

Researchers and Respondents in the 1980s

LAURE M. SHARP

WHAT IS sometimes called the covenant between researchers and respondents—that we are each doing our share to achieve a worthy and widely beneficial purpose—is in the process of being seriously weakened. Furthermore, I feel that we as researchers and some of our sponsors—especially the federal government—may have directly contributed to this erosion.

The most frequently cited evidence of the eroding public support for participating in surveys is the deterioration in response rates over the past several years, which has been widely discussed in AAPOR meetings and in the professional literature. In the 1970s concern about this deterioration led to major initiatives by the American Statistical Association, the National Science Foundation, the Census Bureau, and the National Academy of Sciences, and generated a number of important papers and studies examining the existence and correlates of declining response rates. There were then and continue to be today considerable differences of opinion about how much of the decline is due to lack of willingness to participate and how much to difficulties related to respondent availability and the greater expense required by follow-up efforts. Most observers agree that demographic changes, in particular the enormous growth in the proportion of working wives, and greater access difficulty to residences because of crime fears are the main reasons for the decline, but there is also persuasive evidence that privacy concerns are a major factor in refusals.

In part, these concerns have been fueled by fears about the omnipotence of the computer and skepticism about promises of confidentiality, but beyond these fears, I suspect that the reason may simply be unwillingness to tolerate outside intrusion—whether by telephone, mail, or in person—into busy lives where high priority is

Laure M. Sharp, President of AAPOR in 1983–84, is Research Associate and Assistant Director of the Bureau of Social Science Research. This is a slightly revised version of her presidential remarks at AAPOR's 39th Annual Conference on May 19, 1984.

assigned to time with one's family or time to oneself, the latter a relatively new priority for the allocation of time. Insofar as people are unwilling to give up not just privacy, but their private time, to participate in a survey, we are seeing a change from an earlier period when there was perhaps a greater willingness to give up such time for broader social or communal purposes, or when surveys were more of a novelty and respondents liked the notion of having been selected to participate.

While we have empirical evidence that demographic changes, fear of crime, and privacy concerns have made access to respondents more difficult and costly and led to some increase in refusal rates, there is no supporting evidence for the often heard claim that the growing length of survey instruments, proliferation of surveys, and too frequent requests for survey participation have led to greater unwillingness on the part of respondents to participate in surveys. Yet I suspect that many of us operate on the assumption that this is indeed the case. Furthermore, the federal government has taken a number of actions in recent years which assumed that respondents needed to be protected from the survey takers.

Because the government is the most important sponsor of survey research (according to the National Research Council's study on Survey Measurement of Subjective Phenomena, government surveys accounted for 5 million of the 20 million interviews which were being conducted in 1980—and this excluded the census), its actions were especially important in affecting survey practices, and more subtly, our profession's own definition of the situation.

As far as the profession is concerned, the main concern in recent years has been with the maintenance of acceptable response rates in the face of rising data collection costs. An old standby is receiving new attention in this connection: the use of monetary incentives to reduce refusals. Although the evidence about the value of paying respondents for granting personal interviews is far from consistent, some organizations have found that payments to respondents are more than offset by the resulting reduction in followup costs. While I see no problem with the use of monetary payments for certain types of interviews which make extraordinary demands on respondents (for example, travel to a special location, the keeping of diaries, or several hours of test-taking or physical examinations), I am concerned about the currently popular concept of reimbursement for time spent to be interviewed.

First of all, I worry about the quality of the data, since we all know from the work done by Charles Cannell and others that incentives have effects on response accuracy, some of which may be quality

enhancing (if respondents try harder for accuracy) while others may be biasing (because of compliance behavior). But I also worry about the way in which the nature of the respondent-researcher relationship has been redefined: we are moving from a voluntary act to a pecuniary relationship, where the researcher pays the respondent for his or her time. What's more, I see a tendency to pay the respondent the "market value" which his or her time commands: thus, I have seen study budgets where MD's are paid \$50 or \$75 for granting a research interview, while nurses are paid only \$20 and lower-level personnel \$5 or \$10. If we stayed with the notion of voluntary participation in a useful endeavor, but saw the need to offer some fee, a more appropriate model would be reimbursed public services, for example, jury duty, for which a uniform rate is paid regardless of the juror's income level.

