time, the analysis is hardly worth while if sufficient funds have not been spent to make sure that the probability sampling has been rigorously applied.

PHILIP M. HAUSER (University of Chicago): It seems to me that the sample described by the first speaker was really not a probability sample at all and I would like to take issue with the idea that the probability method is not applicable to the selection of cities. There are methods of using probability sampling for this purpose, and they need not be more expensive. Also, permitting the interviewer to take the next house if he experiences a refusal is definitely a departure from the probability method.

With reference to the remarks of the second speaker, it is my feeling that the permissible extent of clustering is not a matter of belief but of the development of a sample design in which the optimum extent of clustering is determined. In addition, ratio and regression estimates can be used in non-probability samples as well as with probability samples, and the usefulness of various factors for stratification purposes must depend on the total survey design.

RAYMOND FRANZEN: I agree with Dr. Hauser on most of the points he has raised. It is true that regressions can be used in quota sampling, but usable correlations with demonstrable cross validation are not as sure to appear. On the matter of clustering I agree in general, but here one eventually comes to a point where a judgment must be made, and it's a matter of getting the best possible evidence on which to base such a judgment.

ARNOLD KING (National Analysts): There is a need to alert the public to the fact that there are some agencies purporting to use probability sampling which are not in fact doing so, and in such cases the probability of selection cannot be stated. Another general misapprehension is that stratification cannot be carried out in probability sampling. Actually, of course, it can be done and afterwards we still know the probability of selection. In addition, we can take a probability sample and weight it by quotas and groupings without losing its benefits.

With regard to the geographical versus the socio-economic factor in stratification, our experience has shown...
that the geographic method tends to be more satisfactory, because then known economic and social data can be used at the estimation level.

Rensis Likert (Survey Research Center): In spite of its advantages, there is no question that the probability sample costs more. The design, the interviewing, and the procedure for locating the respondent are all more expensive. We have found that 20 to 30 per cent of the field cost of the survey is devoted to getting in contact with the respondent. This does not mean that probability sampling is inefficient, but it does mean that it is more economical to administer a fairly long questionnaire, since this brings down the cost of each question.

Frederick F. Stephan (Princeton University): Mr. Colley referred to a survey done for a shirt company. I would like to ask first whether it was possible to persuade the client to state definitely how much precision he needed for his purposes, and secondly how the client and the agency reacted to the increased cost of using probability methods.

Russell H. Colley: It is usually difficult to persuade the client to commit himself on just how much reliability is needed for every question on a six-page questionnaire. The customary attitude is: "We want all the information we can get." With regard to the added cost, the sampling added only about 10 per cent to the cost of the whole survey, and the added cost of callbacks came to another 10 per cent. This was not considered excessive by the client in view of the increased reliability.

In connection with a comment made earlier, we admit that the sample used in this survey was not a pure probability sample, but complete purity is difficult to achieve and is ordinarily not required. For a survey which does require a pure probability sample it is best to secure the services of a specialized sample statistician or else to consult one of the sampling experts at the Bureau of the Census.

Frederick F. Stephan: The services of competent statisticians are needed not only in the sampling problem but also on other phases of the planning, execution and use of surveys. Perhaps it is not altogether fortunate that the energies of statisticians are being increasingly absorbed by the problem of sample design, since problems of interpretation and of communicating survey results are, if anything, more vital at the present time. Whenever possible, the statistician should follow a survey right through to the stage of interpretation and recommendation.

Leif Holbek-Hanssen (Fakta, Oslo): So far nobody has mentioned the problem of "time sampling." Isn't it true that many people think differently from one day to the next—especially on some subjects? When our main job is to study changes, wouldn't it then be more of a probability sample if we distributed the interviews evenly throughout the days and weeks of a period of about six months and even analyzed some moving averages?

The Chairman: Of course we are all concerned with time sampling, and I think the discussion thus far has shown only that we are more worried about other factors.

Rensis Likert: Research on the influence of the time factor tends to show that some attitudes are fairly stable. For
example, even after a price break respondents' economic plans and expectations continued substantially as before.

HERBERT STEMBER (National Opinion Research Center): NORC has been keeping trend data on expectations of war. Fluctuations in these expectations can be fairly closely related to specific events, showing that with respect to political questions the time factor can be of substantial importance.

EXPERIENCES WITH PROBABILITY SAMPLING IN PRIVATE AGENCIES (II)*

(Monday, September 13, 1948)


Participants: Matilda White, Market Research Company of America; Herbert Hyman, National Opinion Research Center; Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago.

MATILDA WHITE: At the Market Research Company we have run across a number of practical problems in connection with probability sampling. These fall into two groups: (1) Selecting sampling households in the field without bias or error, and (2) Obtaining the required information from the maximum number of these households.

The first problem has been solved by a complete listing of all houses within the sampling area. While this is expensive, once done the job needn't be repeated, and the original cost of the listing can be spread over a number of surveys. Also, in this type of listing the interviewer no longer has the problem of selection since we choose the sample.

This method of prelisting requires careful instruction and supervision of the interviewers. Not content with taking listings from the mailboxes, directories, or other sources, we go directly to the household.

Here there are two possible sources of error: (1) Failure by the interviewer to list all dwelling units, and (2) Listing by interviewers of more dwelling units than are actually within the area. The most glaring errors of this type can be detected by checking all work against up-to-date maps.

The second set of problems is concerned with obtaining full answers from all of the sample. Of course, the person to be interviewed must be found, and found at a time when he is willing to respond; when full attention cannot be given to the questionnaire, a callback is required. Our experience has been that in urban areas respondents in two-thirds of the households are successfully contacted on the first call, and 85 per cent by the second. In rural areas 85 per cent of the respondents have been available on the first call. We have also found that 5 per cent of the homes originally listed proved not to belong in the sample at all, either because the apparent dwelling units proved not to be dwelling units, or because they were unoccupied at the time. Errors made by originally listing office buildings as apartments should not be corrected by

* Reported by Raymond Fink, Opinion Research Center, University of Denver.
substitution; these addresses must be excluded entirely.

It seems to us that the necessity for callbacks to prevent bias is often exaggerated. Instead of callbacks we tried a system of substitution in the field, but this proved inadequate. We also found that the interviewing expense involved in substitution is as great as the cost of making complete callbacks. In addition, we are not entirely convinced of the universal value of callbacks. Whether to use them or not depends on the problem. In comparing those respondents reached on first calls with those interviewed on callbacks we found responses to many questions very similar. Sometimes there was a change in the total of only 1 or 2 per cent, or none at all. This, of course, was not the case when a question concerned the employment of women, where the change in results varied from 16 per cent at the first call to 22 per cent of the total sample—or a net bias of 6 percentage points.

The interviewer will have greater success if first calls are timed properly. It is unwise to give the interviewer a specific number of times he is to make a callback. This tends to lower his morale by implying that he will fail a certain number of times.

A problem greater than callbacks is getting the respondent to complete a long questionnaire. On this we found the key factor to be in getting the cooperation and confidence of the interviewer. Our main effort has been not only in educating the interviewer but in emphasizing to him that the job can be done. Largely as a result of this, the percentage of incomplete returns we have experienced for any reason (including respondents never found at home and refusals) has been cut from an original 15 to 6 per cent in recent years.

Herbert Hyman: I want to discuss the problem of field staff performance as it affects the quality of the probability samples actually obtained. Such sampling presents complex problems requiring a high degree of skill on the part of the interviewer.

A recent letter from one of our staunchest interviewers assigned to an area sample describes the hardships he encountered while in the field. In covering his assigned segment he encountered insane asylums and impenetrable wilderness where farms should have been. From his letter he sounded somewhat discouraged. Yet the average interviewer is not nearly as loyal or as experienced. Therefore errors may easily be introduced. I can illustrate the types and magnitudes of these errors from various surveys done by NORC:

1. In one community survey involving listing of all dwelling units in given blocks, we found an underlisting in poor blocks approximating 13 per cent of all the dwelling units.

2. In another survey where the interviewer was supposed to select every nth house, from such listings, mere examination indicated that for 3 per cent of the dwelling units selected, the interviewer had been unable to count properly and had selected the wrong household.

3. In addition, the use of these listings for the selection of new samples of households for future surveys was impaired since we found that 10 per cent of the entries contained clerical errors such as vague addresses and illegible writing.

4. In another survey we were able
to ascertain whether the interviewer actually did choose the households in the prescribed fashion or whether he covertly biased the selection. This check was made by completing two equivalent listings, one by the office staff and the other by the interviewers. In this way a bias in the interviewers' samples in the direction of selecting wealthier households could be demonstrated.

5. Selection of individuals within households was also subject to error. Individuals were supposed to be selected systematically following an enumeration of all adults within the household. Mere examination of the enumeration sheets indicated that the interviewers were unable to follow the instructions correctly in 4 per cent of the cases.

6. Clerical errors in enumeration, e.g., inadequate entry of age or sex or number of calls, were found in 35 per cent of the entries on the enumeration sheets, impairing their usefulness for future sampling or for checking on the interviewer.

7. In one survey where eight pairs of interviewers worked in the same segments, the average difference between pairs in the number of calls per completed interview was 1.03 indicating that interviewer performance may determine the apparent non-availability of respondents.

The control of interviewer errors in probability sampling lies in administrative procedures of supervision, training, selection, and the like. The analysis of factors relating to such errors is in progress, and some answers will be forthcoming in papers by Manheimer and McRae. I can briefly mention some tentative findings.

In surveys without direct supervision, clerical errors, as pointed out, ran very high, whereas they were negligible among interviewers under direct supervision. However, even with supervision, hidden errors or biased selection occurred. This biasing behavior is related to deeper motivations rather than to carelessness. Aids in controlling such bias include (a) Double procedures where one interviewer does listing, and another the interviewing, (b) Altered sample designs, so as to remove nuisances to the interviewer and improve his morale, (c) Empirical studies of interviewer sentiments leading to better knowledge of the reasons for error and improved procedures. For example, some interviewers remarked in their report forms that they could not see the importance of the procedures they were supposed to follow. In remarking on their main difficulties, it was observed that most interviewers did not mention the phases which were most subject to error, and the particular interviewers who made most errors were less aware of difficulty. Interviewers therefore must be trained to develop insight and to understand the reasons why it is necessary to follow specified procedures.

PHILIP M. HAUSER: In response to the Chairman's request, I am going to give an outline of a probability sample that is 99 and 44/100 per cent pure.

In a probability sample every item in the population has a known chance of being selected. It is not necessarily true that each item has an equal chance of selection, but if the probability of selection is known, the sample is under control.

In a probability sample every item in the population has a known chance of being selected. It is not necessarily true that each item has an equal chance of selection, but if the probability of selection is known, the sample is under control.

Sampling in the AT&T survey previously described is in an ideal setup, since there is a listing of the total population. Random sampling from a complete list is probability sampling
and all standard probability sampling formulae are applicable.

To design a national sample one should first decide on the primary sampling unit. Next, the modes of stratification should be determined. There should be as much homogeneity within the strata as possible, while within the primary sampling unit there should be as much heterogeneity as possible.

Questions may arise as to the best modes of stratification. Some judgment is needed in this determination, but this judgment does not in any way affect the selection of cases. Judgment should be used in setting up the strata, but random sampling methods should be used in the selection of sampling units from each stratum.

In sampling, one may consider that every single county or combination of counties in the United States is in a "box" from which drawings are made. Once the counties have been stratified, primary units from every stratum may be drawn at random, using no judgment at all. This is a restrictive, yet random, sample design.

