



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING/AAPOR ANNUAL CONFERENCE
May 14, 2008
New Orleans, LA

2007-2008 Executive Council Members Present:

Nancy Mathiowetz – President
Richard Kulka – Vice President/President Elect
Robert P. Daves – Past President
Dawn V. Nelson – Secretary/Treasurer
Kate Stewart – Associate Secretary/Treasurer
Frank M. Newport – Conference Chair
Vince Price – Associate Conference Chair (via phone)
Charlotte G. Steeh – Standards Chair
Mary Losch – Associate Standards Chair
Carl Ramirez – Membership and Chapter Relations Chair
Adam Safir – Associate Membership and Chapter Relations Chair
Mark M. Blumenthal – Communications Chair
Mike Brick – Associate Communications Chair
Mark A. Schulman – Sr. Councilor-at-Large
Scott Keeter – Jr. Councilor-at-Large

2008-2009 Executive Council Members Present:

Peter Miller – Vice President/President Elect
John Boyle – Associate Secretary/Treasurer
Michael Link – Associate Conference Chair
Paul Lavrakas – Councilor-at-Large (via phone)
Nancy Whelchel – Associate Membership and Chapter Relations Chair
Stephen Blumberg – Associate Standards Chair
Mike Mokrzycki – Associate Communications Chair (via phone)

Staff Members Present:

Kristin Povilonis – Executive Coordinator
Monica Evans-Lombe – Association Manager

Guests:

Linda Dimitropoulos – Conference Operations Committee Chair
Dave DesRoches – Conference Operations Associate Chair
Dede Gish-Panjada – Sr. Vice President, AMP Management Services
Mollyann Brodie – Education Committee Chair

Absent:

Pat Lewis – Communications Director

I. CALL TO ORDER

Nancy Mathiowetz, President, called the meeting to order at 8:08 a.m. (CST) Wednesday, May 14. She introduced the incoming Executive Council members.

II. RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

Members of the AAPOR Executive Council voted in favor of the following resolutions during the meeting:

1. **RESOLVED** to adopt the minutes from the March 2008 EC meeting. Carl Ramirez moved; Mike Brick seconded; unanimously passed.
2. **RESOLVED** to adopt amicus brief regarding opposition to a motion to compel disclosure of survey respondents written on behalf of AAPOR and CASRO. Dawn Nelson moved; Scott Keeter seconded; unanimously passed.
3. **RESOLVED** to move to have Council suspend its April 2008 decision to terminate *Survey Practice*, pending two points of action to occur by June 15, 2008:
 - a. The Editors of *Survey Practice* will return to AAPOR Executive Council with a formal business plan that needs to include, at a minimum: 1) an organizational structure of roles and responsibilities, 2) budget, 3) multi-year timeline, 4) deliverables, 5) a demonstration of the end product, and 6) a full inventory of already submitted articles and status of each; and
 - b. AAPOR Executive Council will do its due diligence to create an organizational governance structure for *Survey Practice* and its relationship to AAPOR that includes mission statement, reporting, oversight and financial support. Mary Losch moved, Mark Blumenthal seconded; 10 favor; 3 oppose.

The following two motions were made and voted on by the Executive Council during its April conference call. Dawn Nelson, Secretary-Treasurer, asked that they be incorporated into the May minutes as follows:

4. **RESOLVED** that AAPOR encourages John Kennedy to investigate the possibility of publishing *Survey Practice* as a separate online journal with the support of his university; we agree that he is free to use *Survey Practice* as the name of the journal; and we agree that he should ask the authors of the previously submitted manuscripts if they want to publish their articles in this journal. While we encourage these activities, AAPOR will not provide any financial or other substantive support for the activities. John Kennedy and the editors of the journal are not authorized to identify their journal as a product of AAPOR. Mark Blumenthal moved; Kate Stewart seconded; unanimously passed.
5. **RESOLVED** to move to adopt a new edition (5th edition) of the “Standard Definitions” document; subject to changing wording on page 11 from “must” to “should” (so revised sentence will read: “This means the cell-phone answerer should be asked if the phone is used by more than one eligible individual...”). Dick Kulka moved; Scott Keeter seconded; unanimously passed.

III. DECISIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nancy Mathiowetz introduced Dede Gish-Panjada, who is Sr. Vice-President of Management Services at AMP. Dede thanked the group for having her attend its meeting. Dede told the Executive Council that she was there to talk about AAPOR's relationship with AMP. She told the group that AMP values its relationship and partnership with AAPOR, and described how AMP had been pleased to be part of AAPOR's growth since 2002. Dede announced that she is willing to meet with any Executive Council members who would like to discuss the relationship between AMP and AAPOR during the Annual Conference.

IV. DISCUSSION NOTES

A. PRESIDENT'S UPDATE

Nancy Mathiowetz, President, submitted a written report in advance of the meeting (see Appendix of Executive Council Reports). The following items were brought forth for more discussion:

Nancy Mathiowetz updated the Executive Council on the productive year the group had over 2007-2008.

1. New Hampshire primaries were a defining moment for this year's Executive Council. An Ad Hoc Committee was named to review the New Hampshire Primary results. Mike Traugott is chairing the committee and their report will come out later in the summer
2. Education committee's work with the Poynter Institute was a great accomplishment (discussed in more detail under Education Committee's report).
3. A new format for Executive Council meetings was tried this year. Conference calls during months the Council did not meet in person. It will be up to the new Executive Council to decide how to move forward.
4. There was a great deal of outreach to journalists this year and a new endeavor Nancy posted blogs on HuffPo. This received some positive feedback and may be possible to continue in the future.
5. There were a great deal of "behind the scenes" marketing efforts for the Annual Conference by Nancy Mathiowetz and Pat Lewis, AAPOR Communications Director. Specifically, chairs and professors from local universities were contacted.
6. The creation of a Strategic Marketing Committee was sidetracked by the New Hampshire primary but will be taken up by Dick Kulka the incoming President.

Rob Daves stated that Nancy Mathiowetz had done a great job of shepherding the organization.

B. SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT

Dawn Nelson, Secretary-Treasurer, reviewed the activities of the year:

1. Dawn informed the Executive Council that she and Kate Stewart, Associate Secretary-Treasurer, visited AMP and reclassified the operating and conference budgets. Now we have a new financial structure in place.
2. The Executive Council used a consent agenda on a trial basis throughout the year. A consent agenda allows committee members to submit written reports for items that do not need to be voted on or need discussion. The new Council will need to decide whether to continue this practice.

3. SharePoint was used by the Executive Council members to archive information and post documents for distribution, such as agenda item reports.
4. The structure of the meeting minutes was revised. Instead of doing detailed, verbatim minutes, we moved to more action-oriented minutes with a “to do” list posted with action items soon after calls or meetings.
5. An audit was performed in 2008 of the 2007 AAPOR financials. AAPOR received “an unqualified audit rating,” which is good.
6. An investment policy for AAPOR was voted on and approved last September. The investment policy is conservative. It was noted that due to the uncertainty of the economy, many of AAPOR’s bonds are being called in early. This will require careful monitoring of bonds.
7. Dawn requested Executive Council approval of the March 2008 Executive Council meeting minutes (see Resolution #1 above).

C. CONFERENCE PROGRAM AND CONFERENCE OPERATIONS REPORT

Frank Newport, Conference Chair updated the Executive Council on the Conference Chair’s activities throughout the year:

1. A post-conference evaluation will be done. Associate Conference Chair Vince Price is handling that evaluation.
2. The 2008 Annual Conference was the last year of a 2-year experiment on a longer conference. Frank told the Executive Council that continuing with the longer format will have to be evaluated and will be addressed in the post-conference evaluation.
3. A new approach to the plenary session was instituted in 2008. The plenary session was held in the afternoon (4 PM) instead of being held at night as in the past.
4. A session on the New Hampshire Primaries was being held.
5. Frank stated that many of the abstracts submitted for 2008 were more toward methodological issues than in past years. Thinking about the future, Frank reminded Council that Conference committee is traditionally very generous in accepting submissions. The benefits are having more people present and take part in the conference. However, in the future AAPOR may consider having a more rigorous evaluation of papers as an alternative to the current procedure.

Linda Dimitropoulos, Conference Operations Chair, updates Executive Council:

1. Linda stated that AAPOR had planned events during its Annual Conference to help “give back” to New Orleans. Two Women of the Storm Tours are being offered that invite people to tour disaster-stricken parts of New Orleans. Local musicians whose livelihoods were affected by Hurricane Katrina were hired to provide music at different conference events/receptions. The AAPOR backpacks, those donated back from meeting attendees and the overage, will be donated to the New Orleans school district. It was noted that these activities required a lot of effort.
2. Linda also updated the Executive Council on the status of the cancellation of the 2009 hotel meeting contract with the Harbor Beach Marriott Hotel in Ft. Lauderdale, FL and the signing of a new 2009 hotel meeting contract with the Westin Diplomat Resort and Spa in Hollywood, FL with overflow at the nearby Crowne Plaza. The cancellation of the 2009 contract resulted from the hotel’s failure to construct a large ballroom, which AAPOR needed for its events.
3. Linda thanked David DesRoches, Associate Conference Operations Chair, for his work on the Docent Program. There were over 200 new meeting attendees.
4. About \$95,000 was garnered from Annual Meeting Sponsorships in 2008.

D. STANDARDS REPORT

Charlotte Steeh, Standards Chair, and Mary Losch, Associate Standards Chair, updated the Executive Council on their activities:

1. Mary asked that the new Amicus Brief regarding opposition to a motion to compel disclosure of survey respondents written on behalf of AAPOR and CASRO be approved (see Resolution #2 above).
2. Charlotte informed the Executive Council that the Cell Phone Task Force Report, approved by the Executive Council at its March meeting, was posted on the AAPOR Web site. She said a press release and a blast e-mail were sent to AAPOR members regarding that report. A session on the report is scheduled to take place at the Annual Meeting. She noted that Paul Lavrakas, Chair of the Cell Phone Task Force, did a great job of keeping everyone organized and on track with that report. There is a request to put the report into a question and answer format.
3. A new Conflict of Interest Disclosure Policy for the Executive Council and conference presenters is now in place.
4. A revised Standard Definitions booklet has been posted on the AAPOR Web site. Tom Smith was instrumental in updating that report that was approved during the April Executive Council Meeting (see Resolution #5 above).
5. Rob Daves wrote a press release regarding the NASA data collection effort. NASA did eventually release the data.
6. Charlotte stated that there have been six formal Standards complaints this year and five complaints required no action; but there is one complaint that will have an evaluation committee

Rob Daves recommended that all new Executive Council members spend time reviewing the Standards to make sure they are familiar with the process.

