Second International Conference on Public Opinion Research

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS

September 2-5, 1947

PROCEEDINGS

Edited By

HENRY DAVID, PH.D.

QUEENS COLLEGE

Printed and Distributed By

THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER

4901 SOUTH ELLIS AVENUE

CHICAGO 15, ILLINOIS

1948

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The Second International Conference on Public Opinion Research, held at Williams College, September 2-5, 1947, indicated that a relatively young research field had reached a new and significant stage in its development. The informal sessions of the Conference revealed that those who attended were moved by more than a lively technical concern with the crucial problems and current contributions in public opinion research which they considered and critically discussed. They were also sensible of the distinctive professional responsibilities attached to their work and of the relation of public opinion research to the larger world. This was manifested not only in the common recognition that public opinion research is invested with a quasi-public character, that its results bear on democratic theory and living, and that it has a function to perform in the creation of international understanding, but also in the establishment by the members of the Conference of two professional organizations, -- The American Association of Public Opinion Research and The World Congress on Public Opinion Research.

By resolution and election of the necessary committee, the First International Conference on Public Opinion Research, held at Central City, Colorado, in the summer of 1946, laid the foundation for the Second International Conference at Williams College. The Central City gathering, the first of its kind in the United States, had been inspired and organized by the late Harry Field, then director of the National Opinion Research Center. The task of making all arrangements for the Second International Conference and of drawing up its program fell to an Executive Committee consisting of Clyde W. Hart (Chairman), Lloyd E. Borg, George H. Gallup, Samuel A. Stouffer, Elmo C. Wilson, Julian L. Woodward, Paul B.

Sheatsley (Secretary). As Secretary of the Committee, Paul Sheatsley performed his particularly onerous duties with unusual skill and dispatch. The Executive Committee subsequently enjoyed the assistance of a sixteen-member Sponsoring Committee consisting of Wahl Asmussen, Hadley Cantril, Archibald M. Crossley, Stuart C. Dodd, Henry Durant, Guillaume Jacquemijns, Daniel Katz, Arnold J. King, Paul F Lazarsfeld, Rensis Likert, Roy Morgan, Claude Robinson, Elmo Roper, Wilfrid Sanders, Frederick Stephan, Jean Stoetzel.

Two other committees contributed to the work of the Conference. A Committee on Standards, designated by the Central City gathering and consisting of Henry David, Morris H. Hansen and Elmo C. Wilson, was authorized to investigate and report on the related questions of a professional organization and professional standards in public opinion research. A sub-committee on international organization, created by the Executive Committee, was authorized to deal with the question of a professional organization of international scope. This Committee was made up of Stuart C. Dodd, (Co-Chairman), George H. Gallup, (Co-Chairman), Rensis Likert, Wilfrid Sanders, Elmo C. Wilson.

The registered participants in the Second International Conference numbered 194. Among them, fifteen came from outside United States, -- four from England, two each from Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Canada, and one each from Australia, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Switzerland, and Germany. About fifty different research organizations and consultants were represented at the Conference, as well as eight university research centers and five state and local polling agencies. Other affiliations of those attending the Conference included twenty-three colleges and universities, seventeen periodicals and newspapers, three radio broadcasting organizations, ten United States Government departments or agencies, about the same number of civic bodies, and five industrial enterprises. Two Conference participants were associated with the

United Nations.

In Williams College the Conference found a very friendly host and an unusually pleasant setting for its activities. The Conference was graciously and warmly welcomed by James Phinney Baxter III, President of Williams College, and its members were the guests of President and Mrs. Baxter at a memorable reception. To David Truman, the tireless representative of Williams College, the Conference was deeply indebted.

These Proceedings were, in the first instance, made possible by the reporting system organized by Don Cahalan and Paul Sheatsley. Each session was covered by stenographers and an official reporter. While it was not intended to secure a verbatim record of each Round Table and Panel Discussion, the reports turned over to the editor were full and faithful accounts of what had transpired. The editor is, consequently, grateful to each of the reporters for having eased his task. To insure accuracy, the editor submitted his version of each Round Table and Panel Discussion Report to those who had participated in the sessions. Their corrections and emendations were invaluable. He appreciated both their aid and the good nature with which they accepted his account of their remarks. For the final form and language in which each session is now reported and for the summaries, the editor alone is responsible.

New York
March, 1948

Henry David

I

PUBLIC OPINION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

An Address

by

William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State[1]

Delivered September 2, 1947

The appraisal of public opinion is one of the oldest of the political arts. You assembled here in Williamstown are pioneers in the effort to create a scientific basis for that art. And this meeting, international in character as it is, is one of the evidences that your new science is moving toward maturity.

Practitioners of the art of gauging public opinion - including heads of government and foreign ministers - have met in international conference for centuries and have made nice calculations concerning the temper of public opinion in their respective countries and throughout the world. One of the great strategic weapons - and one of the great pitfalls - of the international negotiator has always been his judgment and insight as to what his own public and the other fellow's public will demand and what they will put up with. Scholars point out that Lord Palmerston - brilliantly successful when he was young and in intimate contact with his own people - found the whole basis of his foreign policy abandoned when he grew old and lost touch with the public. Bismarck pitted his judgment of the strength of popular demand for German unity against that of most experts, and Bismarck won out. Disraeli proved a better public opinion analyst than Gladstone. Lincoln and Cavour perceived the deeper thrusts of public sentiment, and adapted their actions accordingly.

[1] Mr. Benton resigned as Assistant Secretary September 30, 1947.

Such insight is even more essential to the politician dealing with domestic issues; in this country, for example, astute political leaders, such as Jefferson, Jackson and again Lincoln, have set a high standard of excellence in sensing the public will, as well as in giving it shape and direction.

This conference is unique in that it brings together private individuals from various nations, meeting on a professional basis, to discuss problems peculiar to research on public attitudes, and with no motive other than the advancement of understanding.

During the past ten or twelve years you experts have been learning how to reduce the element of guess for the policy-makers and administrators. But like all pioneers, you are still crass newcomers. The shrewd guess of the responsible political leader, who must take into account the intensity of public feeling as well as its dispersion, who must predict the direction of opinion and the impact of events upon it, who must judge the political effectiveness of various groups, must still be the guide to action.

I shall not have to argue, before this of all groups, that what large numbers of people believe and think, what they fear and hope, grows ever more important in determining the shape of things to come. The growth of political democracy, the vast extension of popular education, and the miracle of easy, quick and frequent communications have produced a new social situation, the full significance of which is not yet understood. I believe this to be true everywhere, even in the totalitarian countries whose rulers have had to invent new techniques of propaganda and repression to cope with it and to practice old ones on an unprecedented scale, in order to remain in power.

Up to a generation or two ago public leaders, in taking into account the broad aspirations and demands of the populations they represented, could count on the fact that these aspirations moved slowly, like the communications of the time. Today, when uncounted millions of people are bombarded by

headlines, by day-to-day and hour-to-hour newscasts, by millions of words and images poured forth by press, radio and motion pictures - policy-makers and public officials are faced with an immensely more complicated job in attempting to follow or anticipate the swift tempo of popular opinion.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the field of international relations. While a fair degree of continuity may exist in each nation with respect to opinion on domestic problems, the political leader or official dealing with foreign policy must weigh and balance the shifting and interacting public opinions in fifty or sixty nations - public attitudes which he has difficulty in assaying and over which he has little or no influence.

Up to World War I relations between nations were conducted largely as diplomatic negotiations between rulers or their personal representatives. Today these dealings between chiefs of state, or chiefs of diplomatic missions, are being heavily supplemented by direct contacts between and with whole peoples. A growing volume of official or diplomatic business is no longer conducted behind closed doors but, as in the meetings of the Security Council, is open for all to read or hear. It is in fact one of the dilemmas of diplomacy that these publicly-conducted negotiations may be converted into platforms for appeals to the people of the world - into sounding boards - rather than used as a means of securing accomodation and agreement. But such is the need for public information and public education that the open method is to be preferred whenever possible.

It is not uncommon today for government spokesmen to reply to policy statements of other governments by statements in the press or on the radio - as both the United States and the Soviet representatives in the Atomic Energy Commission have recently done. Secretary Marshall's appeal for a joint Europe recovery plan was made, not in a diplomatic note to the governments of Europe, but on a public platform - at the Harvard Commencement. Because of the

speed and range of modern communications, such a message reaches millions and affects world opinion almost at once.