My own hunch is that we have moved in the direction of paying respondents not because we are always convinced that such payments lower refusal rates, but simply because we are more comfortable with this procedure. We have become reluctant to approach the public with our survey instruments. Although surveys are more widely used today than ever before as the basis for private and public discourse and decisions, we seldom hear that our work is useful and important. Instead, we have been told by some of our colleagues, by some newspaper columnists, but especially by the federal government that there are simply too many surveys, that the American public is being overburdened by information demands, that questionnaires are too long and too intrusive.

Back in the sixties, research personnel were made to feel guilty because they were said to become affluent by exploiting the poor people whom they interviewed on behalf of policy makers and scholars: the more aggressive spokespersons for welfare recipients and ex-convicts and drug-abusers succeeded in stipulating the inclusion of payments to research subjects into contracts and grants for the study of social problems. Today, in the changed climate of the eighties, exploitation of the poor is no longer our chief concern; instead, research staffs seem to think that everyone's motivations are predominantly economic ones, and that people who spend an hour to talk to an interviewer should be compensated for their time.

The response-enhancing effects of incentive payments may be often indirect ones: not the respondent's, but the interviewer's motivation is increased. In one experiment, for example, the survey organization found that interviewers who were able to offer a monetary incentive to potential respondents asked to participate in a rather lengthy and demanding interview were more persistent in their follow-up efforts

than those who sought the cooperation of respondents to whom they could not make this offer.

But I think that the main reason why the research community has become defensive in its dealings with the public and no longer operates on the assumption that most Americans will voluntarily participate in surveys is the federal government's emphasis on reduction of respondent burden, defined only in terms of interview length. Respondent burden first surfaced as an issue with the report of the Commission on Federal Paperwork in 1976 and subsequent regulations by the Office of Management and Budget. The passage of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 led to further OMB restrictions on federally sponsored data collection activities. The primary aim of the act was to alleviate reporting requirements imposed on business, universities, hospitals, etc. by the growing array of federal regulations enacted in the sixties and seventies in a number of areas (public health, environmental protection, civil rights, equal opportunity, etc.). However, from the beginning one of the principal targets of OMB's enforcement regulations were surveys carried out by the federal government and its contractors and grantees, perhaps because OMB staff felt that too many surveys were being funded, and used the paperwork legislation as a tool to veto surveys. Respondent burden was defined by OMB as the time an individual had to spend answering survey questions. OMB also decided that as a rule individuals should not be asked to spend more than half an hour to respond to surveys, although there was no scientific basis for the choice of this time interval. Furthermore, agencies are now required to adhere to burden budgets, which means that each federal agency has a given number of respondent hours which it can use up in a given year. For practical purposes this means that once the burden budget is spent, no new data collections can be initiated unless an existing collection is canceled. A number of agencies which are among the major producers and sponsors of federal statistics, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Center for Educational Statistics, and the National Center for Health Statistics, have indicated that the burden budgets are currently a greater obstacle to the updating of the federal statistical system than monetary and personnel constraints.

My concern is the basic assumption about researcher-respondent relations, which are defined as the execution of a burdensome task imposed by the researcher on the respondent. We know from experience and from the work of Bradburn, Sudman, Cannell and others that the relationship is a much more complex one. But because of the OMB definition, the notion of survey participation as simply a burdensome activity which is to be minimized is becoming the accepted

norm, even in the survey community. No longer is there any emphasis on the rationale for surveys as the government's responsibility to perform important tasks—to see to it that we do not get sick from air or water pollution, that handicapped children and adults can obtain schooling and work, that housing and transportation subsidies are spent on facilities likely to be needed and used—which cannot be carried out without adequate and up-to-date national data. There is no suggestion that citizen participation in surveys which meet this need is one of many required voluntary activities in a complex, modern society, and that all citizens will benefit if government spending is based on accurate information.

