Some Issues
of Research Quality

HELEN J. KAUFMANN

I WANT to talk about issues having to do with the quality of research—including issues having to do with the quality of the grubby details, the minutiae that make up research. I would like to focus on some of the things that strike me as particularly bothersome and that I believe we researchers need to address.

To jump right into the fray, let me start with the issue of:

Fieldwork and Interviewing

Complaints about this subject are unending—such hand-wringing, such moaning about the shortcomings of interviewers and interviewing, the need for better controls, et cetera, et cetera. But isn't that all kind of ridiculous?! Few of us know what it's like to do interviewing nowadays and many have never done *any*. How often do you or I go out to ring doorbells, stop people at shopping centers, or interview on the telephone with a questionnaire or via cathode ray tube. How many of us realize that some of the things we are asking interviewers to do are preposterous and even undoable?

Interviewing, on which we rely so much, somehow seems to be beneath us, a lowly task to be performed mostly part-time by housewives, students, unemployed actors, and the like. To be sure, there *are* individuals and organizations that are truly cognizant of field problems and provide excellent training. But this is not the case for a great many of us, including those of us who write questionnaires.

Helen J. Kaufmann, Executive Director, Corporate Research, Clairol, Inc., was President of AAPOR in 1980–81. This is an adapted version of her presidential remarks at AAPOR's 36th Annual Conference.

If we want better interviewing, we will have to lift this phase of research from the level of a disagreeable chore requiring just a bit of preparation and skill to a level with professional status. Why not provide special schooling for interviewing with a regimen of required courses leading to a degree or certificate? Maybe interviewers should even be licensed. At the very least, interviewers must be drawn into more participation in the research process, with more orientation of why they should do what we ask them to do and with more alerting to what to watch out for. And I don't mean training that says you must "probe" and "probe" and "probe." Probe? For what?

We all acknowledge that interviewing provides the very core of everything we study, analyze, report, base our conclusions on. It is high time we did more than pay lip service to this truth.

Scales and Their Construction

Among the many issues of questionnaire development, the construction of scales and the meaning of scale values seem to me to be particularly deserving of attention. The area of scaling has become even more crucial than it has been all along, because of the increased computerization of questionnaires and the increasing use of multivariate statistics.

In this connection, one of the things I'd like to comment on is item selection. Increasingly, or so it seems to me, there is a tendency to phrase everything in one direction—either all positive statements or all negative ones. Say it's an agree-disagree scale—the goal is to have *agree* always have a positive meaning and *disagree* always to have a negative one. But this doesn't always work. That is most clearly evident in the case of controversial issues and other matters on which there are differing points of view.

Take, for example, something like feelings about smoking. If we want to know about attitudes toward smoking, or level of commitment to smoking, we will have to include items that reflect the opinions of those who smoke and another set of items reflecting the opinions of those who don't. The opinions of nonsmokers are not simply the obverse of the opinions of smokers. If nonsmokers agree that smoking is bad for the health, and smokers disagree, it doesn't follow that smokers feel smoking is good for their health. They don't smoke because it's good for their health, they smoke, I suppose, because they feel that smoking helps them to cope.

Whether it is smoking, or abortion, or nuclear energy or something less emotionally laden, the attempt to have everything read in the same direction can sometimes lead to questions that become hard to

answer and hard to interpret (as when one needs to resort to double negatives). It may distort reality and may fail to reflect the positions of groups holding differing opinions.

Another area which could use more reevaluation is the presumption of a continuum of opinions or beliefs arrayed as along a normal curve. With this goes, by definition, a presumption of symmetry. When attitudes are measured with word scales or rating scales, the assumption is that if only we can find similar words, they should be assigned similar weights. In many ways, this goes back to the age-old discussions of equal intervals and other concerns of attitude measurement. But the practice of assigning equal weights has become even more widespread than it used to be.

In the area of market research, for example, interest in an idea, a product, or an advertising communication is almost universally and routinely measured by an "intent-to-buy" question. It goes something like this: "How likely are you to buy——? Would you say you will definitely buy——, that you will probably buy——, that you might or might not buy——, that you probably will not buy—— or that you definitely will not buy——?" The question itself has limitation—is that really how we think about buying products? And what does "might or might not" mean? Is it any different from "I don't know?" But, more important, "definitely will buy" is as a rule given the same weight— say a +2—as "definitely will not buy"—say a −2. That is, each in a sense, weighs a couple of ounces.