E. COMMUNICATIONS REPORT

Mark Blumenthal, Communications Chair, and Mike Brick, Associate Communications Chair, updated Executive Council on their activities for the year:

1. Mark reminded the Executive Council that the name of the Communications Committee was changed from Publications Committee in 2006.
2. Mark described how the hiring of a Communication Director in early 2007 changed the role of the Communications Committee chair. Having a Communications Director also helped expand contact with journalists.
3. A new redesigned AAPOR Web site was launched in September 2007. The portions that do not deal with commerce are viewed positively. In the next year, need to look into improving commerce part of website. He noted that when you type in “push polls” in Google AAPOR comes up as the third citation.
4. A new electronic newsletter was started in 2008. To date, two issues have been released. Members value and want more in the newsletter, such as legislative issues and book reviews.
5. As for unfinished business, the Communications Committee continues to work on the e-commerce issue (registering, paying dues, etc) involving the AAPOR Web site, the listserv and *Survey Practice*. *Survey Practice* will be addressed later during the meeting. The listserv has been hosted by Arizona State University through the efforts of Shap Wolf. Mark indicated that the listserv needs a new home and a change that is

transparent. He said the Communications Committee will investigate how to integrate that online community into the Web site and everything else AAPOR is doing.

6. Mark also pointed out the expanded contact with journalists this year through the new communications director.
7. Mike updated the Executive Council on the Heritage Interview series saying Kaiser would host on its Web site the raw, uncut interviews of 20 AAPOR luminaries and there would be a link on the AAPOR Web site to those interviews that people could listen to. This was for informational purposes at this point, as a motion regarding the Heritage Interviews will be brought before the Executive Council at a later date (about 3 months).

F. MEMBERSHIP AND CHAPTER RELATIONS REPORT

Carl Ramirez, Membership and Chapter Relations Chair, and Adam Safir, Associate Membership and Chapter Relations Chair submitted a written report in advance of the meeting (see Appendix of Executive Council Reports). The following items were brought forth for more discussion:

1. It was a very busy year for membership. The Membership Survey has been two years in the making. The survey was done by Survey Sciences Group and includes a comparison with a survey from 1995.
2. Carl said one big item that Membership and Chapter Relations Committee has been working on, and will continue to focus on, is membership retention. John Fries is working with a committee to look into non-renewals database to understand better who is not renewing.
3. Another task has been looking at how to keep first-time meeting attendees as members. Ideas such as an e-signature for the AAPOR code being explored.
4. AAPOR piloted a move from a hardcopy membership directory to pdf copy that is e-mailed to members. AAPOR hopes this move will increase the quality of the directory and allow it to be updated more regularly. Producing an electronic membership directory will also save money that can then be used for other purposes.
5. More collaboration with chapters this year: 1) Co-marketing efforts with chapters on sharing names of AAPOR national members in the chapter areas has been instituted; and 2) Another big item for the upcoming year will be the pass-thru of membership dues and information back to chapters.
6. Helped struggling chapters in New Jersey and New England.
7. Adam began a pilot program establishing a site for members to post files since attachments are not possible on the listserv. The usefulness and functionality of the site will be evaluated this year.
8. Right now we have about 1900 members and over the past year membership has done brochures, mailings, event outreach, and outreach to sister organizations. Looking to the future, the committee will also do more outreach to students. Carl told the Executive Council that a student outreach liaison is needed to help in the efforts of recruiting more student members. The Long-Range Plan calls for reaching out to different group such as marketing AAPOR membership to graduate programs. Adam Safir stated that with Baby Boomers starting to retire, AAPOR needs to concentrate on replacing its members who may be of that generation. There were suggestions of targeting other populations for membership such as Hispanics and African Americans. Nancy Mathiowetz also noted that with fixed cost rising there is a need to raise the number of members, it not raise dues.
9. Carl encouraged the continued sharing of Short Course information and education with the chapters.

F. COUNCILORS-AT-LARGE REPORT

Mark Schulman, Sr. Councilor-at-Large, updated Executive Council on POQ activities this year:

1. The decision this year to expand the number of pages in POQ and commitment to a 5th issue (special issue).
2. The Oxford University Press contract for *Public Opinion Quarterly* has been renewed or one year. The contract needs to be revisited or sent out for bid.
3. The new POQ editors will be Jamie Drucker and Nancy Mathiowetz.

G. EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mollyann Brodie, Education Committee Chair updated the Executive Council on the activities of the committee:

1. Mollyann informed the Executive Council that five Short Courses and a Professional Development breakfast were being offered at this year's Annual Conference. There were 94 people already signed up for the breakfast. She stated that MRA's Professional Researcher Certification (PRC) credit is being offered this year for the Short Courses. Since this is the first year to offer PRC credit, Mollyann was not sure how that would affect attendance at the Short Courses.
2. The Education Committee also worked with the Poynter Institute on the NewsU course for journalist education. To date, the course has about 1100 enrollees and ranks in the top 5 as most popular courses. A polling session was also held with the Poynter Institute for about 20 participants focused on how to cover the 2008 presidential election.
3. Mollyann discussed how the Education Committee will work in three separate subcommittees in the coming year. Melissa Herrmann will oversee the Short Courses next year. The committee is looking at offering a multi-year curriculum format for the Short Courses. Compensation for the Short Course instructors also needs to be reviewed, as well as the fee charged. Also the committee will follow up on the PRC contact hours and how to arrange this earlier to maximize attendance. Mollyann will head the Journalist Education Subcommittee. This subcommittee will continue to market the NewsU course to journalism schools in an effort to make it part of core curriculums. Establishing more partnerships with journalism schools will also be a focus of this subcommittee. Chuck Shuttles will oversee the third subcommittee—Online Education Subcommittee. This committee will explore what AAPOR can offer in the way of online educational products. A cost-benefit analysis will be done on each proposal and a course of action will be recommended.
4. NewsU would like AAPOR to do a webinar in September that will focus on the first session of the NewsU course. There would be a small fee to produce the webinar. Mollyann felt that benefits from the partnership between AAPOR and the Poynter Institute (NewsU) outweigh the small fee that may be charged to participants. She will provide more details to the Executive Council on this joint venture at a later date.
5. Mollyann thanked the Council for the financial support for the Education Committee. She stated that without the \$4,000 to hire a research assistant it would not have been possible to finish the curriculum for the News U course. She also noted that the activities of the Committee are extremely resource demanding, especially in terms of time. She extended a special thanks to Rich Morin, Michael Traugott and Cliff Zukin for their hours on the journalist education efforts. She also recognized Stanley Presser, Rob Daves, and Scott Keeter for their assistance on the review committee. Mollyann

notes that it is important for Council to recognize the limitations of a volunteer committee and to have realistic expectations for education activities.

6. This is Mollyann's third year as the Chair of the Education Committee. She will transition out of this position in the next year and informed the Executive Council that the committee hopes to name someone to that position this year.

John Boyle, new Associate Secretary-Treasurer, asked the Executive Council if AAPOR is tracking grant support. Nancy Mathiowetz and Mike Traugott are working on this. Part of Nancy Mathiowetz's role as Past President will be to work on getting grant support by working with foundations.

Nancy Mathiowetz provided Mollyann Brodie with a paperweight with the AAPOR and NewsU inscriptions on it as a thank you for all her efforts involving the NewsU courses. AAPOR will send a note of thanks to NewsU.

H. SURVEY PRACTICE

Nancy Mathiowetz reviewed the trail of events involving *Survey Practice* over the past several years. In May 2006, the Executive Council voted on a three year experiment to develop an E-zine and at that time allocated \$30,000 in the budget. Over the next two years, Executive Council received a few updates on the progress and then the Executive Council reviewed a demonstration of *Survey Practice* (E-zine) at its March 2008 meeting. After viewing the demonstration and discussing the progress that had been made to recruit articles, the Executive Council decided on its April Conference Call that AAPOR would no longer provide any financial or substantive support for the activities of *Survey Practices* (see Resolution #4 above).

Upon hearing the Executive Council's April decision, the editors and other involved with *Survey Practice* asked the Executive Council to reconsider its decision. Mike Brick told the Executive Council the real question is "does the Executive Council wish to reconsider its April decision to call a halt to the project?" He explained that there has been activity on the project since April. Nancy Mathiowetz stated that whatever is decided, there needs to be a reporting structure and accountability for financial commitment.

Dick Kulka, Vice President, said that there is a great deal of misinformation about *Survey Practice*. The Executive Council's decision was unanimous and he felt the communications with the *Survey Practice* editors effectively conveyed the sentiments behind that decision. The Executive Council discussed how lack of communication and lack of defined structure were problems with the project. Nancy Mathiowetz stated that going back to 2006 there was no structure put into place to define the relationship between AAPOR and *Survey Practice* and reporting requirements on the part of the editors. Everyone was in agreement that an operational plan with clear expectations was needed if *Survey Practice* was to continue.

After much discussion, Mike Brick recommended suspending the decision to terminate *Survey Practice* (see Resolution #3 above). Some members of Council voiced concern about undoing the April resolution given the progress that had been made to date and the failures to communicate.

The original *Survey Practice* Advisory Committee (Mark Schulman, Nancy Mathiowetz, and Nora Cate Shaeffer) will be reconvened and will put together a governance structure for *Survey Practice* before June 15. Mike Brick and Mike Mokrzycki, Associate Communications Chair, will review that proposal before it is presented to the Executive Council.

I. PASSING OF THE GAVEL

Nancy Mathiowetz commented on her year as president and thanked all the associate chairs, all the outgoing members, and welcomed new members. She handed out small gifts (AAPOR paperweights). She then gave the presidential gavel to Dick Kulka. The outgoing Council members were asked to stay for the remainder of the meeting.

VI. NEW COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. SECRETARY-TREASURER REPORT

1. Dawn Nelson reviewed the 2007 budget. She explained how the 2007 budget was approved as a deficit budget, but the year ended with a surplus budget. The surplus was due in part to lower expenses from the Annual conference, *Survey Practice*, and Communications Director being under budget; POQ revenues were over budget. Dawn stated that AAPOR adopted a deficit budget again for 2008, and she believed that AAPOR would break even or experience a small deficit.
2. The April 2008 financial statement was presented to the Executive Council. Kate Stewart noted that AAPOR's assets look strong. She outlined the breakdown of the revenues and expenses, and stated that AAPOR would continue to recategorize line items as necessary to streamline the budget process. She added that the Annual Conference line items will be more meaningful after all the conference expenses are paid.
3. Budget requests from Chairs should be sent to Kate Stewart and John Boyle by August so they can be incorporated into the budget. It was suggested that committee chairs be given a copy of their 2008 budgets for review.

B. MEETING SCHEDULE

1. The Executive Council discussed its upcoming conference call and meeting schedule. In some previous years, the Executive Council had a summer meeting in July. It was decided that a summer meeting was not needed this year and will be replaced with a conference call (July). Monthly conference calls will be held in all the months where the Executive Council does not hold a face-to-face meeting (July, August, October, December, February, April). Dick Kulka will determine where the Executive Council will meet at its September, November, January, and March meetings. Because at least 6 Executive Council members reside in the Washington, DC, area, it is likely that most meetings will take place there. Dick asked Scott Keeter Counselor-at-Large, and Adam Safir if AAPOR would be able to conduct its meeting in their places of employment: Pew Research Center and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Dick Kulka stated that one meeting would potentially be in another location than Washington, DC.
2. An Annual Conferencing debriefing call will be scheduled for June.
3. Orientation conference calls will be set up in June and July for chairs and new associate chairs. Dick and Kristin Povilonis, Executive Coordinator, will participate in those calls.