Part of the *quid pro quo* on which the covenant between researchers, research sponsors, respondents, and the public at large is implicitly based is the widest possible dissemination of research findings for the benefit of all concerned. I know that this lofty goal is often in conflict with priorities in the business world, where the release of proprietary information poses problems. But we have always taken it for granted that in the public sector, where data were being collected with public monies, the widest possible access to information should be provided. There is now evidence that this policy has changed. As part of the emphasis on user fees and the market value of government services, there has been a gradual shift away from disseminating government publications free of charge or at low cost. The same policy is being followed with respect to government data. Increasingly, data are now provided to the user community in the form of tapes. In the case of one federal agency, direct electronic access is to be provided through an intermediary commercial vendor; the cost of these services is to be determined by "market value" considerations. If much or even some of the government's data collection activity is to be defined as a special service for a special user community, rather than as a public service for the widest possible constituency, then indeed the rationale for generous public participation in government-sponsored surveys is seriously undermined.

It is time for the research community to take stock of where we stand on these issues, what we can do and what we cannot do. We certainly cannot change the new social climate in which we are operating. Most women are no longer home during the day, happy to sit down with a congenial interviewer over a cup of coffee. Personal and telephone interviewing, must take place at times when there are competing demands on respondents' time. Privacy and time for oneself and one's family have indeed become more valuable for many. It may also be true that people—especially members of the middle

class—have shifted their priorities from broader public issues to the furthering of their private economic interests.

But there are countervailing forces in today's society. While the evidence about the increasing emphasis on the value of privacy and private time or "space" is strong, there is also a good deal of evidence about continuing demand for government services and for participation in decision-making processes which affect the quality of one's life. My own research has convinced me that the crucial issue which affects respondents' attitudes toward surveys and survey participation is the belief in efficacy: respondents do not feel burdened even by a long survey if they believe that survey results really provide an opportunity for citizen input and will therefore be beneficial to those who participate. I think that insofar as we can strengthen a belief in the usefulness and policy relevance of surveys—both in our approach to potential respondents and, more broadly, in all of our external communications, we stand a good chance of halting the present trend toward erosion of the respondent-researcher relationship. The efforts now being made by some of the market research associations, to emphasize the importance of the respondent role—by declaring a marketing research week and stressing in the related public relations campaign that "your opinion counts" and that "everyone benefits from marketing and survey research, as citizens and as consumers"—seem to me a step in the right direction. These types of efforts seem more promising to me than the appeal to the most primitive form of self-interest such as efforts to pay people for their time or minimizing—possibly at the expense of data quality and adequacy—the time required for survey participation. Clearly, we will need ingenuity and flexibility to tailor our data collection needs to the lifestyles and priorities of the eighties, but I believe it can be done provided we really believe that our work is important and useful and can convey these sentiments to our respondents and the public at large.

1984 AAPOR-WAPOR Conference Program

WAPOR SESSION I: COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF JOURNALISTS

CHAIR: Seymour Martin Lipset, Stanford University

German and British Journalists

Renate Kocher, Institut für Demoskopie, Allensbach, Germany

American Journalists

Stanley Rothman, Smith College

S. Robert Lichter, George Washington University

DISCUSSANT: David H. Weaver, Indiana University

**WAPOR SESSION II:
VALUES AND NATIONAL CHARACTER
IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

CHAIR: Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Institut für Demoskopie, Allensbach, Germany
National Character in 11 Countries
Sigeeki Nisihira, Sophia University, Japan
A Comparison of Values in 27 Countries
Gordon Heald, Gallup Poll, England

**WAPOR SESSION III: NATIONAL RESTRICTIONS
ON THE CONDUCT AND RELEASE OF PUBLIC OPINION POLLS**

CHAIR: Nils Rohm, OBSERVA, Denmark
PANEL: Yvan Corbeil, CROP, Canada
Jean Stoetzel, Faits et Opinions, France
Robert Worcester, MORI, England

FIRST AAPOR PLENARY SESSION:

CHAIR: David L. Sills, Social Science Research Council
PRESENTATION: The Visual Display of Survey Information
PRESENTER: Edward R. Tufte, Yale University
DISCUSSANT: William H. Kruskal, University of Chicago

