The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) celebrated its fiftieth anniversary and held its fifty-first annual conference May 16–19, 1996, at the Red Lion Hotel in Salt Lake City, Utah. In keeping with tradition for conferences held during even-numbered years, the conference site was shared by the World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR), whose conference ran May 15–17. Joint AAPOR/WAPOR activities included a Thursday night plenary session on deliberative polls, a discussion panel providing an international perspective on the future paths of public opinion research, and four joint paper presentation sessions. Official registration was 568 (only one person short of last year’s record attendance), of which 454 were AAPOR members. The breakdown of registrants by affiliation revealed 42 percent affiliated with academic institutions; 39 percent commercial; 10 percent government; 6 percent nonprofit; and 2 percent other. Twenty percent of registrants were first-time attendees. A total of 454 people were listed as participants in the joint conference in a variety of roles: session organizers, plenary speakers, short-course instructors, discussion panelists, authors and presenters of papers and poster presentations, session chairs, and discussants.

The AAPOR conference included a record number of sessions (63) distributed as follows: 42 paper presentation sessions; seven roundtable discussions, six discussion panels, four short courses, two plenary sessions, a poster session, and—taking advantage of our conference location—an introduction and tour of the Mormon Family History Library.

The opportunities for continuing education at this year’s conference were more extensive than usual, thanks in part to a mandate from AAPOR’s council to expand educational efforts at the conference, and in part to AAPOR secretary treasurer Nancy Mathiowetz’s skills at finding and persuading potential instructors. The AAPOR program opened on Thursday with a 6-hour limited-enrollment short course taught by Colm O’Muireachartaigh and attended by 13 participants, titled “Introduction to Survey Sampling.” A 4-hour short course, “Thinking about Answers: The Application of Cognitive Process to
Survey Methodology,” by Norbert Schwarz and Seymour Sudman, was presented to 46 participants on Thursday afternoon. Tom Smith taught a free 90-minute Saturday morning short course describing and demonstrating “The General Social Survey Data and Information Retrieval System” to an audience of about 45 attendees. The final short course of the conference was Mike Weeks’s 3-hour session titled “A Practical Guide to Project Management for the Survey Researcher,” presented on Sunday morning to 70 participants.

The conference included two evening plenary sessions, one on Thursday and the other on Friday, both of them organized and moderated by conference chair Jack Ludwig, of Princeton Survey Research Associates. The Thursday night AAPOR/WAPOR panel grappled with “Deliberative Polls: What Do They Add to Our Understanding of Public Opinion?” The Friday night AAPOR panel probed “The Wellsprings of Political and Social Discontent in the United States: An Historical View.”

The Thursday session on deliberative polls included four speakers. The first was James Fishkin, of the University of Texas at Austin, creator and foremost proponent of deliberative polling, who presented an overview of the rationale for conducting deliberative polls, showed a brief video clip of the one held in Austin, Texas, in January, and recounted anecdotes designed to provide an experiential understanding of the process. The second speaker was Roger Jowell, of Social and Community Planning Research (located in London) who has worked with Fishkin on two deliberative polls conducted in the United Kingdom. The thrust of Jowell’s methodologically focused comments was that critics of deliberative polls have focused on weaknesses that are shared by traditional surveys—especially panel surveys—and that the value of deliberative polls for understanding attitude formation and change has been neglected. The third speaker was Andrew Kohut, of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, who began by praising those who had conceived and conducted deliberative polls for pioneering an innovative approach to studying public opinion. Kohut then summarily compared pre- and postdeliberation survey responses reported in the wake of the Austin “National Issues Convention,” and concluded that instead of proving the superficiality of public opinion as measured using traditional survey approaches, the data provided a validation of the results of traditional public opinion assessment. The final speaker was Warren Mitofsky, of Mitofsky International, who leveled a variety of criticisms at deliberative polls. He charged that the deliberative process was artificial, that the concept of deliberative polls was connected obliquely, at best, to the real-world political decision making of the U.S. electorate, and that the experiment suffered
from the absence of a control group. The session ended with a lively rebuttal and floor discussion.

The Friday night plenary featured Robert Samuelson, columnist for *Newsweek* and the *Washington Post*, and author of the recent book *The Good Life and Its Discontents: The American Dream in the Age of Entitlement, 1945–1995*. The author summarized the book’s thesis that the decline in Americans’ trust and confidence in political institutions and leaders over the past 50 years is a consequence of unrealistic expectations set during a historical period when increases in prosperity, economic stability, and the amelioration of social conditions made the prospect of eradicating social problems and economic uncertainty seem like a realistic possibility. Samuelson argued that the perpetuation of the idea that not only can we achieve this utopian goal, but we are entitled to it, is due in part to the unpalatability of a more realistic stance for political leaders in what he has called the “age of entitlement.” The other two speakers, Frank Newport of the Gallup Organization and Michael Traugott of the University of Michigan, brought archived survey data to bear on Samuelson’s hypothesis. Newport explored Gallup Poll data on Americans’ discontent, underscoring the divergence between Americans’ appraisals of their personal situation and their more negative evaluations of political institutions and leaders. He raised questions about whether a culture of unrealistic expectations was the root cause of their discontent, suggesting competing explanations such as revelations of political scandal and malfeasance, and the critical tone of the media in reporting on political events. Finally, he presented data questioning the notion that Americans expect or desire the government to solve some of the country’s most serious social and economic problems. Traugott shed an interesting light on the discussion by investigating the question of whether increasing discontent represented a broad national shift in perspective or whether there were differences by cohort that might lead to a clearer understanding of the phenomenon. He presented data suggesting cohort differences. Traugott concluded with the proposition that it would be useful to evaluate Samuelson’s hypotheses more directly, but that to do so would require the development of new survey questions and indices. Comments were solicited from the audience, and the session ended with a thoughtful question-and-answer session.

Seymour Sudman presented the AAPOR award for exceptionally distinguished service to Eleanor Singer at Saturday evening’s award banquet. The student paper award was presented to Maria Krysan, a new faculty member at the Pennsylvania State University, for her paper, “Experiments, Quasi-Experiments, Surveys, and Depth Interviews: A Multi-Method Approach to Understanding White Racial Attitudes.” Additionally, two papers were cited for honorable mention

Several sessions focused on the future of our discipline and our organization, topics especially appropriate in view of the conference’s fiftieth-anniversary theme: two discussion sessions (one a joint AAPOR/WAPOR panel) focused on the future of public opinion research, and another on the results of the AAPOR membership survey intended to provide guidance for the future direction of the organization. A Friday discussion panel titled “Push Polls and Truth in Polling Laws: How Shall We Respond?” organized by Thomas Guterbock, attracted many attendees. In addition to a lively discussion about this threat to our industry (at which AAPOR’s position paper on push polling was made available), it generated a story printed in the New York Times the following week and a number of calls to AAPOR to report suspected instances of the practice.

Another highlight of the conference was Peter Miller’s Friday night dinner presentation, lampooning many AAPOR notables. Many conference attendees took advantage of the technology exhibit engineered by Robert Lee of Pace University and the book exhibit and sale organized by Phyllis Endreny. Michael Traugott and Murray Edelman assembled a Fiftieth Anniversary Commemorative Booklet, provided to all conference registrants, filled with AAPOR history and special citations to friends, mentors, and colleagues. In addition, a copy of the 1946 Central City Conference program was included with the conference registration materials.