C. MEMBERSHIP SURVEY REPORT

Carl Ramirez and Adam Safir presented the results of the AAPOR Membership Survey to the Executive Council (see Appendix of Executive Council Reports). One question presented was “how do the results guide the organization?” Nancy Mathiowetz stated that there are a great deal of data for decision-making in the future.

All AAPOR members were surveyed over the web or by mail. The membership survey repeated many of the questions from the survey done in 1995-96. A survey for former members, whose membership expired in 2005-06, was also completed. Both surveys were fielded by Survey Sciences Group, LLC, largely at its own expense. Carl gave a special thanks to David Roe from Survey Sciences Group for his efforts toward this survey.

Overall, Carl reported little change from the 1995 findings and where there is change it is small, and generally in a positive direction. About 33% of AAPOR members view AAPOR as their primary association—this is an increase since 1995. When asked what aspects of AAPOR are important, POQ, Standard Definitions, and The Code of Professional Ethics and Practices received the highest ratings.

Carl described that attitudes regarding the Annual Conference content; reasons for not attending the Annual Conference; and the content of POQ have remained relatively the same since the 1995 survey.

Carl concluded from the survey results that AAPOR needs to concentrate on offering more educational opportunities. The survey also showed that some members are unfamiliar with the Code of Professional Ethics and Practices and are unsure about the level of standards enforcement, but more are familiar and feel AAPOR is enforcing the Code than in 1995.

Carl explained that the costs and expenses of being an AAPOR member is one reason for people not continuing membership. The Annual Conference expense is increasing in its prominence and one reason offered why people choose not to attend the Annual Conference. Many respondents reported that the AAPOR Annual Conference is more expensive than other conferences they attend. Among former members, the cost was a prominent reason why members drop out of AAPOR.

Carl said the former members’ survey did not include many negative responses about AAPOR per se. Former members cited that they were too busy, the expense of membership, or finding a better fit with another association as reasons for not renewing their membership. Carl stated that there are several indicators that AAPOR is failing to retain younger members, possibly students and this is an area for further investigation.

Carl said that the survey data set will be shared further with members and is just starting to trickle out. Data relevant to chapters will be sent to them. Carl said if anyone had further questions regarding the survey, he or she should contact Adam Safir.

D. NEW BUSINESS/OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Oxford University Press contract for *Public Opinion Quarterly* is up for renewal. The contract needs to be renewed or sent out for bid.
2. Dick Kulka stated that an evaluation of AMP and AAPOR will be conducted. He said an evaluation needs to be completed so there is a clear path of where AAPOR is heading in the future. A committee will be established to begin the evaluation process

this summer. The committee would also help develop a new RFP for management services.

3. A Strategic Marketing Committee is being established and it was recommended that the Treasurer or Associate Treasurer should sit on this committee. An AAPOR Web site Committee is also being established (see Appendix of Executive Council Reports).
4. Kate Stewart, Secretary-Treasurer, reviewed the To Do list for the Executive Council.

E. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 11:57 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kate Stewart
Secretary

As prepared by Kristin Povilonis

Appendix

AAPOR Executive Council, 2007-2008

I. President/VP/Past President

1. Ad hoc committee in response to New Hampshire
Increased outreach to journalists, expanded resources
2. Education Committee (Mollyann Brodie) —Partnership with Poynter;
NewsU, short course offerings, professional breakfast
3. New format for conduct of council business—monthly telephone calls
4. New Communications approaches—press releases, HuffPo
5. Marketing of conference: listserves, neighboring universities
6. Start up of Marketing Committee (sidetracked by NH)

II. Secretary/Treasurer

1. Tackled classification and tracking system used for budget and finances
2. Trial period for consent agenda
3. Use of Sharepoint for archives, distribution
4. Revised approach to minutes, to do lists

III. Conference/ Conference Ops

1. 2nd year of a two year experiment on longer conference—need to evaluate
2. Plenary—new approach this year
3. Cancellation of 2009 hotel contract and location of new site
4. Multiple dimensions of conference marketing; sponsorships; outreach

IV. Standards

1. Cell phone task force report
2. Conflict of interest for conference papers, board members
3. Amicus brief for respondent confidentiality protection
4. Revised Standard Definitions
5. NASA data collection effort
6. Formal complaint

V. Communications

1. Redesigned Web site
2. *Survey Practice*
3. Experiment with all electronic newsletter
4. Expanded contact with journalists via communications director

VI. Membership and Chapter Relations

1. Membership and non-renewal survey
2. Online membership form/renewal process
3. Electronic membership directory
4. Posting site for member's files (web)
5. Development of listserv among Chapter officers
6. Integration of chapter and national websites

VII. Councilors at large

1. Expanded investment in POQ—more pages, commitment to 5th issue
2. 1 yr. renewal of OUP contract
3. Selection of new POQ editor

Items continuing into 2008-2009

1. Begin developing RFP for executive management contract
2. Interface with ecommerce for membership (e.g. conference registration)
3. Evaluation of expanded annual meeting format
4. *Survey Practice*—including memo of understanding
5. Publisher contract for *Public Opinion Quarter*
6. Evaluation of moving to electronic newsletter
7. Evaluation of electronic only directory
8. Better firewall (security) for members only area of website
9. Evaluation of conference operations
10. Investment in education—exec council representation; investment and staff (?)
11. Web site committee
12. Marketing committee revitalization

AAPOR Benefits Table & Proposed Website Committee

May 9, 2008

1. AAPOR Benefits Table

Issue: Recent member comments suggest that AAPOR’s gradual movement from hardcopy to electronic materials is viewed negatively and as coming at member expense. Specific instances cited include:

- No hardcopy mailing of the Membership Directory
- No hardcopy mailing of the Newsletter
- No hardcopy mailing of the Preliminary Conference Program with presenter names and paper titles

Proposed Response: On an ad-hoc or as needed basis, review the distribution of hardcopy and electronic benefits to ensure an appropriate balance. Additionally, refrain from eliminating hardcopy benefits until electronic or website functionality has been implemented at an agreed upon level of quality (e.g., print function in online directory).

Table 1. Mean Value Scores of Member Benefits & Current Delivery Mode

Tangible Benefit ¹	Mean Value ² (Scale: 1-5)	Hardcopy	Electronic
<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	4.3	X	X
Standard Definitions	4.2	X	X
Annual Conference	4.0	n/a	n/a
COE	3.9	-	X
AAPORnet	3.8	n/a	X
Membership Directory	3.6	-	X
AAPOR Website	3.5	n/a	X
<i>AAPOR News</i> , the Newsletter	2.9	-	X
Regional Chapter	2.8	n/a	n/a
<i>The Blue Book</i>	2.7	X	X

2. Website Committee

Issue: Some website features have been deployed without benefit of a structured review process (e.g., the conference registration form, online directory, etc.). The result has been dissatisfaction among membership regarding the quality of AAPOR’s online presence and related services.

Proposed Response: Establish a website subcommittee charged with:

1. Regularly reviewing the site for outdated or incorrect information
2. On an ad-hoc basis, reviewing new "major" features (e.g., conference registration form, online directory, etc.) for QA/QC before deployment to the production server
3. On an ongoing basis, maintaining a log of website issues and new initiatives, and bringing questions about priorities and costs to EC meetings as appropriate

¹ In other words, excluding intangible benefits such as networking, comradery, maintaining ethical standards in the profession, etc.

² From 2007 AAPOR Membership Survey

I. Current Member Survey - Summary

A. Data Collection

Sample. The final sample for the 2007 AAPOR Membership Survey was comprised of 1,836 active members. Sample was received from AAPOR and reflected all members as of 2007. In addition to the initial sample delivered from AAPOR, seven individuals listed as former members were added to the member sample file after membership was verified. Table 1 below illustrates the makeup of the final sample file.

Table 1. Final Sample for the 2007 Aapor membership Survey

Record Type	N=
Council Members	22
Regular Members	1,807
Former Members Added to Sample	7
Total	1,836

Overall Response Rates. Overall, the 2007 Membership survey was completed with an AAPOR2 response rate of 55.4%. Table 2 below illustrates the final disposition codes assigned to all cases.

Table 2. Final Dispositions

Code	N=	%
Complete	992	54
Partial	25	1.4
Refusal	6	.3
Active Nonrespondents	813	44.3
Total	1,836	100

Respondent Communication. Whenever possible, sample was delivered with both email address and postal mailing address, in order to maximize respondent contact options. Study methodology dictated that the study's initial invitation would be administered via email, with subsequent follow-ups being administered by email and US mail. This was possible in almost all of the cases in the sample. As table 3 points out, a limited number of cases were sent invitations by US mail as a result of missing email addresses.

Table 3. Respondent Invitations by Group and Mode

Contact Group Type	Contact Method	N=
Council Members	Email	22
Regular Members	Email	1,719
Regular Members (no email)	US Mail	88
Former Members Added to Sample	Email	7
Total		1,836

In addition to survey invitations, a series of reminder prompts were sent to sample members throughout data collection. In all, three emails or letters were sent to respondents based on available contact information. Further, two email reminders were issued via AAPORNet. Table 4 displays the

number of contacts sent at each reminder stage, and the web completes that occurred on the same day each email was sent.

Table 4. Respondent Reminders and Resulting Completes

Contact	N=	Completes on the Day of Reminder
AAPORNet Reminder 1	NA	51
Personalized Reminder 1	1303	168
Personalized Reminder 2	1003	73
AAPORNet Reminder 1	NA	1
Final Personalized Reminder	823	69

In addition to reminder contacts, a paper version of the survey was produced and sent to 500 randomly selected nonrespondents in an effort to offer an alternative mode for completion. Results were underwhelming, with only 9.9% (N=44) of selected nonrespondents returning the survey. Mail surveys accounted for only 4.4% of all completed interviews. At the same time the surveys were mailed, another hard copy reminder letter was sent to all sample members who had yet to complete a survey (N=1,268). In total, a very small percentage of mailings (4.6%, N=85) were returned to SSG due to bad addresses.

Support Contacts. SSG provided both an email and toll free number for respondents to contact project staff and request support during data collection. In total, 15 respondents contact SSG for survey support; 14 by email and one by phone. Table 5 below displays the reasons for respondent contact, and the frequency with which they occurred.

Table 5. Reasons for Survey Support Contact

Reason	N=
Refusal	6
Questions about the Survey	5
Paper Survey Requested	2
New Email Address	1
R on Both Lists	1
Total	15

B. Analysis of Questionnaire Content

Respondents' relationship to AAPOR. The first section of the questionnaire presented respondents with items directed at measuring the perceived value of various aspects of AAPOR, respondents' membership in other professional organizations and attendance of other associations' annual meetings.