From these primary sampling units sub-samples can be drawn by further stratifying the county sampling units by cities, industrial areas, etc.; and elements from each county primary sampling unit can then be drawn at random to represent that county. Information about the composition of the sample does not have to be known in advance, since the sample gives the answers.

One can also enumerate city blocks or rural townships completely, but since this is usually too inefficient or costly, one can sub-sample these areas, stratifying by whatever characteristics are available. This leaves the researcher with clusters of dwelling units within city blocks and clusters of farmsteads in rural areas for enumeration.

In every step cases are drawn according to the principles of probability, and the formula for the measure of error varies with the design. A mathematical statistician is needed to determine the optimum allocation of sampling units. Only the mathematical statistician can outline this procedure, although not always with set rules.

For further information a publication entitled "A New Sample of the Population" by Hansen and Hurwitz may be obtained from the Bureau of the Census. A bibliography and reprints are also available at the Bureau. New books on sampling will appear shortly: one by Stephan and McCarthy, another by Deming, and a third by Hansen, Hurwitz, and Madow.

The Chairman: At the Opinion Research Corporation we have been interested in the problems of cost. In 1937 we tried to find out why interviewers took so long to do a job. First we attempted to reduce travel costs by assigning four contiguous blocks instead of one, but we had exactly the same cost per block as with the original method.

Recently we made some experiments in area block sampling which consisted of sending out four sets of interviewers with matched samples of blocks. The first set of interviewers was assigned quotas; the second set was given pre-selected houses but was allowed to select individuals within the houses by quotas; the third set was given a method for randomized selecting of individuals within households but was allowed to choose any house in the block; and for the fourth set both house and individual were preselected.
We found that preselecting individuals increased costs 13 per cent net, and preselecting households increased costs 10 per cent net. Yet all four samples were indistinguishable with respect to results.

Clyde Hart (National Opinion Research Center): About a year ago NORC went into probability sampling to overcome some of the difficulties referred to. Since our people had experience only in quota sampling, we sent four of them to Washington where they learned little that was helpful in the field. They found a memorandum written by Matilda White on her first set of field experiences to be most useful.

Philip M. Hauser: The staffs doing this kind of work in Washington are very small and overworked, and a great deal of the material necessary for describing their activities has not yet been written. The best persons to consult are those actually engaged in field operations.

In designing surveys one should decrease the necessity for the enumerator to use his judgment. In the Census, field workers are given addresses and maps. They may interview the person coming to the door, but they also list the other members of the household. The universe is then split into two groups: the first consists of the people who came to the door, and the second is the remainder of the universe. A random sample is then taken of the second.

Roe Goodman (Survey Research Center): Hauser’s technique is ideal under some conditions, but a larger total number of interviews is needed if more than one interview per household is made. An alternative procedure is to select one individual at random within each sample household. I’d also like to ask Miss White whether or not her callback system on the same block involves any additional cost.

Matilda White: It does not as compared with substitutions made in the field. In other words, if a given number of cases is required for the block, callbacks do not appear to add materially to the cost of obtaining them.

Herbert Hyman: Administrative problems are not solved by culling out interviewers. The natural mortality rate among interviewers approximates 100 per cent. Culling them out means that the initial investment made in the interviewers has been lost. It is better to determine what demands will be made on the interviewer and then set up a system to prevent the selection of poor ones.

Frank Chokel (Opinion Research Corporation): Our turnover of interviewers is not 100 per cent. We keep a record of interviewers and they are rated. We have experimented, using every device at our disposal to expose cheaters. When we ran tabulations “with” cheaters and “without” cheaters, however, none of the results varied by more than 1 per cent. When an interviewer is rated as “suspicious” it is usually discovered that he is a cheater. The most valuable are those trained in the field and well indoctrinated. We correspond frequently with interviewers throughout the country to keep them interested. If paid well they do a better job.
OPINION RESEARCH AS AN AID TO PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTICE

(Monday, September 13, 1948)


Participants: Fred L. Palmer, Earl Newsom and Company; Carolyn Crusius, Elmo Roper; Le Baron Foster, Opinion Research Corporation.

The Chairman: This morning we have with us experts who represent three areas with which our discussion will be concerned. Mr. Palmer is a practitioner of public relations, Miss Crusius is an experienced research technician, and Mr. Foster is a specialist in reporting the results of research for the use of public relations practitioners.

Fred L. Palmer: The close connection between public opinion research and public relations should be recognized. The one involves measurement and analysis of opinion, and the other consists of the art of helping people deal constructively with the force of public opinion. While public relations is more an art than a science—part of the art of leadership—it's future depends on a large extent on the progress of public opinion research. The public relations counselor must understand the opinion of his publics if he is to help an enterprise deal with public attitudes. Research is accordingly a valuable tool for public relations firms. For example, Earl Newsom and Company has worked with Elmo Roper on many public opinion problems including those of the Ford Motor Company and Standard Oil of New Jersey, companies which have placed high value on studies of employee attitudes.

Especially valuable to public relations practitioners would be a wider use of continuing series of questions to facilitate the study of public opinion in motion. Such series as the Link Barometer are helpful in detecting seasonal trends. More such research (conducted with greater frequency) would allow a more systematic comparison of opinion data with economic data. Second, there is need to develop indices which will indicate the climate of public opinion at any given moment. The Fortune “Consumer Outlook” is a move in this direction, and ORC’s “Collectivist Ideology in America” took another step by attempting to measure how far left or right various elements of the population might be in the realm of political ideas. Indices for measuring the public desire for security as compared with the values of work, enterprise, and independence would be valuable in this connection. Third, there is need for a central agency supported by leading research and public relations organizations, and by various industries and institutions, to accumulate, centralize, and compare a great quantity of public opinion data, and to undertake “pure research” in the general interest.

In conclusion, the public relations profession would profit from experimentation with new techniques, especially techniques for simple and cheaper ways of quickly testing opinion, and doing so frequently.

Carolyn Crusius: In my opinion, Mr. Palmer’s most important challenge to
us is the need for more research into research, particularly the kind that will allow better appraisals of the meaning of our results. For example, consider a basic problem to public relations: what does it mean when a person says he is favorably or unfavorably disposed towards a company, or industry, or movement? What will he do as a result of his attitude?

Good techniques have been developed for reporting the percentages of different kinds of people sitting on different sides of an emotional fence with respect to corporations. Good techniques have been developed for reporting up-surges and down-surges of emotional attitudes toward corporations, and the reasons for them when the up-surges and down-surges are occasioned by dramatic enough happenings. Good techniques have been developed for finding out what people want, what they have done, and how they react on matters concerned with their regular lives and thinking.

But consider just a few questions that still remain unanswered: (1) How much actual interest is there anyway in any given company or organization; or in the way businesses as a whole conduct themselves? (2) How much can any organization count on a person who says he approves of it, and how likely is he to stay that way, if he reads or hears something to the contrary about the organization? (3) What is the relative long-term effect on an organization of a dramatic business personality as compared to an enlightened program? (4) What is the maximum attention a company can expect if its products are never seen as such by the public, or never get into the home?

Such questions are not easy of solution, nor can they be answered in any single study, and maybe it is beyond public opinion research really to answer some of them. But certainly there is within the framework of public opinion techniques, if imaginatively applied, a good possibility of building up some real knowledge of the workings of this abstract thing called "good will."

Le Baron Foster: With regard to the application of research to policy and action, perhaps some illustrations from our experience will be helpful.

1. Identifying the Target. Top administrators often find it hard to visualize what really counts with their publics, and sometimes extensive advertising or public relations campaigns are launched with no objective evidence that they are pointed at the right targets. The Association of American Railroads, after an ORC study, shifted from its 1941 strategy of telling the public that the government was unfair in subsidizing competitors of the railroads to the theme that the railroads were helping win the war. At the start of the campaign 50 per cent favored government operation of the railroads in wartime; this figure dropped gradually to 15 per cent by 1944.

2. Shaping Policy. For years the American Medical Association opposed plans for the prepayment of medical bills on an insurance basis, fearing that such plans would take the control of medical practice out of the hands of the doctors. When a survey showed an insistent public demand for insurance of medical risks, the Association devised plans under the control of the doctors to meet the demand, instead of resisting it. Also, the trend in business is toward giving the public relations man an increasing voice in top policy decisions.
3. Setting the Themes of the Campaign. Important for success is choosing themes of high importance to the audience rather than those of particular interest to you.

4. Pretesting Materials. Without test results it is anybody's guess as to whether any one method of getting across ideas really works. A small research expenditure may pay great dividends.

5. Auditing Campaign Results. Good public relations work sometimes goes unrecognized because no audit is taken to demonstrate what was accomplished. The railways' wartime campaign is one of many illustrations where the audit paid off.

If public opinion research is not called upon more frequently by top management, the chances are that it is because we have not shown how research findings can be put to practical use.

Fred L. Palmer: I agree heartily with Carolyn Crusius as to the high value of probing techniques. A public relations firm has to tell clients "to do something," and so naturally has to go in for interpretation—successful interpretation. One caution must be observed, however. Reasons given by respondents in surveys may not be the real reasons. Accordingly, qualitative analysis is of high importance. It is also equally important to educate the client.

In planning information campaigns, it should be remembered that it is impossible to set all the facts before the public. Pouring out facts may smother out attention. In the development of public opinion, presentation should be clear and simple, should deal with the significant. The public would never get any impressions if it had to wait for all the facts.

Le Baron Foster: I wonder whether a clearing house or central agency (as suggested by Mr. Palmer) would produce the hoped-for results.

Fred L. Palmer: Such an organization could certainly obtain trend data, the collection of which no single existing research organization would be willing to finance.

The Chairman: Perhaps AAPOR might help sponsor trend studies and assist in setting up a clearing house.

Frank Lang (Association of Casualty and Surety Companies): It would represent a step in the right direction if public relations and opinion specialists would learn more about the businesses they are assisting and study their particular problems in more detail. This would help them present their findings to top management in a form that might be more readily comprehended.

Richard W. Dittmer (Opinion Research Corporation): Is it preferable for pollsters, or for the public relations counselor to present survey findings to top management?

Fred L. Palmer: Cooperation between both groups may be best. In general, researchers and counselors are each likely to have a particular field of expertise, and this should be taken into account in determining the manner of presentation.

Max Barioux (Service de Sondages et Statistiques): Poll-taking itself may best be described neither as art nor as
science, but as using a camera. The clarity of the picture presented largely determines the excellence of the survey.

Louis Harris (Elmo Roper): In addition to the functions which have been described, public relations firms have the task of assisting corporations in redefining their place in the broader context of business and social organization. Consequently, research should not overlook investigation of these long-range social problems.

William A. Yoell (New York City): Studies giving more attention to the totality of the respondent’s experience and personality would also be valuable. Knowledge of how factory workers spend the full day, for example, proves valuable in analysis of workers’ attitudes toward management.

Julian Woodward (Elmo Roper): The difficulty of such a procedure is that the validity of free association methods is hard to establish.

William A. Yoell: I was referring to a procedure for establishing objective facts, not to depth interviewing as some use it.

The Chairman: The facts obtained will, of course, differ with the methods used. Years ago Sir Isaac Newton formulated the third law of motion—for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Psychology is also a field of scientific endeavor and has its laws. The weakness of depth interviewing may be summed up by the “first law” of psycho-dynamics, which is: “The deeper you dig, the higher you have to pile it.”

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS RESEARCH
(Monday, September 13, 1948)

Chairman: L. N. Lascau, Director of Employee Research, General Motors Company.

Participants: Ralph L. Mason, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Rensis Likert, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; Paul Grabbe, formerly consultant, American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Ralph L. Mason: I am not a research expert, but I should like to review our company’s experience in connection with employee attitude surveys.