This democratization of the conduct of international relations will, I believe and hope, continue to develop rapidly, spite the presently successful efforts of some nations to insulate their peoples from direct contact with the rest of the world. It is developing at the very moment when, in nearly every nation, old priorities have been upset and the problems of foreign relations have superseded in importance all of the traditionally controverted domestic issues. What I am saying is that peace - just and lasting peace - has become the paramount issue for all peoples and that peace can be built only in the minds and hearts, or call it the opinions and attitudes, of hundreds of millions of people in many lands. Without such building, there can be no assurance of peace.

The upsurge of public interest in international problems has nowhere been more dramatic than in the United States. The front pages of our papers are crowded, day in and day out, with foreign datelines. The State Department is on the front page almost daily. In the last fiscal year the Department received 1,613 requests for speakers, and filled 813 of them, contrasted with 48 requests filled in 1944. Last year the Department received 45,000 letters from the public, not including form letters or petitions, in support of some particular policy, and it was in communication with 327 organizations seeking information. When Dr. Gallup asked last month, "What do you think is the most important problem facing this country today," 47% of the public named problems of international affairs, this was twice as many as named the high cost of living. A similar question asked in 1945 and 1946 showed only 15% to 16% giving priority to international issues. Such a phenomenon would have been as unthinkable twenty years ago as would the convening of an international conference of public opinion analysts.

What is happening in the United States is happening in varying degrees everywhere. The various world

publics exhibit a deepening anxiety. If they must decide the issues that make for peace or lead to war, on what basis shall they decide? We of the Western world of course -- out of our deepest-held political traditions -- answer that the whole people, on the basis of full and fair information made freely available to them, should decide, and that they will decide rightly if they are permitted to do so; and that further, no decision will stick except on such a basis. We would echo the great cry of John Milton "Let Truth and Falsehood grapple, who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?" Information, no matter how full and fair, is not synonymous with truth, and is no substitute for judgment, but it is an indispensable foundation for both.

I have been stressing the increasing power of public opinion, the increasing public interest in international affairs, and the increasing ability of the communications system to match the need for public information. What, then, is the state of the world public's information about world affairs -- this force which may now determine world survival? It is, I am sorry to say, woefully inadequate at best and dangerously distorted at worst. For all our proud achievements in communication, we are uninformed. I find myself more deeply concerned about that fact than I am about coal shortages and atom bombs.

There are many reasons why we are uninformed. One set of reasons springs from the use in some countries of the twin instruments of censorship and propaganda, which represent reactions against the flood of world information. Although the world as a whole is probably in worse case today with respect to freedom of information than it has ever been, I do not believe that censorship can hold off indefinitely the surging tide of facts and ideas.

Poverty and inability to acquire facilities are still key factors in determining the adequacy, as contrasted with the freedom, of information. /Monopoly and cartel practices keep costs high. There are shortages of paper and of film-stock. And basically, of course,

there is the inadequacy and the poor quality of education, of which illiteracy is only the most flagrant example. Information becomes intelligible only through education. In our own country, where higher education is more generally available than in any other land, it is not a good omen that our college graduates prefer Milt Caniff to Walter Lippmann by an overwhelming margin.

From my particular vantage-point in the Department of State I see the consequences of these factors as they affect foreign opinion about the United States. In the position of world leadership into which it has been catapulted, albeit reluctantly and to its surprise, the United States is today the object of intense curiosity throughout the world. In the absence of a system of world communications and exchanges free and adequate to the need, we see this curiosity developing into misconceptions about us that are fantastic in their their proportions. We are pictured in some quarters as a dragon intent on enslaving the world, and not even given credit as a reluctant dragon. Some of these misconceptions are deliberately fostered by our detractors, but more are due to plain unmitigated ignorance. In either case they are dangers as great as any we face. In a world rife with tensions and controversy, in a world of dislocation and suffering, they compound the mischief and set the stage for conflict.

We Americans too have our misconceptions about foreign peoples, and about the nature of foreign relations, and they are serious misconceptions. But in justice I will say that, in view of our deepening interest in world affairs, our splendid popular communications system and our relative wealth and freedom, these American misconceptions are perhaps more readily correctible than those held abroad about us.

We in the State Department are deeply concerned with public misconceptions both here and abroad. Although our efforts are not as yet remotely commensurate with the magnitude of the problem, certain lines of action have been laid down. We are pressing, as best we can, to advance the concept and practice of

world-wide freedom of information, in the face of very considerable difficulties. We seek to stimulate the activities of private information agencies in the international field, and to reduce the economic barriers as well as the political. We are energetic and enthusiastic participants in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Through the Office of International Information and Educational Exchange, we are attempting to fill the information gaps left by the other agencies -- an enterprise, that is novel for us now, after extensive debate in Congress and the press, an enterprise that is accepted, I believe, as an integral part of the conduct of foreign affairs. On the home side, through the Office of Public Affairs, we are having some minor success in opening to the public gaze the operations and the problems of the State Department itself.

I have been talking in very general terms. Now I want to enlist you in this enterprise. Half a century ago Lord Bryce pointed out that one of the difficulties of our American democratic system was that of measuring accurately the drift of public opinion between elections. If he were here at Williamstown today I doubt that he would put as much stress on that difficulty as he did in 1893. And the chief reason is that you ladies and gentlemen have developed, and are developing, new instruments for measuring public information, opinions, attitudes and preferences. We can now supplement the study of press opinion, party opinion and leadership opinion with the responses of representative cross-sections of the public as a whole. Never until recent years has it been possible to obtain in any systematic way a balanced picture, in perspective, of the opinions of all groups in the populations. It is now possible to find out what "the public" thinks on any given issue or range of issues. It is also possible to ascertain the trends of opinion, and the variations and peculiarities of opinion as between one group and another. The policy-maker's\opportunity for self-deception -- the tendency for believing that the opinion of one's own particular group is the opinion of the public -- is diminished.

Like most ingenious people you have brought upon yourselves new responsibilities, as great as your ingenuity. You have found a way to make this a more democratic world, and thus, we can hope, a more peaceful world, and you must now live up to your responsibility to do so.

You are interested in what people know, feel and think, and you can measure it. I am interested in that too, but I am even more interested in what makes them feel and think as they do, and in what the consequences are. If I am right that the opinions of national publics are increasingly the key to peace; and if I am right that massive misconceptions may be the greatest single menace to peace, then I have a challenge for you.

When a congressman asks me -- as many have -- whether anybody abroad pays any attention to the output of our Office of International Information and Educational Exchange, I can usually convince him that they do by citing a variety of statistics and incidents, all somewhat unscientific but nevertheless real. But if a congressman asks me to prove that our output has modified public opinion about the United States abroad, or overcome specific misconceptions, I am much less persuasive. An act of faith is involved -- as it is in all public information activities --faith in the curative power of honest information widely disseminated. It is a faith that is justified; Mr. Sulzberger does not have to measure the effect of the New York Times on public attitudes to know that he is adding to public understanding. But it is nonetheless true that in these critical times all agencies of international information can do a better job if they are not shooting in the dark.

What are the misconceptions about America held abroad, country by country? How deeply are they held? What causes them? What are the effective ways of dissolving them? I believe your group may know how to help find the answers to these questions, and I hope this conference will devote some time to them. I would similarly hope that American misconceptions about foreign peoples could be clarified,

though I am frank to say that opinion analysis, which is much more highly developed here, has already progressed to the point where it is probably more useful to the foreign offices of other countries than much of the traditional work of their Embassies in Washington.

(Let me say parenthetically that, if it were possible, public opinion analysis in certain Eastern European countries would offer unique possibilities for controlled experiments in the formation of public opinion.)

I would also ask our American analysts for a more intensive concentration on issues of U. S. foreign policy, to help crystallize that policy. We do not feel that we are omniscient in the Department of State. But we do feel that because the members of the Department make a full time job of it -- often a lifetime job -- we have a better grasp of the international problems faced by the U. S. than many members of the public. Our conviction in our own policies is buttressed by the fact that the better informed elements of the population seem to agree with us on most issues.