Many people worked together to make this year’s conference a success. In addition to those mentioned above, special gratitude must be expressed to Marlene Bednarz, AAPOR secretariat, for unflagging support and assistance at many points; to Paul Lavrakas, Dawn Von Thurn, and Jenna Powell of the Site Selection and Coordination Committee, who with grace and good humor handled the daunting task of coordinating the ever-changing details of the conference with the hotel; to Jennifer Dykema, who organized the Fun Run/Walk, slogan contest, and T-shirt sale; and to Rob Daves, who organized the golf outing. Roger Tourangeau, AAPOR’s 1997 conference chair, selected and chaired the Student Paper Competition Committee and was one of three people who joined me for an invaluable daylong meeting in Princeton, New Jersey, last winter to evaluate the unprecedented number of submissions for this year’s conference and to sort them into topical sessions. Scott Keeter, Cliff Zukin, and Frank Newport are the other members of this group. Judy Johnson, Jeanne Howarth, and
Connie Keefe provided varied and essential assistance with creation of conference databases, various mailings, and the assembly of the conference program. In the end, of course, the success of this year's conference was the result of the energy and enthusiasm of the speakers, presenters, organizers, discussants, chairs, and participants who contributed their work and ideas to an extraordinarily rich fiftieth-anniversary conference program.
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Through her career she has become a role model for women in our profession - a spouse, a mother, a teacher, a leader, a caring scientist. While juggling all these commitments she has, sometimes single-handedly, built a career of scholarship through dogged devotion to her craft. Her good cheer and decency and approachability have built a legion of young (and not so young) professionals who have been nurtured by her and who love her.
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Vignette 1. During the last 10 years of my father’s life, I’d see him maybe once or twice a year. Almost every time there would come a point, after we talked about family and old memories, that he would ask the question, “Now, Bob, exactly what do you do in your work?” As I recall, my answers would vary over successive occasions, in some attempt to use words that might make, at long last, the right connections in my father’s mind. I must profess an utter failure over those years. In meeting my father’s neighbors and friends on those visits, they would often say, “Oh, you’re the son who works with computers!” the one attribute that must have registered permanently for my father.

Vignette 2. One of my friends, who also specializes in survey methodology and design, was asked to become a member of a technical advisory board for a survey measuring economic issues on a sample of households. All other members of the advisory board were economists, only a minority of whom were ever involved in actual data collection or formally trained in research design. One such member, in a side conversation during a coffee break, asked, apparently sincerely, “Is there really anything scientific about what survey methodologists do? I mean, do you really know anything or do you mainly give opinions about what works?”

Vignette 3. I was called a few years ago by a political pollster who runs a firm that provides campaign strategy advice and polling to inform that advice. His firm is reported to have gross revenues that exceed most survey organizations in the country. Indeed, it later dawned on me that he had probably designed and conducted more surveys than I had. He called to ask me whether it really made any difference who in the household answered the questions: would taking the person who answered the phone be acceptable?
Vignette 4. A presidential commission decided to do a survey to measure the extent of the social problem they were investigating. They perceived that they needed assistance in the statistical design of the sample and the statistical analysis of the data but felt completely at ease constructing the questionnaire, because it was, in their words, basically "common sense," and they were the experts about the problem.

These stories illustrate several facts. We don't have a simple occupational title for survey methodologists or researchers; there is widespread belief among both academics and other users that there is no scientific basis or stable theoretical foundation for most survey design decisions; many persons who use the survey method most actively have no formal education (or interest?) in quality aspects of surveys. To the majority of users of the survey method, it is merely a tool to answer questions about a population. They tend not to possess an intellectual curiosity about improving surveys in general.

What follows are the thoughts of one in AAPOR for whom measurement through statistical surveys and qualitative investigations is a paramount concern. In choosing this topic, I think I return to the roots of AAPOR. Indeed, the very first AAPOR gathering, the Central City, Colorado, meeting of 1946 was explicitly called to grapple with the problems of an emerging survey research industry.

Those specializing in surveys are found in market research organizations, in academic research institutes, in the classroom teaching research methods, in political polling organizations, in media research and audience measurement, in the print and electronic media themselves, and in government statistics agencies measuring the society or economy. The common theme to this field is the application of research methodology in framing research questions, moving from concept to measure, statistical knowledge of sample design, social science knowledge of questionnaire design, management skills and knowledge regarding data collection, computer expertise in database construction and manipulation, statistical expertise in the analysis of data, and technical writing abilities to put into words the results of empirical analysis. Members of the field strongly believe that the value of information to a decision is irrevocably a function of the design and execution of the measurement step. All data are not created equal.¹

This discussion makes three observations: (1) the increasing demand for information in our world is going to place survey research more

¹ This statement seems obvious but stands in stark contrast to the common teaching of the statistical analysis of data as if they were pure reflections of the concepts of interest to the analyst. Lack of attention to the measurement step of science seems to plague many disciplines currently; see, e.g., Griliches 1994.
and more at the forefront; (2) the field has identified an expanding body of theoretical and technical knowledge that must be mastered in order to be a competent survey professional; and (3) we lack, however, key ingredients of a profession; there is much work to do preparing the next generation of survey researchers.

A View of the Future

I have more and more confidence that the perceived importance of information will grow at increasing rates in future societies. The explosion of the Internet, the embedding of customer satisfaction surveys into management decisions, the ubiquity of opinion measurement on current events, the demand for more timely and richer economic statistics—in all fields the demand for information by business and the citizenry seems only to be rising. Surveys are key to feeding this information frenzy. We could be approaching a golden age for survey research, where the sophistication of users of information will grow as they are exposed to more and more information, and their demands for higher-quality information will rise. Part of this golden age I foresee will be a deepening of the technical sophistication of those producing the information—that is, the maturation of a profession that designs, collects, and analyzes survey and other data on human populations. I speak today about whether we as a field are positioning ourselves to take advantage of this opportunity.

I fully acknowledge that such a future need not occur. We should not confuse motion with progress. There may be no process of natural selection and evolution out of the unorganized anarchy of the World Wide Web as it now exists. Users may not demand good information but only lots of information. Finally, survey research professionals may not prove to be up to the task of serving this new world.

The Status of the Field

We are a field that is only about 60 years old.2 Do we have the ingredients of a profession? Since we are an association with many having formal training in sociology, I'll cite Parsonsian requirements of a profession (Parsons 1979): service to the society, skill development, and formal technical training.

2. Before the reader objects, I too am aware of early "surveys" of large-scale populations. I start the clock at the development of well-grounded theories permitting the measurement of the quality of inference from the sample to the population.
By "service to the society" Parsons meant some institutionalized means of making sure the competencies of the profession were put to socially responsible uses. We are strong on this; it unites us. It includes the founding beliefs of George Gallup that surveys are instruments communicating the people's wishes in a democracy. It is reflected in more recent revolts by statistical societies in Britain, protesting the Thatcher government's redefinition of the unemployment rate, as violating the fact that those numbers belong to the people, to be used to judge the government, not to the government, to shape public opinion. Those in the commercial survey sector can feel proud of informing providers about the reactions of their customers; those in the federal sector gain satisfaction from knowing their surveys provide feedback for an informed citizenry and its elected government to judge the state of the common good; those in the academic sector gain rewards from discovering the behavioral and attitudinal bases of important social problems.