At the end of the war, we decided we wanted to get a check on our overall employee relations policies. There were three approaches that we might have used to obtain this information: (1) Attitude surveying, (2) Consultation with a specialist, such as a labor economist who would analyze our set-up, and (3) Educator conferences. We decided to use all three approaches, and started by engaging Elmo Roper to formulate the questionnaire for our first attitude survey, which was conducted at our Baton Rouge plant in 1945.

At the outset we realized that there—
wasn't much use in conducting attitude research if we didn't do something about the findings. Also, we felt it necessary to let those who were canvassed know the results of the survey. Lastly, we wanted to be sure that the employees' bargaining agency knew what we were doing and why, so we called in the representatives of the union and showed them the questionnaire. The only group canvassed in this initial survey was the wage earner group. We made it clear that we had no intention of trying to pin anything on anyone, but rather that we would study the over-all findings and then see what could be done about it. The final report of the survey was submitted to the union group.

The following are the areas we explored in this questionnaire: (1) Attitude towards the company and its management, (2) Attitude towards supervisors, (3) Attitude towards pay, (4) Attitude towards company plans and policies, and (5) Attitude towards the work.

In another plant, the Baytown Refinery of the Humble Oil & Refining Company, an attitude survey included not only wage earners, but supervisors, clerical workers, and the technical workers as well. Our survey results indicated a desire for greater opportunity for promotion, and showed that certain groups were concerned about salary and administration. Also, where we had thought that our salaries for technical employees were on a pretty sound basis, the survey indicated that these employees were not convinced that they were being paid as well as other technical groups.

Another problem disclosed by the survey was to get the supervisory employees to feel that they were a part of management. We found that they didn't feel they had an adequate pay differential over those they supervised, and also that the channels of communication were not as open as we had thought they were.

All in all, it is our company's feeling that the surveys gave a good picture of the feeling of our employees, and we plan to continue them.

Rensis Likert: Industrial relations when they are a problem are a symptom of poor management. The best prevention is intelligent and competent management. Therefore, how does one assure the type of management that will do the best job? Survey research techniques provide an extremely powerful research tool for attaining this goal.

The assumption we make is that wherever people are engaged in a task that has a common objective, certain basic principles of organization and management are applicable. In order to ascertain these principles, we must study operations that are high in productivity and see how they differ from comparable operations that are low in productivity. We must do the same for operations that differ in job satisfaction. In other words, we are trying to find out what kinds of supervisory practices and what kinds of organizational structure yield a high level of productivity, and a high level of job satisfaction.

We began to study this problem two or three years ago. The first investigation was made in the home office of the Prudential Insurance Company. There we found a situation where several groups of employees were doing exactly the same kind of work. Aptitude tests showed no difference among these groups, yet there were differences in
productivity. We interviewed groups of employees with both low and high levels of productivity, using general questions such as: How do you do your work? How do you feel about it? etc. We also surveyed the practices of the management.

Another concern investigated was a large utility company. Here it was not possible to get satisfactory measures of productivity, so we used morale and job satisfaction as a basis for making comparisons among employees. We interviewed a sample of employees, administering five different questionnaire forms. We then tabulated a sample morale score, marking off the groups with low and high morale, and interviewed workers to determine what was causing the low morale or the high morale.

In some managements one finds that the supervisors are putting more pressure on the employees under them, because management has been putting pressure on the supervisors for production. Employees in these situations tend to have few chances to make decisions, and are restricted in how they make them, etc. Also, these managements tend not to be interested in the individual, as such, but in getting the work done. We have found this situation to be associated with low production. On the other hand, some managements place emphasis on a happy working situation; sore spots are sought and ironed out. Here more opportunities for initiative are given, and the management makes it clear that suggestions and criticism are welcomed. We found this situation to be associated with high production.

In the utility company study, we found that (1) Blue collar workers are less satisfied with their jobs than white collar workers, (2) The larger the work group, the lower the level of employee morale, (3) Supervisory practices affect morale.

What do the employees say about management? First of all, where management deals with employees so as to give them real opportunities to participate, you get a higher level of morale. Secondly, when the worker's sense of security is increased, higher morale results.

Paul Grabbe: I was originally asked to come into the AT&T as a consultant because as an outside observer I might be able to suggest improvements in employee relations. The research which was conducted to formulate suggestions started with the middle level of management—i.e., with sub-department heads—and proceeded down into the ranks. While dealing with middle management we found it quite possible to understand each other by means of questions and answers, but the lower we went in the hierarchy, the less effective words seemed. Our questioning techniques were no longer effective. We therefore developed a pictorial interview in which responses were charted on an abstract scale, using morale as an indicator, and were related to respondents' jobs. This technique proved to have a high reliability and the quantitative results gave valuable leads.

Having completed this operation in interviews with the rank and file, it occurred to us that a variation of this technique might be used for gauging the effectiveness of communication within management. Hitherto everybody, myself included, had viewed the problem of communication largely in terms of channeling up to higher man-
agement an accurate picture of the needs and the reactions of the rank and file, and then channeling back to the rank and file the intentions and policies of higher management. But this appeared to be an over-simplification. Good communication should also mean that management lets the rank and file know its reaction to their needs, and what it (management) is prepared to do about them. Also, this concept of communication omitted the middle range of management. We therefore applied the same pictorial interview technique to middle management—embracing five levels above the rank and file, and found that a different outlook seemed to prevail at each level of management. If more refined work could be done on this score, we might find that certain ideas are held by people as a characteristic of the level they occupy, and that some tendencies increase as you go up the management ladder, such as the tendency of the individual to project his own fears into his view of conditions on the rank and file level the farther he is removed from personal contact with people on that level.

In conclusion, communication in industry is a much more complicated affair than students of industrial relations have generally recognized. The problem goes beyond the conception of merely channeling certain information down from the policy level and in turn channeling certain information up from the rank and file level. It's a question not of one big gap to be bridged, but as many gaps as there are management levels.

The Chairman: At General Motors, we operate on the idea that the only improvements we are ever going to achieve in employee relations must be brought about through changes at all levels of management. Therefore we are not seeking methods which would put management on the defensive. We need to develop ways of analyzing data something like the procedures used by psychoanalysts. We made one study to determine employee reactions to the working situation, and spent a year studying the 175,000 replies. For example, we made a sample count of the reasons employees mentioned for liking or disliking their jobs, and then classified these according to the division. In this way we were able to locate more accurately the factors affecting employee morale—i.e., if, for instance, the term "supervision" appeared more often in the responses from one division than in the whole group, we looked for positive supervisory practices in that division, or negative if the term appeared less often. We are anxious to receive criticisms from anyone interested, and would be very glad to give a fuller description of our system to anyone who would like to have it.

George Hausknecht (Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture): Any job situation is going to yield a certain number of dissatisfied people. Sometimes this dissatisfaction is the result of a feeling of non-recognition, or other reasons pertaining to the individual. Or again, it can be the result of the social situation. Certainly both types of causes should be investigated.

The Chairman: The question might be formulated as follows: How can one distinguish between the subjective aspects of the job and those which are objective? How far should industry go
in making job satisfaction its goal, when this involves changes in the social situation?

Rensis Likert: In our studies we have tried to determine first the general factors of major consequence in connection with any kind of organized human activity, and secondly the special factors which apply to particular activities, such as heavy industry, sales, office operations, etc. But far more knowledge about human activity is needed before we can write a generalized theory of management—a formula, if you will.

H. H. Remmers (Purdue University): In studying industrial relations at Purdue, we have used the technique of measuring reciprocal empathy. This consists of measuring each group’s attitudes toward relative issues and also asking each of the two presumably opposing groups to fill out the scale as they think the opposing group would fill it out. Thus we obtain a quantitative measure of the “gap” between the two groups with a respect to the various attitude variables in question and have a benchmark from which to compute changes in attitudes as affected by procedures designed to narrow the “gap.” Psychologically, the technique is closely analogous to that used in a number of studies concerned with “faking” scores on interest and personality inventories.

Dilman M. K. Smith (Opinion Research Corporation): In various types of attitude tests, using self-administered questionnaires, we found that there must be some manner of guaranteeing anonymity to the respondent. Another thing that must not be lost sight of is the need for explaining satisfactorily the motives of management for making the survey. The individual must know why his opinion is being sought.

Rensis Likert: It is also important to interpret survey results to management; merely providing a set of figures isn’t sufficient. Management will ask, “What do they mean?”

Arthur Kornhauser (Wayne University): In studies of this type, management and the employee directly concerned are not the only considerations. Aren’t some of the most serious and important problems the ones that have to do with the organized groups’ relations—i.e., with unions and their leaders and with topmost business leadership that is often remote from the areas immediately under study? How are the employees oriented toward the union, and toward the union’s proper role vis-à-vis management? How far do these employees feel that certain of the management functions should be performed by the union (or by the union with management)? How far do they feel that certain management prerogatives should be further “infringed upon”? We must realize there are some conflicting interests here, and that we are facing problems that go beyond finding out what particular employees and members of management think. If this broader kind of study is not feasible for commercial research, then it is the responsibility of those of us operating in universities, in a somewhat detached position, to undertake it.

Rensis Likert: That is a very important question in our democratic society.
Certain groups must determine their roles toward each other.

DILMAN M. K. SMITH: We are doing some study along this line.

ANDREW G. BATO (Fortune Magazine): There is also the problem of technological developments which affect an individual's attitude toward his job by making his specialized skills obsolete. In general, people can adjust themselves to such situations, but it's management's job to make such adjustments as painless as possible.

LOUIS MOSS (Social Surveys, London): It seems to me that direction of union activities in this country (U.S.A.) is beginning to emphasize purely monetary considerations less, and social security aspirations more, although this may not be a permanent trend.

I would like to see comparative industrial relations studies made, for example, in the textile industries of the U.S., Great Britain, and Poland, because here you have three different types of social systems. We must learn to evaluate the effect of different social structures on social aspirations.

RENSIS LIKERT: In connection with Mr. Smith's statement, I would like to know more about his study on the relation of unions to management.

DILMAN M. K. SMITH: We have no statistical results to present at this time, but so far have found two principal areas in which unions and management may conflict and in neither area does rank and file union membership support the expressed views of their labor leaders: (1) The desire of the union to step into certain management functions, (2) The tendency of the union to engage in political activities. A third area of misunderstanding is based on management's misconception that labor tends to believe the union more than management. Our findings to date are quite conclusive: on a pronouncement on economic affairs, union members give greater credibility to their own company's statements than they do to their own union's.

STANDARDS IN PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
(Monday, September 13, 1948)

Chairman: Philip M. Hauser, Chairman of the Standards Committee of AAPOR; Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago.

Participants: Leland DeVinney, Rockefeller Foundation; Frederick F. Stephan, Princeton University; Robert Williams, Elmo Roper; Percival White, Market Research Company of America.

The Chairman: The problem of standards is not peculiar to this Association; numerous professional and business groups have had to face it. Research standards are particularly difficult to establish in this field, however, since opinion research is still as much an art as a science. Some aspects of it are governed by rigorous scientific procedure, but others are based on the accumulated experience, judgment, and ability of the survey director.
Since its very first meeting, the Association has been struggling with the problem of establishing minimum research standards. Differences of opinion have been marked, but the very fact that representatives of commercial research, universities and government have been able to come together to discuss the problem augurs well for the future.

The AAPOR Committee on Standards helped to arrange this panel in order to encourage discussion of certain aspects of the problem of standards which will come up for consideration before the business meeting tomorrow.

At the present time, the Association is confronted with two proposals prepared by individuals in the field of public opinion and market research. These proposals have been submitted to this Association, to the American Marketing Association, and to the Market Research Council. They consist of two parts: (1) A code of professional practices, and (2) A set of minimum standards for reporting survey results.