**POLLING ON THE BARRICADES:
U.S. FOREIGN POLICY THROUGH FOREIGN EYES***

CHAIR: Bernard Roshco, U.S. Department of State
Grenada After the Fighting
Warren Mitofsky, CBS News
Polls as Ammunition in the German Missile Debate
Kenneth Adler, U.S. Information Agency
A View from Across the Atlantic: British Attitudes Towards America's World Role
Robert Wybrow, Social Surveys Ltd., London
DISCUSSANT: Irving Crespi, Irving Crespi and Associates

IMPROVING RESPONSE RATES

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Edward Schillmoeller, A. C. Nielsen Co.
Financial Incentives and Diaries: Results of an Experimental Design with Diaries of Gasoline Purchases
Dawn Day, Dierdre Carrol, Maria DiMaggio, Linda Russell, Response Analysis Corporation
Refusals in Telephone Surveys: When Do They Occur?
Theresa DeMaio, U.S. Bureau of the Census
Method Does Make a Difference: A Comparison of Responses to Telephone. Face-to-Face and Mail Questionnaires
Don A. Dillman, Robert G. Mason, Washington State University
Maximizing Response Rates
Herschel Shosteck, Herschel Shosteck Associates

*WAPOR/AAPOR Joint Session.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY TO SURVEY RESEARCH

CHAIR: Judith Tanur, State University of New York at Stony Brook
An Information Processing Approach to Recall in Surveys
 Norman M. Bradburn, University of Chicago
Attitude Measurement: A Cognitive Perspective
 Roger Tourangeau, NORC
 DISCUSSANT: Elizabeth Martin, BSSR

SURVEY INNOVATIONS

CHAIR: Stanley Presser, University of Michigan
Analysis of Surveys Through Fuzzy Set Techniques
 Kurt W. Back, Duke University
Reducing the Cost of High Response Rates
 Ira H. Cisin, Judith Miller, The George Washington University
A Scale for Measuring Attitudes and Opinions
 Eric Marder, Eric Marder Associates
*Negative Affect in Unstructured and Solitary Situations: Experiential Correlates of
 Heavy Television Viewing (AAPOR Student Paper Award)*
 Robert W. Kubey, University of Chicago
 DISCUSSANT: Ronald C. Kessler, University of Michigan

GENDER GAP: THE LATEST RESEARCH

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Kathleen Frankovic, CBS-News
The Gender Gap and Female Candidates: Do Women Dislike Female Candidates?
 Eugene R. Declercq, Merrimack College
*The "Gender Gap" within the Family: Husband-Wife Differences in Stated Opinions
 and Perceived Opinions*
 Jack M. McLeod, University of Wisconsin
 Carroll J. Glynn, University of Georgia
Is Woman Making a Man of Herself?
 Pat Cafferata, Needham, Harper & Steers

TOWARD THEORY IN PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Joe L. Spaeth, University of Illinois
Public Opinion as a Decision-Making Process
 W. Phillips Davison, Columbia University
An Action-Based Theory of Persuasion
 G. Ray Funkhouser, Rutgers Campus at Newark
Prediction as a Tool: The Abortion Issue and Change
 Fred H. Goldner, Queens College
*Public Opinion and Community Conflict: Threshold Models, the Spiral of Silence, and
 Anti-Busing Protest*
 D. Garth Taylor, University of Chicago

ROUND TABLE SESSIONS

The Use of Personal Computers in Survey Data Collection and Analysis
 CHAIR: Robert S. Lee, Robert S. Lee Associates
 Bernadette D. McBrien, Orchard Associates Inc.
 Charles Palit, Computer Assisted Survey Systems/University of Wisconsin
 Lucy Saunders, SPSS Inc.
 Kurt Schlichting, Fairfield University/The Analysis Group
 Bill Springer, Quantime Corporation
 David Walonick, Walonick Associates
 Leland Wilkinson, SYSTAT, Inc.

Steven Wittels, Space-Time Systems, Inc.
Hank Zucker, Creative Research Systems

Did "The Day After" Have Any Effect?

CHAIR: Guy Lometti, American Broadcasting Company
Rudy Fenwick, University of Akron
Don D. Smith, University of Iowa
Charles Funderburk, David Karns, James L. Walker, Wright State University
Mallory Wober, Barrie Gunter, Independent Broadcasting Authority, London

Standards for Reporting of Polls in Media

Ted J. Smith, III, University of Virginia

What Needs to Be Found Out About Focus Groups

Marcia Weiner, Needham, Harper & Steers, Chicago

Men and Women: Research on Changing Roles

Barbara Lee, Columbia Broadcasting System

Ina Hillebrandt, Hillebrandt Consultants, Inc.