First, respondents were asked to rate a series of 10 aspects of AAPOR on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 meant "Very valuable" and 1 meant "Not at all valuable." Table 6 below displays results of the results of these items. Over half of respondents indicated that *Public Opinion Quarterly* was very valuable, and large proportions found Standard Definitions, the Response Rate Handbook (46.9%) and the annual conference (41.1%) to be very valuable. The aspects of AAPOR receiving the largest proportion of "Not at all valuable" were the *Blue Book* (16.7%) and the respondents' regional chapters (15.6%). [NOTE: chapter ratings were understandably higher among chapter members. See Crosstab section II below for that breakdown.] Also interesting to note is the relatively high percentage of "Don't Know/Not Applicable" responses selected for *AAPOR News* (14.9%) and the respondents' regional chapters (27.3%), suggesting possible underutilization of those two features.

Table 6. Overall Ratings of Various Aspects of AAPOR.

Aspect of Aapor	% 1 Not at all Valuable	% 2	% 3	% Selecting 4	% 5 Very Valuable	% Don't Know/Not Applicable
<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	.6	4.8	11.2	29.5	52.4	1.5
The Annual Conference	3.0	8.5	13.7	21.6	41.1	12.2
Your Regional Chapter	15.6	14.8	18.4	15.0	8.8	27.3
The <i>Blue Book</i>	16.7	24.8	24.8	17.8	8.0	7.8
The Code of Professional Ethics & Practices	2.7	7.3	17.7	33.1	37.2	2.1
The Membership Directory	4.4	12.7	26.2	31.0	22.2	3.5
Standard Definitions	1.5	4.9	12.6	28.8	46.9	5.3
AAPORNet Listserv	4.5	8.3	18.0	25.3	35.8	8.1
AAPOR Website	4.6	11.7	29.2	34.2	16.4	3.9
<i>AAPOR News</i> , the Newsletter	6.5	20.4	32.6	20.0	5.7	14.9

Table 7 below displays mean scores for the aspects of AAPOR this block of items asked about. Overall, *Public Opinion Quarterly* was rated as the most valuable (4.3) while the *Blue Book* was rated as the least valuable (2.7).

Table 7. Mean Value Scores of Various Aspects of AAPOR.

Aspect of Aapor	Mean Value Score (Scale of 1 to 5)
<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	4.3
Standard Definitions	4.2
The Annual Conference	4.0
The Code of Professional Ethics & Practices	3.9
AAPORNet Listserv	3.8
The Membership Directory	3.6
AAPOR Website	3.5
<i>AAPOR News</i> , the Newsletter	2.9
Your Regional Chapter	2.8
The <i>Blue Book</i>	2.7

Turning to respondent demographics, education played a significant role in rating *Public Opinion Quarterly*, where respondents with Ph.D.'s or professional degrees were more likely to consider the publication very valuable, the *Blue Book*, where respondents with Ph.D.'s or professional degrees were more likely to consider the publication not at all valuable while those with some college were more likely to consider it very valuable, and *AAPOR News* which was selected as significantly more valuable to those with some college education and less valuable to those with a Ph.D. or professional degree. This would suggest that members earlier in their career or still completing their education are more likely to use such resources, compared to those who are further in their career, and perhaps can rely on other networking tools and relationships.

Differences by gender were significant when rating the value of the *Blue Book*, where males were more likely than females to find this aspect not at all valuable. Female respondents were significantly more likely to rate the Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, the membership directory, Standard Definitions, AAPORNet, the AAPOR website and *AAPOR News* as very valuable more often than their male counterparts.

Turning to age, respondents between 25 and 44 were significantly more likely to rate the annual conference very valuable. Respondents between the ages of 18-24 were significantly more likely to rate the membership directory as very valuable, while respondents 65 and over were more likely to rate AAPORNet and the AAPOR website as not at all valuable, and rate *AAPOR News* as very valuable.

Respondents of Hispanic origin were significantly more likely to rate the membership directory, the AAPOR website and *AAPOR News* as very valuable. Race however, did not play a significant role in establishing value ratings of aspects of AAPOR.

Membership in Other Associations. Respondents were next asked if they were members of other associations. As shown in table 8, just over 7 out of 10 respondents indicated being members of other associations along with AAPOR.

Table 8. Are you a member of any other professional association(s)?

	N	%
Yes	720	71.7
No	284	28.3
Total	1004	100.0

Respondents who indicated membership in other associations were also asked to indicate what other associations they were a part of via a two part multiple response block. Disciplinary associations were listed first (table 9), followed by professional associations (table 10). It is interesting to note here that few respondents indicated being members of only one single additional disciplinary association (12%) or professional association (2.6%). Its also worth noting that while the percentage of respondents who chose "Other" is relatively high, the open ended responses gathered for specificity vary greatly, with no clear pattern or suggestion for associations that should have been added to the list emerging.

Table 9. Memberships in Disciplinary Associations.

	N	% of Cases
American Economic Association	12	1.7%
American Educational Research Association	18	2.5%
American Evaluation Association	27	3.8%
American Political Science Association	130	18.1%
American Public Health Association	47	6.5%
American Psychological Association	48	6.7%
American Statistical Association	161	22.4%
American Sociological Association	103	14.3%
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication	28	3.9%
Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management	7	1.0%
International Communication Association	38	5.3%
International Statistical Institute	21	2.9%
Midwest Sociological Society	7	1.0%
Population Association of America	15	2.1%
World Association for Public Opinion Research	76	10.6%
Other disciplinary associations	288	40.1%
None of these	128	17.8%
Total	1154	160.7%

*Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to multiple responses.

Table 10. Memberships in Professional Associations.

	N	% of Cases
Advertising Research Foundation	22	3.1%
American Marketing Association	76	10.8%
Association for Consumer Research	13	1.9%
Marketing Research Association	55	7.8%
Newspaper Association of America	5	.7%
Qualitative Research Consultants Association	9	1.3%
Other professional associations	128	18.2%
None of these	500	71.2%
Total	808	115.1%

*Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to multiple responses.

In a typical year, most respondents (58.6%) attend either no other conferences or one other conference, while 28.6% of respondents indicated attending two other conferences, and 12.8% attend 3 or more (Table 11). Nearly one third of respondents who belong to other associations generally think of AAPOR as their primary association. Twenty-six percent think of AAPOR and another association equally, while 35.5% think of another association alone as their primary association. Almost 6% indicated that they did not know (Table 12). As one would expect, those who indicated that they attended no other meetings (61.1%) were significantly more likely than others to say that AAPOR was their main association. Those

Table 11. Attendance at Other Associations' Annual Meetings.

	N	%
None	149	20.50
One	277	38.10
Two	208	28.61
Three	67	9.22
Four or more	26	3.58
Total	727	100

Table 12. Primary Association

	Frequency	Valid Percent
AAPOR	239	32.87
AAPOR and another equally	189	26.00
Another association	258	35.49
Don't know	41	5.64
Total	727	100.00

who indicated attending one other association meeting in a typical year were also most likely to say that AAPOR was their main association, while those who indicated attending two or three other association meetings were significantly more likely than others to indicate that they thought of another association as their primary association. Those who attend four or more meetings each year were the more likely than others to think of AAPOR and another association equally when considering their main association (Table 13).

Table 13. Primary Association by Attendance at Other Meetings

	% AAPOR	% AAPOR and another equally	% Another association	% Don't know	Total
None	61.1	18.1	14.8	6.0	100
One	35.0	27.4	30.0	7.6	100
Two	18.8	26.4	51.9	2.9	100
Three	13.4	32.8	49.3	4.5	100
Four or more	11.5	34.6	46.2	7.7	100

Respondents were next asked to indicate, whether they have attended past aapor conferences or not, whether or not they felt that the annual AAPOR conference should offer more, less, or the same amount of 10 key areas. Results compiled from the entire block of items can be found in table 14.

Table 14. Should the Annual Conference Offer More, the Same, or Less in the Following Areas?

	% More	% The Same	% Less	% Don't Know
Discussion of theory	29.6	46.8	10.5	13.1
Substantive findings from empirical research	36.4	49.1	4.8	9.6
Qualitative data collection methods	30.7	44.5	14.9	9.9
Quantitative data collection methods	38.6	50.4	2.8	8.2
Quantitative Analysis technologies	35.6	49.8	5.9	8.7
Discussion/demonstration of new technologies	51.0	37.0	2.9	9.1
Issues facing the profession	45.5	43.0	4.0	7.6
Discussion of Survey Operational Issues	22.3	42.6	23.5	11.6
Tracked sessions on special topics of interest	23.1	53.8	7.1	16.0
Special interest group meetings or sessions	25.8	52.0	7.9	14.3

For all of the items, many respondents hovered around the “same” category. Respondents favored more discussion and demonstration of new technologies (51%) and wanted to see more offered in regards to issues facing the profession (ethics, nonresponse, etc. – 45.5%) over other areas. Respondents most frequently reported wanting to see less discussion of survey operational issues (23.5%), qualitative data collection methods (14.9%), and discussion of theory (10.5%).

Following this block, respondents were asked whether or not they had in fact ever attended an AAPOR conference. Over three quarters indicated that they had, while 22.3% said they had not (table 15).

Table 15. Ever Attended an AAPOR Conference

	N	%
Yes	775	77.7
No	223	22.3
Total	998	100.0

When comparing the opinions of those who have attended conferences and those who have not, in regards to offering more, less or the same of certain items at conferences, some interesting opinions are revealed (tables 16a through 16j). Those who had attended conferences in the past were consistently (and significantly) more likely to give firm opinions on all items, while those who have not attended were always more likely to offer a “Don’t Know” response.

Tables 16a through 16j (Will go here).

Next, past conference attendees were asked to rate the importance of a number of possible reasons for attending the conference, on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 meant Not at all important and 5 meant very important. Overall recruiting and interviewing potential employees and looking for a job seem to be the least important reasons for attending, while learning new methods and keeping up to date on public opinion and other substantive findings are the most important. Results can be viewed in tables 17 and 18 below.

Table 17. Importance Ratings of Reasons to Attend the AAPOR Conference.

	% 1 Not at all Important	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5 Very Important
Meeting new people, networking	3.4	5.9	20.2	36.0	34.6
Learning new methods	.5	4.0	13.5	35.0	46.9
Keeping up to date on public opinion and other substantive findings	1.8	4.6	13.7	29.7	50.3
Opportunity to have fun	9.3	16.0	29.9	30.2	14.6
Recruiting and interviewing potential employees	48.2	21.7	20.0	8.1	2.0
Looking for a job	54.6	20.8	15.1	7.2	2.3
Seeing old friends	12.3	12.1	21.8	27.9	25.8
Developing new business opportunities	28.5	19.3	20.8	21.3	10.1

Table 18. Mean Scores of Reasons to Attend the AAPOR Conference.

Reasons to Attend	Mean Value Score (Scale of 1 to 5)
Learning new methods	4.24
Keeping up to date on public opinion and other substantive findings	4.22
Meeting new people, networking	3.93
Seeing old friends	3.43
Opportunity to have fun	3.25
Developing new business opportunities	2.65
Recruiting and interviewing potential employees	1.94
Looking for a job	1.82

Respondents who indicated attendance at an aapor conference were also asked whether or not they had attended each conference from 2003 through 2007. Results are presented in table 19 below, where a fairly steady increase is visible.