By "skill development" Parsons meant that not only must a cultural tradition be mastered, in the sense of being understood, but skills in its use must be developed. Here, I think that the survey industry does have a set of professional practices that move from selection of the sample, questionnaire development and pretesting, interviewer training and management, data file structure design, coding and data editing, data analysis, and technical writing (turning statistical findings into words). Unfortunately, they remain uncodified by any professional organization.

By "formal technical training" Parsons included some institutionalized mode of validating both the adequacy of the training and the competency of the trained individuals. It is interesting, and unfortunate for us, I believe, that our field may be the weakest on this third point. After 50–60 years of activity for large-scale statistical surveys, it is still the norm to enter the field with no formal education in its theories and practices, to learn from experience slowly and at great expense to an employer, and, if blessed with the right opportunities and mentoring, to become competent. There is no mechanism for the field to validate whether such experiences have provided minimal competency as a survey professional.

At the origins of the field, when the invention of techniques was key to its survival, this lack of formal training in the field itself was irrelevant. Indeed, from the 1940s to the 1960s the field was founded and enriched by those with formal education in physics, psychology, economics, mathematics, and a host of other fields. They created and evaluated the theories and practices that form the field. Their creativity and that of the next generation of survey researchers were so great, however, that the body of knowledge now needed for competency is
1. Full-time performance of an occupational function
2. Establishment of a school not connected to a university
3. Establishment of a university school
4. Formation of a local professional organization
5. Formation of a national professional organization
6. Enactment of a licensing law
7. Development of a formal code of ethics

**Figure 1.** Wilensky's (1964) steps of formation of a profession

much broader than was true in their time. What served the field decades ago will not serve it well in the future.

This viewpoint may appear to be elitist to the current survey researchers who "came up the hard way," who did not receive formal education in the theories and methods of survey research (because it was not available). I want to distinguish my thoughts about the past of survey research from my thoughts about the future of survey research. I believe that the success of the current generation of survey researchers has been sufficiently large that the next generation has much more to learn than can be efficiently absorbed without more formal educational systems. The first attorneys were those who helped write the laws. Their productivity made necessary the legal training of the next generation. So too, the legacy of past and current survey researchers is a body of knowledge large enough to require formal study by the next generation.

While Parsons took a static view of the requisites for a field to be a profession, Wilensky (1964) asserted a seven-step process in the creation of a profession. It's useful to assess where the survey field lies in this sequence. Most of my comments focus on item 3 in figure 1, the establishment of a university school, but I make brief comments on the others.

**1. Full-time performance of an occupational function**

There certainly is an occupational function—the U.S. federal government spends approximately $2.7 billion per year on economic and social information collection and dissemination (Office of Management and Budget 1996). There are over 12,000 staff members of the statistical agencies. The U.S. commercial sphere spends about $4–$5 billion and has many more employees. In each year there are tens of thousands of surveys conducted by state and local organizations to learn about client or member satisfaction, to learn the health care priorities of local areas, or to learn about employee concerns.
Table 1. Membership in Sections of Selected Professional Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Approximate Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAPOR</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Evaluation Research Association, Education Statisticians</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Marketing Association, Research Special Interest Group</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association, Political Methodology Section</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association, Evaluation, Measurement, Statistics Division</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Association, Methodology Section</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Statistical Association, Survey Research Methods Section</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Association of Survey Statisticians</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Research Association</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Establishment of a School Not Connected to a University

In the early 1940s the U.S. Department of Agriculture established a school that trained many of the first-generation sampling statisticians; in 1947, the Survey Research Center at Michigan established the Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques; somewhat later the Burke Institute established a series of courses in survey and marketing research. There is now a very active set of continuing education activities sponsored by commercial, academic, and nonprofit organizations.

4. Formation of a Local Professional Organization

The survey field appeared to skip this phase of development and go directly to the next.

5. Formation of a National Professional Organization

As table 1 demonstrates, there is no single organization for survey researchers. AAPOR was formed in the 1940s; the Survey Research Methods Section of the American Statistical Association was not formed until the 1970s. Some of the associations are linked to academic
disciplines, as interest sections. Some are linked to industry groups. Only two appear to be devoted to the profession solely—the International Association of Survey Statisticians and the Marketing Research Association. There are many persons in the field who are members of more than one of the groups listed in table 1. Given the size of the industry, many survey professionals are not members of any of the associations.

6. ENACTMENT OF A LICENSING LAW

There are no such plans, to my knowledge, and the division of the field into government, commercial, and university sectors has led to diverse standards in the field.

7. DEVELOPMENT OF A FORMAL CODE OF ETHICS

The AAPOR code of ethics is one of the few with an enforcement provision (American Association for Public Opinion Research 1991); the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) has a statement of ethics; the American Statistical Association has a set of principles of behavior of statisticians (American Statistical Association 1995). The AAPOR history shows that the code of ethics was one vehicle chosen to increase the professional stature of the association (instead of having it be, in Cisin’s words, a “Chowder and Marching Society” [Sheatsley and Mitofsky 1992, p. 72]). The code was the tool by which the standards of the field were asserted. It is interesting to note that the code contains standards of ethical behavior and not, by and large, professional practice.

Let me return to the third step in Wilensky’s creation of a profession.

3. ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSITY SCHOOL

The recent AAPOR member survey included a question asking the respondent to check all fields of formal education. Most marked more than one field. For purposes of this talk, I was interested in assessing the extent of formal training reported in technical areas of our field, for which I included marketing research, statistics, and survey research. About half of the respondents reported education in some combination of the social sciences (communications, demography, journalism, political science, psychology, sociology) with no mention of technical training. About 10 percent reported degrees in education or some other field, with no technical training reported. In total about 40 percent reported at least some formal education in marketing research,
statistics, or survey research, most of these combining the training with some social science discipline (fig. 2). We all mostly trained in mainline disciplines and have technical training as a sideline.

After spending all my life in the academy, I regret to say that I believe one of the most significant challenges to the intellectual maturation of the survey field is the organization of the U.S. university. Most universities are divided into a set of colleges and departments. Staff are viewed essentially as citizens of a department more than of the university; evaluations and promotions are made by criteria accepted within the field; and honors are conferred by the national association of that discipline. Departments determine what courses are offered; they determine what research questions are deemed interesting; they determine what is hot and what is not. In the frog pond of the campus, what lily pad you’re on makes a difference.

On most college campuses throughout the United States, however, there is no one home for a survey methodologist or statistician. Some are in departments of statistics; some are in departments of sociology; some are in departments of political science; some are in schools of business. In almost all cases, however, they are at the margins of their disciplines.

These scholars face intense pressures to define themselves primarily as members of their disciplines. Many must say, ‘‘I am a statistician, with interest in surveys,’’ or ‘‘I am a sociologist who’s interested in research methods.’’ Hence, it is a field of hyphens—a statistician—
survey researcher or a sociologist—survey methodologist. Worse, it is a field that is often the post-hyphen part of the pair.