But in our society, to say "no," especially in relation to products and innovations, has far more potency than to say "yes." If someone says, "No, I definitely won't buy this," he or she may in effect have taken a far stronger stance than if the response is definitely yes. So why not give the "no" response a greater weight (say 4 or 5 ounces) than we give to the corresponding "yes" response? And the same goes for other rating scales. "Poor" is a far rarer response, almost no matter what the issue, than is "good" or even "excellent." In many other areas, too, rejection is less common than acceptance. By a ratio of two or even three to one, people will more often cite things they like about a product or service than they will cite things they do not like.

Assorted techniques to resolve these problems have been developed.[1] But for the most part, in our questioning and in our interpreta-

---

[1] For example, as reported by Diana Stover Tillinghast, "Direct magnitude estimation scales in public opinion surveys," Public Opinion Quarterly (Fall 1980) 44:377–84, or the article on optimum allocation statistics by Solomon Dutka and Lester R. Frankel, "Let's not forget about response error," Modern Marketing Series #12, Audits & Surveys, 1976.

tion of responses, we continue the quest for symmetry and we are reluctant to accept lopsided reality and to work our data accordingly.

The Electronic Era

Now I'd like to turn to some of the implications of the electronic era. Inevitably, one needs to touch on the subject of computers. They are a godsend, so long as we run them and they don't run us.

That may have become a trite observation by now, but it is awfully hard to resist the wealth of information—useful and useless—the computer can grind out. It's important not to drown in that sea of information but to try to swim in it and take advantage of some of the computer capabilities. In tab specs, for instance, some nifty near-miracles can be achieved by doing summary runs in the form one is likely not only to look at data but also to present or report on them.

The computer has much to do with our mania for numbers. There seems to be a fair amount of truth to a statement I heard attributed to Senator Moynihan: "Americans don't think something counts, if it can't be counted." Increasingly, I believe, we tend to express things in quantitative terms, in ratios, in percentages, in numbers. It really is as if things were more real, more factual, if they can be numerically pinned down.

In some ways, computers have sparked the development of what might be termed instant research. You have a problem or a question—get it on a Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) or into a Computer Assisted System (CATI). Literally, you can, as I imagine you know, type—or I should say input—a simple questionnaire onto the system this afternoon, do your interviewing tonight, and get printed-out answers tomorrow. Things are presampled, preprogrammed—no sweat. This approach, too, is very tempting. It may lend itself more to asking questions than to doing research, as Merv Field has pointed out, but it is hard to resist. It probably is responsible for at least some of the growth of survey research and public opinion polling. Why guess when presumably we can quite easily get the facts, *know* where things stand.

Needless to say, instant research creates a whole set of its own problems. For example, as a rule, you do not see a person's whole questionnaire. He or she becomes sort of disembodied and distributed among the replies. And, of course, the interviewer does not see what-all a person has said. Even the respondent becomes mechanized. If you listen in on some of the interviews, you can hear how the responses turn from a conversational mode, with whole

sentences, and the desire to explain and clarify, the little stutters and "well's" with all the overtones of question, of uncertainty—you can hear how these get turned off and transformed into the desired staccato, robot-like responses that fit into the neat questionnaire categories of "very," "somewhat," or whatever is called for, which the interviewer can punch on his or her keyboard. Also, questions often are *read* with deadly monotony; they are not asked. (Will we end up with robot interviewers?)

One story which brought the problem home to me had to do with asking people their reasons for using haircoloring. It was a properly organized question, consisting of 10 or 12 items, and the respondent was to say whether or not a given alternative had been important to her—and how important—in deciding to use haircoloring. Well, the interview went along swimmingly and the respondent answered mostly "not important." About half way through the exercise, she was evidently eager to cut through the baloney and broke into the interviewer's litany with the question, "Do you really want to *know* my reason for coloring my hair?" "No" the interviewer replied sharply and proceded to ask the question exactly the way she was supposed to. Well, that respondent had certainly gotten the message—and *we* probably never found out why she really did take up haircoloring. So, the electronized respondent is a new problem.

The digital era has provided neither fuller data nor better data, and perhaps it provides less valid data than we have been obtaining. As has been pointed out again and again, if the researcher did not, to begin with, come up with the more important or the right set of reasons, we might never know what really moves people. And it does not help that often we are not really listening.