The proposed code of professional practices reads as follows:

“1. CODE OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

   Toward the goal of maintaining sound practices in the profession of marketing research and the confidence of all those who recognize the value of research, we subscribe to the principles expressed in the following code.

   “A. This organization will:

   1. Strive at all times to maintain the highest research standards.

   2. Endeavor always to preserve a thoroughly objective, impartial and unbiased attitude in our work.

   3. Be constantly mindful of the limitations of survey techniques and accept only such assignments as can be performed within those limitations.

   4. Fully and truthfully describe to the client the methods and techniques used in the performance of a research project.

   5. Hold confidential all information obtained about a client's business and markets.

   6. Search for and be receptive to new and improved techniques in the profession of marketing research.

   7. Encourage and participate in the exchange of ideas and experiences relative to general marketing research techniques with other organizations adhering to this code of ethics.

   8. Participate in and contribute to the work of societies, schools, and other organizations interested in the improvement of research standards.

   9. Exercise care in the acceptance of assignments and clients with a view toward the maintenance and advancement of the highest standards of marketing research.

   “B. This organization will not:

   1. Knowingly allow its creative professional services to be hired in any case where price, rather than quality, is the only consideration.

   2. Knowingly deviate from established research standards or indulge in questionable research practices in order to ‘prove’ a case.

   3. Authorize its name to be used in published survey material without prior examination and approval of the material to be used.

   4. Release to any client or other organization confidential research findings paid for by another client without the latter’s specific authorization.

   5. Knowingly interpret survey re-
results nor tacitly permit interpretations to be made inconsistent with, or not substantiated by, data available.

6. Accept business from competitive companies where the confidential nature of the relationship will be imperiled.

7. Accept confidential information offered by present or former staff members of other research organizations.”

(The Chairman then asked the panel members to comment on these proposals, and in particular to state whether in their opinion the proposals should be adopted by AAPOR.)

PERCIVAL WHITE: Having had a hand in preparing these proposals, I am naturally prejudiced in their favor, and therefore should perhaps withhold comments until later.

LELAND DEVINNEY: As one not directly concerned with public opinion research, I cannot see how anyone can oppose these proposals, but on the other hand I see no reason why the Association should adopt them.

ROBERT WILLIAMS: In my opinion, the important point is not whether these particular proposals are adopted, but whether constructive thinking on the subject is stimulated, as a result of which some definite positive action will be taken by this group.

FREDERICK F. STEPHAN: There is some question as to whether these proposals really fill the needs with respect to standards which were mentioned at Williamstown last year—and of course they were not drawn up with these specific points in mind. Until it can be determined whether they really fill the needs of the Association it would be premature to endorse them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Devinney would enlarge on his original remark to the effect that he could see no reason either for opposing or endorsing these proposals.

LELAND DEVINNEY: Quite tentatively, I would define my feelings as follows: What is the point of telling the public that opinion researchers intend to be reasonably honest and reasonably competent? Certainly there can be no objection to these two qualities, and therefore I do not see how the proposals can be opposed. On the other hand, if adopted, they would tend to be meaningless.

Other questions also arise. Is AAPOR a trade association, or is it a professional association? How would the code be enforced with respect to business organizations, or with respect to individuals?

PERCIVAL WHITE: Those of us who worked out these proposals didn’t think it necessary to stress that the profession as a whole was honest; we were rather looking for a way to keep out dishonest practitioners. The code was drawn up with the needs of market research rather than public opinion research in mind, and there is no reason why AAPOR should adopt it ready-made. Perhaps AAPOR would do well to adopt only those provisions which appear to be useful and practicable in view of its special needs, and then let another set of principles grow by accretion.

ROBERT WILLIAMS: Regarding the question of whether AAPOR is a trade or professional organization, I would say it is more similar to the professional type, because it is made up of individ-
uals, not of organizations. Hence the second part of the proposals—standards for reporting results—may be applicable to the Association. The first part, on the other hand, deals with practices of business organizations, and may therefore be unsuitable.

FREDERICK F. STEPHAN: There is some question as to whether the organization and the profession have matured sufficiently to adopt a set of standards. The proposals say that we should strive to achieve the highest research standards, but there is as yet no general agreement as to what these standards are. There is also lack of agreement on what constitutes bias, and as to the limitations of various survey techniques. Adoption of a set of general principles would not solve these problems, but would merely point up the necessity of working towards a solution of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The sense of the Standards Committee is that we must take some beginning step toward establishing a yardstick of quality, even if a tentative one. With this in mind, perhaps it would be best to discuss the proposed standards of reporting. These read as follows:

"II. STANDARDS OF PRACTICE TO BE USED IN THE REPORTING OF SURVEY RESULTS

"A. Every report of a survey should contain an explanation of the following points:

1. The purpose of the survey.
2. For whom and by whom the survey was conducted.
3. General description of the universe covered.
4. The size and nature of the sample and description of any weighting methods.
5. The time the field work was done.
6. Whether personal or mail interviews were used.
7. Adequate description of field staff and any control methods used.

"B. The main body of every report of a survey should contain:

1. Questionnaire and findings.
2. Bases of percentages.
3. Distribution of interviews."

LELAND DEVINNEY: Agreed that these proposals represent a useful beginning toward defining standards in the opinion research profession, but the question of enforcement is still a thorny one. Certainly a differentiation should be made between setting up standards for individuals, and defining trade association policy. The latter should, of course, have teeth for enforcement.

ROBERT WILLIAMS: The purpose of this organization, as stated in its constitution, is "to encourage the development of the highest professional standards in public opinion research." We should therefore make some move toward defining what it is that we are going to encourage.

FREDERICK F. STEPHAN: If we look at the experience of the Psychological Association we see that they have been struggling with this question for a long time and are only now coming to grips with some of the basic aspects of it. The real formulation of standards in the opinion research profession will come not through formal statements, but through discussions at meetings, in professional publications, and so forth. One danger of a set of formal standards that are not based on long experience is that shady characters may
make it clear to the public that they conform to the letter of the law, and at the same time engage in slipshod research. In effect, formal standards could be used as a screen to mask poor research.

Percival White: Those who drafted the proposals in question did not envisage a system of policing to enforce them. They were regarded more as an effort to formulate principles generally held by those in the profession than as a legal code. Perhaps Art Dougall, who has worked with us on the problem of developing a set of standards, would be willing to say a few words on the subject.

Arthur B. Dougall (Stewart, Dougall, and Associates): We realized, in working on this code, that it was difficult to enforce technical standards and therefore we concentrated on formulating general standards. Merely as a matter of good business any organization must have principles for which it stands, and therefore AAPOR should give considerable attention to developing a set of precepts of this type, whether or not it wishes to adopt this particular code.

The Chairman: The question of standards is one that is hard to drop without action once one has tackled it. Even if these proposals should be adopted as a first step, the question then would be, “Where do we go from here?” I should like to hear the opinions of the panel on what the next step should be.

Leland Devinney: As a program for further action, this organization should continue to seek answers to the question, “What are the best standards?”, and then do everything in its power to see that these are generally accepted by individuals in the profession. Minimum standards may be enforced by emphasizing that those who do not live up to them cannot be considered as being in good professional standing. However, the problem of encouraging high standards should be clearly divorced from the problem of policing. As an organization of individuals, AAPOR is in no position to bring direct pressure on business firms which appear to be guilty of unethical practices. Most professional associations help develop high standards and then rely on the mechanisms of public opinion and social pressure to make their members live up to them. Associations of doctors and lawyers are an exception, since they exclude violators, but their problem is also a different one. On the other hand, if AAPOR merely stresses general standards and keeps clear of enforcement, this policy may be taken as a tacit admission of the intention to do nothing.

Percival White: It seems to me that AAPOR may be showing itself poor at public relations in dealing with the present problem. Depending on the outcome of our discussion, a copy editor writing a headline for a story about it might choose one of three headlines: (1) AAPOR adopts professional standards, (2) AAPOR rejects professional standards, or (3) AAPOR fails to agree as to the feasibility of adopting professional standards.

Frederick F. Stephan: While we may be interested in what appears in the paper tomorrow, it is still what happens to professional standards in the long run that concerns us most. Our discussion should certainly not be un-
duly constricted by considerations of public relations.

CLYDE W. HART (National Opinion Research Center): Discussion of standards started at the first meeting of this group at Central City, and has had a turbulent history. Last year at Williamstown, however, it was firmly decided that AAPOR was to be an organization of individuals, with no authority over organizations represented through members of their staffs. Accordingly, we must limit ourselves to those contributions which can be made by individuals toward building up a body of standards. We cannot consider enforcement when it comes to practices of organizations.

PAUL TRESSELT (Philadelphia Evening Bulletin): With regard to standards of reporting, such as those proposed, newspapers have a special problem. In the limited space available they cannot give all the necessary background information about surveys which the proposals specify, but must restrict themselves to the most newsworthy aspects within the available column-inches. The same problem would be faced by opinion researchers writing for newspapers. The Bulletin does, however, make a full description of its survey methods available to those who wish to inquire about them.

ROBERT WILLIAMS: Standards of presentation should certainly apply to the original presentation of material, rather than to popular write-ups. It is the survey director who should keep these practices in mind when passing his material to the editor. Interested members of the public should then be able to consult the original report if they so desire.

FRANK LANG (Association of Casualty & Surety Companies): It is important that information regarding survey methods be available to all interested persons. Too many people believe that polling involves some sort of magic, an impression unfortunately supported by a few practitioners. Therefore, it is vital that information concerning survey procedure be made available as a basis for interpretation particularly in the case of two different surveys with varying results on the same question.

HERBERT WILLIG (National Better Business Bureau): The Better Business Bureaus have, in effect, already been enforcing certain minimum standards in the survey field. Several commercial enterprises making use of improperly-conducted surveys for advertising purposes have already agreed to desist. The BBB is ready to cooperate with any reputable research organization in enforcing basic standards regarding the misuse of legitimate findings in advertising and the use in advertising of questionable research data.

RENSIS LIKERT (Survey Research Center): If the opinion research profession really employs the scientific method, the problem of standards becomes far easier. The essence of science is verifiability; therefore if information about research methods is available, science tends to police itself. The future of standards in this field depends in large measure on whether a firm scientific foundation is used in opinion research.

THEODORE LENTZ (Attitude Research Laboratory, St. Louis): We must not forget our responsibility to the public on whom the research is done. There is a danger in concentrating exclusively on the problems of the pollsters and
those of the client, and using the people merely as means to ends.

William Lydgate (American Institute of Public Opinion): AIPO has recently published a pamphlet which sets forth the research methods to which its surveys conform. The proposed code of standards is useful as a beginning, but it should be made far stricter as time goes on.

Cornelius DuBois (DuBois & Company): A distinction might well be made between endorsement and adoption. If the proposed code of standards applied primarily to organizations, then AAPOR—as an association of individuals—can endorse it, but cannot adopt it. It can merely be a springboard for a statement adapted to the Association's special needs.

The Chairman: As a matter of fact this is similar to the stand taken by the Standards Committee. The proposals have been regarded as a useful beginning, but not as an instrument that can be taken over ready-made.

PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH IN THE SERVICE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY*

(Tuesday, September 14, 1948)

Chairman: Richardson Wood, New York City.

Participants: Dean Manheimer, American Jewish Committee; Edward Suchman, Cornell University; Hugh Parry, Opinion Research Center, University of Denver.