*The Development of Survey Research in the 40's, 50's, and 60's in the U.S. and Western Europe**

Mark Abrams, London, England

USES OF MEDIA

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Horst Stipp, National Broadcasting Company

The Functions of Reading Mass-Produced Romance Fiction

Susan B. Neuman, Eastern Connecticut State University

Vicarious Experience and Social Participation: The Effects of Religious Broadcasting

David Pritchard, Gary D. Gaddy, University of Wisconsin

Intergenerational Transfer of News Media Use During Adolescence

Albert R. Tims, Jonathan L. Masland, Indiana University

Cognitive Psychology, Information Processing & "The Day After"

Don D. Smith, University of Iowa

COMMERCIAL RESEARCH WORTH KNOWING ABOUT

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Gale Metzger, Statistical Research, Inc.

The Simmons Data Base

Frank Stanton, Simmons Market Research Bureau

Looking Beneath Life-Style Trends

William D. Wells, Needham, Harper & Steers

OPINION FORMATION AND CHANGE

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Marie Crane, University of Texas

Political Context and Changing Attitudes Toward School Integration, 1964-1978

Lawrence Bobo, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

Effects of Two International Incidents on Youth's Intentions to Join the Military

Robert M. Bray, Research Triangle Institute

Attitude Polarization, Stability and Self-Report Accuracy: The Effects of Attitude Centrality (AAPOR Student Paper Award)

Jon A. Krosnick, University of Michigan

*WAPOR/AAPOR Joint Session.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION:
EARLY CALLS OF ELECTION RESULTS AND EXIT POLLS:
PROS, CONS, AND CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Congressional Concern About Early Calls

U.S. Representative Al Swift, State of Washington

Public Attitudes Toward Early Calls and Other Press Practices

Burns W. Roper, Chairman, The Roper Organization

Why the Networks Report Early Calls

Richard S. Salant, Former President, CBS News; President, The National News Council (recently dissolved)

Press Practices, Polling Restrictions, Public Opinion, and First Amendment Guarantees

Floyd Abrams, Cahill, Gordon, and Reindel

KILLING THE MESSENGER:

A MORE DETAILED LOOK AT ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE NEWS MEDIA

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Philip Meyer, University of North Carolina

A Survey of Public Attitudes About the Ethics of American Journalists

Ralph Izard, Ohio University

Why Newspapers Will Survive

Greg Martire, Clark, Martire & Bartolomeo, Inc.

Attitudes Toward the News Media: Three Publics

D. Charles Whitney, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Anti-Press Violence and Popular Attitudes Toward the Press: A Historical Perspective

John C. Nerone, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

RESEARCH ON THE NEW MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Mel Goldberg, American Broadcasting Company

Videodiscs for Public Education

Susan H. Evans, Paul Kerns, Peter Clarke, The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Southern California

New Technologies and Newspapers

Charles Kinsolving, Thelma Anderson, Newspaper Advertising Bureau

High-Tech Audience Measurement for the New-Tech Audiences

William S. Rubens, National Broadcasting Company

Profiling Cable and High Technology Households

Robert A. Maxwell, HBO, James R. Smith, State University of New York at New Paltz

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE MEDIA

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Bernard Roshco, U.S. Department of State

The Risks and Benefits of Dealing with the Mass Media

Sharon Dunwoody, University of Wisconsin

Social Science in the News: 1970 and 1982

Eleanor Singer, Phyllis Endreny, Columbia University

News Values and Science Values: The Editorial Role in the Presentation of Social Science News

Phyllis Endreny, Columbia University

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN POLITICAL STUDIES*

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Michael Traugott, Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan

The Don't Know Voters

Richard F. Carter, University of Washington

Election Research in Germany

Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Friedrich Tennesädt, Institut für Demoskopie, Al-lensbach, Germany

Sequence Effects in a Guttman-Type Scale: The Case of Political Efficacy

Harm't Hart, Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, The Netherlands

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES' THREATS TO PRIVACY

CHAIR: Al Gollin, Newspaper Advertising Bureau

Computer Privacy: How Concerned and Trusting Is the Public?