Research: Present, Past and Future

So far, my focus has been on where research is at present. As to where research was and where it is going, what it will need in the future, I'm a bit schizoid on the subject. On the one hand, I deplore what I see as the loss of training, of thoroughness, of meticulous attention to detail, of thoughtfulness, of the effort really to understand what is being studied. On the other hand, we cannot keep looking back, we cannot have "the old days" back, we ought to adjust, learn how to live with the contemporary research era, and learn how to take advantage of what it offers.

This seems to me quite a dilemma which, of course, cannot be neatly resolved. But I'd like to plead for a few things even if they

seem from another era and even if I don't exactly know how to attain them.

I'd like to see a rekindling of interest and curiosity in the world around us. What happened to our wondering about what makes people tick? That probably sounds naive, but isn't the essence of our profession precisely that—to explore and assess how people deal with problems, issues, opportunities and why they do what they do? Surely, we haven't run out of topics. Seems to me we continue to have many more questions than we have answers.

Instead, we have moved into a direction which requires tangible, useful, immediately applicable results. Adventures in research and exploration are frowned upon if their findings are not instantly usable. This demand for functionality is, of course, true not only for our field. Think of the space shuttle, for example. All this money, and what does it do for us? What is it good for? These were questions raised over and over. If it weren't for reminders of Teflon and the hinting at military application, out it would have gone long ago. The miracle of the achievement gets only passing attention.

But it is important in our field to ask questions about phenomena around us, to try and discover, to gain knowledge and understanding for their own sakes. Where would we be if James Watt had not been curious about the steam that raised the lid of the kettle or if Faraday had not noticed and pursued the phenomenon of static electricity? Let's not be all that immediate-results oriented. Let's encourage inquiry and curiosity, among ourselves and especially among the people entering our profession.

A lot of exciting and fascinating things *do* remain to be studied.

AAPOR 1981 Conference Program

FIRST PLENARY SESSION:
THE 1980 ELECTION: WHY THE POLLS DIFFERED

CHAIR: Albert H. Cantril, Bureau of Social Science Research
SPEAKERS: Richard B. Wirthlin, Decision Making Information
Warren J. Mitofsky, CBS News
DISCUSSANT: Irving Crespi, Irving Crespi and Associates

PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT THE MILITARY AND DEFENSE

CHAIR: Mady Wechsler Segal, University of Maryland and Walter Reed
Army Institute of Research
Trends in High School Seniors' Views of the Military
Jerald G. Bachman, University of Michigan
American Attitudes Toward Security Issues After Vietnam and Afghanistan
Alvin Richman, U.S. Department of State
West European Security Concerns for the Eighties: Is NATO in Trouble?
Kenneth P. Adler and Douglas A. Wertman, U.S. International
Communication Agency
*Perception of National Security in the U.S. and the Federal Republic of
Germany: Stability and Change in Public Opinion*
Mathias Schoenborn, Sozialwissenschaftlichen Instituts der Bundeswehr
(SOWI), F.R.G.
DISCUSSANT: Kurt Lang, State University of New York, Stony Brook

THE NEW COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

CHAIR: Joseph T. Klapper, CBS
Media Marvels of the Eighties
Marilyn S. Watts, RCA
Marshall McLuhan, James Bond, New Woman, *and the Information Society*
Harold Mendelsohn, University of Denver
The Information Society: Social and Public Policy Implications
Albert E. Gollin, Newspaper Advertising Bureau

QUESTION WORDING AND INTERVIEW EFFECTS

CHAIR: Alfred E. Goldman, National Analysts
Context Effects and the Assessment of Attitude Change
Howard Schuman, University of Michigan
Stanley Presser, University of North Carolina
Jacob Ludwig, University of Michigan
Interviewer Effects in Telephone Surveys
Clyde Tucker, CBS News
Measurement of Respondent Burden
Laure M. Sharp and Joanne Frankel, Bureau of Social Science Research
Question Order and Context Effects in Measuring Political Interest
George F. Bishop, Robert W. Oldendick, Alfred J. Tuchfarber, University
of Cincinnati

Why Do They Say That?: Extensions of Experimentation on Question Wording
Susan A. Stephens, Mathematica Policy Research
Rick Monroe, Indiana University
Sydney Pierce, Emory University