The Chairman: In order to set the stage for a discussion of the ways that opinion research can be of service to the local community, we must first decide what we mean by the expression "community." The pattern of community structure may be easier to understand if one studies a fairly simple case: e.g., a gold-rush mining town. It takes a job to make a town. Something must be there to attract people in the first place—in this instance gold. After the prospectors arrive, people who sell to prospectors soon make their appearance. The prospectors find their market outside the community; the later arrivals find theirs in the community. Then you get some form of local government and finally, social agencies outside the formal government. You can think of it in terms of primary jobs, or the reason for existence, and secondary, or service, jobs. Then come tax-supported services and privately supported agencies, such as newspapers, radio, churches, and clubs.

Local polls find their work in the relationships which exist with these various jobs.

Edward Suchman: Perhaps the problem under discussion can be formulated by asking how polls can be put at the service of the community, and how the community can be persuaded to do something about poll findings. Let us
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postulate a municipal Department of Public Opinion, whose job it is to service the officials of the city and the various agencies, and which has a staff to conduct community research. What problems would it face?

Some experiences which Cornell has had may throw some light on these questions. In Elmira, New York, for example, we embarked on a study of inter-group relations, the purpose of which was to help groups in the community live together more peacefully. In the course of this study we became involved in investigating why and how people vote, since voting is a phenomenon related to group conflict, and people are more likely to express their disagreements during an election period. We are studying how people come to make up their minds for whom to vote, by setting up a panel and interviewing each panel member several times to find out if he changed his mind during the election campaign, and if so, why. This procedure makes it possible to identify various types of group pressures to which voters are exposed. Following the election, we hope to be able to frame an action program aimed at specific sub-groups, based on a knowledge of the existing tensions in the community.

How can these findings be used? One way is to set up a community council made up of civic leaders who will have the support of the community in putting the program into effect.

A different type of community survey was made in Odessa, N.Y., where we wanted to find how to prevail upon people to adopt the best farming and home-making practices. Here we interviewed all of the members of a farm community to determine their current practices, and their attitudes toward these practices. From the data accumulated we were able to form hypotheses as to the reasons for farmers' resistance to adopting superior techniques. We plan to set up a program to overcome this inertia in which local community leaders themselves will have full control, and to study its effects five years later.

We have used both open-end questions and check-lists in probing attitudes toward the community. In one survey we asked: "How do you feel about your community? Is it a good place to live, a fairly good place, or not good at all? Why?" And on the second panel interview in Elmira we presented a check-list of community services and asked how much need there was for each service on the list. The answers gave a good picture of the principal needs and problems of the community.

Coming back to our hypothetical Department of Public Opinion, here are some of the functions that could be discharged by such an official agency: (1) Study of economic factors: buying habits; source of income, etc.; (2) Evaluation of community services; (3) Study of community issues, including political disagreements; (4) Study of community problems: delinquency, group tensions, public health, housing; and (5) Study of community public relations, ascertaining what kind of reputation a community has, and the importance of this reputation for economic welfare.

DEAN MANHEIMER: The experience of the American Jewish Committee, in the course of its work in combatting prejudice, indicates various ways in which community studies can be useful to national agencies.

Most national studies have been of
limited usefulness in studying prejudice
on the community level for the following
reasons: (1) There are not enough
cases to make possible a study of prob-
lems on a local community level; (2) Misleading interpretations are made be-
cause anti-Semitism is often not clearly
defined in the minds of the survey
directors; (3) Very often stereotypes
regarding minority groups have been
the sole type of question used in a sur-
vey. However, stereotypes taken by
themselves do not give a true indica-
tion of prejudiced attitudes; (4) Inter-
pretation of national trends in anti-
Semitism is difficult, since events which
affect anti-Semitism are usually of local
rather than of national character.

In studying anti-Semitism, and preju-
dice against other minorities, the AJC
has investigated three areas: (1) Peo-
ple's willingness to discriminate against
minority groups; (2) The wishes with
regard to social distance between mi-
nority and majority groups expressed
in terms of social and employment con-
tacts; and (3) The image people have
of minority groups and the stereotypes
they apply to them.

We constructed a questionnaire to
cover these three areas and used scaling
techniques to test whether the items
held together. The scaling techniques
used not only give assurance that the
items all measure one variable, but also
enable us to single out the most preju-
diced and least prejudiced respondents.
Since answers to single questions are
never reported, it is possible to ask
"loaded" questions, so as to invite
statements of prejudice. Experience has
shown that if non-loaded questions are
asked, people tend to give the expected
democratic answer.

A community survey of anti-Semi-
tism must make use of several sources
of data. Not only should attitudes of
the majority group be studied, but it
is also important to discover what the
minority groups themselves consider
their own problems to be. In addition,
information should be collected on all
aspects of objective discrimination, such
as in housing and employment, and all
visible signs of tension should be re-
corded. Finally, all pertinent facts about
the community in question should be
gathered to make possible a more mean-
ingful interpretation of results.

The questionnaires used not only
contained items on prejudice but also
questions to test certain hypotheses,
such as relationship between personality
characteristics and anti-Semitism, and
between associations with minorities
and prejudices, to name a few.

We now have plans to make several
community surveys of this nature each
year, and after a few years to do repeat
studies in the same places. In that way
we will have comparisons of prejudice
levels between communities and also a
time trend for each community studied.

To date we have tested three com-
munities, but only one survey has been
completely analyzed. From those sur-
veys we hope to get data which will
enable us to work out better techniques
for combatting anti-Semitism, and
through a comparison of the back-
ground characteristics of different com-
munities we hope to develop hypotheses
of the social settings in which inter-
group understanding can be accom-
plished. These studies also have im-
mediate applications. For example, we
can act as an information bureau to
help local minority leaders understand
the problems of their groups. This proj-
ect is still in the experimental stage, and
it is hoped that as the study develops it
can be made increasingly useful to those interested in fighting prejudice.

HUGH PARRY: I would like to discuss some of the problems of the community audit type of survey. We have made three surveys of this type so far: two on level of information, and one on inter-group relations.

The first survey on level of information was on tuberculosis, made in cooperation with the National Tuberculosis Association. This body wanted to find out whether their educational campaign had had any impact and whether they were using the most effective techniques. T.B. is, in effect, one of the main industries of Denver, and we consequently expected that the level of information regarding it would be very high. Actually we found the level of information very low, and recommended changes in the educational techniques being used.

The second survey on information attempted to establish to what extent the University of Denver was identified with the community. We found that the people of Denver knew very little about the University. They felt some vague goodwill toward it, and were interested in education in general, but they had little specific information.

The third survey was a community audit of Denver in the field of inter-group relations. This study had one special aspect of interest in that we worked as part of a committee of local citizens. The study combined attitude measurement with factual information and was sponsored by the city of Denver. Its purpose was to provide guidance for a permanent committee to investigate inter-group relations, and also to provide information on which to base an educational campaign. This survey revealed, among other things, that the city government itself was one of the worst offenders in hiring practices. It also related certain social problems to the rising tax rates, and made recommendations for action.

Such a survey presents special problems of public relations. For example, it is probably unwise even to mention local organized "hate" groups by name. Newspapers thrive on conflict, and will tend to publicize these relatively insignificant groups to the exclusion of the more important findings. In the report of the committee in question, some 2 per cent of the content was devoted to local "hate" groups. Nevertheless, one newspaper devoted 38 per cent of its news accounts to this minor point; and then editorially attacked the committee for causing conflict. The main findings of the report—existing discrimination in employment, housing, recreation, and the like—were almost completely overlooked.

Don't make your release to the press in the form of a hundred-page book, as the committee did. It is best to give a 15-20 page outline condensation of the report, and to allow seriously interested persons to get the full report separately.

Then there is the problem of getting money. If possible, get financed by some philanthropist or foundation having little vested interest in the community. Perhaps the major question in this type of survey is how to get a community to support the research. Almost any study of inter-group relations very soon begins to touch on the sins of the respectable; so in a sense you are asking many leading citizens to pay for their own execution.

A final survey of inter-group relations, just now completed, obtained results similar to those reported by Dean
Manheimer. We found that prejudiced persons seem to be of two kinds: (1) People whose aggression is general—almost "free-floating"; and (2) People who channel their aggressions against a particular group. Additionally, we noted two very different types of anti-Semitism. On the one hand, we found it in an unrestrained state among the lower-income, poorly educated people. On the other hand, prejudice in the better educated groups is not only "politer" and better rationalized, but it seems to differ in kind as well as in degree.

The Chairman: Now that the panel members have outlined various aspects of community research, I'd like to turn this session into a sort of Ways and Means Committee and get a show of hands on some questions. Is local polling a good idea? In cities of a certain size is it useful to have continuous local polling? (The show of hands was unanimously in favor.)

Now, if it is a good idea, through what agency should it be done—newspapers, universities, or special groups or agencies? But first, let's ask this, what is the minimum budget on which such a survey can be run in a town of approximately 250,000 inhabitants? (A count of hands showed that no one thought it could be done for less than $500; 5 thought it could be done for $10,000 or less; 12 said $20,000; 9 said $25,000; 2 said $30,000; and 3 said more than $30,000.)

The largest number think it could be done for $20,000 a year. That is a modest figure in terms of the amounts spent for other services. But the question then arises as to who should pay for it. Manufacturers are not interested in the growth of the community, but they should be interested in conditions which promote a healthy labor market; what happens to the worker while he's away from his job is important in determining what he does on the job. Merchants are interested in the growth of the market. Social agencies and taxing bodies have to justify themselves. It would seem that all these groups should share the cost.

Julian Woodward (Elmo Roper): In the city of Louisville we are conducting a series of polls sponsored by the mayor and paid for by the city. Last spring we made a study of tax issues, and we have just recently made a survey to find out what people think of their school system and to learn how they react to certain policies of the school administration. One of these latter is the question whether the sexes should be segregated in the high schools. This is an example of a city using polling techniques as a regular adjunct to city administration.

Edward Suchman: It would be a big mistake to approach local governments to set up a Research Bureau which would attack only administrative problems. Polling should include research on all aspects of some community problems.

The Chairman: As a matter of practice, when a polling agency is set up it usually develops into a general statistical and social research department.

Raymond Franzén (New York City): Although an analysis which stems from the local situation must be accomplished, it is important to study the differences between communities. For this we need some sort of coordinating
council, so that techniques, questions, and scales can be correlated.

Preston Valien (Fisk University): Fisk University operates a service bureau on inter-group problems using general community survey techniques. In order to have the residents of the community participate in the discovery of conditions and to encourage local responsibility for needed improvements, we rely largely on a self-survey technique; we don't go into any city on our own initiative, but only on the invitation of a local agency. Then citizens of the community are involved in every step. First we set up an advisory citizens' group, with a chairman—and special committee chairmen in special areas, such as housing, education, labor and management relations and so forth. Following that, Fisk specialists meet with planning committees and design a questionnaire for each area. This questionnaire is approved by the planning committee responsible for the area it covers before it is used. All interviewing is done by volunteer workers, and clerical assistance is provided by sponsoring groups. The material is then assembled and analyzed by Fisk. Specialists take the analysis back to the committee and conferences are held on what to do about the findings. Fisk's work ends at the point of recommendations. In three surveys completed so far the recommendations have resulted in constructive action.

The Chairman: We have seen that a very large amount of opinion research on local problems has been done, and that most surveys can profit from consulting the work of similar surveys completed in other communities. Perhaps it would be helpful to establish a central registry which researchers could consult to find what types of work have been done and are being done in this field.

(Numerous participants agreed that such a central registry would be useful, and the meeting was adjourned.)

**ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC RESEARCH—DISTINCTION AND INTER-RELATION**

(Tuesday, September 14, 1948)


Participants: Clyde W. Hart, National Opinion Research Center; C. T. Smith, American Telephone and Telegraph Company; David B. Truman, Williams College; Paul Stewart, Stewart, Dougall, and Associates.

The Chairman: Practical pollers have often felt that academic critics don't come to grips with the real problems of opinion research. There is, however, much healthy criticism coming from both camps. Our purpose here today is to try to find a common ground for our work, and to take advantage of the fine thinking now coming out of the universities.

In particular, I would recommend the following specific problems for the
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universities to consider: (1) *Turnout*—who will and who will not vote in elections. The perfect system of questioning to predict turnout has not yet been discovered, but turnout is an important aspect of political behavior. (2) *Causes of non-voting in the U.S.*—whether because of sociological, educational, or other factors, voting in the U.S. is shamefully low. In the recent election in Italy, 80 per cent of those eligible voted; in South Korea, 90 per cent; in France, 80 per cent. In the United States in 1940, 63 per cent of eligible citizens over 21 voted; in 1944, 55 per cent; in 1946, only 38 per cent. There have been no thorough studies of this problem since the ones made by Merriam and Gosnell some twenty years ago. (3) *Aptitude test for interviewers*—who would or would not be a good interviewer. Such a test would be of great value to all opinion research.

CLYDE W. HART: Later speakers, I hope, will tell us how academic people can best supplement and criticize the work commercial people are doing. But it would be difficult to set limits to academic research; what academicians do may not always seem relevant, but in the end it may have great utility.

Here are some ideas for discussion on the role of a research organization affiliated with a university. These suggestions are given as rules of thumb, or guides in designing research programs—they are not necessarily descriptions of what NORC now does:

1. University research should be concerned with problems which contribute to knowledge, particularly in the social disciplines. A university agency, in general, hasn't any business accepting purely service jobs where the methods and techniques are well known. These should be left to the business departments of commercial organizations. Furthermore, there are many areas of ignorance which we ought to be working on. The fundamental question to be asked is: Does this job promise any substantive or methodological contribution to the general fund of knowledge?

2. Universities should not ordinarily be concerned with projects, but with programs, where each specific project defines variables more precisely, checks hypotheses developed, builds on previous projects, or suggests subsequent, more refined projects within the continuing program.

3. Universities should not accept studies that cannot lead to full and complete publication of the results. Such a restriction would keep us out of many jobs we have no business in. Of course, there would have to be some exceptions; for example, an NORC market research job for the University of Chicago to pay for our board and keep.

4. University research organizations ought to accept and abide by the principle of "open covenants openly arrived at." Every job done should be thoroughly cleared through the sponsoring University.

C. T. SMITH: According to Webster, the word "academic" means pertaining to an academy, college or university; it also means formal or theoretical, as opposed to practical. This definition doesn't ring true to me, because commercial people can no more insulate themselves from theoretical problems than academic people can from practical ones.

Research has an important place in the work of the Bell System. The research unit of the parent company, the
American Telephone and Telegraph Company, has three main functions: (1) To advise and consult with the operating companies; (2) To conduct pilot studies and experimental works; (3) To carry out studies where system-wide results are wanted. The research is to answer such questions as: What does the public think of telephone service? How effective are activities designed to keep the public informed about the business? What is the market for telephone service and how is service used?

Our basic job is a practical one—to aid in the economic and efficient operation of the telephone business by supplying facts to supplement operating judgments. This emphasis on the practical means that methodological work must have a practical objective, which is probably true of most business organizations. The universities' role is to develop methods and principles which can be applied in many situations. Some problems we meet we cannot solve ourselves. For example: (1) What are the reasons behind public opinion regarding a company and its service? (2) What is the effect of specific public relations activities in increasing knowledge or goodwill or changing public habit? (3) What is the validity of expressed opinion in terms of behavior—the relation between answers to attitude questions and actions?

There is a tremendous overlap between the interests of academic and non-academic workers. It is therefore pertinent to inquire what can be done to promote the free exchange of ideas and to work out ways of exploring problems of mutual concern.

For one thing, commercial people have in their files much material which might be of interest to academic people, and which could probably be released. Secondly, commercial concerns might add something to their studies to cover matters of methodological significance. Or, thirdly, we could all get together and work out projects to cover both content and method.

We are in the early stages of opinion measurement, but much progress is being made. Close cooperation between academic and non-academic agencies seems essential to continued progress in this difficult field.

DAVID B. TRUMAN: An area of agreement seems to be developing this afternoon, but I believe it may be more apparent than real. I don't want to stir up a controversy, but there are difficulties in actual situations.

I agree that the function of the universities is to extend the realm of human knowledge, and that anything which does not is not a university function. Academic people could well give their attention to the problem of non-voting. (Incidentally, the figure of 55 per cent of eligible voters who cast their ballots is not necessarily shameful, as Mr. Lydgate said—it may be no less healthy than the participation of 90 per cent in places where revolutionary crises might be causing a large turnout.) Another possibility for academic research is the meaning of the term “public opinion.” The “why” question that has been mentioned is very important. So is the historical conception—to watch developments and supplement the journalistic preoccupation of agencies which concentrate on “newsworthy” events.

A dividing line is not easy to draw, except for some obvious cases, such as a university doing a study on the market for a certain brand of soap. It is
especially difficult on matters of methodology, since pure methodological research occurs relatively infrequently. Research on methodology usually is an outgrowth of particular problems. Because of the lack of clear distinction between the two types of agencies and their work, the possibility of hard feelings is likely to remain.

Paul Stewart: Both academic and non-academic researchers certainly have a great deal to contribute. Commercial research organizations should feel obligated to provide material for academic research wherever possible. There is an abundance of information available which could be used for laboratory purposes without harming the interests of clients. With safeguards, many clients could be convinced that research materials could be re-analyzed from the methodological standpoint to make a real contribution to research in general. Case materials for use in teaching could be provided in this way, as is already being done in the American Marketing Association. The impetus and initiative for such contributions must come from the commercial organizations, because the academicians do not know of the existence of most of this material. Whether 35 or 40 per cent of the people in New York City like their telephone service or not is not the point—but how the study was done and how it differs from others is important.

Another possibility for joint action is a student training program similar to that now provided to NYU and CCNY students, giving them part-time experience and practical "know-how." Credit might be arranged, especially for graduate students, for work done in commercial research organizations.

The situation is not that of two sides irreconcilably opposed. Universities should not compete with commercial organizations, but they certainly can attack problems of a local community nature. I'm not nearly so much disturbed as Mr. Truman is on this score.

Clyde W. Hart: I think that the substantial contributions made by the universities should be made available to commercial agencies. But a commercial group has every right to set up purely experimental work if it wants to.

Community projects are sometimes the most desirable type of academic-non-academic cooperation. The Social Science Research Council studies on attitudes and consumer wants provide an example, and projects done through Columbia, NORC, Princeton, and Cornell have all been weighted heavily with people drawn from the commercial field.

I am convinced that the old suspicion is gradually dying away. At the Central City conference we were all close-mouthed and isolated; but now we lay our problems out quite openly.

C. T. Smith: There is certainly a large area of agreement, but there may be some question when it comes to a specific project. However, if we agree in principle, we may be able to work out the details.

Paul Stewart: I don't think any of us should be all things to all people, and each group should carefully delineate its own field of activity. A review of the types of academic research now being carried on would be a great help to everyone. The idea is to push the frontiers of knowledge ahead so we will all do a better job.
H. H. Remmers (Purdue University): There is a real problem in deciding what jobs to accept. Some years ago a large chain store wanted to set up fellowships for the purpose of finding out public attitudes on a bill then under discussion to regulate chain stores. They were afraid that commercial pollers would have given the answer they thought the chain stores would want. Four methods of surveying were tried: (1) Mailed questionnaires to be returned (these gave about a 10 per cent return), (2) Mailed questionnaires enclosing a quarter (these got about a 90 per cent return), (3) Mailed questionnaires promising a quarter if returned (these got about a 40 per cent return), and (4) Personal interviewing. The differences in the results obtained by these various methods were not great. This problem was both practical and theoretical, and therefore we finally accepted it.

Richard W. Dittmer (Opinion Research Corporation): University agencies may need some outside work to help pay their bills. There is also the problem of personalities and personnel. Since the universities are training many people who intend to go into commercial work, the commercial agencies could contribute much—for example, raw data used for a client's report to give students practice in handling material and meeting commercial problems.

David Truman: This is now being done at Williams College with material contributed by Elmo Roper.

John W. Riley (Rutgers University and Market Research Company of America): I am one of the increasing number of people who divide their time and have both interests simultaneously. I think the progress AAPOR has made in bringing the two groups together is very heartening; perhaps the main purpose of the organization. Probably there is no one here who is not engaged in active research—plain theorists just don't exist. Academicians can't make surveys without practical application, even in the "drainage, drunkenness and divorce" category. I doubt that any university takes projects without methodological possibilities.

My suggestion, perhaps a radical one, is that commercial agencies could adopt somewhat the same principle, and add a certain percentage to the cost of each survey for methodological exploration.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES IN MASS COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH

(Wednesday, September 15, 1948)

Chairman: David Wallace, *Time*, Inc.

Participants: Bernard Berelson, University of Chicago; Douglas Williams, Fred Rudge, Inc.; Samuel Northcross, Audience Research Institute.

The Chairman: The field in which mass communications research operates is so large that our round table can cover no more than portions of it today. As a backdrop for the discussions, we might remind ourselves that communi-
cation implies both transmission and reception. If the material transmitted is not received there is no communication. Also we may consider “mass” as referring to groups of more than two persons. Our subject includes not only the physical processes and instruments of communication but the psychological aspects of individual reception. Since every member of an audience reacts differently to a given stimulus, we have an infinite number of degrees of reception. Semantics is in the problem. We must also study the motivations that have caused people to be a part of a particular communications audience—why they are reading, listening, or looking.

This is a brief delineation of our topic area. The three participants in this round table will report on their experiences in three sectors of it.

Samuel Northcross: My remarks this morning concern the fast-moving television industry. Audience Research became involved in the field in the course of preparing a book on it, and the speed with which such a treatment becomes out of date is indicative of the fast pace.

As yet television has offered only limited commercial opportunities in terms of mass markets, when compared to other advertising media, and therefore funds available for research in it have been limited. The networks are doing some, and the Broadcast Measurement Bureau has a television committee. This committee has attempted to coordinate information on the number of sets in operation, but has had trouble obtaining accurate figures. At present the best estimate is approximately half a million sets. It is also believed that the home audience is becoming more and more important for television, as the bar and grill audience gradually reaches a saturation point.

Audience Research has been studying television along two lines: (a) Consumer reaction to television advertising, and (b) Audience reaction to various types of programs.

With regard to the first subject of study it can be said that the qualities of sight, sound, and motion combine to make television an unusually effective advertising medium.

When it comes to audience reaction to television programs, it was at first widely assumed that the novelty of the medium was such that people would accept almost any program uncritically. Preliminary research indicates that this is not the case. Panels of reviewers registering their reactions with recording dials graduated from “like very much” to “very dull” show wide discrimination. Testing several consecutive programs on one Monday night, it was found that a newsreel scored very high, but a female singer very low. A short subject on sports showed a fair degree of interest (the audience was 60 per cent women), and a male singer received a low score. An educational program, a coin quiz, and a “hangman’s” game were all dull in the opinion of the panel, but a skit about Francis Scott Key scored fairly high.

By way of comparison, the reaction of the panel to a motion picture showed a fairly high degree of sustained interest. The comparison is not really a fair one, however. A motion picture represents an expensive and carefully-created production. The usual television producer, on the other hand, must put on a show every week, with an investment of from three to four thousand dollars per week. There are more expensive shows, of course, but this is
about the average. These costs are extremely low, even when compared with AM radio programs.