Of all the possible university venues for survey design issues, I’ve always thought that departments of statistics might be most natural. After all, sampling statistics, perhaps the tightest theoretical substructure for surveys, was taught rather early in such departments, and they could have expanded on that base. The first university texts in surveys were for sampling statistics (Deming 1950; Hansen, Hurwitz, and Madow 1953).

I recently commissioned a small survey of statistics departments, chosen from among those offering statistics degrees. There were 44 departments represented in the study. For their graduate degree programs, only nine of the 44 require a course in survey sampling (almost all of which were sampling theory courses). Almost none offer courses in applied survey methodology.

For anyone trying to hire a well-trained sampling statistician, such results are no surprise. Survey statistics, except perhaps that related to adjustment procedures for missingness, is not currently “hot” in statistics. By this point in our history there are very few teaching faculty with practical experience in large-scale sample design; hence, the students cannot be turned on to the field by the practical problems facing real survey designs.

Having your own lily pad in the frog pond has the advantage of nurturing the theoretical as well as the applied. It permits curiosity-driven research in a way that is rarely possible in a commercial or government environment, where premiums are paid for identifying solutions in a timely fashion. Not all truth can be unlocked by the threat of a deadline. Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton recognized this as early as 1950, when they prepared a proposal for a School of Social Research at Columbia and submitted it to the Ford Foundation. The proposal would have created an educational structure that might have changed the last 40 years of the field. The proposal was rejected by the foundation.4

But there is good news here. Even universities change, albeit very slowly. In 1980 the University of Georgia established its master’s in marketing research (to be followed by the University of Texas at Ar-

---

3. The sampling frame consists of departments of statistics listed in *Schools Offering Degrees in Statistics*, 1995 edition, American Statistical Association. A total of 81 departments or divisions of statistics that offered graduate degrees in statistics were identified and telephoned repeatedly. Data were obtained from 44 of the 81.
4. My thanks to Allen Barton for pointing out this fact. See Lazarsfeld and Merton 1950; the text of the Ford Foundation proposal is largely reproduced in Lazarsfeld (1972, pp. 361–91). It is noteworthy that the Netherlands did build departments of research methods, while the United States failed to act on the idea.
Table 2. U.S. Graduate Programs in Survey/Marketing Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Degree Title</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Marketing Research</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Survey Research</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Marketing Research</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Marketing Research</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>Marketing Research</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Program in</td>
<td>Survey Methodology</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1981, Michigan began its program in Applied Social Research; in 1984 Connecticut began its survey research master's. The National Science Foundation–sponsored Joint Program in Survey Methodology was founded in 1992, creating, in essence, a separate department of survey methodology within the University of Maryland.

These programs have diverse curricula and lengths. Some emphasize design, some analysis and presentation; some emphasize the statistical side and some, the social science issues of surveys. Those attached to a mainline discipline generally have the student take some courses in that discipline; those in business schools have the students learn some management and marketing principles.

It is interesting to me that these programs largely developed after the field was about 45 or 50 years old; they are creations of second- or third-generation survey researchers. They developed at a time when the technical knowledge underlying practice had accumulated and was documented in scholarly articles and books so that graduate-level education could be focused on the field.

These programs were late on the scene and are educating too few students. I believe that our country alone could use 20–30 such programs.

Advancing the Field as a Profession

Let me summarize my thoughts on the survey field as a profession. We already possess several of the key components of a profession.
We have recognized occupational categories and complete work organizations devoted to our business. Our work spans every sector of the economy and society. We have codes of ethics that guide us in our work. We serve the society by informing it about itself, and we gain satisfaction and prestige from that role.

Further, the world needs us more and more. We live during a significant expansion of demand for our services. By luck or wisdom, we have chosen a great career for our little time on this earth.

We are a dynamic field. Our practices are changing rapidly. Computer and other electronic technologies are permitting measurement techniques that were unthinkable 10 years ago; advances in our understanding of cognitive and communicative aspects of surveys are identifying theoretical principles underlying key measurement issues; advances in statistical estimation are improving our handling of nonresponse and measurement of uncertainty.

For example, in 1951 Stanley Payne wrote the first serious text on survey question wording, a compendium of his experience with questionnaire development. By 1996 there were over 10 volumes of scientific research findings that have identified the cognitive and communicative principles underlying the role of question wording in survey measurement error (for a recent example, with an extended bibliography, see Sudman, Bradburn, and Schwarz 1996). In 1953 Hansen, Hurwitz, and Madow, wrote a two-volume exposition of the theory of sampling, almost exclusively devoted to estimated means and totals. By 1989, the theory and practice had been extended to whole families of complex analytic statistics, including regression models, multilevel models, and a variety of models on discrete data (Skinner, Holt, and Smith 1989). In 1953 Cochran’s text on sampling contained less than 20 pages on nonresponse issues, out of a total of 400 pages. By 1990, there were full texts reviewing social science behavioral principles underlying survey participation, survey design features to reduce nonresponse, and statistical techniques of imputation and weighting to compensate for missing data (Dillman 1978; Goyder 1987; Rubin 1987). As late as the early 1980s almost all survey data collection used paper instruments; by the 1990s there were many survey organizations that used no paper instruments, all of them relying on some form of computer-assisted data collection. Every one of these advances required the survey professional to learn new concepts and technical practices. In short, to do a state-of-the-art survey today requires much more knowledge than was true just 10 years ago. It’s harder and harder to keep up as a hyphenated survey researcher.

On the other hand, I am disappointed that after 50–60 years of scientific surveys, it is a field that must recruit new employees from a labor market that is by and large unschooled in its principles and practices.
It appears to be stuck in an unspoken model of informal apprenticeships as the way careers are formed. Apprenticeship models are fine for fields that are stable but act as brakes to change for fields that are dynamic.

Engineering firms, in contrast to survey organizations, can look forward to hiring new engineering school graduates, well trained in the latest developments in material science and computerized design systems. The older staff update themselves through exposure to the new hires. The firms’ socialization processes can be more focused on the specific work of the company, dealing with clients, and other aspects of day-to-day practice. (Note that formal education does not replace the need for practical experience.) Their firms save thousands of dollars in education costs with each new hire—costs that survey organizations must bear. Further, innovation in their firm is energized by hiring new talent.

Large survey organizations, with little chance of hiring well-trained new recruits, have adapted by constructing work organizations that compartmentalize the design and production process. There are separate work units for questionnaire design and pretesting, for sample selection, for programming, data collection, and so forth. This structure allows organizations to save costs in training, by limiting training only to those tasks performed by the narrowly defined unit. The consequence is young staff can acquire comprehensive skills only slowly, by moving across the units of the organization.

Some of our remaining shortcomings as a profession come, I believe, as the unintended residue of the university disciplinary paradigm in which my cohort and earlier cohorts were educated. At that time there were no departments of survey methodology or marketing research or survey research. Our educational worlds taught us that the important questions and career options lie within the conceptual framework that determined undergraduate majors and graduate fields. Only the deviant and the stubborn could resist those forces.

In the last 15 years we have begun a slow process of legitimation within the university setting. There now exist in the United States at least seven graduate programs offering professional education in the technical aspects of the field. They are mixed between the social sciences and business schools, and this hampers coordination and collaboration. Further, and most important, they are training many too few students for the needs of the industry.