BLACK AMERICA: PERSPECTIVES ON THE 1980s

CHAIR: Jean-Marie B. Mayas, Lawrence Johnson & Associates
Political Status of Black Americans in the 1980s
James S. Jackson, Phillip J. Bowman, Ronald Brown, University of Michigan
Social Psychological Status of Blacks in the 1980s
Phillip J. Bowman, Alida D. Quick, Shirley J. Hachett, James S. Jackson, University of Michigan
*The Effects of Question Wording on Class Identification and Racial Alienation Among Detroit Blacks
Lawrence D. Bobo, University of Michigan
DISCUSSANT: Russell H. Jackson, Mathematica Policy Research

INTERVIEWING BY TELEPHONE

CHAIR: Howard E. Freeman, U.C.L.A
A Methodological Study of Telephone and Face to Face Interviewing
Robert M. Groves, Peter V. Miller, Charles F. Cannell, University of Michigan
On the Appropriateness of Interviewing Older Respondents by Telephone
Richard A. Kulka, Research Triangle Institute
A. Regula Herzog and Willard L. Rodgers, University of Michigan
Quality Improvement and Time Savings Attributed to CATI: Reflections on Eleven Years of Experience
James C. Fink, Chilton Research Services
The Present Status of Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing
J. Merrill Shanks, University of California, Berkeley
DISCUSSANT: Seymour Sudman, University of Illinois

LEADERS, BUREAUCRATS AND MAYBE THE PUBLIC

CHAIR: R. Richard Ritti, Pennsylvania State University
Public Hearings and Public Preferences: The Case of the White House Conference on Families
Michael J. O'Neil, Arizona State University
A Model of Public Opinion Data Use by Local Governments
James Walker and David Karns, Wright State University
Confidence in Institutional Leadership
Lee B. Becker, Ohio State University
Jane D. Brown, University of North Carolina
Opinion Leaders: Is Anyone Following?
Joan S. Black, General Electric

* Student paper award winner.

ROUNDTABLE SESSIONS

Children and Television: New Findings
    Robert Krull, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
    Peter V. Miller, University of Michigan
Networking State Polls
    Cliff Zukin, Rutgers University
Diffusion of News of the Reagan Shooting
    John E. Polich; *The New York Times*
Exit Polls and Pseudo Polls: Public Opinion's Electronic Future?
    Mark Levy, University of Maryland
    Barry Orton, University of Wisconsin Extension
The New Grants (Dis) Economy
    John P. Robinson, University of Maryland

AGENDA SETTING

CHAIR: Paul B. Sheatsley, National Opinion Research Center
Re-examining the Agenda-Setting Hypothesis: An Experimental Approach
    Shanto Iyengar and Mark Peters, Yale University
The Claims for Agenda Setting: Too Much or Too Little?
    Gladys Engel Lang and Kurt Lang, State University of New York, Stony
    Brook
The Agenda-Setting Process and Five Issues: 1948–1976
    James P. Winter, Syracuse University
DISCUSSANT: Lutz Erbring, National Opinion Research Center

SEX, RUM AND POT

CHAIR: Roberta S. Cohen, Bell Telephone Laboratories
Interviewing Respondents in the Commercial Sex Industry
    William Kornblum and Terry Williams, The Graduate School and Univer-
    sity Center, C.U.N.Y.
    Charles Winick, City College, C.U.N.Y.
The Birth of Demon Rum
    Harry Gene Levine, Queens College, C.U.N.Y.
Trends in Opinion Regarding Marijuana Policy
    Eric Josephson, Columbia University

DIDACTIC SESSION: ARIMA TIME SERIES ANALYSIS
AND FORECASTING PUBLIC OPINION

SPEAKERS: Richard Maisel, New York University
          Robin Wunsch, Columbia University

SECOND PLENARY SESSION: ANALYZING EQUALITY:
IS EMPIRICISM ENOUGH?

CHAIR: Fred H. Goldner, Queens College, C.U.N.Y.
SPEAKER: Andrew Hacker, Queens College, C.U.N.Y.
DISCUSSANTS: Ira H. Cisin, George Washington University
             Norman H. Bradburn, University of Chicago

CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

CHAIR: Valentine Appel, Simmons Market Research Bureau
Consumer Behavior in a Time of Uncertainties
    Donald E. Payne, Oxtoby Smith

Public Opinion, Consumer Sentiment, and Advertising
  Franco M. Nicosia, University of California, Berkeley
  Robert Jacobson, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco
A Landmark Use of Survey Evidence in Litigation
  Clark Leavitt, Ohio State University
Public Perceptions of Uses of Mass Communication: An Analysis of Source Credibility
  Franklin R. Carlile and Howard Leonard, Young & Rubicam