Evaluating television as entertainment, we find that it falls between the motion picture and the ordinary radio in the opinion of most audiences.

It is extremely difficult to select representative panels to test television programs. Some research in television homes has been done, but the sampling problems here are serious, because of the low percentage of homes having television at the present time. Results so far, however, show little difference between the results obtained from measuring the reactions to television of persons in public gatherings and those obtained from research in homes.

Stratovision—transmitting a television signal from a high-flying airplane—gives a prospect of increasing greatly the range of the television signal. This method was used in the Louis-Walcott fight, and consequently the areas of transmission were greatly enlarged. The total audience was measured at 7,100,000 of whom approximately one million saw it from the street, looking through the windows of establishments having television.

Douglas Williams: This report consists of a case history in a very different field—Army morale research in the Mediterranean theater. I go back to this case history because it represents a technique which has considerable potentialities but is now little used.

Toward the end of the war, infantry replacements in the Italian theater became so scarce that the Fifth U.S. Army was forced to retrain many truck drivers, clerks, etc., for combat duties. This led to high casualties and poor morale, and the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division suggested that a carefully prepared "combat tips" booklet might assist in remedying this situation. Army authorities agreed to the plan, particularly because only two weeks would be needed for the complete job to be done.

To gather material for the booklet, the Research Branch detailed two officers and two enlisted men to interview veterans of the firing line. The interviews made use exclusively of general, open-end questions, such as "What did you have to learn about combat the hard way?" After two days of intensive interviewing along these lines, the data acquired was put on cards, with one idea to a card. Then the ideas on the cards were taken to another sample of front-line soldiers, and it was ascertained which ideas were the most unanimous and which the most intense. In both these sets of interviews, the group method was used, with three or four men being questioned at once. This usually resulted in a pattern where one man would suggest an idea and the others would develop it further.

The most unanimous and intense ideas were then arranged in book form, with illustrations by Mauldin. Little rewriting was done, and the final form of the book followed closely the original expressions of the respondents.

Two days before new men went into combat they were given copies of the booklet. While no systematic survey of its effectiveness could be made, there were a large number of reports that it was of immediate and direct use, and after the end of the campaign it was used in training troops who were to be transferred to the Pacific theater. As far as could be ascertained, the use of original data in this form was far
more effective in gaining the attention of green troops than any similar material available.

BERNARD BERELSON: When we deal with any of the mass media, we encounter the notion of "audience." This notion is difficult to define precisely. For instance, is a person who listens to the radio fifteen minutes a day part of the radio audience? How many items in a magazine must a person read in order to qualify as a member of the magazine audience? We must draw an arbitrary line somewhere, but this still leaves possibilities for wide variations within any given audience.

To represent the audience of any medium graphically, we can show the number of persons involved on one axis and the amount of exposure on the other axis. For instance, we know that the first 10 per cent of the radio audience does 30 per cent of the listening, the next 10 per cent only 15 per cent of the listening, and so on. This graphical representation will give us what might be called the curve of concentration for that particular medium.

On the basis of such data as these, we may form a hypothesis that the larger the audience the less the concentration of exposure and the smaller the audience the higher the concentration of exposure. Thus, 90 per cent of the population listen to the radio, but their degrees of exposure show a very wide spread; a large number of people provide 80 per cent of the listening audience. In the case of books, however, a fairly small number of people account for 80 per cent of book readership. Thus there is a hierarchy of concentration in the various mass media corresponding to the extent of exposure.

We may use this concept of concentra-
these people have to drop one of the papers, then they retain the one the central audience of which corresponds more nearly to their socio-economic status.

Bernard Berelson: This phenomenon is similar to that found in the Sandusky study of voting reported in *The People's Choice*; many voters reverted to the party which represented their socio-economic characteristics most accurately. Perhaps condition applicable to political loyalty is also found in the definition of the central audience.

The Chairman: Another example of facts which need further psychological interpretation can be found in the field of magazine reading. We know most of the economic and occupational characteristics of readers, but we don't know enough about why they read—what motivations and gratifications make them readers of a particular magazine.

Raymond Franzen (New York City): In relating behavior to media exposure, it is difficult to separate out any one item of behavior, since many behavioral characteristics are interrelated in a manner which is often impossible to determine. For instance, a person may listen to program X because he uses appliance Y; or he may use Y because he listens to X; or else it may be that both these types of behavior are characteristic of social group Z.

William Reynolds (National Broadcasting Co.): There is some question whether we can lump "concentrated" media, where 5 per cent of the population account for a large portion of the exposure, with media which include as much as 20 per cent of the population in their central audience. Is it really useful to describe both of these as "mass" media?

Bernard Berelson: That depends again on the definition of "mass" as well as on the unit of measurement being used. Unless we are willing to accept time as a measure for exposure to both media, then it is very difficult to compare them.

William A. Yoell: Very often interrelations between various types of exposure can be found and then correlated with the personality type. For instance, we charted the amusement habits of a divorced woman and found that she avoided all radio, magazine, and film items which used the triangle theme.

John F. Maloney (The Reader's Digest): We have tried testing the effect on readers of articles in *The Reader's Digest*, some of which may have produced swings of opinion. These experiments were made with attitude questions tacked on the end of readership questionnaires. For example, 73 per cent of our readers said they favored compulsory military training the month before an article appeared on the subject. The month after the article appeared 55 per cent favored it, while AIPO Surveys showed that there was little change in the opinion of the general population during the same period. On the other hand, an article promoting military aid to China showed no change in reader attitudes. We don't know whether the changes we have noted are lasting in any degree.

Bernard Berelson: This problem of measuring effect is particularly difficult. Conversion is often a long, slow proc-
ess, and involves much more than a single article or other stimulus. We must look at the whole context within which attitude changes occur, and then try to gauge the effect of the various stimuli which are involved. In the example cited, there may be several technical difficulties.

RAYMOND FRANZEN: There is also a particular danger of bias involved in measuring the effect of single magazine articles, since those whose opinions have been supported by the article are far more likely to answer than those who disagreed with it.

FRANK LANG (Association of Casualty and Surety Companies): What concrete evidence do we have that advertising can in fact change attitudes?

SAMUEL NORTHcross: Considerable data are available regarding the extent to which advertising can change attitudes. For instance, a household cleanser recently jumped its sales figures from almost nothing to a point where it topped the field as a result of soap opera promotion.

LEBARON R. FOSTER (Opinion Research Corporation): Further evidence on the extent to which advertising changes attitudes can be gained through “laboratory” tests. We try to make the experiment situation duplicate the actual situation as closely as possible. If the stimulus proves effective in the test situation, we assume it will be effective in a real life situation.

There is some indication that different media reinforce one another. Three media of different types, used jointly, may be more effective than the same effort concentrated on one medium. We need better methods to test the joint results quantitatively.

NEIL DuBois (DuBois & Company): In studies of brand consciousness, we have found wide differences within media and education groups in the ways in which people absorb trade marks, slogans, symbols, and other aspects of advertising. In other words, independent of their physical exposure to advertising, there are differences in peoples' psychological accessibility to the advertiser.

THE CHAIRMAN: One thing our discussion this morning has shown is that it is impossible to cover the field of mass communication research in one session. I hope, however, that most of us have profited from this exchange of experience.

MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH EAGLES MERE, PENNSYLVANIA—SEPTEMBER 14, 1948

The meeting convened at the Crestmont Inn, Eagles Mere, Pennsylvania at 4:00 p.m. with President Clyde Hart in the chair.

Since the minutes of the first meeting of AAPOR held in Williamstown, Massachusetts had been printed in the Conference proceedings, they were approved without being read.

The Secretary reported on the meetings which the Executive Council had held in the past year, and in the ab-
The Treasurer presented a report of current financial status of the organization as follows:

TREASURER’S REPORT—SEPTEMBER 14, 1948

Income
Membership fees 212 members @ $10.00 $2120.00

Expense

Pre-conference
Stationery $148.70
Postage 61.14
Telephone and Telegraph 211.05

Conference Expenses
Programs $117.50
Cards 10.00
Tags 31.04
Eagler Theater rent 25.00
Secretary travel and expense 83.04
Public Relations Committee travel and expense 80.09
Jean Joyce-fee 100.00

Total expense $867.56

Balance remaining
Estimated cost of proceedings 530.00
Cost of running Association September 1948-January 1949 (est.) 200.00

Estimated balance on January 1, 1949 $522.44

It was pointed out by the Treasurer that if the estimates in the report were correct, the Association might have to choose between paying for a subscription for each member to the official journal and defraying the expenses of printing the Conference proceedings. Discussion on this point was postponed until the report of the Publications Committee.

Mr. Hart reported on the grant received from the Rockefeller Foundation to be used towards the expenses of foreign delegates to the meeting of the World Association for Public Opinion Research. The National Opinion
Research Center acted as a receiving and administering agent for this fund. A committee consisting of Messrs. Wilson, F. Williams, and Sheatsley was set up by NORC to administer it. Mr. Wilson, reporting for this committee, said that the expenses of eight foreign delegates had been defrayed through use of the fund.

On motion, it was voted that the Secretary send to the Rockefeller Foundation a unanimous vote of thanks for the grants received.

For the Publications Committee, Mr. Cornelius DuBois reported on the meetings of his committee, at which a decision was made to recommend the adoption by the Association of the following agreement with the Public Opinion Quarterly:

"In order to give the Association a voice in the administration of the Quarterly, it is proposed that:

1. The Chairman of the Association Publications Committee be a member of the Faculty Editorial Committee, and be notified of each meeting seven days in advance.

2. The President of the Association and the Chairman of the Association Publications Committee be ex officio members of the Advisory Board. (It is noted that, in any event, a large number of the members of the Advisory Board are members of the Association.)

Suggested Editorial Arrangement

"Because of its appreciable past and current investment in the Quarterly, amounting to approximately ten thousand dollars a year, Princeton University is anxious to retain the general editorial policy which has governed publication of the magazine thus far. It is proposed, therefore, that the mast-head of the Quarterly be altered so as to indicate that the University retains primary editorial responsibility, at the same time that the journal serves as an organ of the Association. A possible formulation, based on the text which presently appears in the mast-head, is indicated below:

The Public Opinion Quarterly
Editorially sponsored by Princeton University. Published by Princeton University Press. Organ of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

The Quarterly is supported solely by Princeton University, Princeton University Press, and income from subscribers and advertisers.

Statements of fact and opinion are made on the responsibility of the authors alone, and do not imply an opinion on the part of the magazine, which is hospitable to all points of view, provided only that the material presented helps the reader to gain insight into the problems of public opinion. The American Association for Public Opinion Research assumes responsibility only for material which is signed by an officer of the Association in his official capacity. The advisory board listed below is generous in its assistance and advice on particular problems, but is not responsible for policy or the content of issues.

"It is also suggested, in order to avoid possible misunderstandings, that the Quarterly agree to provide up to four pages in any one issue for official purposes of the Association if requested to do so at least six weeks prior to manuscript deadline.
This does not mean that additional space cannot usually be made available when needed, but only that the Quarterly may restrict the space to four pages in the event that prior editorial commitments have been made.

"It is understood that, in the absence of a special arrangement in each case, official material of the Association will be sent to the Quarterly in a form ready to be printed.

Suggested Financial Arrangements

"It is proposed that the Association agree to place with the Princeton University Press a subscription to the Quarterly on behalf of each of its members and officers every year. The University Press will accept such subscriptions at a special rate (for members and officers of the Association only) of $3.75 per annum. This special rate will apply only when subscriptions are placed by the Association. In the event that a general increase in costs should force the University Press to increase its rates to other subscribers, the rate for the Association will be increased proportionately.