When we believe we are right -- and when a minority who have the knowledge necessary for an intelligent opinion agree with us, but a numerical majority of the public disagrees with our policy, what then? This problem is as old as democracy itself. One thing to my mind is clear, however. If there is to be any role at all for leadership in a democracy, the policy-makers -- the President and his cabinet, Congress and the Department -- at least have the obligation to state the facts to the public and explain their position in regard to those facts. This applies both domestically and, in a world where the U.S. has grave responsibilities of leadership and power, to foreign peoples as well.

In his speech at Salt Lake City in July Secretary Marshall said: "The greatest problem we have to deal with is in bringing the American public to a

general understanding of the conditions involved at home and abroad which influence all negotiations and therefore all efforts to reestablish the peace and prosperity of the world." Such a general understanding must rest on accurate information. The Department of State is under an obligation to make sure that the American people have the fullest possible access to facts relating to foreign policy problems, to the policies as developed, and the reasoning behind them.

Except for the handling of day-to-day news developments, the Department up to three years ago had no special personnel or budget for discharging its information obligations. Its small staff of overworked technical officers had to cope as they could with mail from the public, and turn down ten speaking invitations for every one they accepted. Funds and staff for preparing the most elementary documentary material were so severely limited that justice could not remotely be done to inquiries from organizations and individuals. Much less was it possible for the Department to undertake a positive program for stimulating interest in foreign policy problems.

It is still unable to carry out its now enlarged responsibilities on any scale at all comparable with the need and demand. The Department's program in this field must be improved and expanded. At the same time it must avoid high pressure selling campaigns in support of its policies. The use of public money by executive agencies for the purpose of conducting campaigns to influence congressional votes is properly forbidden. But, as Dean Acheson once pointed out, the Department is damned for secretiveness if it doesn't put out information and damned for propagandizing if it does. There is no place for Dr. Goebbels' methods, Mr. Acheson said, but neither is there a place for Colonel Blimp.

I cannot conclude without pointing out that the greatest role of groups such as this in the pursuit of peace is not as analysts of current opinion but as social psychologists. The misconceptions I have spoken of often seem to revolve like storm clouds

around hotly debated issues. These pass; what they spring from, and the increment they leave, do not pass so easily. The misconceptions are seldom woven out of whole cloth. They are usually related to basic stereotypes, to deep-seated prejudices and antagonisms. Programs of current information are usually designed to offset the immediate misconceptions, and though they may be indispensable at a given moment, tend to be ephemeral in their effect. The more basic and permanent antagonisms can be countered only by longer range methods -- notably by the exchange of students on a wholesale scale. Ultimately, of course, only education can provide the permanent foundation for international understanding.

Your task is large. It is complex. It is urgent. The social scientists of the world, whether in universities or other research organizations, have a great role to play in the drama of war or peace and all signs indicate that it will become steadily greater.

II

ROUND TABLE

Problems of Polling in Different Countries

Herbert Hyman, National Opinion Research Center

R. J. Jessen, Statistical Laboratory,
Iowa State College

Laszlo Radvanyi,
Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion

Chairman: Rensis Likert, Survey Research Center,
University of Michigan

SUMMARY

Public opinion research in each country is marked by distinctive problems. The rich experience of American polling is valuable, but it must be properly employed. American public opinion research procedures and habits should not be made to serve as a fixed model for the conduct of polling operations elsewhere. Societies are differently structured in different countries; sampling data are not of the same order or worth; similar questions have different meanings. The literal application of American procedures and assumptions to other countries invites error and trouble, but if they are wisely used they can be very helpful. The problems which arise with the extension of polling to new areas can be solved fairly quickly, if existing knowledge and experience are intelligently applied. Even extraordinarily difficult sampling problems can be overcome. These generalizations were illustrated and illuminated by specific instances supplied by persons engaged in opinion surveys outside the United States.

Herbert Hyman:

RESPONDENT REACTION IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Dr. Hyman observed, by way of introduction, that the extent of polling in foreign countries is suggested by the approximately sixty polling organizations recently established in Japan. What Americans and other peoples think about the polling process -- what their reaction to being polled is, how they feel about the interview, whether they liked it or disliked it, etc. -- is, he declared, critically important. A recent study by NORC showed that although the majority of the respondents reacted favorably to being polled, a surprisingly large number responded unfavorably, -- some for quite "exotic" reasons. The increasing number and the extent of public opinion polls make the problem of respondent reaction to the polling process an important issue for further study.

If a substantial number of respondents react unfavorably and oddly in the United States, where the democratic tradition is of long standing, then, said Dr. Hyman, we should expect even more unfavorable reactions from respondents in countries where experience with democracy has been limited or nonexistent. Although the application of polling techniques in foreign countries raises special problems, Dr. Hyman was certain that surveys can be successfully conducted abroad if sufficient care is taken with all the details of the polling operation and the latter are modified to suit each particular national and cultural setting.

The respondent's reactions may be viewed, according to Dr. Hyman, on two levels: (1) his reaction to the interview as such, and (2) the broader issue of the meaning of his responses. The first involves such questions as, how does the reaction vary from situation to situation; what conditions tend to improve the respondent's reaction? The second involves questions at the heart of a polling operation: what do the answers mean? How are we to go about analyzing them so that

we may properly understand them?

With respect to the first level, it is hard to generalize about respondent reaction in different countries, said Dr. Hyman. Sometimes they are quite different from American reactions; sometimes they are very much the same. One rarely knows in advance when the responses will resemble American responses and when they will differ. Dr Hyman's experience in Japan raised the issue of the anonymity of the respondent. In America we take great pains always to assure complete anonymity in polls and and surveys, because we believe that to do otherwise restricts the responses and increases the possibility of dishonest responses. In Japan, however, the situation is quite different. At first polls were conducted on an anonymous basis. In a recent poll anonymity was discarded and names were taken before the questioning. Although the study is not yet completed, available findings indicate that the response is much better when the respondents are told that their name will be taken, because the Japanese take the interview more seriously and answer with more care. Apparently this procedure flatters Japanese respondents, and gives them the feeling that their opinions really do matter. This study indicates one essential difference between Japanese and American respondents, and suggests the advisability of further study of the question of anonymity in the United States.

Dr. Hyman's experience also embraced a Japanese reaction which was more along the lines common in the United States. When confronted by the interviewer, one Japanese respondent exclaimed, "Oh! This is the Gallup Poll." With this as a starter, the interview proceeded quite smoothly. In Japan the existence of hierarchical institutions accounted for reactions not common in America. When asked for her opinion, the housewife often says that the questions should rather be asked of her husband. In some areas the respondent is likely to tell the interviewer to ask the "Boss" of the community. In some cases, differences in reactions which were anticipated did not occur.

Dr. Hyman cited the Bombing Survey in Germany and Austria where those concerned initially believed that the respondents would refuse to talk. This didn't turn out to be the case. Under proper conditions, the people did respond and meaningful results were obtainable.

Turning to the broader meaning of the respondent's reactions, Dr. Hyman pointed out that the correlates of opinion in Japan are different from those in the United States. The same factors and variables do not have the same significance. Accepted American types of analysis of Japanese responses often fail to yield significant returns. Some differences in response in foreign surveys are attributable to cultural factors, but others seem to be determined chiefly by field factors. The results of some polling in Austria and Germany, for example, took on greater significance when they were interpreted in the light of field factors. The fact that people expressed the desire to have only one party in Parliament, for example, did not mean that they were totalitarian, but rather that they were dissatisfied with inaction resulting from constant inter-party strife. What they wanted, consequently, was a respite from the evils of factionalism. An amusing example of the cultural factor and its effect on the response occurred during an interview in Hanover. A question about the people living with the respondent unhappily employed the word, zusamminleben, and produced the sharp comment, "Dammit, you Americans want to know everything." Zusammenleben means "to live in sin!" In another instance, the impeccable Tyrolian dialect of one interviewer drew the spontaneous comment from an old Tyrolian that America must surely be a land of unlimited possibilities if he could speak Tyrolian so well. This, of course, much enhanced the interview.