MASS MEDIA EFFECTS—RECONSIDERED

CHAIR: Hope Lunin Klapper, New York University
Toward a Paradigm of Television Effects
  George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, Nancy Signorielli, University of Pennsylvania
Public Perceptions and Interpretations of Mass Media Disaster Warnings
  Don D. Smith, University of Iowa
Who Watches How Much Television (or None at All)? Profiles and Changes since 1975
  Paul M. Hirsch and Tom Panelas, University of Chicago

TRENDS IN PUBLIC OPINION:
RACE RELATIONS, AUTHORITARIANISM, AND FLUORIDATION

CHAIR: Naomi Rothwell, Bureau of the Census
Trends in White Racial Attitudes, 1942–1980
  Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, Howard Schuman, University of Michigan
Post World War II Changes in Authoritarianism Among Adolescents in West Germany and the United States
  Gerda Lederer, Scarsdale, New York High School
Trends in Attitudes Toward Fluoridation
  P. Jean Frazier, University of Minnesota

TAKING THE PULSE OF THE ECONOMY:
A FRESH LOOK AT ECONOMIC INDICATORS

CHAIR: Doris A. Graber, University of Illinois
Indicators of Aggregate Consumer Behavior
  Richard T. Curtin, University of Michigan
Consumer as Forecaster
  Fabian Linden, The Conference Board
Consumer Confidence Measurements: Their Predictive Value
  Burns W. Roper, The Roper Organization

UNDERSTANDING RESPONSE RATES

CHAIR: Irving Roshwalb, Audits & Surveys
A Comparison of the Randomized Response Approach and Direct Question Approach to Asking Sensitive Survey Questions
  Ralph E. Folsom, Jr. and Michael F. Weeks, Research Triangle Institute
Informed Consent Procedures in Telephone Interviews: Effects on Response Rate and Item Nonresponse
  Eleanor Singer, Columbia University
  Martin R. Frankel, National Opinion Research Center

Measurement of No Opinion and Nonopinion Responses in Sample Surveys
  Robert Mason and G. David Faulkenberry, Oregon State University
Some Unusual Statistical Aspects of the Nonresponse Problem
  Irving Roshwalb, Audits & Surveys

ROUNDTABLE SESSION

The Role of the Editorial Page in the Public Opinion Process
  Maxwell McCombs and Elsa Mohn, Syracuse University
Computerization and Telephone Interviewing
  Pat Feuhlhart, Bureau of the Census
  Lewis Mandel, University of Connecticut
  Don Trees, The Rand Corporation
Private Polling for Local and Other Elections
  Peter Tuckel, Hunter College
  Kurt Schlichting, Fairfield University
Organized Religion, Media, and the Political Process
  Gillian Lindt, Columbia University
Studying the Urban Homestead Experience
  Diane Porcari and Peter Eleftherakis, Urban Systems Research and En-
  gineering
Sampling Hard-to-Find Populations
  J. Georg Cerf and Audrey McDonald, Mathematica Policy Research
  Diane Colasanto, University of Wisconsin
  Janet D. Griffith, Research Triangle Institute
On Response Rates vs. Self Selection
  Michael Rappeport, RL Associates
Polls and the News Media: The POQ Symposium Revisited
  Albert E. Gollin, Newspaper Advertising Bureau
  David Paletz, Duke University

FOUNDATIONS OF OUR CRAFT:
WHAT IS A QUESTION, WHAT IS AN ANSWER?

CHAIR: Elizabeth Martin, National Academy of Sciences
Questions, Answers, and Social Reality
  Kurt W. Back, Duke University
Basic Principles
  Eric Marder, Eric Marder Associates
Survey Research Meets Cognitive Psychology: Dalliance or Alliance?
  Albert D. Biderman, Bureau of Social Science Research

THE MEANING OF THE 1980 ELECTION

CHAIR: Burns W. Roper, The Roper Organization
PANEL DISCUSSANTS: Everett Ladd, University of Connecticut
                   Adam Clymer, *The New Yok Times*
                   V. Lance Tarrance, Jr., V. Lance Tarrance and
                   Associates

Annual Advisory AAPOR Business Meeting

The annual business meeting was held on May 30, 1981, with Helen J. Kaufmann, retiring president and meeting chair, presiding. The year's activities were reviewed by Council members and committee chairs.