Start of Agreement

"This agreement will enter into force when approved by the Faculty Editorial Committee and signed by its Chairman, and when signed by an officer of the Association empowered for this purpose.

Termination

"This agreement is provisional, and may be terminated by either party six months following written notification. In the event of termination, however, all subscriptions to the Public Opinion Quarterly which have been entered by the Association will be allowed to continue until they lapse, regardless of the termination date."

Mr. DuBois moved the adoption of this recommendation.

Mr. Richardson Wood inquired if the fee of $3.75 for the Quarterly subscription would come out of the ten-dollar dues paid by Association members, and asked if an additional assessment would be necessary in view of the picture of Association finances previously presented by the Treasurer.

The Treasurer replied that an assessment would probably not be necessary but that the Association with its present membership could not stand the expense of having the Conference proceedings appear both in the Public Opinion Quarterly and separately in mimeographed form. He stated that the problem could probably be solved temporarily by waiting until 1949 to enter subscriptions to the Public Opinion Quarterly for members of AAPOR, and that inasmuch as many of the members probably had subscriptions for 1948 already, perhaps that would be the best thing to do.

Mr. Williams then asked what the fiscal year for the Association would be and was told by the Treasurer that no decision on that point had yet been made.

Returning to the discussion of the proposal of the Committee on Publications, Mr. Wood asked if there were any other candidates for the official journal other than the Public Opinion Quarterly and was told by the Chairman that he did not know of any.
The proposal for entering into an arrangement to make the Public Opinion Quarterly the official journal of the society was then put to vote and adopted.

Mr. Phillips Davison, who had been appointed Editor by the Executive Council of AAPOR, presented a proposal for the publication of proceedings of the Eagles Mere Conference. He said the Association had a choice of publishing the proceedings as a separate pamphlet of 50 pages, the cost of which would be approximately $700, or of having an additional 50 pages added to the Winter issue of the Public Opinion Quarterly and distributed with it. This latter plan would cost about $530.

After some discussion concerning the relative merits of the two proposals and the availability of reprints of the proceedings if the second proposal was adopted, a motion was made to authorize the Editor to proceed along the lines of the second proposal. After discussion, the motion was adopted.

In Daniel Katz’s absence, Mr. David Wallace of the Nominations Committee presented for that Committee its slate of nominations for Association officers for the coming year. Mr. Wallace outlined the procedure employed by the Committee in arriving at these nominations, pointing out that the Committee had observed the Constitutional requirement of a sample poll of the membership and had in its nominations conformed to the outcome of this poll, except where there had been an undue concentration of officers from any one firm, or where for some reason the prospective nominee refused to run for office. The nominees presented by Mr. Wallace were:

For President, Paul Lazarsfeld and Elmo Wilson; for Vice-President, Herbert Hyman and Richardson Wood; for Member-at-Large of the Executive Council for a three-year term, Archibald Crossley and Paul Stewart; for Chairman of the Committee on Standards, Philip Hauser and Samuel Stouffer; for Chairman of the Conference Committee, Jerome Bruner and John Riley; for Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, Angus Campbell and Cornelius DuBois.

In view of the fact that there had been no additional nominations submitted by members of the organization to the Committee in advance of the meeting, the Chairman declared the nominations closed, and the Association proceeded to ballot on the nominations. The following were elected:

President, Elmo Wilson; Vice-President, Herbert Hyman; Member-at-Large of the Executive Council, Archibald Crossley; Standards Committee Chairman, Samuel Stouffer; Conference Chairman, John Riley; Nominations Chairman, Cornelius DuBois.

For the Committee on Standards, Mr. Philip Hauser presented the following report:

“The AAPOR on May 19, 1948, received for consideration a suggested ‘Code of Professional Practices’ and ‘Standards of Practice to be Used in the Reporting of Survey Results.’ These proposals were prepared by representatives of six organizations engaged in survey research in marketing and public opinion.

“The Committee on Standards, mindful of the basic importance of its constitutional assignment to AAPOR and to its members, agreed that the proposed ‘code’ and ‘standards’ could constitute a good starting
point for the development of standards in the field of public opinion research. To assure maximum consideration of the proposals, the Committee arranged for a panel discussion on standards as part of the program for the annual meeting, and mailed copies of the proposed codes to the membership in advance of the business session.

"Through these arrangements, it was hoped that members would have ample opportunity to consider and evaluate the proposals prior to the business meeting.

"The Committee on Standards, after careful consideration, recommends that the proposed 'Code of Professional Practices' and 'Standards of Practice to be Used in the Reporting of Survey Results,' with the substitution of the phrase 'public opinion and marketing research' for 'marketing research,' be commended by AAPOR as an initial step in the development of standards for public opinion research. It is recognized by the Committee that the proposed 'Code of Professional Practices' and 'Standards' for reporting 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. It is also recognized that the implementation of these proposals is entirely dependent on the voluntary adherence, and the good faith and professional conduct of individual members.

"The Committee believes that with this action, the way will be paved for the development and adopting a code of detailed standards of performance in the various aspects of public opinion research. It urges consideration be given in the coming years to the development of standards in the following areas of operation:

1. The design and pre-testing of schedules;
2. The design of samples, methods of estimation, and measures of precision;
3. The evaluation of validity of response;
4. The organization and supervision of field and office operations;
5. The analysis, interpretation and presentation of results.

"The Committee urges that the Association, through its Committee on Standards, keep abreast of methodological developments, and that all members of AAPOR, in accordance with their ability, continue to conduct research on these vital matters. The Committee suggests that results of such research be made available to the Committee on Standards. Through these means it should be possible to pool the salient research findings from all sources, and achieve a broad and sound factual basis for the development of operating standards on public opinion and marketing surveys."

Mr. Hauser then, on behalf of the Committee, made the following motion:

"That the American Association for Public Opinion Research commend the proposed 'Code of Professional Practices,' and 'Standards of Practice to be Used in the Reporting of Survey Results' prepared by the representatives of six leading research organizations, as an initial step in
the development of standards for public opinion research;

"Recognizing that these proposals consist largely of a statement of broad principles which only research, continued effort, and time can convert into operational and procedural terms of an objective and definitive character, and

"Recognizing that the implementation of these proposals is entirely dependent on the voluntary adherence and the good faith and professional conduct of individual members."

Speaking to the motion, Mr. Hauser commented that the Standards Committee was aware that some members of the Association thought the measures proposed in the Code were too strong, and others thought them too mild. However, he thought it absolutely necessary that the Association commit itself at least to the idea that there should be standards of some sort to be observed by members. He pointed out that as the Association grew, its Code of Ethics and Standards could be further developed in the light of experience.

After considerable discussion from the floor, the motion was adopted without dissent.

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. He noted that the National Better Business Bureau had uncovered many evidences of this and that a representative of the Bureau was present to answer any questions that any members of the audience might have about the nature of the abuses. Mr. Hauser then moved the following resolution:

"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, in the belief that the National Better Business Bureau offers a widespread organization experienced in combatting fraud and misrepresentation, the Association urges the individual members and their agencies to give financial support to the National Better Business Bureau to deal with this situation.

"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."

Mr. Gaskill then asked for an explanation of the term "selling device" and Mr. Hauser explained that it referred to a salesman gaining entry to a home by saying that he was doing a survey and wanted the housewife's opinions, but, having gained entry, proceeded to attempt to sell goods. In some cases, Hauser reported, the respondent was asked to fill out slips or blanks supposed to be part of the survey but which later turned out to be sales contracts.

Discussion then followed concerning the wording of the phrase "as a selling device," and Mr. Hauser amended his motion to substitute the phrase "to sell goods to the respondent at the time of
the interview” in place of the phrase “as a selling device.”

Mr. Isador Lubin suggested that it might not be desirable to refer to a particular outside organization in a resolution such as this, and that while he hoped he would not be misunderstood as casting reflections on the Better Business Bureau, he thought it unwise for the Association to specify the Better Business Bureau alone in the resolution. He moved that paragraph 2 of the resolution be deleted and this amendment was carried by a voice vote. The original motion of Mr. Hauser as amended was then put to a vote and adopted.

Under the heading of “New Business,” Mr. Frank Lang pointed out that the Association was made up of three groups: academicians, commercial practitioners, and “consumers of research,” and moved that the new nominating committee be instructed to provide representation of all three groups in its slate for 1949. The Secretary raised the question of whether the Association could so instruct the nominating committee without amending the Constitution. Whereupon, Mr. Lang changed his motion to read that it was the sense of the meeting that such a distribution of officers among the three groups was desirable.

Mr. Bevis asked how numerous the third group (consumers of research) was in the Association, and in a show of hands, called for by the Chair, it appeared that nine such individuals were present. Mr. Lang’s motion was then put to a vote and failed of a majority.

Mr. Leo Bogart then brought up the subject of Dr. Laszlo Radvanyi’s inability to obtain a visa to enter the country in order to attend the Conference. He noted the action of the Executive Committee of the World Association for Public Opinion Research in dispatching a telegram to Secretary of State Marshall and moved that a similar message be sent on behalf of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Extended discussion of Mr. Bogart’s motion ensued, during which the telegram sent by WAPOR was read to the membership by Mr. Jean Stoetzel. The motion was opposed by Mr. Gaskill and Mr. Burke and supported by Mr. Lee.

Mr. Elmo Wilson reported on the inquiries he had personally made to the State Department relative to Mr. Radvanyi’s case. He said that an Assistant Secretary of State had told him the reason for not issuing Mr. Radvanyi’s visa was “ideological” and that the final action had been made at Mexico City.

Mr. Dan Clark then moved as a substitute motion that the Executive Council investigate further the facts of the situation and then take such action as they deemed proper in view of the future welfare and progress of the Association.

Mr. Bogart then withdrew his original motion at the consent of his second and moved to add the following paragraph to the motion made by Mr. Clark:

“The American Association for Public Opinion Research wishes to record at this time its feeling that the free exchange of ideas and persons is of value in furthering both the cause of scientific progress and international understanding.”

The discussion then proceeded on the amendment to the substitute motion and Mr. Gaskill restated his feeling that the matter was irrelevant so
far as the Association was concerned and that he still deemed it unwise for the Association to go on record. Mr. Lee pointed out that the issue was not so much that Mr. Radvanyi had not received a visa, but that he had not been told whether he would receive a visa or not after having applied for a visa six weeks in advance. He had received no information and had been given a runaround.

Mr. Clark wanted to know if it was a definite known fact that the State Department had refused to give information about Mr. Radvanyi's case to the Association and was told by Mr. Wilson that so far as he knew, the State Department had not given out any information concerning Mr. Radvanyi's case.

By voice vote, the amendment to the substitute motion was then adopted. On the question of the substitute motion itself, a standing vote was taken and it was carried.

Mr. Robert Williams inquired if it would be proper to appoint a committee from the Association to work with the Better Business Bureau in its program to eliminate misuse of survey approaches. Mr. Hauser stated that the Standards Committee would approve the appointment of such a committee. Mr. Williams moved "that the President appoint a committee of three members to be drawn from commercial marketing research agencies to consult with the National Better Business Bureau in the problem of using interviewing methods as a selling device." Mr. Lubin moved an amendment to the motion to insert the words, "and other organizations," after the National Better Business Bureau in the original resolution. Mr. Williams accepted the amendment and on a voice vote, the amended resolution was carried.

Mr. Hart then turned the meeting over to the newly elected President, Mr. Wilson. After a few remarks by the new President, the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.