We need more such programs. My preference is that they be separate departments, free to make their own appointments, without subservience to a mainline discipline. Only then can the significant advances in survey methods arising from individual disciplines be blended into a fully comprehensive theory of surveys.
Given this history it is then understandable that there is no one professional association in which we gather. We are spread across several associations, some still holding to the structure of the disciplines, some linked to a branch of the profession, others independent. I do not now espouse the creation of an American Association of Survey Methodology. I do, however, see the need for partnerships among those representing professionals in the field.

In addition to needing more programs to improve the field, we must attract the best students to them. We need to make the profession visible to the next generation earlier in their education. One common life story of AAPOR members, I suspect, is that they discovered the fact that they could make a living and have fun as a survey researcher, after their undergraduate years, after they had chosen a major—maybe even after a first career was started and then stopped. We need to approach young people much earlier to alert them to the career option and educational opportunities.

Closing

How do I end these musings about our field? I think we are beginning our adolescent years as a collection of occupational skills. I believe we as a field could soon be visited with enormous benefits from the inevitable increase in demand for information about the society and the economy. We lack only a few ingredients to become a full-fledged profession. Most of them are focused on the next generation of survey researchers.

They must be able to blend the quantitative and qualitative aspects of our field; they must incorporate and advance a set of knowledge that is interdisciplinary and growing; they must create integrated designs and collection schemes that fit the new world. In short, they must be better than we are. I am convinced that we need to get our educational house in order for the field to become the profession it deserves to be.

Imagine, for a moment, a world where survey organizations could look to the hiring of new staff as a source of innovation for the organization rather than as a cost in on-the-job training. Imagine a world where it became more commonplace that staff could execute both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of our practice. Imagine a world where young staff could articulate to clients how question wording or nonresponse or CATI screen design can affect the information produced. To attain this world we’re going to need a new partnership among the commercial, academic, and government branches of our
field. This won't happen working within our own sectors. We need each other to make this work. It is up to us to make this happen.
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Asking Questions about Race, Ethnicity, and Ancestry: Lessons Learned from the 1995 CPS Supplement on Race and Ethnicity
Ruth McKay, Bureau of Labor Statistics

A Flexible Approach to the Measurement of Race and Ethnicity
Judith Schejbal, National Opinion Research Center; Paul J. Lavrakas, Northwestern University Survey Laboratory; and Tom W. Smith, National Opinion Research Center

Question Wording and Partisanship Reexamined: A Preliminary Report
David Moore, Gallup Organization

Discussant: Theresa DeMaio, U.S. Bureau of the Census

AAPOR SESSION—RESEARCH DESIGN ISSUES FOR ESTABLISHMENT SURVEYS

Chair: Janice Ballou, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

Respondent Selection in Mail Surveys of Establishments: Personalization versus Organizational Roles
Carl Ramirez, U.S. General Accounting Office

Increasing Response Rates in Business Surveys: A Split-Half Experiment
Young I. Chun and Kenneth W. Robertson, Bureau of Labor Statistics

The Relationship between Informant Role and Reporting Style
Joan Phillips and Seymour Sudman, University of Illinois

Evaluating Respondent Performance in an Establishment Survey
David Cantor, W. Sherman Edwards, Jeffrey Kerwin, and Kerry Levin, Westat, Inc.

Which Is Better: Grid Listing or Grouped Questions Design for Data Collection in Establishment Surveys?
Laureen Moyer, CSMR, U.S. Bureau of the Census

EXPLORATIONS OF THE THIRD PERSON EFFECT

Chair: Daniel Merkle, Voter News Service

A Social Categorization Model of the Third Person Effect
Mads Stenbjerrre, Stanford University
An Experiment in Mass Media Appeals to Comply with the Law: Variation in the Third Person Effect
Robert Mason, Oregon State University

Public Perceptions of Television Influence and Opinions about Censorship in Singapore
Albert Gunther, University of Wisconsin, and Ang Peng Hwa, Nanyang Technological University

Denying the Holocaust: Third-Person Effects and Decisions to Publish a Controversial Advertisement
Vincent Price, Li-Ning Huang, and David Tewksbury, University of Michigan
Discussant: Doris A. Graber, University of Illinois at Chicago

TRANSLATION AND OTHER CHALLENGES OF CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCH
Chair: Ann Brunswick, Columbia University

A Study of Infant Mortality among Puerto Ricans
Karl R. Landis, Institute for Survey Research, Temple University

Methodological Challenges in Measuring the Behavior and Attitudes of Hispanic Consumers in the United States
Horst Stüpp, NBC, and M. Isabel Valdes, Hispanic Market Connections

Robert Patchen and Marla D. Cralley, Arbitron Company

Meaning and the Eyes of the Beholders: Translating Survey Items
Janet Harkness, ZUMA, and Alisu Schoua Glusberg, Research Support Services

Learning How to Ask: Some Lessons from Cross-Cultural Interview Research for Surveys in a Multicultural Society
Matt T. Salo, U.S. Bureau of the Census

ROUNDTABLE SESSIONS

Introductory Scripts for Surveys
Vincent Parker, University of Illinois at Chicago, and Elizabeth A. Severns, University of Illinois

Practical Considerations for Cognitive Interviewing
Diane O’Rourke, University of Illinois; Timothy Johnson, University of Illinois; and Rachel Caspar, Research Triangle Institute

The Impact of Religion on Public Opinion
Daniel A. Stout, Brigham Young University, and JoAnn Valenti, Brigham Young University

Ethical Survey Practice—Surveying Policies and Procedures
John Kennedy, Indiana University, and Beth Webb, University of Maryland

Alfred J. Tuchfarber, Institute for Policy Research

The American Community Survey: The Future Vehicle for Collecting Small Area Data Every Year
Preston Jay Waite, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Pretesting Survey Questionnaires: New Techniques and Changing Practices
Jennifer Rothgeb and Elizabeth Martin, CSMR, U.S. Bureau of the Census

PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT PUBLIC OPINION AND POLLING
Organizer and Chair: Al Gollin, Freedom Forum Media Studies Center

Asking Respondents to Estimate Public Opinion: Who Can Do It and How Accurate Are They?
Daniel Merkle, Voter News Service, and Paul J. Lavrakas, Northwestern University
CMOR Refusal Rates and Industry Image Studies
Harry O'Neill, Roper Starch Worldwide
Further Experiments on Presentation of Survey Findings in Newspaper Stories
Peter Miller and Michael Roloff, Northwestern University
Polls on Polls: An Update
Alec M. Gallup, Gallup Organization

ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE SCALES
Chair: Linda Piekarski, Survey Sampling, Inc.
Measuring the Intensity of Response Categories
Tom W. Smith, National Opinion Research Center
Rating Scales and Question Interpretation: When the Numbers and Graphics Tell You What the Words Don't
Norbert Schwarz, Carla Grayson, and Bärbel Knäuper, University of Michigan; and Michaela Wänke, University of Heidelberg
The Unfinished Business of Designing Response Scales in an Applied Research Setting
Wendy Davis, Tracy Wellens, and Theresa J. DeMaio, U.S. Bureau of the Census
Discussant: John P. Katosh, Mathew Greenwald & Associates, Inc.