Dr. Hyman observed that there is no single rule for polling in foreign countries, but that he found the following general points useful in carrying out the Japanese surveys and believed that they are applicable in the planning of all foreign surveys. (1) It is

unwise to assume that there will be uniformity between American and foreign reactions. We must, consequently, always be ready to modify American methods so as to make them applicable in other cultures. (2) It should not be assumed that many years of work are necessary to find out what techniques are best suited for the particular foreign country. Two or three months of intensive work are sufficient to determine what kind of survey can properly be made. Dr. Hyman found it extremely helpful to make use of Japanese sociologists and other social scientists who know the social setting in solving such difficult problems as sampling, the "Don't Know" response, refusals, etc. (3) Because we can never predict in advance just how a particular poll or ballot is going to work out, it is essential to develop and maintain continuing methodological research on all foreign surveys. Constant check on the work as it comes in from the field and on the validity of the ballot is imperative whether we are conducting surveys at home or abroad.

R. J. Jessen:

SAMPLING PROBLEMS IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

In his introductory remarks Dr. Jessen touched on the crucial importance of sample problems in the field of public opinion research and on the two categories of sampling methods, the area and the quota methods. It was not his purpose to analyze the two methods, said Dr. Jessen, but rather to deal with the application of the area method, which, he suggested, was poorly labelled, outside the United States on the basis of his experiences in Greece. There, he was responsible for the sampling designs and survey methods used in the study of the Greek elections. Dr. Jessen felt that the danger of generalizing from his work in Greece was reduced by the number of experiments and techniques put to the test there. In dealing with the problem of selecting a representative sample, the sampler often wants to know the total number of elements in the universe or population as well as its characteristics. In Greece, said Dr. Jessen, the total number of persons in the population

was not known, nor was the total number of registered voters. Only estimates based on old census data taken in 1940 and corrected for births and deaths since were available, and these estimates varied considerably amongst the statisticians making them.

To find out the total number of registered voters, the total number of people of voting age, and some of the characteristics of the registered voters were therefore basic problems in the Greek Survey. The method followed involved first the setting up of a number of strata or groups of communities based on the 1940 census of population and geographic location. A hypothetical universe of sampling units of about 15 households each was created and a sample of 1 in 500 elements of that universe was drawn.

Next it was necessary to secure maps of the Greek communities which by random selection came into the sample. As a result of a long and arduous search, a good set of maps was finally obtained which provided the required information on the limits of places and helped clarify the issue of overlapping or omitted communities. With these maps the investigator determined locally the approximate number of persons for each small area, such as a block or some other easily identified area, indicated thereon. This information made it possible to set up and allocate sampling units within the sample community which were to be used for the household survey. With interview cost, time, and manpower considerations taken into account, the sampling designs were then specified for two surveys, one of households (for all persons) and one of names on election registers. This included the number of places to be canvassed and the sampling rates to be applied within the places for both households and for names on the registration lists. The households and names for investigation, Dr. Jessen continued, were chosen objectively by random selection. The number of such elements in the sample was, therefore, not predetermined for each community, but was the result of applying given sampling rates in a specified manner. Where no maps

were available for the sample place, the interviewers had to go out into the field to make them. At first, interviewers resented this task, which was sometimes very onerous, but later accepted it when they were told why it was necessary. With the help of the UNRRA, village chieftains, and village priests the job of mapping was generally done in one or two days. The over-all sampling rate, said Dr. Jessen, was one out of 500.

Rather than estimate the totals for Greece by multiplying the sample totals by 500, more accurate results were obtained by means of regression procedures. The calculated standard error for the estimate of total population was 1.8% of the estimate.

In concluding, Dr. Jessen pointed out that his experiences in Greece exemplified the need for accurate estimating methods for data obtained on a sampling basis especially when auxiliary information is available. With the help of good maps and a proper estimating method, the total population can be accurately estimated, even though the exo-sample data utilized are incomplete and faulty.

Laszlo Radvanyi:

DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES TOWARDS POLLING IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Dr. Radvanyi, "pinch-hitting" for Jean Stoetzel, welcomed the opportunity to deal with some of the problems of polling in different countries along the lines of his article ("Problems of International Opinion Surveys") published recently in the International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research (vol. I, no. 2, pp. 30-51).

One of the chief problems of international surveying, declared Dr. Radvanyi, is created by the varying attitudes which the people of different countries have toward opinion polls. Some of these attitudes, resulting from the weakness or lack of democratic tradition or thought, produce responses without value for the survey when the interview is not appropriately conducted. Such attitudes may result in doubt as to the

value of individual opinions and their expression; inability to understand the real significance of public opinion surveys; excessive fear of possible consequences of the expression of opinions contrary to those of the government (which, of course, may also be the result of actual government oppression); the conviction that political and other opinions are "private" and not to be shared with others (even in South American countries with long democratic traditions, respondents often refuse to express an opinion because they do not wish anyone to penetrate their privacy); a high degree of apathy or contempt toward "public affairs," "government matters," and the like.

Inability to understand the real significance of the surveys, pointed out Dr. Radvanyi, increases considerable distrust in them. This commonly occurs where polling agencies are new, and the lack of confidence may produce the following suppositions: the survey is conducted by the government in order to ascertain the opinions of the inhabitants; the survey is conducted by the Treasury authorities in order to ascertain the income and other details of the economic situation of the inhabitants, for the purpose of increasing taxes; the survey is made by a political party which, by pretext of questioning, seeks to influence the people for election purposes; the survey is dishonestly conducted, and its results will be used dishonestly for undesirable purposes; the survey is made by "smart folk" who find an easy way to earn their livelihood in trafficking with the thinking of the people. All such suspicions create problems in the initiation and conduct of surveys, and Dr. Radvanyi asserted that the weaker the democratic traditions are, the more difficult it is to solve such problems.

In some parts of Central and South America, the lack of individualistic thinking places difficulties in the way of surveys, because respondents want to know what other people (particularly educated people) have answered, or what specific individuals have answered, or desire to be interviewed together with their friends and colleagues. Surprisingly enough, the weight of

experience shows that the lack of or insufficiency of democratic traditions does not result in a high percentage of refusals and "Don't Knows" in opinion polling in Central and South American countries. Generally refusals and "Don't Knows" run about the same or only slightly above the levels in the United States, England, and similiar countries.

Dr. Radvanyi explained the apparent contradiction by the preference of many respondents to answer "Yes" or "No," or select answers from a list presented to them, rather than to indicate fear, distrust, lack of opinion, or failure to understand the question by a refusal or "Don't Know." Such "false answers" flow from widely different attitudes, said Dr. Radvanyi. Very often there is the belief that giving a false answer conceals much better one's real opinion than a refusal or a "Don't Know." Sometimes respondents hope that by answering in a certain way certain advantages can be obtained. Frequently, particularly in the Far East and among the indigenous populations of Central and South America, respondents believe that the questions are not asked to obtain factual information, and their desire to be polite leads them to answer what the interviewer wants to hear. Frequently, respondents who do not wish to admit that they do not understand the question or have no opinion, prefer to answer "Yes" or "No" or select one of the choices of a multiple choice question, instead of saying they have no opinion. To save face they express concrete opinions. Dr Radvanyi cited experiments conducted by the Mexican Institute of Public Opinion which support his conclusion. Five measures for controlling the high cost of living were polled in several countries, using a split ballot in which the order of the choices was varied. The first choice was selected by a majority of both samples in most of the countries. Though other factors may have played a part, there is no doubt that the first alternative was frequently selected by respondents who did not want to admit that they were unable to make a choice.

One other attitude, which is more common than one would imagine, results in giving of answers which are

not meant seriously, but are rather intended to "make fun of" the poll or the interviewer. This is more difficult to detect and to account for than some of the others.

Dr. Radvanyi emphasized his conviction that such difficulties are not insurmountable. With adequate control questions the true opinions of the respondents can be secured even if he tries to give false answers.

Dr. Radvanyi pointed out that quota sampling is most widely used in Central and South America, even though in such a country as Mexico, there are little or no data on factors such as income, which are important in establishing quota controls. On the other hand, detailed information is available in Mexico concerning eating habits, sleeping habits, the usage of different types of footwear, habits of dress, and the languages spoken. These data are important indices of cultural affiliation, and are very helpful in establishing a truly representative cross-section. Dr. Radvanyi suggested that they should be regarded as "cultural controls" and used wherever possible.