Richard Baxter, The Roper Organization

The Public and Its Leaders: Attitudes About the New Technology and Its Future

Michael Kagay, Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

Frank Ferrucci, Southern New England Telephone Company

Scott Taylor, Janice Ballou, Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

OPINION FORMATION AND CHANGE: MEDIA INFLUENCES

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Paul Hirsch, University of Chicago

*The Great American Values Test: Influencing Behavior and Belief Through Television**

Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach, Milton Rokeach, Joel W. Grube, Washington State University

National Problems, Media Coverage, and Opinion and Policy Change

James R. Beniger, Princeton

W. Russell Neuman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The Influence of Opinion Leaders and Mass Media Compared

Joan S. Black, J.S. Black & Associates

American Public Opinion and Mass Media Coverage of the Arab-Israeli Conflict

Neil J. Kressel

ROUND TABLE SESSIONS

Research on the Public's Understanding of the News

Barrie Gunter, IBA London

Mark R. Levy, John P. Robinson, University of Maryland

Chasing the Elusive Respondent

Johnny Blair, Diane O'Rourke, University of Illinois

Ann F. Brunswick, Ann Miles, Columbia University

Catherine Keeley, Charles D. Cowan, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Issues Pertaining to the Accuracy of Preelection Polls

Irving Crespi, I. Crespi Associates

Ad Hoc Committee for Research on the 1984 Elections

Kurt Lang, Gladys Lang, State University of New York at Stony Brook

Max McCombs, Syracuse University

Guilt by Association: Can Researchers Do Anything to Avoid Rub-Off from Phony and Pseudo Polls?

Nicholas Schiavone, Barry Cook, National Broadcasting Company

Gale Metzger, Statistical Research, Inc.

Debra Hensler, Rand Corp./AAPOR Standards Chair

Finding Useful Market Segments

Rena Bartos, J. Walter Thompson

*WAPOR/AAPOR joint session

RECENT METHODOLOGICAL WORK

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Tom Smith, NORC

The Measurement of Values: A Comparison of Ratings and Rankings

Duane F. Alwin, Jon A. Krosnick, University of Michigan

Gauging Noise in Public Opinion Polls Through the Use of Fictitious Issues

George F. Bishop, Alfred J. Tuchfarber, Robert W. Oldendick, University of Cincinnati

Sex on the Phone: Gender Effects on Productivity, Cost, and Responses Among Telephone Interviewers

Robert M. Groves, Nancy Fultz, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

Some Procedures for Collecting Large Amounts of Data

Gary Siegel, DePaul University

GROWTH AREAS FOR RESEARCH:

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND SURVEYS AS LEGAL EVIDENCE

CHAIR: Stuart Herman, Technical Analysis & Communications, Inc.

Research on Financial Services

Jenene Geerdes Karamon, Merrill Lynch Futures Inc.

A Decision Framework for Selecting Data Generating Methods in Rapidly Evolving Service Industries

David A. Karns, Thomas Dovel, Wright State University

Through the Looking Glass—Judicious Survey Research

Sandra L. Marks, Dennis K. Benson, Appropriate Solutions Incorporated

RESEARCH ON 1984 PRIMARIES

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: Everett C. Ladd, The Roper Center/University of Connecticut

New Hampshire: The Media Primary

David W. Moore, University of New Hampshire

What Happened in Connecticut?: What Surveys Tell Us

G. Donald Ferree, Jr., University of Connecticut

The New York Primary

Kathleen Frankovic, Warren Mitofsky, CBS News

QUESTION WORDING AND QUESTION ORDER EFFECTS

CHAIR AND DISCUSSANT: George Balch, Needham, Harper & Steers

Random Start vs. True Randomization of Question Order: A CATI-Based Experiment

Richard A. Kulka, Stephanie A. Pierson, Research Triangle Institute

Response Order Effects for Forced Choice Questions

McKee J. McClendon, University of Akron

Salience vs. Importance of National Problems Over Time

Howard Schuman, Jack Ludwig, Jon Krosnick, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

1984 Annual AAPOR Business Meeting

The annual business meeting was held from 4:00 to 5:30 PM on May 19, 1984 at Lake Lawn Lodge, Lake Delavan, Wisconsin. Retiring President Laure Sharp presided. About 60 members attended.