EVALUATING THE UTILITY OF COGNITIVE METHODS FOR DESIGNING QUESTIONNAIRES
Chair: Karen Bogen, CSMR, U.S. Bureau of the Census
How Well Do Question Evaluation Techniques Predict Test-Retest Reliability?
Jennifer Hess, U.S. Bureau of the Census, and Eleanor Singer, University of Michigan
Cognitive Design—Improved Accuracy or Increased Measurement Error—a Mixed-Mode Comparison of Behavioral and Attitudinal Questions
Todd Rockwood, CORC, University of Minnesota, and Rodney K. Baxter, Washington State University
Getting the Truth in Evaluation Reinterviews: Results of a Study to Compare Cognitively Designed Reinterview and Reconciled Reinterview
Rachel Caspar and Paul Biemer, Research Triangle Institute
Discussant: Roger Tourangeau, National Opinion Research Center

RACE AND INTEGRATION IN CONTEXT
Chair: Charlotte Steeh, University of Michigan
Attitudes of Minority Residents of the Gold Coast, Fairfield County, Connecticut, before the Simpson Verdict
Kurt Schlichting, Fairfield University
The Difference between Black and Brown: Explanations of Racial Economic Inequality
Lawrence Bobo, Russell Sage Foundation, and James R. Kluegel, University of Illinois
America’s Reaction to the O. J. Simpson Trial
Frank Newport and Lydia Saad, Gallup Organization
Discussant: Tall Mendelberg, Princeton University

DISCUSSION PANEL—THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
Organizer and Chair: Richard A. Kulka, Research Triangle Institute
EVALUATING VALIDITY

Chair: John P. Katosh, Mathew Greenwald & Associates, Inc.

Can Participating in a Panel Sample Introduce Bias into Trend Estimates?
Michael Battaglia, Abt Associates; Elizabeth R. Zell and Pamela Ching, Centers for Disease Control

The Impact of Interviewer Characteristics on Cocaine Use Underreporting by Male Juvenile Arrestees
Michael Fendrich, Timothy Johnson, and Joseph Wislar, University of Illinois at Chicago

Testing the Validity of Public Assistance Surveys with Administrative Records
Wei Yen and Harold Nelson, Office of Financial Management

Checking Up on Respondents: A Voter Turnout Validation Study of the 1992 Election
Lydia Saad and Andy Anderson, Gallup Organization

Discussant: William Nicholls, U.S. Bureau of the Census

RESPONSE ORDER EFFECTS: IDENTIFYING PATTERNS AND CORRELATES

Chair: Sheldon R. Gawiser, Gawiser Associates, Inc.

When Poor Memory Makes for Good Data (and When Not)—Age and Response Effects in Attitude Measurement
Barbel Knauper, ISR, University of Michigan

Standing the Test of Time: Aging and Response Order Effects
Andrew E. Smith and George Bishop, University of Cincinnati

Direction of Comparison Effects: Fact or Artifact?
Michaela Wänke, Universität Heidelberg

Public Policy Questions and Response Order: Prevalence of the Recency Effect
David Moore and Frank Newport, Gallup Organization

Discussant: Alfred J. Tuchfarber, Institute for Policy Research, University of Cincinnati

METHODS TO INCREASE RESPONSE RATES

Chair: Karin Clissold, Columbia University

The Effect of Questionnaire Length on Response Rates—a Review of the Literature
Karen Bogen, CSMR, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Increasing Response Rates and Data Quality in Personal Interview Surveys without Increasing Costs: An Application of CQI to the NHSDA
Tom Virag and Brian Burke, Research Triangle Institute

The Effect of Additional Callbacks in a Telephone Survey
Robert Baumgartner and Bryan K. Ward, Hagler Bailly Consulting, Inc.

Arbitron's Methods for Improving the Survey Response of Young Males
Jennifer Novak, Arbitron Company

Using Advance Letters in an RDD Telephone Survey
R. Paul Moore and Kathryn L. Dowd, Research Triangle Institute

INTERVIEWER TRAINING AND FIELD SUPPORT FOR CAPI SURVEYS

Chair: Larry Cohen, SRI

Training Interviewers at Home on CAPI: Measuring the Effectiveness of Westat's On-Line Tutorial CAPITRAIN as a Home Study Training Tool
Debbie Bittner and Ben Gill, Westat, Inc.

The Perils and Promise of CAPI: The View from Field Support
Robert Wager and Shawn Marsh, National Opinion Research Center Affiliates

How Far Is Too Far? Balancing the Technological and Human Limits of Computer-Assisted Interviewing
Mark Wojcik and Julie Ingels, National Opinion Research Center
An Alternate Model of Case Management for Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing
Lisa Thalji, University of Chicago; Mark S. Wojcik and Brian C. Young, National Opinion Research Center
Discussant: Reginald Baker, Market Strategies, Inc.

SHORT COURSE—A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT FOR THE SURVEY RESEARCHER
Michael Weeks, Research Triangle Institute

RACIAL ATTITUDES
Chair: Murray Edelman, Voter News Service
Public Opinion about Affirmative Action
Stephen Earl Bennett, Eric Rademacher, Alfred Tuchfarber, and Andrew E. Smith, University of Cincinnati
Across the Great Divide: Examining Black-White Differences in Political Attitudes
Robert W. Oldendick, Michael W. Link, and C. Blease Graham, University of South Carolina
Maria Krysan, Pennsylvania State University
Cohort Effects on Racial Attitudes: Does the Topic of the Question Make a Difference?
Charlotte Steeh, University of Michigan
Discussant: Lawrence Bobo, Russell Sage Foundation

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS ABOUT HEALTH AND SAFETY
Chair: Judith A. Schejbal, National Opinion Research Center
Trends in HIV/AIDS-Related Knowledge and Testing, 1987–1994: Data from the National Health Interview Survey
John Anderson, Division of STD/HIV Prevention, and Ronald W. Wilson, National Center for Health Statistics
People's Trust in Official Health Agencies as AIDS Information Sources: What People Perceive Medical Experts Say and What They Actually Believe
Nurit Guttman, UMDNJ, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School; Daria Boccher-Lattimore, UMDNJ; and Charles T. Salmon, Michigan State University
IssueTrack/USA: Measuring the Impact of Events on Public Perceptions of Product Safety and Health
Barry Feinberg, Audits & Surveys Worldwide
Getting Behind the Numbers on Access to Care
Karen Donelan, Harvard School of Public Health; Craig A. Hill, National Opinion Research Center; and Robert J. Blendon, Harvard School of Public Health
Discussant: Mollyann Brodie, Kaiser Family Foundation

POLITICS, ELECTIONS, AND VOTING
Chair: Susan H. Pinkus, Los Angeles Times
The Rise of Mail Ballot Voting in California
Mark DiCamillo, Field Institute
Defining the Religious Right: Issues of Self-Identification and Measurement of Political Groups
Cheryl Arnedt, CBS News
African American Realignment: 1937–1965
Daniel Dowd, Yale University
Neighborhood and Community Context Effects on Voter Turnout: A Case Study in Baltimore, Maryland, and Bridgeport, Connecticut
Kurt Schlichting, Fairfield University; Peter Tuckel, Hunter College, City University of New York; and Richard Maisel, New York University
Discussant: Adam Clymer, New York Times