DISCUSSION

Claude Robinson (Opinion Research Corporation) asked what a public was, both outside and in the United States, where the tendency is to define it in terms of the voting population. The question arises in international polling especially. He wanted to know which groups contribute to opinion forming and how international pollsters answer the question, what is a public? Herbert Hyman replied that the Japanese have raised that issue. Some even maintained that there is no public opinion in Japan on the ground that the Japanese has no conception of a horizon larger than himself, and, therefore, an individual's opinion is not relevant to the political scene. When Hyman remarked that in the United States where the aim is to act according to the voice of all people, we think of the public as consisting of all the adult members of our

society, Robinson observed that that is a highly artificial view. Without arguing this point, Hyman remarked that polling in Japan is used to show what the people are like, rather than as a mandate.

In commenting on Robinson's query on how the opinion of different people was to be weighed in determining policy, Hyman said that policy unfortunately does not always follow poll results. Frederick W Williams (Opinion Surveys Section, Information Control Division, U.S. Office of Military Government for Germany) said that most pollsters in Germany are more interested in the degree of understanding the Germans reveal in regard to American policies and programs than in their approval or disapproval. About half of the German people misunderstand occupation policies and processes. For example, they fail to understand that the Germans, and not the Americans, are carrying out denazification, and it is useful for policy makers to be aware of this. In speaking of the effects of the reeducation program, Williams observed that studies showed that efforts to reorient the German public ideologically have thus far been unsuccessful. Another important problem in German polling is that of the private vs. public opinion issue, and that interviewers' reports on the openness and sincerity of the respondent are often used as a basis for tackling it. Williams reported that the split ballot and sometimes a three-way split ballot, with biased questions on one form and objective questions on the other, are sometimes used to determine the lines along which the people may be influenced.

Radvanyi agreed with Robinson on the need for defining the public and pointed out that the definition must vary with the countries. He suggested that the public be regarded as that part of the population which is actually participating in the issue.

Otto Klineberg (Columbia University) developed the point that some problems of polling in new areas could be anticipated on the basis of studies of national character. In Japan, for example, to ask the respondent for his name gives him a sense of dignity, but it

should be known that there are certain questions for which the name cannot be asked. He remarked that in Britain, according to certain British pollsters, there is greater reticence about answering questions than among other peoples. Klineberg emphasized the importance of capitalizing on opinion poll data in the study of national differences and of the reasons for the difficulties of understanding national differences. His comments prompted Radvanyi to state that public opinion is only part of a broad new science of Comparative Social Psychology, and that a complete psychological inventory for each country was needed. He thought that now, for the first time, it is possible to compare the social psychology of different nationalities. Klineberg and Hyman agreed, and suggested that public opinion researchers should collaborate with all social scientists. The latter pointed out that many journalistic accounts of national differences are based on too little and too subjective data, citing Geoffrey Gorer's article in Life (Aug 18, 1947, p. 95) as a case in point. Hyman referred to several current Japanese studies which bear on the problem of national character. One is concerned with the basic values of the common man, and another dealing with social structure and class-identification shows that 90% of the respondents said they belong to the working class. Self-classification by Americans would be very different.

Elmo Wilson (Columbia Broadcasting System), called on by the Chairman because of his polling experience overseas, referred to the platitude that the Englishman's home is his castle. The Norman peasant is also supposed to have a great sense of privacy, but he was hospitable to public opinion polling, and was ready and willing to talk. He suggested that Mark Abrams (Research Services Ltd.) and Robert Silvey (British Broadcasting Corporation) might like to comment along these lines. Abrams denied that the Englishman is a reticent respondent. While the public-opinion-forming groups, the upper classes, are reticent, the working class shows great interest in public opinion surveys. The main problem encountered in polling is the lack of appreciation of the

significance of public opinion polls conducted for business and governmental purposes. Respondents frequently ask, "What's going to come out of this?" Silvey agreed that the British are not reticent. The tendency to answer politely and in a way thought to be pleasing to the interviewer appears in England and especially in Wales. If some respondents appear to be reticent when questioned by BBC interviewers, said Silvey, it is probably that they have not paid their radio license fees.

Stuart C. Dodd (University of Washington) spoke of his experiences in the East. Because of Moslem sex segregation, men can be interviewed only by men and women by women. Many local customs, said Dodd, can be met by careful selection of interviewers. Interviewers of higher status, for example, gain entrance almost anywhere in the Near East and get better responses than those obtained by interviewers of lower status. Physical stature is also important for respondents often resent being interviewed by a short person. He urged that each culture and ballot must be explored to determine what resistances are present, under what conditions they hold, and how the pollster can avoid arousing them. Dodd urged the need for much more methodological research, and suggested that perhaps 10% of each survey budget should be set aside for this purpose. In connection with this last point, the Chairman observed that many methodological researches have never been reported on, and emphasized the value of publishing such findings.

Daniel Katz, (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan) in dealing with the preconceptions which condition the approach to a poll, declared that the German Bombing Survey showed that the so-called "Nazi Mind" was an erroneous preconception. Class differences were enormously important, and the rank-and-file Germans did not have the "Nazi Mind." While Goebbels did not succeed in making them into Nazis, upper class Germans were Nazi in ideology. Katz remarked that there were many similarities in the war gripes of American and German working

class housewives. He urged the exploitation of techniques of indirection in public opinion research.

Called on by the Chairman, Cenek Adamec (Czechoslovak Institute of Public Opinion) described the state of public opinion polling in Czechoslovakia. Since surveys were initiated early in 1946, the problems encountered have been similar to those found in the United States. Sampling was especially difficult because the last census was taken seventeen years ago. He and his colleagues were worried about their election predictions, and felt that they had been lucky when the error of prediction turned out to be only about 1.5%. Respondents initially suspected the interviewers of being spies, but this was overcome by extensively publicizing the polls and their results through the radio, press, periodicals, and books. In consequence, the most serious difficulty facing the early polls was surmounted, and refusals were reduced to 7%. Adamec reported that hostile critics were effectively prevented from making fun of the polling procedure by releases of the Czechoslavak Institute which kidded the organization.

In answer to a question on the Greek elections and Leland Stowe's assertion that they were influenced by police state methods, Jessen said that the purpose of the Greek survey was to determine whether the Greeks voted fairly according to the law, and not to predict election results. It sought to determine, for example, how many people registered more than once. In doing this registered voters were asked whether and where they voted so that a check could be made on double voting. The analysis made of reasons for not voting showed that 7.5% stated that they did not vote because of left-wing party affiliation. Considering other plausible excuses, it was estimated that at the most 20% did not vote for political reasons. The actual total vote, declared Jessen, was very close to to the estimate based on the observed sample of polling places. Replying to a query from Paul Sheatsley (National Opinion Research Center) about the cost of the Greek survey, Jessen said that it probably had more equipment and funds at its disposal than any

other survey. Transportation costs were high; 250 observers had to handle 3000 polling places; and the preliminary surveys and population estimates were also quite expensive compared with usual experience in this country.

Eric Stern (Analyses Sociales et Economiques, Switzerland) raised the question of the difference between polls in foreign countries which employ native interviewers and those which employ non-native interviewers, e.g., Americans. Hyman said he knew of no such comparison in Japan, and Williams reported that there was considerable agreement in the data gathered in Germany by American and by native interviewers. The Chairman observed that German reports on the effects of the bombing uncovered by the army of occupation agreed substantially with the results obtained by the American Bombing Survey, and Helen Peak (Connecticut College) pointed out that estimates of the percentage of Nazi party members in Germany on the basis of American surveying, coincided with the public records kept by the Germans on Nazi party membership.

III

ROUND TABLE

Problems of State and Local Polling

Alfred McClung Lee, Wayne University

Jane Shepherd, Washington Post

Paul H. Trescott, Philadelphia Bulletin

Chairman, John W. Riley, Jr., Rutgers University

SUMMARY

State and local polls, under newspaper and other sponsorship, have uses apart from the measurement and reporting of public opinion. The local poll can secure data about the community not obtainable in other ways. It is invaluable for the study of community problems and for securing participation in community programs, as well as for insuring the success of the latter. It can also serve as an information clearing-house to the advantage of citizen organizations and local government bodies. Newspapers use local polls to discover areas of ignorance and to determine whether their editorial messages are understood. The local poll is thus an instrument for rendering the newspaper more purposeful and effective. Civic organizations have not yet exploited the possibilities of local poll research. Enough has been done to indicate that the latter is indispensable for effective work in this area. Local polls are employed in reporting problem situations, evaluating existing agencies, diagnosing public relations resources and needs, improving programs, and demonstrating accomplishments. They have not yet been adequately employed in connection with intergroup tension problems. Budgetary, institutional, and personal considerations have stood in the way of research by almost all kinds of "do-good" organizations. Their specialized research needs can be met without

large-scale expenditures through intelligent planning and cooperation with university and other research bodies.