President Sharp thanked committee chairs for their good work during the year. She referred especially to the hard work performed by Deborah Hensler as head of the Standards Committee, and thanked

Warren Mitofsky and Bud Roper for their contributions to the discussion of standards. She also thanked Phil Meyer for his work as head of the Publications and Information Committee, editor of the *AAPOR News*, of the *Agencies & Organizations Blue Book*, and of the *POQ Index*; Chuck Cowan for the good choice he made in booking the Conference at Lake Lawn Lodge; Ron Milavsky for the fine Conference program; Ken Adler for his careful watch over AAPOR expenditures; Donna Charron for her work on the AAPOR history; Selma Monsky, who chaired the membership and chapter committee; and Naomi Rothwell for representing AAPOR on COPAFS. She gave special thanks to Beth Eastman for her excellent minutes as Recording Secretary, and to Susan Weisbrod for handling the Membership Directory. Finally, she thanked Diane Druker for her continuing superior service to AAPOR.

Council members and committee chairs then reported on activities and accomplishments during the past year:

Secretary-Treasurer—Ken Adler reported that AAPOR continues to be in sound financial condition, with current net worth close to \$90,000. After distributing copies of the Financial Summary, he pointed out that the higher income which the revised dues structure is expected to generate will be more than offset by higher expenses. A one-time payment of \$7,000 to the University of Chicago to establish the AAPOR archives, combined with increased costs of *POQ* subscriptions to permit AAPOR members to receive the *POQ Index* free of charge, will result in an expected deficit of about \$3,000 this year. Without these extraordinary expenses, there would have been a small surplus.

The Secretary thanked Diane Druker for her invaluable and always friendly help during the year. He also thanked the newly formed investment advisory committee (Ray Funkhouser, Phil Meyer, and Es Druker) for guidance on how to invest AAPOR funds. During the year, Council had agreed informally to an investment policy which encourages placing roughly \$75,000 in a reserve fund invested in longer-term but fluid instruments (usually T-notes and T-bills). At current rates, interest yielded by this reserve pays about 10 percent of AAPOR's budgetary needs and enables AAPOR dues to remain relatively modest.

Nominations—Past President Burns W. Roper reported on the results of the election. The newly elected officers are:

Vice-President and President-Elect: Howard Schuman

Associate Secretary-Treasurer: Charles D. Cowan

Standards Associate: David L. Sills

Conference Associate: Joan S. Black

Membership & Chapter Relations Associate: Diane W. Schray
Publications & Information Associate: Donald R. DeLuca
Councillor-at-Large: Andrew Kohut

Reporting on election procedures, Mr. Roper proposed that the councillor-at-large position should rotate between commercial and noncommercial candidates. The proposal was accepted by the meeting. He then proposed that the competitive nomination for officers should be abolished in favor of a single slate. After thorough discussion, a show of hands indicated that most of those present opposed a single slate.

Membership and Chapter Relations—Selma Monsky reported that the number of members had changed little since last year. The dues increase does not seem to have affected membership, which continues to hover at close to 1,100. Of the five AAPOR chapters, New York, Washington/Baltimore, and Midwest had been active, while Southern and Pacific were inactive.

Standards—Deborah Hensler briefly reviewed the standards case which had recently been decided by Council and reported in the AAPOR *News*. She noted that, in addition to handling cases, she has sent many letters asking organizations which use surveys for fund solicitation to cease and desist. Public Citizens was one such organization which agreed to stop using surveys to raise funds. The League of Women Voters, on the other hand, refused to stop their practice. Dr. Hensler proposed that in future both those who agree to stop using alleged surveys to raise funds and those who continue the practice be listed in the AAPOR *News*. This was approved by those present at the meeting.

The Standards Committee has proposed changes in the AAPOR Code of Ethics and Standards for Reporting which require first Council and then membership approval. A summary of these proposed changes was distributed for comment.