Secretary-Treasurer—Ray Funkhouser reported that AAPOR continues to enjoy sound financial health, with a net worth of approximately $92,000, up from $71,000 the previous year. During the year, the policy of providing complimentary POQ subscriptions to Honorary Life Members was reinstituted. AAPOR secured liability insurance to cover officers and committee members in the event of litigation arising from AAPOR activities. The costs of operating AAPOR continue to increase, and while there is no apparent need to raise dues, it was suggested that costs be continually scrutinized to find ways to keep them down, as long as service to members does not suffer by it.

Nominations—Jack Elinson reported on the results of the election and introduced the new Council members. Burns Roper's election as Vice President left a vacancy in the office of the Standards Committee. Council voted to appoint Barbara Bailar, the newly elected Associate Chair, to this post and to appoint Deborah Hensler, the other candidate for that office, for a one-year term as Associate Chair.

Standards—Mike Rappeport reported that during the year, the Standards Committee had resolved a formal standards complaint to the satisfaction of all parties involved. He noted that 40 to 50 letters per year are received by AAPOR regarding solicitations of funds or sales pitches under the guise of "conducting a survey." AAPOR always responds but has not been very effective. This situation may require further thought and action by the incoming Standards Committee. Rappeport also urged that the Standards Committee continue to pursue the issue of self-selection of sample in "instant polling" by TV networks and newspapers, and in operations such as QUBE.

Conference—Fred Goldner described some of the details of this year's program. Ninety-six papers were submitted, more than double the number submitted last year. Of these, 32 were selected for the program. Fred thanked Warren Mitofsky, Paul Hirsch, and Dorothy Jessop for their help. Fred was congratulated for organizing what was generally agreed to be a fine program.

Membership and Chapter Relations—Joan Black noted that AAPOR membership continued the steady growth trend of the past several years. Retention of current members was slightly higher in 1981 than in previous years, and more members chose to renew in higher dues categories. Each member of AAPOR was sent a membership application and was asked to recruit a new member. In addition, a small recruitment mailing went out in May with a conference program to key people in academic research centers, in research functions in business schools, and to persons concerned with research at major newspapers. Local chapter activities at the conference, coordinated by Pat Fishburne, included an opportunity for each chapter to hold its own meeting at a time scheduled in the conference program. A proposal from local chapters that national AAPOR help them recruit in conjunction with local programs was made too late in the year to be possible in 1980–81. Joan urged that next year's committee undertake this project.

Publications and Information—June Christ reviewed the committee's activities. They ranged from preparation of the Directory of Members to intensive solicitation of listings for the Blue Book Directory of Member Agencies and Organizations and the Conference Program to participation in *POQ* and securing publicity and coverage for the Conference. The number of listings in the Blue Book and the Directory were up this year. Further, John Robinson, the committee's Associate Chair, worked with June and others toward a number of changes in the Newsletter. Barbara Lee will be taking over as Editor, and the new format will include: special reports by Council members; materials from the various chapters; and news from correspondents, each covering a "beat," for example, marketing and organizational research, academic research, media research and research methodology.

Committee of Past Presidents—Irv Crespi delivered the recommendations of the ad hoc committee formed to advise AAPOR as to the most efficacious disposition of surplus net worth. The committee advocates fiscal caution, with AAPOR retaining a reasonably large amount against future contingencies as well as to insure the stability of the dues structure for the next few years. Beyond that, surplus funds might be used for: increasing student participation in AAPOR; special workshops or conferences, possibly in conjunction with the annual conference; and educational activities for journalists and other publics of special interest to AAPOR.

Committee on the History of AAPOR—Donna Charron reported on this ad hoc committee's activities during the year, which included: working to establish a site for AAPOR archives; developing a system

for identifying current archive holdings; inventorying current archive holdings; and communications to raise the "history consciousness" of AAPOR members, with particular emphasis on gathering information from many early AAPOR members.

Site Selection—Almost everybody was delighted to be back at Buck Hill Falls. Jim Fouss reported that next year's conference will be held at the Hunt Valley Inn in Hunt Valley, Maryland.

Helen Kaufmann thanked all Council and committee members for their help during the year. She noted that AAPOR was one of the few professional organizations to express its support of the Bureau of the Census during the recent controversies, having sent letters to the incoming Secretary of Commerce and to the heads of the House and Senate Committees concerned with the census. A motion from the floor was proposed, passed, and discussed urging that AAPOR explore ways to express our considerable concern over the apparently forthcoming changes in levels of federal support for activities that involve survey research.

Respectfully Submitted,
G. Ray Funkhouser
Secretary-Treasurer