Jane Shepherd:

HOW THE LOCAL POLL CAN HELP IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND PLANNING

State and local polls differ little from the national surveys in the techniques used, said Miss Shepherd, but in approach they differ substantially, because they are so much more closely related to their particular publics. A local poll may contribute to community research and planning by collecting data about the community; by registering public opinion on current local powers and pending legislation; by studying the social structure of the community; by determining the character of and changes in community tensions; by increasing participation in community programs; by serving as a clearing house for information.

In commenting upon these activities with reference to Washington and the Post Poll, Miss Shepherd pointed out that its surveys were useful for planning programs of public minded service groups in the community. As a part of a continuing survey, the collection of statistics about the locality gradually grows into a store of information about income, family composition, housing and employment. The registering of public opinion in the nation's capital has particular significance because its citizens have no vote. On the serious problem of Negro-white relations, as well as on the problems of labor-management relations, unassimilated population groups, new residents, and the like, the Post Poll can provide data of great worth. It may also serve to reveal to what extent people are willing to take advantage of child guidance centers, social service workers' help with delinquent children, and knowledge about health programs and resistance to them. By making its accumulated information available to civic groups with local problems to solve and by advising other organizations on the uses of research, the local poll may fulfill invaluable clearing-

house functions.

Miss Shepherd expressed the conviction that local polls are not realizing their full potential in community participation. First, the quota samples being used are not adapted to the collection of valid population data, which the polls should and could be collecting. Local questionnaires seldom take advantage of their continuity by including each time a few questions that would develop trends about community problems. Too much space is devoted to trivial questions of the "Do-you-have-a-pet?" type, which could be covered less expensively by an inquiring photographer. Miss Shepherd also felt that too much space is being devoted to questions that could more appropriately be handled by the national polls. In some cases, local polling on national issues is of importance, but more often than not such questions have little significance when applied to a limited sample of people. Local polls include too many questions which have no action implications, or which fail to express a basic issue. She also remarked that local poll results are often taken at face value, and little effort is made to determine what lies behind the attitudes which are found. The main goal of a local opinion poll, she contended, should be the accurate measurement of public opinion and the application of the information derived where and when it will do the most good. In the light of this, she criticized poll technicians who have apparently accepted as their function the reduction of error to a minimum and the production of unassailable results, and those newspaper pollsters who respond to editorial pressure to make the poll primarily a device for providing entertainment.

After describing the organization of The Post Poll, which she feels is dramatized in Washington because District of Columbia residents lack the vote, Miss Shepherd cautioned against the danger in having the pollster himself take an active part in the application of his results. If polls are to be used as testimony, for example, she urged that it was desirable for the results to be presented by someone other

than the pollster.

Paul H. Trescott:

HOW THE LOCAL POLL CAN HELP IN IMPROVING NEWSPAPER PRACTICE

As an editorial writer, Mr. Trescott reported that he was concerned with the use of local polls in connection with the problem of the misinformed American. They might have quite different meaning for the technicians, but for him and other editorial workers throughout the country, the polls are useful not only because they accurately gauge public opinion, but because they also point to the specific targets of misinformation.

Local polls, even more than national or international surveys, said Mr. Trescott, are important to the live editor, for he may discover with their aid areas of ignorance right within his own office. To isolate an area of ignorance is pointless, if nothing is done about it, or if the wrong thing is done. Most editorial pages fall short of performing their mission, because they do not make clear to their readers what they are talking about. With the Philadelphia Bulletin Poll it has been discovered that most newspaper readers do not know what "collective bargaining" is, and that they are ignorant of the meaning of the words "tariff," and "subsidy," and of even such a commonplace term as "city-wide." Because of these discoveries, the Bulletin endeavors to phrase its editorials in terms all readers can understand. If a subsidy is discussed, the reader must be informed what a subsidy is. Perhaps other papers do not have the same problems of understanding the Bulletin does with its daily circulation of almost 800,000 covering all population strata, but Mr. Trescott believed that the areas of ignorance uncovered by its poll were not unique. Through the local polls, said Mr. Trescott, we can learn the reader's language and use it in speaking to him, and in doing this the Bulletin Poll made perhaps its most important contribution to the newspaper.

In pointing up areas of ignorance, the Poll also made other contributions. In the fall of 1946, for example, three weeks before the election of Governor and U.S. Senator, four out of five voters in Philadelphia did not know the names of the major party candidates. After the election only half knew the names of the men who had been elected. Surveys consistently show that a remarkably high percentage of women know little or nothing about civic affairs -- local, national, or international -- and, what is even worse, the majority of people say they don't care. This situation led to a carefully-studied effort to attract more women readers to the editorial page of the Bulletin. The results so far have been encouraging, reported Mr. Trescott, although the goal of 100 percent women readership is far from being reached. The Poll has also measured with greater accuracy the size of pressure groups. For a long time it had been known that letters to the editor were misleading as an index of a group's size, because readers are more prone to write against than for something. The Poll has given a basis for more accurate appraisal of the letters.

Ever since the organization of the Bulletin Poll, declared Mr. Trescott, it has aided civic and governmental organizations, such as the City Planning Commission and the Red Cross and even the City Council has availed itself of the Poll's facilities. In one instance the Poll provided the answer not to a $64 but to a $500,000 question. In the fall of 1946, there was considerable agitation for an upstate water source, and a special election at the cost of half a million dollars was urged. The Poll indicated the public did not want upstate water at what it would cost, and the city followed the popular will. The cost of an election was saved. Whenever the Bulletin Poll asked a question dealing with civic improvement, said Mr. Trescott, it always follows with one, frequently oversimplified, inquiring whether the respondent would be willing to pay more taxes to get the improvement. For instance, if a proposal is to cost roughly two million dollars, the question might ask, "Would you be willing to pay a dollar more tax for each member of your

family?" The Poll has been used for consumer analysis and newspaper readership research, and Mr. Trescott also found service benefits in the intimate contact with readers achieved by the interviewers. It is doubtful if the Bulletin could in any other way have made personal calls on the families of 45,000 of its readers so inexpensively and secured the resulting prestige.

Frequently the Poll ties local opinion on national and international questions with the Gallup results and uses the stories simultaneously. Normally, one poll is made a month, but when an important or particularly newsworthy local question comes up, special polls are taken. Operation of the Bulletin Poll, concluded Mr. Trescott, has added one more to the many reasons why "In Philadelphia Nearly Everybody Reads the Bulletin."

Alfred McClung Lee:

THE CIVIC SERVICES OF A LOCAL OPINION SURVEY

Dr. Lee declared that in order to improve program effectiveness and to demonstrate accomplishment to skeptical donors, those directing civic projects are giving more attention to the uses of local opinion surveys. Only in some of the larger cities, however, have special survey organizations been developed or existing commercial agencies utilized for these purposes. Dr. Lee said that his remarks were based upon experiences with research of this character in Detroit and in several other cities. Four major problems, which are not unique to local opinion surveys, attend this research: (1) sponsorship and funds; (2) personnel and technique; (3) agitation versus information, and (4) ritualistic generalities versus useful opinions and other information. In connection with sponsorship and funds, Dr. Lee stated that ideally the local survey for civic agencies should be a continuing cooperative endeavor, preferably under joint sponsorship with an active college or university department of sociology, psychology, or social relations. This

enables civic agencies to obtain a high grade of objective service at a price they can pay, and it helps the academic department to expand its practical laboratory facilities by making funds available for the development of a flexible survey program of educational value to students and of research utility to cooperating faculty members. The funds available, even when supplemented by special-purpose grants, are ordinarily not adequate to cover the charges of commercial agencies which generally handle problems of a quite different order than those having to do with city planning projects, municipal nuisances, intergroup tensions, and evaluations of agency functioning.