The chair announced that Norman Bradburn, slated to take over Standards this year, is unable to do so because of his appointment as Provost of the University of Chicago. Dr. Hensler has agreed to continue as Standards Chair for another year.

Conference—J. Ronald Milavsky reported that attendance at the Conference was better than expected, with 295 paid registrations. Of the 99 papers which had been submitted, 61 were accepted. Submitted papers made up 77 percent of the program—only 18 papers were solicited. Although 67 percent of the submitted papers came from academe, the final program mix was 56 percent academic, 39 percent commercial, 4 percent government, and 1 percent DK. The regional mix of papers was 42 percent from Northeast, 37 percent Midwest, 13

percent, from Southeast and West, and 8 percent from foreign countries. Dr. Milavsky lauded the excellent cooperation received from WAPOR, especially Executive Secretary Donald DeLuca, in arranging the WAPOR portion of the program and the joint sessions.

Student Award Committee—Chaired by Ronald Kessler, the Committee received a record total of 38 papers. Because there were so many good papers, the Committee chose two winners—Robert Kubey from the University of Chicago, and Jon Krosnick from the University of Michigan. Three additional papers were given honorable mention.

Publications and Information—Barbara Lee reported for Phil Meyer that three editions of the AAPOR *News* had been published, with high-quality photos of Council members. The *POQ Cumulative Index* had been completed and distributed. The *Index* is now on computer, which will greatly facilitate the next updating. The *Blue Book of Agencies and Organizations* was in the mail.

AAPOR History and Archives—Paul Sheatsley reported that the Archives agreement with the University of Chicago had been concluded. The materials would soon be turned over, with the proviso that Standards files would not be available to the public for 20 years. The AAPOR history has been started under Sheatsley as editor-in-chief. Three of the planned 12 chapters have been drafted, and the history should be ready for publication in 1986.

POQ Editor—Eleanor Singer reported on the *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Nineteen-eighty-four was the year of the *Cumulative Index*, mailed free to subscribers as a fifth issue just prior to the Spring issue. Extra copies were printed, but it is too early to tell how many individual copies were sold or whether the *Index* is attracting new subscribers.

Subscriptions declined again last year, from 4,659 to 4,506. But the 3.2 percent decline was smaller than the 6.5 percent drop the previous year. Other journals have experienced similar decreases in the last several years.

The decline in manuscript submissions seems to have stopped: 172 manuscripts were received in 1983–84, six more than the previous year. Of the manuscripts received, 26 were accepted, and 20 others were invited to revise and resubmit. The others were either rejected or are still under review. Average time for decision on papers sent out for review was two and three-quarters months.

Subscription rates for next year will be lower because *POQ* is reverting to its normal four issues. Rates will be \$37 for institutions, \$18 for individuals, and \$16 for AAPOR and WAPOR members.

Dr. Singer thanked Philip Meyer and Mary Spaeth for their strenu-

ous efforts of the *Cumulative Index*. She also thanked the many reviewers whose generous support helps to maintain the quality of the journal. Finally, she thanked the other editors—Ina Jaeger, Managing Editor; Phyllis M. Endreny, Book Notes; Marc B. Glassman, Book Reviews; Philip A. Harding, News and Notes; and Tom W. Smith, the Polls.

A Legislative Committee?—Harry O'Neil asked on behalf of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) that ARPOR pay more attention to restrictive legislation which would affect survey research activities. He mentioned specifically a California bill which, if passed, would require inclusion of certain questions concerning minorities. CASRO had already spent \$20,000 to fight such planned restrictions. He urged that AAPOR set up a legislative committee to track and report on potential legal threats to survey research.

Site Selection—Chuck Cowan, after being applauded for his selection of the Lake Lawn Lodge, announced that the 1985 Conference would be at the Americana Great Gorge in McAfee, N.J. Situated on 212 acres about one and three-quarters hours from Newark, the hotel is reserving about 300 rooms for AAPOR in one of its two wings. Single rate will be \$108, double \$75 American plan.

For 1986, AAPOR is slated to meet in the South. Hotels in Florida, North Carolina, and elsewhere are being considered, and recommendations are welcome.

Respectfully submitted,
KENNETH P. ADLER
Secretary-Treasurer