Table 19. Respondent Attendance at AAPOR Conferences 2003-2007.

2007 – Anaheim	2006 – Montreal	2005 – Miami	2004 – Phoenix	2003 – Nashville
53.9%	48.5%	49.5%	44.8%	39.8%

Respondents who either indicated that they had never attended an AAPOR conference, or had attended, but not at all in the last five years were next ask a series of questions about possible reasons why members do not attend conferences. Table 20 presents the percentage of respondents who answered “yes” to the items presented.

Table 20. Reasons AAPOR Members do not Attend the Conference.

	N	% of Cases
I attend other conferences instead	159	51.5
I can't spare the time from my job	143	46.3
The costs are too high	137	44.3
It's a hard time of year to travel	131	42.4
My employer doesn't cover my travel expenses	109	35.3
My job isn't conducive to writing papers	85	27.5
The conferences are usually too far away	82	26.5
The conference locations don't interest me	42	13.6
There are limited opportunities for business contacts	39	12.6
The programs don't interest me	34	11.0
My paper was not accepted	3	1.0

*Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to multiple responses.

The most frequently reported reason for not attending is attending other conferences (51.5%), followed by an inability to spare the time to attend (46.3%) and high costs (44.3%). Limited business opportunities (12.6%), a lack of interest in programs (11%) and having a paper rejected (1%) are the least frequently chosen reasons.

When asked about the cost of AAPOR conferences, whether they had attended or not, almost one half of respondents thought the cost of the AAPOR conference was about the same as other conferences they've attended, while 30.4% felt it was more expensive and 8.4% felt it was less expensive (table 21).

Table 21. Comparison of AAPOR Conference Costs with other Conferences.

	N	%
More expensive	300	30.4
Less expensive	83	8.4
About the same	475	48.2
Don't attend other conferences	128	13.0

When looking at the differences between opinions of those who have attended an AAPOR conference and those who have not, respondents who had been to an AAPOR conference were significantly more likely to indicate that AAPOR conferences were more expensive than other annual meetings (32.3%), while those who had not been to an AAPOR conference were more likely to respond that costs were about the same (56.1%).

Table 22. Comparison of Costs by AAPOR Attendance.

Cost Compared to Other Conferences				
Ever Attended an AAPOR Conference	% More expensive	% Less expensive	% About the same	% Don't attend other conferences
Yes	32.3	10.2	46.1	11.4
No	23.6	1.9	56.1	18.4

Other Membership Activities. The questionnaire section focused on other membership activities began with a series of items about the AAPOR Newsletter. First, respondents were asked to describe the way they usually read the semi-annual newsletter (Table 23). Forty-three percent of respondents said they read selected articles, while just over 20% say they don't read it. Sixteen percent said they read all or most of it, while roughly 20% indicated that they haven't received it.

Table 23. Use of the AAPOR Newsletter.

	N	%
I read all or most of it	159	16.1
I read selected articles	430	43.4
I don't read it	205	20.7
I haven't received it	196	19.8

Respondents were also asked to give their opinions on whether they would like to see a lot, some or a little when it came to content on certain topics in the AAPOR Newsletter or a similar online publication (Table 24). Most respondents said they would only like to see *a lot* of articles describing recent public opinion studies (46.8%), *some* content on pre or post conference reports (52.6%) reviews of recent publications (49.2%) legislative and policy news (47.1%), employment opportunities (40.4%) and *only a little* content on new members (63.1%) and member news (62.7%).

Table 24. How Much Content Respondents Would Like to See in the AAPOR Newsletter.

	% A lot	% Some	% A little
Articles discussing recent public opinion studies	46.8	39.4	13.8
Employment opportunities	21.8	40.4	37.7
Lists of new members	6.8	30.1	63.1
Legislative and policy news	38.9	47.1	14.0
Reviews of recent publications	35.9	49.2	15.0
Pre or post conference reports	29.2	52.6	18.3
Member news	8.7	28.5	62.7

When asked about the potential value (on a scale of 1 to 5) of an annual hardcopy of the members directory, results were mixed, while more respondents felt that a frequently updated online version of the directory and indexing or online searchability by region, employer, etc. would be more valuable than not (Tables 25 and 26). Surprisingly, those who felt that an online directory would be valuable also thought that a hardcopy directory would be valuable, while those who felt that an online directory would not be valuable at all were significantly more likely than others to find the hardcopy version not at all valuable. Most would probably expect that those who preferred paper would not see much value in an online version, and vice versa, but this was not the case (Table 27).

Table 25. Value of Directory of Members Features.

	% 1 Not at all Valuable	% 2	% 3	% Selecting 4	% 5 Very Valuable
Annual hardcopy of the directory	21.8	14.2	23.3	18.9	21.7
Frequently updated online version	7.4	8.2	17.4	26.7	40.4
Indexing or online searchability	8.5	8.4	18.2	23.6	40.3

Table 26. Mean Values, Directory of Members Features.

Feature	Mean Value Score (Scale of 1 to 5)
Indexing or online searchability	3.78
Frequently updated online version	3.85
Annual hardcopy of the directory	3.04

Table 27. The Value of a Hardcopy Directory by an Online Directory.

Online Directory	Annual hardcopy of the Directory				
	% Not at all valuable 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% Very valuable 5
Not at all valuable 1	58.9	4.1	12.3	9.6	15.1
2	27.2	23.5	11.1	16.0	22.2
3	18.6	18.6	30.8	17.4	14.5
4	16.3	16.3	22.7	25.4	19.3
Very valuable 5	19.0	11.0	25.0	17.5	27.5

Turning to AAPORNet, 74% of respondents are members of the listserv, while almost 10% were subscribed and dropped out. The remaining 16% are not members (Table 28). Table 29 displays how useful current AAPORNet members find it to be, with around 92% finding it very or somewhat useful.

Table 28. AAPORNet Membership.

	N	%
Yes	734	74.0
Was subscribed, but dropped out	98	9.9
No	160	16.1
Total	992	100

Table 29. AAPORNet Members Rate the Usefulness of the Listserv.

	N	Valid Percent
Very useful	298	40.7
Somewhat useful	375	51.2
Not very useful	56	7.6
Not at all useful	4	0.5
Total	733	100

Public Opinion Quarterly. When asked to rate the value (on a scale of 1 to 5) of various aspects of POQ, respondents felt that articles discussing methodological research was the most valuable, followed by articles reporting substantive findings. Book reviews were seen as the least valuable aspect of POQ (Tables 30 and 31).

Table 30. Value of Certain Aspects of POQ.

	% 1 Not at all Valuable	% 2	% 3	% Selecting 4	% 5 Very Valuable
Articles discussing methodological research	.7	1.8	8.4	22.0	67.1
Articles reporting substantive findings	1.8	6.3	17.8	33.7	40.3
'The Polls' trends	7.2	15.8	30.0	25.3	21.7
'The Polls' reviews of surveys	4.4	11.2	29.3	30.1	24.9
The book reviews	6.7	19.8	31.1	28.5	13.9
Research notes	2.8	8.2	24.1	34.1	30.8

Table 31. Mean Value Scores of Certain Aspects of POQ.

Feature	Mean Value Score (Scale of 1 to 5)
Articles discussing methodological research	4.53
Articles reporting substantive findings	4.04
Research notes	3.82
'The Polls' reviews of surveys	3.60
'The Polls' trends	3.38
The book reviews	3.23

Respondents were also asked whether or not they would like to see more, the same, or less of certain areas in POQ. The results presented in table 32 show that respondents are looking for more features with practical implications (65.5%), the same amount of reporting of recent findings (56.4%), discussion of theory (54.4%), short findings and research notes (54.4%).

Table 32. Desire to See More, the Same or Less of areas in POQ.

	% More	% The Same	% Less
Features with practical implications	65.5	31.7	2.8
Reporting of recent findings	33.5	56.4	10.1
Discussion of theory	30.5	54.4	15.1
Short finding/research notes	41.0	54.4	4.6

The Code of Ethics. Two questions on the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards were asked of respondents. Overall, a vast majority of respondents are either very or somewhat familiar with the Code (85.8%), while only 2.9% are not at all familiar (Table 33). Nearly 55% of respondents feel that AAPOR enforces its standards very well or somewhat well, while 10% feel that standards are not enforced too well, and 5% feel that there is no enforcement (Table 34). In table 35, those respondents

who consider themselves very familiar with the content of the Code are significantly more likely to say that AAPOR’s standards are enforced very well (24.9%) *and* not too well (13.1%).

Table 33. Familiarity with the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards.

	N	%
Very familiar	321	32.4
Somewhat	530	53.4
Not very familiar	112	11.3
Not at all familiar	29	2.9
Total	992	100

Table 34. Perceived Enforcement of Standards.

	N	%
Very well	184	18.5
Somewhat	359	36.2
Not too well	100	10.1
There is no enforcement	54	5.4
Don't know	296	29.8
Total	993	100

Table 35. Perceived Enforcement of Standards by Degree of Familiarity.

Familiarity	Enforcement				
	Very well	Somewhat	Not too well	There is no enforcement	Don't know
Very familiar	24.9	39.6	13.1	8.1	14.3
Somewhat	17.7	38.9	9.8	4.3	29.2
Not very familiar	8.0	21.4	5.4	2.7	62.5
Not at all familiar	3.4	6.9	0.0	6.9	82.8

AAPOR, its Culture and the Future. Two blocks of questions were then presented that gave respondents the opportunity to weigh in on AAPOR’s future, both in terms of changes that may be made and the areas AAPOR should or should not attract more members from.

Generally speaking, respondents were in favor of all of the proposed changes presented to them, with a majority of respondents offering agreement to all changes. Offering longer (1 or 2 day) continuing education opportunities at conferences was the least popular proposed change, with 49.8% of respondents disagreeing with the change (Table 36.)

Table 36. Agreement with Proposed Changes.

	Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Strongly disagree
More vocal in the mass media on issues relevant to public opinion	50.2	43.6	5.0	1.2
Take on controversial issues, pursuing public stances on ethics in practice, on policy and in other areas	35.3	44.7	16.5	3.5
Provide more continuing education via workshops not linked to the conference	39.5	47.1	12.3	1.0
Provide more short (half-day) continuing education opportunities at the conference	25.4	50.4	22.7	1.2
Provide longer (1-2 day) continuing education opportunities at the conference	14.5	35.8	44.1	5.7
Offer a professional certification program and continuing professional education credits for its short courses	25.4	37.6	27.0	10.0
Increase job placement services	17.3	46.7	31.6	4.4
Establish interest groups	27.0	48.5	18.9	5.5
Establish conference tracks	23.8	46.7	24.5	4.9

Respondents generally favored attempting to attract more members from all proposed sectors. The Market Research sector received the least support, with only 61% of respondents indicating that AAPOR should work to bring in more members from this sector (Table 37).

Table 37. Support for Attracting More Members from Various Sectors.

	N	Percent of Cases
Federal, state, local government	731	80.6
Academic sector	706	77.8
Mass media	643	70.9
Political polling organizations	616	67.9
Commercial research sector	615	67.8
Market research sector	566	62.4
Other	280	30.9

*Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to multiple responses.