ASSESSING THE EFFECTS OF NONRESPONSE—AND REFUSAL CONVERSION

Chair: Rajesh Srinivasan, Gallup Organization
The Effects of Coverage and Nonresponse Bias in the Measure of Past Week Newspaper Readership
Sue Greer, Behavioral Science Research Corporation, and Virginia Dodge Fielder, Knight Ridder, Inc.
The Effect of Refusal Conversions on Survey Estimates
Pamela Rathbun and Robert M. Baumgartner, Hagler Bailly Consulting, Inc.
Lies, Damn Lies, and Response Rates: The Noncooperation Effect in Telephone Survey Research
Scott Goold, University of New Mexico
Initial Cooperators versus Converted Refusers: Are There Response Behavior Differences?
Johnny Blair, Timothy Triplett, Teresa Hamilton, and Yun-Chiao Kang, University of Maryland
Discussant: Donald Cundy, Decisions Research

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING—OF SURVEY RESPONSE

Chair: Charles D. Cowan, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
The Effects of Question Wording on Survey Responses: A Review of Recent Polling
George Pettinico, University of Connecticut
The Effect of Length of Recall on the Quality of Survey Data: A Meta-Analytic Approach
Nancy Mathiowetz, JPSM, University of Maryland, and Linda Stinson, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Ambiguity in Survey Questions
Matthew Berent, Idaho State University
Does Decomposition Improve the Accuracy of Behavioral Frequency Reports?
Robert Belli, Norbert Schwarz, and Eleanor Singer, University of Michigan
Discussant: Roberta L. Sangster, Bureau of Labor Statistics

AUDIO COMPUTER-ASSISTED SELF-INTERVIEWING

Organizer and Chair: Allen Duffer, Research Triangle Institute
Telephone Audio-CASI and Surveys of Sensitive Behaviors
Timothy Smith, Charles F. Turner, Heather Miller, Phillip C. Cooley, Susan M. Rogers, and Lori Von Colln, Research Triangle Institute
Interviewer-Respondent-Computer Interaction in a CAPI Survey
Allen Duffer, Jutta Thornberry, and Janice Kelly, Research Triangle Institute
Audio-CASI in Personal Interview Surveys
Susan Rogers, Barbara Forsyth, Heather Miller, Charles Turner, and Tim Smith, Research Triangle Institute
Survey Measurement of Sensitive Behaviors Using Audio-CASI
Charles Turner, Heather Miller, and Barbara Forsyth, Research Triangle Institute

SLIPPERY OPINIONS OR SQUISHY MEASUREMENT? EXPLORING ARTIFACTS OF CONTEXT AND COGNITION

Chair: Jennifer Rothgeb, CSMR, U.S. Bureau of the Census
Knowledge of and Attitudes toward the Death Penalty and Rehabilitation: Artifact or Effect?
Patricia Moy, Jack M. McLeod, William P. Eveland, Jr., and Dietram A. Scheufele, University of Wisconsin—Madison
Geographic Context, Information Sources, and the Meaning of Responses to the "Number One Problem" Item
Paul Lavrakas, Northwestern University Survey Lab, and Judith A. Schejbal, National Opinion Research Center

The Effects of Recalling Consumer Experiences on Satisfaction Judgments
Barbara Bickart, Rutgers University

Question Order Effects for Ranking and Rating Questions: Comparison between Mail and Telephone Mode of Survey Administration
Todd Rockwood, CORC-University of Minnesota

Discussant: R. Kelly Myers, University of New Hampshire

PUBLIC OPINION AND PUBLIC POLICY

Chair: Sandra Bauman, Roper Starch Worldwide

Jump-Starting School Reform: Can Public Opinion Force Change?
Floyd Ciruli, Ciruli Associates, Inc.

Who Listens When America Speaks? Constituent Representation on Environmental Issues in the Senate
Amy Richardson, Princeton University

Anne Hildreth, University at Albany, State University of New York

Making Major Changes in the Health Care System: Public Opinion Parallels between Two Recent Debates
Robert Blendon and John M. Benson, Harvard School of Public Health

Discussant: Kurt Lang, University of Washington

EFFECTS OF INTRODUCTIONS AND INCENTIVES ON RESPONSE RATES

Chair: Cecilie Gaziano, Research Solutions

Exploring the Impact of Survey Introductions
Pamela Campanelli, Survey Methods Centre, Social and Community Planning Research; Nick Moon, NOP Research, London; and Patrick Sturgis, Survey Methods Centre, Social and Community Planning Research

Introductory Interactions in Telephone Surveys and Nonresponse
Mick P. Couper and Robert M. Groves, JPSM, University of Michigan

The Effect of Incentives on Response Rates in Face-to-Face, Telephone, and Mixed-Mode Surveys
Nancy Gebler, Eleanor Singer, Trivellore E. Raghunathan, and Kate McGonagle, Survey Methodology Program, University of Michigan

Incentives and Response Rates: A Classic Experiment with Physicians
Craig Hill and Krishna L. Winfrey, National Opinion Research Center

Discussant: Robert Baumgartner, Hagler Bailly Consulting, Inc.

SURVEYS ON SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Organizer: Dianne Rucinski, University of Chicago

Chair: Eleanor Gerber, CSMR, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Accessing an Injecting Drug User Population
Albert Pach III, Julia Silhan Ingels, and Ellen Kaplowitz, National Opinion Research Center

Videotaping Neighborhoods
Woody Carter, Jody Dougherty, and Karen Grigorian, National Opinion Research Center

Confronting the Challenges of Data Collection in Distressed Public Housing
Vicky Gwiasda, University of Illinois; Susan J. Popkin, Abt Associates; and Elise Martel, University of Illinois
Identifying Recipients of Housing Assistance through Survey Questions
Dianne Rucinski and Leslie Athey, National Opinion Research Center; and Laurent Hodes, Department of Housing and Urban Development

DISCUSSION PANEL—DOES THE PRESS DRIVE OR MIRROR PUBLIC OPINION?
Organizer: David Fan, University of Minnesota
Panelists: David Fan, University of Minnesota; Shanto Iyengar, University of California; Leo Jeffres, Cleveland State University; Vincent Price, University of Michigan; and Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Institut for Demoskopie Allensbach, Germany
The annual membership meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) was called to order by outgoing president Robert Groves at 3:35 P.M., with approximately 85 members in attendance.

**Report of the president.** Dr. Groves began with comments about the last 2 years of discussions by the AAPOR Council concerning issues facing the organization. He noted that in September 1994 the council had discussed what was liked and not liked about AAPOR, what was not known, and what needed to be known. One result was an article by Andy Kohut that described four issues facing AAPOR. They included (1) concern that AAPOR is not visible on the national scene; (2) concerns about inclusiveness and diversity, and the recognition that members from commercial, academic, government, and nonprofit organizations are each important parts of AAPOR for which we provide a common meeting place; (3) the nature of our standards and enforcement practices; and (4) continuing education and development for ongoing professionalization of the membership.

One result of these discussions by the council was to conduct a survey of membership for the first time in about 15 years. In response to visibility concerns, a public affairs officer was appointed. Discussions are continuing about the nature of this position and what actions should be taken to increase our national visibility.