Under such a sponsorship arrangement, more competent personnel and more sound technique than are otherwise ordinarily available are assumed, said Dr. Lee. Moreover, the strengthening of such urban university laboratories provides a means of spreading an understanding of opinion survey methods, as well as of creating a pool of trained interviewers and other technicians, thus benefiting the national survey organizations. Unfortunately, declared Dr Lee, a great many civic leaders fail to see the value of objective survey reports. Such reports have a way, when properly executed, of forcing changes in methods of operation. The heads of established, financially-solvent non-profit organizations have much greater difficulty in changing their perspectives and methods than business or even governmental leaders. Dr. Lee cited a recent survey for a downtown Protestant church in a large city under academic auspices which brought its director praise for his painstaking and accurate job, but produced findings which were different from what the church committee had wanted. Through the planning stage, the committee members had tried to put items into the schedule which were promotional in purpose. In a study of intergroup relations, a conflict between agitation and information may have the most serious consequences, as it did in one city where it created a wave of intolerant rumors.

The problem of ritualistic generalities versus

useful opinions and other information is a serious issue for all opinion surveying organizations, particularly because it is seldom adequately recognized. Interviews are usually conducted in terms of glittering stereotypes -- war, peace, cost of living, taxes, Taft-Hartley Law, Marshall Plan, communism, democracy, personal names, ethnic and racial minority labels, and trade names. These terms are variously defined and mean different things to different people. Opinion polls and their reports utilizing them, declared Dr. Lee, become one more of the tremendous number of stimuli making for discourse in terms of vague ritualistic conceptions (pulpit words, advertising slogans, political generalities). Threats inherent in democratic processes to outworn vested interests are thus mitigated by the interposition of stereotyped ritualism between the people and the realities of life. For this reason, Dr. Lee urged the use of other techniques and criteria in the construction and maintenance of an urban or sectional interracial barometer. Such a barometer should take its readings from group sentiments and from reports of actual incidents, rather than from superficial answers to the usual type of questions. Group sentiments can only be assessed by well-trained pollsters who can establish group-level rapport through the use of open-end interviewing techniques.

Dr. Lee indicated that the services which can be performed by survey organizations for civic and other non-profit agencies set up in line with his suggestions fall into three groups: (1) reports of problem situations; (2) evaluations of existing agencies; and (3) diagnoses of the public relations needs and resources of agencies. Where planning for the solution of urban problems rests on a priori basis and decisions are heavily colored by impressions derived from stray conversations, random experiences, and newspaper items, the difficulties of city planners are increased. Reports of problem situations would ease their tasks. The extent to which people are annoyed by smoke and rats, remarked Dr. Lee, is an even more important factor in smoke and rat-abatement than surveys of the physical costs of smoke and rats, although these

may contribute to public recognition of the nuisances. City planners are more often than necessary surprised at unexpected opposition to what they regard as well-indicated municipal improvements. A few city planning organizations have gone much further and faster in their work than they had anticipated through having reasonably accurate opinion data upon which to base strategies.

Community Fund agencies, councils of churches, public schools and universities, and other organizations dependent upon contributions or tax allotments cannot afford to wait to see what their publics think of them at contribution or appropriation time. That, said Dr. Lee, is too late, and, because contributions or support for the appropriation of tax funds are given for a wide range of reasons, some of which may have no bearing on the organization or may even obscure growing dissatisfactions with its work, funds currently available may constitute an inadequate indicator. On the other hand, evaluations of agency functioning on an authoritarian basis by experts usually contain large elements of politicking and other biasing factors. Survey techniques are imperative in evaluations of agency functioning. Only such evaluations by pertinent publics can give satisfactory perspectives for the orientation of agency operation and for the adaptation of agency philosophy and function to meet changed community opinions and needs.

In Dr. Lee's experience, surveys of public relations' needs and resources most frequently point to the common failure of civic and non-profit organizations to take their publics adequately -- that is, both in terms of frankness and in terms of frequency of impact -- into their confidence. Public relations needs become most obvious when public relations resources are most required. For example, when a school system decides to convert a junior or senior high school into a specialized unit of some sort, it cannot wait until it has completed an expensive change to learn how its publics will react. And when publics apparently do react through vocal leaders, it is just as important to know what support such leaders actu-

ally command. Trial balloons, too, are frequently breeders of ill will, and except on relatively unimportant matters, should not be used by public bodies.

In Dr. Lee's view, the most challenging and fascinating problem in civic opinion surveying and public relations operations is that of intergroup tensions, an area in which the contribution of polls has thus far been of very limited utility. He was convinced, however, that much can be done in this area, particularly by relatively small local surveying organizations under academic auspices which have an especial interest in experimentation. Commenting on the diverse and conflicting suggestions put forth for easing anti-Jewish and anti-Negro tensions and incidents, and the lack of adequate opinion and sentiment knowledge, Dr. Lee dealt with the advice tendered in 1946 by an anonymous public relations counselor ("I wish they wouldn't do that!") in Commentary (vol 2, no. 4, pp. 320-326):

> "Anti-Semitic incidents of a minor nature have been going on for years. Most Jews realize this, and many of them have found that by ignoring minor incidents and minor-league hatemongers they gain the most in the long run.
>
> No one can measure accurately the extent of anti-Semitism today...
>
> If -- this observer believes -- the Jews would only 'take it easy,' they would gain more in public opinion than they do by emotional demonstrations and dramatics." (pp. 323-324).

To this counsel of ignore-evil-and-be-happy, traditionally offered by the secure to all sorts of insecure minority persons, some fairly adequate answers can be made on the basis of historical experience, said Dr. Lee, but it is quite true that "No one can measure (or at least has measured) accurately the extent of anti-Semitism (or other anti-minority sentiment) today." He was certain that the techniques for such measurement are either available or can readily be worked out, but now we have to depend largely upon

impressions and incidents. Dr. Lee pointed out that contributions to the problem of intergroup tensions through opinion surveying will be beneficial in many very crucial areas, because interracial and inter-ethnic tensions have many points in common with employer-employee tensions and other problems.

Through the medium of the urban academic opinion laboratory -- jointly sponsored by university and cooperating non-profit agencies --concluded Dr. Lee, more adequate experimentation can be undertaken on such crucial problems, as work along these lines at Chicago, Columbia, and Wayne Universities has demonstrated.

DISCUSSION

John W. Riley, Chairman, introduced the discussion by noting the extent to which local opinion research is geared to action. In making it their duty to discover areas of ignorance, the local opinion pollsters also assume responsibility to do something about their findings. Julian Woodward (Elmo Roper) remarked that local surveys face a series of questions in offering services to civic groups. With whom should they cooperate? When should they refuse their services? He wanted to know what was done by the newspaper polls, presumably concerned with the newsworthiness of questions, when a local study was requested that probably would not result in publishable material? What happens with polls, he also asked, that might go contrary to the editorial policy of the paper? Trescott replied that the Bulletin's policy was to make its polling facilities available free to philanthropic agencies and the like, and to turn down requests for purely commercial research, referring these to commercial agencies. The Bulletin has cooperated on community improvement problems, a University of Pennsylvania Poll on international issues, and the like where newsworthiness did not enter. Jane Shepherd said the Washington Post's policy is similar to that of the Bulletin, and that it turns down all requests that appear to be promotional in nature.

Henry Kroeger (The Iowa Poll) described the operation of the Iowa Poll, which is comparable to a local poll, in that the circulation of the sponsoring newspaper, the Des Moines Register, is statewide. During the four years of its operation the poll has been of definite practical value to the newspaper which for instance, used the former in its campaign to get parking meters and a baseball park. He felt that the Iowa Poll has found its place as a permanent feature of the paper, and it is recognized as an authority on Iowa opinion in discussions in the state legislature.

In answer to a query on the relationship of poll data to newspaper editorial comments, Shepherd declared that in the case of the Washington Post, the paper's editorial writers have used poll findings to bolster their points of view and to hit at points of ignorance which the surveys disclosed, but that that was the extent of their relationship. Trescott thought that the Bulletin Poll had in no instance changed editorial position, but that it has affected editorial approach. He said that in deciding editorial policy, it is not assumed that dominant public opinion necessarily is the best opinion.