C. Respondent Demographics.

The survey closed with a series of questions about respondent background and demographics. A majority of respondents (84.3%) hold a Masters Degree or a Ph.D. or professional degree (Table 38). Table 39 displays the formal areas of education respondents come from. While many offered multiple responses to this item, Sociology (27.4%), Survey Research (27.9%) and Political Science (26.7%) were the three most frequently selected areas. More respondents were male (54.9%) than female and almost the majority (55.8%) of respondents were age 45 or older (Tables 40 and 41). Only 1% of respondents were between the ages of 18 and 24. Four percent of respondents were of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, and just over 90% of respondents were white (Tables 42 and 43).

Table 38. Respondent Education (Degree).

	N	%
Some college	11	1.1
BA/BS	66	6.7
Some graduate training	78	7.9
MA/MS	340	34.4
Ph.D. or professional degree (e.g., JD, MD)	493	49.9

Table 39. Formal Areas of Education.

	N	Percent of Cases
Communications	111	11.2
Demography	33	3.3
Economics	66	6.7
Education	49	5.0
Journalism	51	5.2
Marketing/Market research	68	6.9
Political science	264	26.7
Psychology	193	19.5
Sociology	271	27.4
Statistics	201	20.3
Survey research	266	26.9
Other (please specify)	208	21.0

*Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to multiple responses.

Table 40. Gender.

	N	%
Male	542.0	54.8583
Female	446.0	45.1417

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

Table 41. Age.

	N	%
18-24	10	1.0
25-44	415	43.2
45-64	446	46.4
65 and over	90	9.4

Table 42. Hispanic Origin.

	N	%
Yes	30	3.1
No	949	96.9

Table 43. Race.

	N	%
White	887	91.6
African American or Black	15	1.5
Asian American or Asian	41	4.2
Something else	25	2.6

II. Member Survey – Selected Crosstab Analysis

Rating the value of aspects of AAPOR. Differences by gender were significant when rating the value of the *Blue Book*, where males were more likely than females to find this aspect not at all valuable. Female respondents were significantly more likely to rate the Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, the membership directory, Standard Definitions, AAPORNet, the AAPOR website and *AAPOR News* as very valuable more often than their male counterparts.

Turning to age, respondents between 25 and 44 were significantly more likely to rate the annual conference very valuable. Respondents between the ages of 18-24 were significantly more likely to rate the membership directory as very valuable, while respondents 65 and over were more likely to rate AAPORNet and the AAPOR website as not at all valuable, and rate *AAPOR News* as very valuable.

Respondents of Hispanic origin were significantly more likely to rate the membership directory, the AAPOR website and *AAPOR News* as very valuable. Race however, did not play a significant role in establishing value ratings of aspects of AAPOR.

Ratings of “your regional chapter” were fairly low overall, but that differed widely depending on whether or not the respondent was a member of a chapter. Among those in a chapter, the top two box rating (5, or “very valuable” and 4) was 43.5%, while among those not currently in a chapter, that rating was only 13.6%.

Membership in other professional associations. Gender, education, age, affiliation and years in AAPOR all had a significant effect on membership in other associations. Males (77.5%) were more likely than females (64.7%) to be members of other associations. Members with a Ph.D. (85.6%) and members from the academic sector (81.6%) were far more likely than others to be involved in another association. Turning to age and years in AAPOR, a trend is visible. As age increases, and years in AAPOR increases, a significantly larger proportion of members also hold memberships in other professional associations. This makes sense, as one would expect that more experienced members would spread themselves professionally and be involved in more activities and outlets than their less experienced counterparts.

Attendance at other associations’ meetings. When looking at attendance at other associations’ meetings, no strongly significant differences stand out. Differences that do appear are notable, but may not be as significant as they appear due to low cell counts. Most notably, members in the commercial (27.6%) and non-profit (27.3%) were more likely to say that they attended no other meetings, while PhD’s and those with some college education were more likely than other to indicate that they attended more than one additional meeting.

Primary association. Males (38.9%) were significantly more likely than females (30.5%) to think of another association as their primary association, while females (33.6%) were more likely than males (21%) to think of AAPOR and another association equally as their primary association. Members of 6 to 10 years (42.3%) were significantly more likely to think of AAPOR as their primary association, while members of more than 30 years (32.5%) were the most likely to indicate that AAPOR shared primary status with another association. AAPOR’s newest members (49.4%) were significantly more likely to say that they thought of another association as their primary. As years in AAPOR increase, the proportion of those who say that they think of another organization as their primary drops significantly. Differences

among levels of education were notable, but here again, may not be as significant as they appear due to low cell counts.

Conference offerings. Differences among male and female respondents were significant when it came to discussion of operational issues. Here, females were more likely to indicate they wanted more (27.7%) while males were more likely to indicate they wanted less (27.2%). Significantly more females (27.5%) than males (19.3%) also wanted to see more tracked sessions on special topics of interest, while males were more likely to say they wanted to see the same or less. Females also wanted to see more special interest groups meetings when compared to males, and once again males wanted to see the same or less.

Turning to education, respondents with a PhD. (37.2%) were significantly more likely than others to indicate that they would like to see more discussion of theory at the AAPOR conferences. This was the only aspect of the conference in which there was a clearly significant difference among respondents with different levels of education. Differences were notable in regards to substantive findings from empirical research, qualitative methods, issues facing the profession and discussion of survey operational issues, but significance scores may be invalid due to low cell counts.

There were notable but potentially non-significant differences across age groups when it came to qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and discussion of survey operational issues, where the desire to see more content in these areas dropped as age increased.

Notable but potentially insignificant differences among respondents in different races were visible in some areas as well. A smaller proportion of Asian American or Asian (17.1%) respondents wanted to see more discussion of survey operational issues when compared to other groups. These respondents (24.4%) and white respondents (23.7%) were also more likely to say they wanted to see less of this type of discussion. African Americans (53.3%) appear more in favor of special interest group meetings or sessions when compared to respondents of other races.

A larger proportion of respondents from the academic sector (35%) wanted to see more discussion of theory, while a greater proportion of commercial (61.6%) and non-profit (54.3%) respondents wanted to see more discussion and demonstration of new technologies. Once again, while these differences are notable, they may not be as significant as they appear due to low cell counts.

Years in AAPOR was a significant factor when it came to respondents' feelings on qualitative data collection and quantitative analysis techniques. In both cases, as years of membership increased, respondents were significantly less likely to say they wanted to see more content and more likely to say they wanted to see less content in these areas.

Ever attended an AAPOR conference. A significantly greater proportion of members with either a Ph.D. (82.2%), or those with a HS degree or some college (81.8%) reported attending an AAPOR conference. Respondents age 18-24 (40%) were significantly less likely to say that they have attended in the past, compared to the next lowest proportion, 73.5% of 25-44 year old members. African Americans were significantly less likely (40%) than members of other races to have attended. Finally, years of membership in AAPOR has a significant relationship with attendance. As the number of years in AAPOR increases, so does the proportion of members who indicated being to a conference in the past. There is a drastic difference between those who have been a member for less than one year (47.7%) and those who have been a member for more than 30 years (95.9%).

Reasons for attending the conference. There were many notable but potentially insignificant differences visible when it came to the reasons why respondents attend AAPOR conferences. Relatively few clearly significant differences are visible. A significantly greater proportion of females (56.3%) felt that keeping up on public opinion and other substantive findings was very important when compared to males (45.7%).

Seeing old friends becomes significantly more important to respondents as years of AAPOR membership increases. Consider that a greater proportion of those who have been members less than one year (27%) and one to 5 years (16%) indicated that this was not at all important, while respondents with 21 years of membership or more (21 to 30 years – 40.4%, More than 30 years – 67.4%) were significantly more likely than all others to consider this aspect very important.

Years of membership also played a significant role in which respondents considered developing new business opportunities important. Forty four percent of respondents with less than one year of membership in AAPOR considered this to be important or very important (choosing a value of 4 or 5 on the scale), while only 8.7% of respondents with over 30 years of membership felt the same.

Attendance at the last 5 conferences. Education appears significant for attendance in Anaheim only, but here, these notable differences may not be as significant as they appear due to low cell counts. A greater proportion of members with a HS education or some college (88.9%) reported attending the 2007 conference than all other members. Ph.D.'s actually seemed the least likely to attend, with only 45.1% of members at this level attending.

Members' age appears to play a role in conference attendance for all five conferences. However, in every case, significant low cell counts may be contributing to the apparent significance. However, these differences are worth noting. Eighteen to twenty-four year old respondents came to Anaheim in force (100%), yet they were not in attendance (at all) in any of the four prior conferences. With the exception of the nonexistent 18-24 year old cohort and the 2003-2006 conferences, older members were consistently less likely to attend each conference. For all 5 conferences, lower proportions of members in each increasing age category reported attending the conference in question.

As age goes, so does the number of years a respondent has been an AAPOR member. However, the relationship between years of membership and conference attendance is significant for all 5 conferences. Each year, attendance drops as years of membership increases.

Affiliation appears to be a significant factor on attendance for the Anaheim conference only. Members who fell outside of the 4 standard sectors (30.4%) and retired members were significantly less likely to attend the Anaheim conference than were members in the academic, commercial, government or non-profit sectors.

Reasons for not attending the conference. Males (16.6%) were significantly more likely than females (5.4%) to say that they felt that there are limited opportunities for business contacts. Education played a notable, but potentially insignificant factor when it came to attending other conferences instead of AAPOR, where PhD's were more likely than others to indicate that this was a reason for not attending. Greater proportions of respondents with a BA/BS (40.9%) or some graduate training (44%) indicated that their jobs were not conducive to writing papers as a reason they did not attend conferences.

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

Respondents with some graduate training (16.7%) and respondents with a PhD (18.2%) were more likely than others to indicate that the conference locations don't interest them.

There were notable, but potentially insignificant differences when it came to age as well. Young respondents were more likely to site high costs as a reason not to attend conferences, and were also more likely to say that the conferences were too far away, which was also true for older respondents. A greater proportion of younger respondents also indicated that their employers did not cover travel expenses. Respondents who are likely more established in their careers (age 25-44 and 45-64) were more likely than others to indicate that attending other conferences and an inability to spare time from their jobs as reasons why they do not attend.

Affiliation had a notable but potentially insignificant influence on attendance in terms of timing. Academics (47.9%) and commercial employees (42.1%) were more likely than others to say that the annual conference fell during a hard time of the year to travel. Respondents in the academic sector (58.2%) were significantly more likely than others to indicate that they attended other conferences instead. Retirees (33%) responded in greater proportion than others that the programs did not interest them, but here again low cell counts may be contributing to apparently significant results. The same is true in the case of respondents in the commercial sector (43%) who indicate more regularly than others that their job is not conducive to writing papers. Respondents from the commercial sector (56.5%) and the non-profit sector (50%) were more likely than others to say that they can't spare time for their jobs. A greater proportion of respondent from the commercial sector (23.6%) felt that there are limited opportunities for business contacts at the conferences. Retired respondents (66.7%) indicated that the locations did not interest them in much larger proportion than other respondents.