Groves also reported that the council has passed some standards statements on push polls and other abuses of survey research methods. Progress is being made slowly and deliberately, but the council has decided not to make major changes in standards enforcement. However, he noted that the council decided in its meeting earlier in the week to streamline procedures on enforcement. It also approved a statement on good and bad survey practices.

On the issue of inclusiveness, concern was expressed that we are losing younger commercial members. A key finding of the survey is that this concern may not be as much of a problem as we had thought.

Concerning the fourth issue, the first step has been taken to beef up our didactic and continuing education offerings, and to offer them both at the beginning and at the end of the annual conference.

**Nomination and elections.** President Groves announced that the following individuals had been elected to office in AAPOR for the coming year:
Vice President and President-Elect—James Beniger
Associate Secretary-Treasurer—Mark Schulman
Associate Conference Chair—Murray Edelman
Councillor-at-Large—Michael Kagay
Associate Standards Chair—Clyde Tucker
Associate Chair, Membership and Chapter Relations—Susan Pinkus
Associate Chair, Publications and Information—Robert Daves

Secretary-treasurer. Outgoing secretary Mathiowetz reported that the organization appears to be in good financial shape, while noting that this is a difficult time of year to balance books because of the conference being a major source of income and expense. She noted that we attempt to keep about 1 year’s operating budget ahead, and that our current assets amount to $220,000. She noted that unusual expenditures this year included $4,000 for the membership survey and $5,000 for the upcoming INTERCASIC conference. Two years ago about $14,000 was allocated for the anniversary celebration, and it appears the total cost will be somewhat less. She also noted that the didactic educational series has been shifted from being a conference expense to a separate line item in the budget.

Conference chair. Jack Ludwig expressed his thanks to his employer for supporting his work on this conference; Marlene Bednarz, who provided tremendous help from the AAPOR Secretariat; and numerous other people. He received 271 proposals for inclusion in the program, 80 percent of which were accepted for presentation in 2 plenaries, 7 roundtables, 19 poster presentations, 159 paper presentations in 42 sessions, and 4 short courses. There were 454 participants (both AAPOR and WAPOR). A total of 568 people registered, of which 112 were first-time attendees. Next year’s conference will be at the Waterside Marriott in Norfolk, Virginia. Paul Lavrakas added his thanks to many other people who helped with local arrangements.

Nancy Belden asked, in the interest of inclusiveness, whether tracking was being done by the type of presenter so that we could see how well we were doing in this regard. Jack Ludwig said he was not sure. However, he also noted that this year’s conference seemed to be a little bit higher on methodological papers than in the past.

President Groves reminded members that Paul Lavrakas and Dawn Von Thurn were working together as chair and future chair to provide continuity on the important work of local arrangements. Wolfgang Donsbach, president of WAPOR, asked whether plans had been made for future programs, noting that it was unusual for AAPOR to be meeting in a midtown hotel. Lavrakas indicated that AAPOR is seeking a resort location in the middle part of the United States for the 1998
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meeting. He also indicated that Florida would be the logical place in 1999.

A straw poll was taken on preferences for a resort (29–34), downtown location (11), and no preference between the two locations (32) as locations for future meetings. It was observed that this poll only included people in the room and should be interpreted accordingly.

Standards committee. Eleanor Singer gave a short report indicating that the council had debated the role of AAPOR standards enforcement. She noted that the council voted to keep standard enforcement but also attempted to develop a statement on good and bad survey practices. Dick Kulka distributed a statement on best practices. A companion statement on practices that AAPOR condemns was also passed out. These will be distributed to members in various ways. Kulka, Groves, and Edelman were thanked for their work in putting these statements together. Singer reported that she had sent out several letters to those who were thought to have violated the AAPOR code. One formal standards case is now before the committee and will be resolved during the coming year.

Bob Lee asked whether the council had considered being more aggressive in getting this information out to the press. Singer responded that no specific plans had been made.

She also indicated that a streamlining of enforcement procedures had been approved by the council, and that this would be distributed to AAPOR members. It will be printed in booklet form. The main effect is to streamline procedures by eliminating a preliminary review committee.

Membership and chapter relations. Groves observed that Karen Goldenberg had taken the lead on the survey and provided very important leadership in implementing it. Carolee Bush reported that as of today we have 1,344 members, up slightly from 1,317 members last year. Overall, membership has been stable the past several years. A session yesterday reported results from the member survey. It was noted that the ballot initiative allowing the New York chapter to elect chapter officers who are not members of AAPOR had been approved by the AAPOR membership. Bush also reported that the annual chapter representative luncheon was held, and she felt that the conference buddies program was appreciated by first-time attendees.

Groves reported that a council meeting was held with the Midwest Chapter of the American Association of Public Opinion Research (MAAPOR) at its twentieth annual meeting in Chicago. He also noted that a New England chapter had been formed with much enthusiasm from its members.

Publications. Murray Edelman reported that activities of this committee had expanded to building a website and thanked Herb Abelman
for this important work. He reported that we are attempting to get “aapor.org” as the address for our website. The website will be expanded to include a number of services, including council decisions, a membership directory, local chapter information, an AAPOR conference page, the ethics code, and other services.

He said that AAPORnet has approximately 800 subscribers, and the council continues to discuss its role. He noted that Diane O’Rourke reported on the Bluebook and that we had made a significant profit on it during the last year. It was also mentioned that, in response to the membership survey, the newsletter would be changed to include more issues important to the profession.

Edelman also noted that the fiftieth-anniversary book had been published and expressed appreciation to Mike Traugott for his leadership on the project. A question was asked about whether we could get Public Opinion Quarterly and other services onto the website. It was requested from the audience that information be put into the newsletter on how to access the website.

President Groves noted that the council was now interacting extensively by a listserv, thus enabling it to act more quickly than in the past.

Public Opinion Quarterly. Stanley Presser reported that a special issue of POQ on race was being put together, with Larry Bobo as editor, and that good progress was being made. He also reported that POQ submissions were up slightly this year to 126, which is consistent with recent years. He reported that the acceptance rate is running around 13–14 percent and the median time for first decision on externally reviewed new manuscripts was 59 days. He also reported that subscriptions were down slightly from 4,319 to 4,290.

Presser expressed his appreciation to the editorial board members and referees, without whom the journal could not operate. He also reported that he is now completing the third year of his 4-year term as editor, and that the advisory committee must make recommendations for a new editor who would take office after next year’s annual meeting.

Larry Bobo, chair of the advisory committee, asked the membership to make nominations for editor of the journal and to do so quickly so that continuity could be maintained. The committee hopes to make a recommendation to the council by November 22, 1996, the time of the second council meeting for the coming year.

Ad hoc committee on response rate definitions. Tom Smith reported that the committee is working on a set of classifications for all cases in surveys that can then be used to calculate carefully defined response rates. The goal is to create a set of response rate standards that can be promulgated by AAPOR. The committee has several members.
New business. The 1997 conference will be in Norfolk, Virginia, May 14-18.

A question was asked about where we stood on producing a careers brochure. Bob Groves said work on that would begin next year.

Jack Elison, the one member of AAPOR in attendance at this year’s meeting who was also at Central City, was recognized with a warm round of applause.

Dr. Groves welcomed our incoming president, Diane Colasanto, and wished her well during the coming year.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:45 p.m.

DON A. DILLMAN
Secretary-Treasurer