Respondents with more than 30 years in AAPOR (27.3%) were significantly less likely than all others to indicate that attendance at other conferences was a reason for not attending the AAPOR conference. A large proportion of this same group indicated that the programs did not interest them. Respondents with 6 to 10 years of AAPOR membership were significantly more likely to indicate that the lack of business contacts and a lack of interest in the conference locations were reasons for not attending.

Conference cost comparison. Males (52.4%) were significantly more likely than females (43.1%) to report that AAPOR costs were about the same as other conferences, while females were significantly more likely than males to say that AAPOR conferences were more expensive (32.9%) or that they did not attend other conferences (15%).

A greater proportion of respondents with a Ph.D. (37%) reported that they felt AAPOR was more expensive when compared to respondents with other levels of education. As age increases respondents appear less likely to feel that AAPOR is more expensive (40% of respondents 18-24 vs. 21.8% of respondents 65 and over). Greater proportions of respondents in the Academic (43.6%) and government sector (40.2%) thought of AAPOR as more expensive. However, while notable, these differences all may be falling prey to low cell counts.

Years in AAPOR does play a significant role in cost evaluation. Respondents who have been members for 1 to 5 years (35%) and those who have been members for 21 to 30 years (34.2%) were more likely to say that AAPOR was more expensive.

Describe how you read the newsletter. A significantly larger proportion of male respondents (47.3%) reported reading selected AAPOR News articles than did their female counterparts (39.1%). Females on

the other hand were more likely (20%) than males (14.7%) to say that they hadn't received the newsletter.

Years in AAPOR was also significantly tied to readership. As years of membership increase, so does the proportion of respondents who indicate reading most or all of the newsletter. This may be tied to members with a longer tenure being used to receiving the newsletter routinely, and keeping up with it over a long period of time as other mediums of communication have been introduced. Meanwhile, a significantly larger proportion of newer members (less than one year – 26.6%, 1 to 5 years – 14.3%), report not having received the newsletter. Similarly, respondents age 18-24 (70%) and 25-44 (28%) were more likely to say that they had not received AAPOR News, but significance scores here should be viewed with caution due to small cell counts.

Respondents with a PhD. (18%), and those who are retired (44.4%) or whose affiliation is classified as "other" (39.3%) said that they read all or most of the newsletter in greater proportion than their counterparts, but here again, small cell counts may be contributing to significance results.

How much content is desirable. There were some significant differences among respondents when it came to content in the form of articles describing public opinion studies. A greater proportion of males (16.6%) than females (10.3%) wanted to see "a little" of this type of content. Respondents with a HS or some college education (63.6%) were the most likely to want to see more of this type of content, while respondents with a BA/BS were more likely to say they wanted to see some of this type of content and those with some graduate training (16%) or a PhD. (16.2%) said that they wanted only to see a little of this type of content in greater proportion than other respondents.

Significantly greater proportions of respondent who have been AAPOR members for less than one year (49.6%), 1 to 5 years (51.9%) or more than 30 years (54.3%) wanted to see more of this type of content, while respondents with 21 to 30 years in AAPOR (20.2%) were more likely to say they wanted to see only "a little". There were some notable differences on this topic when it came to age, with younger respondents seemingly the least interested in this topic, but the significance of these results is questionable due to low cell counts.

Males (42.4%) and respondents with more than 30 years of membership (75.6%) were significantly more likely to indicate that they wanted to see only a little content on employment opportunities, while those with less years of membership appear significantly more interested in seeing a lot of this type of content. This mirrors differences among age groups, where the interest in seeing a lot of this type of content decreases as age increases, but the significance of differences here should be taken with caution due to low cell counts. The same goes for education, where those respondents with a Master's degree (28.7%) appear most likely to desire a lot of content on this topic, while those with a HS or some college education are most likely to say they want to see only a little.

A significantly larger proportion of males (8.6%) than females (4.5%) wanted to see a lot of content related to lists of new members, while females were more likely to only want to see a little of this type of content. Notable but potentially insignificant differences appear on this topic when race is examined, with white respondents (63.9%) wanting to see only a little of this type of content in greater proportion than respondents of other races.

Education is a significant factor when evaluating how much legislative and policy news respondents want to see. Those with a HS or some college education (72.7%) were more likely than others to say

they wanted to see a lot, while respondents with a BA/BS (52.3%) were more likely to say they wanted to see some and those with an MA/MS (19.5%) were more likely to say they wanted to see only a little. Respondents with less than one year of AAPOR membership (18.1%) and those with 1 to 5 years of membership (17.4%) were significantly more likely than others to want to see only “a little” of this type of content.

A significantly larger proportion of males (11.3%) than females (5.2%) wanted to see a lot of content related to member news, while females were more likely to only want to see a little of this type of content. Those respondents with less years of membership appear significantly less interested in seeing a lot of this type of content than those who have been involved in AAPOR for a long period of time.

Value of different Directory features. Years in AAPOR was the only clearly significant factor on the value of an annual hardcopy of the directory, with respondents who are members for 10 years or less more likely to find it not at all valuable, while those with more than 10 years of membership find it more valuable. Education and age appear significant but may be falling victim to low cell counts. Those with less education appear to find it more valuable, while respondents with a PhD were the most likely to say it was not at all valuable. A greater proportion of 18-24 year old respondents (40%) rated the directory as very valuable compared to other respondents.

Respondents age 25-44 (45%) and those age 45-64 (38.7%) were more likely than others to indicate that a frequently updated online version of the Directory of Members would be very valuable, while those 65 and over (15.9%) were the most likely to say that they saw such a tool as not at all valuable. Similarly, a greater proportion of respondents who have been members for more than 30 years (14.9%) said that this would not be at all valuable. While again notable, due to low cell counts, the significance of these results is questionable.

Males (10.5%) were significantly more likely than females (5.9%) to classify indexing or online searchability as not at all valuable, while a greater proportion of females than males felt that this was very valuable.

Respondents with a PhD., those 65 and over and retirees were more likely than others to indicate that this would not be at all valuable, however, in all three circumstances; the apparent significance of these relationships may be affected by low cell counts.

AAPORNet membership. A significantly higher proportion of respondents with a HS or some college education (90.9%) indicated being a member of AAPORNet. Respondents with a PhD. (12.4%) were significantly more likely to indicate that they were subscribed, but dropped out. Respondents between the ages of 18 and 24 were less likely to be members of the listserv, along with members in the academic and commercial sectors, but low cell counts may play a factor in the apparent significant differences. A greater proportion of respondents who have been an AAPOR member for less than one year (31.3%) were indicated note being a member of AAPORNet, while those who have been members for 6 to 10 years (13.6%) were significantly more likely to have dropped out after subscribing.

While not clearly significant due to low cell counts, there were some notable differences between groups when it came to how useful those who subscribe to AAPORNet find it to be. Those respondents with a HS or some college education (50%) and those with a PhD. or professional degree were more likely to find the listserv very useful. As age increases, so does the proportion within each group that

responded that AAPORNet was very useful. It should also be noted that responses in the negative direction (not very useful or not at all useful) were scarce.

Value of certain aspects of POQ. As level of education increases, so does the proportion of respondents who would find articles discussing methodological research very valuable. Respondents with a PhD (72.7%) were the most likely to rate such content very valuable. Respondents from the government sector (78.1%) also appear to be more interested in this type of content than others, but in both instances, although notable, significance tests may be invalid due to low cell counts.

Respondents from the academic (45.6%) and government (49%) sectors and those with 21 to 30 years in AAPOR (46.4%) and those with more than 30 years in AAPOR (50%) appear significantly more likely than others to rate articles reporting substantive as very valuable. Here again significant results should be observed with caution due to low cell counts.

Significantly more men (25.4%) than women (17.4%) and respondents with 21 to 30 years (33.6%) and 30 or more years (34.8%) of AAPOR membership felt that "The Polls: trends" was a very valuable aspect of POQ. Age and affiliation had notable but potentially insignificant differences, with 18-24 year olds saying that this aspect would be very valuable more than others and respondents from the government sector (11.5%) describing this aspect as not at all valuable more so than other respondents.

Again, significantly more men (28.2%) than women (20.9%) and respondents with 21 to 30 years (37.3%) and 30 or more years (39.1%) of AAPOR membership felt that "The Polls: reviews of significant surveys and issues raised" was a very valuable aspect of POQ. Differences among respondents of different education and age appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts.

Men were significantly more likely to classify the book reviews as valuable (47.7% rated a 4 or 5) when compared to women (35.8% rated a 4 or 5). There were also significant differences in terms of years of membership. Members of 6 to 10 years were the most likely (12.6%) to say that the book reviews were not at all valuable; while members of 21 to 30 years were the most likely (23.6%) to say that the book reviews were very valuable. Differences among respondents of different education, age and affiliation appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts.

Only differences among respondents who have been AAPOR members for certain amounts of time were clearly significant when it came to rating the value of Research Notes in POQ, where respondents who have been AAPOR members for over 30 years (23.9%) were far less likely than others to describe this aspect as very valuable. Differences among respondents of different education and affiliation appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts.

More or less in POQ. Only differences between males and females were clearly significant when respondents were asked about how much information on practical implications, applications of methods and techniques they'd like to see in POQ. A greater proportion of females (69.8%) than males (62.2%) indicated that they would like to see more on this topic. Differences among respondents of different education, age and affiliation appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts.

Respondents with a PhD (35.7%) were significantly more likely than others to indicate that they wanted to see more discussion of theory in POQ, while those with a BA/BS indicated in greater proportion than others (24.6%) that they wanted to see less. Differences among respondents of different affiliation

appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts. This is also true for results related to research notes, where notable differences between education groups and affiliation are visible.

Familiarity with the code of ethics. As years in AAPOR increase, so does the proportion of respondents who feel that they are very or somewhat familiar with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices. Respondents who have only been members of the organization for 5 years or less (31.3% not very or not at all familiar for less than one year, 17.1% not very or not at all familiar for 1 to 5 years) were significantly more likely than others to express a lack of familiarity with the Code. Differences among respondents of different ages and race appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts.

Effective standard enforcement. Females (23.1%) were significantly more likely than males (14.6%) to say that they felt the AAPOR standards were enforced very well. Experience seems to play a factor as well, with the proportion of respondents responding very well significantly decreasing as years of membership in AAPOR increase. Members for 21 to 30 years (18.9%) and more than 30 years (22.4%) were significantly more likely to express that they felt AAPOR's standards were enforced "not too well", compared to respondent who have been members for shorter periods of time. A similar relationship is visible when comparing age groups, but this may be due to low cell counts.

Proposed stances. Males were significantly more likely (2.1%) than females (0%) to strongly disagree with the notion of AAPOR becoming more vocal in the mass media. It should be noted that relatively equal proportions of males and females agreed on this issue.

Males (17%) were also significantly more likely to disagree with AAPOR providing more continuing education via workshops than their female counterparts (9%). Differences among respondents of different ages, education and length of AAPOR membership appear significant, but this may be due to low cell counts. When it came to providing continuing education via more short courses, a significantly greater proportion of males (26.8%) than females (20.3%) once again disagreed with AAPOR providing members more in this area.

Forty three percent of male respondents disagreed with aapor offering a professional certification program, while significantly less female respondents (29.6%) felt this way. Years in AAPOR appears significant, with the proportion of those disagreeing increasing with years of membership, but the apparent significance may be invalid due to low cell counts.

Years in AAPOR was significantly tied to opinions on whether or not AAPOR should provide job placement services. Members for 6 to 10 years (37.1%) and members for 21 to 30 years (38%) were significantly more likely than others to somewhat disagree with the association providing this service. Gender and years in AAPOR also played a significant role in respondents' agreement with whether or not AAPOR should establish interest groups. Females (31.3%) were significantly more likely to strongly agree with this than males (23.5%), as were those who have been AAPOR members for 10 years or less, when compared to those who have been members for more than 10 years.

When it comes to establishing conference tracks, it appears as though age is a significant factor in determining support, with proportions of respondents agreeing that AAPOR should establish these tracks diminishing as age increases. However, due to low cell counts, the significant results of this cross tabulation may not be valid.

Attracting more members. Males were significantly more likely than females to support AAPOR attracting more members from the commercial (69.7% to 61.8%) market research (65.2% to 55.9%), political polling (72% to 58.9%) and mass media sectors (74.3% to 63%).

A significant relationship between education and recruitment was visible when respondents were asked about the academic sector, where a significantly larger proportion of PhDs were in favor of AAPOR doing more to attract new members.

Age was significant when respondents age 18 to 24 were significantly less likely than others to support AAPOR attracting new members from the academic sector. Race was significant when white respondents were significantly less likely than others to support AAPOR attracting new members from the commercial sector.

Significant differences by sector were not especially surprising when looking at this block of questions. Respondents from the commercial sector were most likely to be in favor of attracting more members from the commercial and market research sectors, significantly more likely to support attracting more members from the academic sector and those from the government and non-profit sectors were more likely than others to favor AAPOR attracting more members from the government sector.

Years in AAPOR was a significant factor in determining support for attracting more members from the market research sector, where 72.5 percent of those respondents who were members for 21 to 30 years supported the effort, the academic sector, which was favored by 81.2% of those who have been members for less than one year, and political polling, where respondents who were AAPOR members for 1 to 5 years were significantly less likely to support attracting more members.

III. Analysis of Former Member Questionnaire Content

Regional chapter membership. The first question asked of former members focused on regional chapter membership. Ten percent of respondents indicated that they are currently still members of AAPOR chapters, while an additional 33% said that they were chapter members in the past. Over half of the former member survey respondents (56%) indicated that that have never been a member of an AAPOR chapter.

Q1: Have you ever been a member of a regional AAPOR chapter?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes, currently	27	3.3	10.3	10.3
	2 Yes, in the past	87	10.6	33.2	43.5
	3 No, never	148	18.0	56.5	100.0
	Total	262	31.8	100.0	
Missing	System	562	68.2		
Total		824	100.0		

Employment status and length of time in the field. Respondents were next asked questions that focused on their employment and experiences. A vast majority of respondents were employed full time (78%), while 8.8% were working part time. Almost 7% of respondents were retired and 5% were students.

Q2: What is your current employment status?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Working full-time	204	24.8	78.2	78.2
	2 Working part-time	23	2.8	8.8	87.0
	3 Student	12	1.5	4.6	91.6
	4 Retired	18	2.2	6.9	98.5
	5 Other	4	.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	261	31.7	100.0	
Missing	System	563	68.3		
Total		824	100.0		

When asked how long they had worked in the public opinion/survey research or allied fields, results show that former member survey respondents had a fare amount of experience. Only 1.5% of respondents indicated being in the field for less than one year, while 15% have been working for 1 to 5

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

years, 22% have been working for 6 to 10 years, and 31% have been working for 11 to 20 years. Thirty percent of respondents indicated working 21 years or more.

Current field or industry. Respondents were also asked to categorize their current field or industry. The most frequently chosen field was issue research/public policy (15.4%) followed by market research (12.7%), federal or national government (11.5%) and “other” commercial/nonprofit field or industry (9.2%).

Q4: Which one of the following BEST describes your current field or industry? Please consider the work you most often do when answering

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Business/Public administration	4	.5	1.5	1.5
	2 Communication	11	1.3	4.2	5.8
	3 Economics	1	.1	.4	6.2
	4 Health/Medicine	6	.7	2.3	8.5
	5 Political science	17	2.1	6.5	15.0
	6 Psychology	6	.7	2.3	17.3
	7 Sociology	9	1.1	3.5	20.8
	8 Survey methods	16	1.9	6.2	26.9
	9 Other academic field	12	1.5	4.6	31.5
	10 Issue research/Public policy	40	4.9	15.4	46.9
	11 Market research	33	4.0	12.7	59.6
	12 Media	7	.8	2.7	62.3
	13 Political polling	4	.5	1.5	63.8
	14 Other commercial/nonprofit field or industry	24	2.9	9.2	73.1
	15 Federal/National	30	3.6	11.5	84.6
	16 State or Local	13	1.6	5.0	89.6
	18 Retired	15	1.8	5.8	95.4
	19 Other (General)	12	1.5	4.6	100.0
	Total	260	31.6	100.0	
Missing	System	564	68.4		
Total		824	100.0		

Membership in Other Associations. Respondents were next asked if they were members of other disciplinary or professional associations. When first asked about disciplinary associations, 40.6% of respondents indicated that they were not members of any disciplinary associations, and 17.3% of respondents indicated that they were members of an organization other than those listed. Of the disciplinary associations respondents do belong to, the most frequently selected was the American Political Science Association (9.4%) followed by the American Statistical Association (8.2%) and the American Sociological Association (5.3%).

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

When next asked about professional associations, a large majority (74.5%) of respondents indicated that they were not members of any disciplinary associations, and only 8% of respondents indicated that they were members of an organization other than those listed. Of the disciplinary associations respondents do belong to, the most frequently selected was the American Marketing Association (7.6%) followed by the Marketing Research Association (4.3%).

Rating AAPOR. Similar to the Members' Survey, respondents were asked to rate a series of 10 aspects of AAPOR on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 meant "Very valuable" and 1 meant "Not at all valuable." Table X below displays results of the results of these items. About one third of respondents indicated that *Public Opinion Quarterly* was very valuable, and large proportions found Standard Definitions, the Response Rate Handbook (28.2%) and the annual conference (21.1%) to be very valuable. The aspects of AAPOR receiving the largest proportion of "Not at all valuable" were the *Blue Book*, AAPOR News and the respondents' regional chapters (16.8% for all 3). Also interesting to note is the relatively high percentage of "Don't Know/Not Applicable" responses selected for the *Blue Book* (29.3%) and the respondents' regional chapters (44.5%), both tools for networking and maintaining connections that may keep people engaged in membership.

Table X. Overall Ratings of Various Aspects of AAPOR.

Aspect of Aapor	% 1 Not at all Valuable	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5 Very Valuable	% Don't Know/Not Applicable
<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	3.2	9.5	21.8	32.1	31.3	2.0
The Annual Conference	9.0	6.6	17.2	29.7	21.1	16.4
Your Regional Chapter	16.8	15.2	8.6	9.0	5.9	44.5
The <i>Blue Book</i>	16.8	18.4	16.8	13.7	5.1	29.3
The Code of Professional Ethics & Practices	8.6	14.5	21.5	25.4	19.5	10.5
The Membership Directory	16.0	20.3	22.3	19.1	11.3	10.9
Standard Definitions	6.3	7.8	15.3	27.1	28.2	15.3
AAPORNet Listserv	13.3	12.9	18.4	20.8	17.3	17.3
AAPOR Website	14.1	21.9	24.6	20.7	8.6	10.2
AAPOR News, the Newsletter	16.8	20.3	23.4	12.1	4.3	23.0

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

Table Y below displays mean scores for the aspects of AAPOR this block of items asked about. Overall, *Public Opinion Quarterly* was rated as the most valuable (3.8) while regional chapters were rated as the least valuable (2.5).

Table Y. Mean Value Scores of Various Aspects of AAPOR.

Aspect of Aapor	Mean Value Score (Scale of 1 to 5)
<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	3.8
Standard Definitions	3.8
The Annual Conference	3.6
The Code of Professional Ethics & Practices	3.4
AAPORNet Listserv	3.2
The Membership Directory	2.9
AAPOR Website	2.9
<i>AAPOR News</i> , the Newsletter	2.6
The <i>Blue Book</i>	2.6
Your Regional Chapter	2.5

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

Respondents were also asked to rate the importance of a series of suggested reasons for not renewing their AAPOR membership, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 meant "Very important" and 1 meant "Not at all important." Table Z below displays results of the results of these items. Respondents most frequently cited the expense of membership dues (18.4%), the expense of conference participation (14.6%) and being too busy to participate (13.8%) as very important reasons for leaving AAPOR.

Table Z. Importance of Suggested Reasons for not Renewing AAPOR Membership.

Aspect of Aapor	% 1 Not at all Important	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5 Very Important
Not relevant to my work	55.8	10.4	16.7	7.5	9.6
Didn't have much in common with members	49.8	18.8	16.7	10.5	4.2
Articles in POQ were not of interest to me	59.2	18.1	14.7	5.9	2.1
Quality of products and services not high enough	63.2	16.3	10.9	6.7	2.9
Too busy to participate	36.0	10.0	18.8	21.3	13.8
Conference at inconvenient time	57.7	16.6	10.4	10.4	5.0
Didn't like conference content or location	62.9	17.5	14.2	2.5	2.9
Attended a conference only for a one time purpose	76.9	10.9	5.0	3.8	3.4
Conference was too expensive	51.3	10.0	12.5	11.7	14.6
Membership dues were too expensive	44.4	9.6	13.4	14.2	18.4
Another association better met my needs	60.3	8.4	8.9	9.3	13.1
I changed professions	77.9	4.7	3.8	3.8	9.8
Employer no longer supports membership	73.2	6.7	4.6	3.8	11.7
I retired	89.6	.8	2.1	.4	7.1

2007 AAPOR Member and Former Member Survey

Table ZZ below displays mean scores for the reasons respondents did not renew. Overall, being too busy to participate was rated as the most important reason (2.7) while retiring was rated as the least important (1.4).

Table ZZ. Mean Value Scores of Various Aspects of AAPOR.

Aspect of Aapor	Mean Value Score (Scale of 1 to 5)
Too busy to participate	2.7
Membership dues were too expensive	2.5
Conference was too expensive	2.3
Not relevant to my work	2.1
Another association better met my needs	2.1
Didn't have much in common with members	2.0
Conference at inconvenient time	1.9
Articles in POQ were not of interest to me	1.7
Quality of products and services not high enough	1.7
Didn't like conference content or location	1.7
Employer no longer supports membership	1.7
I changed professions	1.6
Attended a conference only for a one time purpose	1.5
I retired	1.4