Clyde Hart (National Opinion Research Center) turned to the problem of ethics in local polls. Some people attempt to influence public action by using poll results, and somebody among those who operate the poll must decide when results which may be so used are to be released and when they are to be withheld. When, he queried, is the public to be heard and when not? In this connection, Woodward asked the local survey managers whether all poll results were available to anyone. Trescott replied that Bulletin poll results were available to those who asked for them, the paper sometimes paying for work involved in producing the needed information, and sometimes turning the tabulations over to a commercial firm. Joe Belden (Joe Belden & Associates) did not agree that poll results should always be available to all who ask for them. From his experience with the Texas Poll, he thought that results, especially in politics, can at times

be damaging. For instance, when certain racial or religious support is enjoyed by a candidate, his opponents can use facts produced by a reliable, accepted poll against him. In such cases, the poll may actually be fostering prejudices. The release of that type of information poses a debatable and responsible issue for the pollster.

Commenting on the observation that local polls often seem to ignore informational surveys and important issues, Trescott remarked that polls sponsored by newspapers had to depend on newsworthiness in most instances. To this Belden added that important problems were not necessarily "hot" issues at any given moment. William J. Gaskill (Hawaiian Economic Foundation) said that when he was associate editor of the Gallup Poll, informational news stories based on polls were sometimes dropped in favor of powerful and dramatic news polls because newspapers, due to the tight newsprint situation and their desire for news, had no room for informational stories.

Bernard D. Feld, Jr., (Birmingham News-Age Herald) inquired about the readership of poll stories in newspapers. Belden, judging from readership studies done for Texas newspapers, said Gallup Poll reports drew from 25 to 40 percent, both among men and women, and Shepherd stated that she had found about the same readership of the Washington Post Poll stories. It appeared that survey stories seem to be among the few that interest men and women equally, and that they have good readership among high school students.

IV

ROUND TABLE

Measurements of Intensity and Information

J. Stevens Stock, Opinion Research Corporation

Jerome S. Bruner, Harvard University

William A. Lydgate,
American Institute of Public Opinion

Chairman, Claude Robinson
Opinion Research Corporation

SUMMARY

More concern with and greater refinement in the measurement of information and intensity of opinion are needed. In this area, the Guttman scaling technique can be exploited, even though it involves difficulties. These, however, can be overcome, and commercial research would be helped by the application of the technique. New types of interviewing not only offer a key to intensity, but reveal why opinions are held with intensity. These techniques of a clinical character come to grips with the deeper psychological sources of opinion and with the psychological functions served by opinion. Intensity and function are related, and anxiety and the mode of reaction to frustration are significantly linked to intensity of opinion. Quintamensional question design is an attempt to deal practically in national surveys with the problems of the place of information in opinion and with intensity in opinion. Five types of questions distinguish this method of question design: filter or information; open or free answer; dichotomous or specific issue; reasons why: intensity.

J. Stevens Stock:

MEASUREMENT BY SCALING TECHNIQUE

Mr. Stock's purpose was to call attention to the possibilities of the Guttman scaling technique which, although it was not new, has been largely neglected by commercial research. He saw three main problems for which scale analysis had utility. The first was that many consumers of research can not understand more than a simple dichotomy. Secondly, businessmen and other research users are confused by anything that goes beyond a simple answer regardless of the breadth of the question. Finally, experience shows that in the interviewing situation there is sometimes a favorable bias; that is, respondents tend to give answers to please the interviewer.

Mr. Stock presented the following set of four problems:

1) 2 x 2 = ?
2) 2/3 of 12 = ?
3) 30% of 90 = ?
4) $1.00 at 6% compounded annually for 3 years = ?

He maintained that if these are given to a group of people familar with our number system between 90 and 95 percent of them would fall into five types: (1) Type I would not be able to answer any of the questions: (2) Type II would be able to answer only one of the questions, and it would almost always be the first one; (3) Type III would be able to answer two of the questions, which would in most cases be the first two; (4) Type IV would be able to answer the first three questions; and (5) Type V would be able to answer all four questions. In general, the number of questions a person can answer correctly is determined by the most difficult one he can answer correctly. Only rarely does one find a person who can answer a difficult question, and not all the others which are easier. The possible combinations of answers are many, said Mr. Stock, but, if a scale existed, most persons would fall into a limited number of types. A scale means

that one type is better than another, and not that the scale types are equally apart in ability.

The substitution of a question such as "What is the capital of Vermont?" for one of the arithmetic problems would not provide a scale because it would introduce a new area of content. Some people who knew the answer to the question about the capital of Vermont would not be able to answer the arithmetic questions and vice versa. The existence of a scale, Mr. Stock declared, was an objective test for determining whether one is dealing with a single subject. With such a device, one can tell objectively whether a given problem area contained one idea or many, whether the subject matter dealt with ideology, workers' morale, or whatever. Stock reported that all questions about workers' morale, for example, did not form a single scale, but made up many scalable areas.

Moving to the question of intensity analysis, Mr. Stock observed that given a scalable area, in the case of workers' morale, one wants to know how many have high morale and how many have low morale. Intensity analysis here rested on the assumption that if a person liked everything about his job, he would feel intensely about it, and that if he disliked everything about his job, he would feel strongly about it. People with mixed feelings about their jobs would not in general feel too strongly. In intensity analysis, one can determine how strongly people felt at each point along the attitude scale. Regardless of the questions used, Mr. Stock declared, the lowest point of intensity would always remain the same. He cited an instance of intensity analysis in relation to a scale of attitude found among workers in the national urban labor force. The scale consisted of six questions dealing with (1) comparison of place of work with other possible working places; (2) steadiness of employment; (3) chances for promotion; (4) interest in the work; (5) interest of the company in the workers; and (6) satisfaction with job. The point of lowest intensity, or that point on the scale where the average intensity was lowest, divided the worker population into 79 percent satisfied and 21

percent dissatisfied. Using a sub-set of three questions of the six, Mr. Stock found the point of lowest intensity dividing the population into 78 percent satisfied and 22 percent dissatisfied, which, he felt, was very good agreement. When identical people were cross-classified on the two scales, 85 percent were found to be classified the same on both scales. That is, those who were designated as favorable in one set of questions were designated as favorable in the other set; and those who were designated as unfavorable in one set were designated as unfavorable in the other set. Mr. Stock concluded, therefore, that reasonable invariant cutting points could be obtained even with variant sets of questions. Using either set of questions, he also found that the measured characteristic correlated identically with other variables.

Mr. Stock then discussed a number of difficulties in the application of scaling and intensity techniques and some of the practical steps his office had taken in overcoming them. For scaling purposes a whole series of questions about a single area have to be used, and for intensity analysis each of the scale questions has to be followed by an intensity question. This is not only costly, but some interviewers might also become embarrassed by the repetitious nature of the questions and lose rapport, if not cheat. Another budgetary objection was that considerable pre-testing must be done to determine the existence of a scale. Objections to the use of many questions are answered by what is called the "fold-over technique," which involves the combination of a scale question and its companion intensity question into a single question, such as, "How do you like your boss: Very Well, Well, Dislike, or Dislike Very Much?" The answer to this question can be scored both on the scale of content and on intensity. The "cafeteria question" and the "radio script technique," said Mr. Stock, are other ways of dealing with the problem of asking many questions. In the cafeteria question, one asks, "Which of these things do you like best?" and then hands the respondent a list of twenty or so items. Items which are not checked can be taken as having low intensity. He stated that this procedure went rapidly and avoided

interviewer cheating. In the second technique, the interviewer reads a "radio script" and stops after significant inserted items to ask the respondent, "Do you agree or disagree with this?" This procedure made for an easy interviewing situation.

In his final evaluation of the Guttman scaling technique, Mr. Stock held that it is not a panacea, but that it is a technique which with a little more attention paid to simplification can constitute an extremely valuable research tool.

Jerome S. Bruner:

MEASUREMENT THROUGH NEW TYPES OF INTERVIEW

Dr. Bruner dealt with the problem of determining why people hold the opinions they do and why they hold them with intensity. His concern lay with the deeper psychological sources for peoples' opinions, often quite removed from the "issue" or "product." To ascertain these deeper reasons, Dr. Bruner and his fellow investigators at Harvard have been experimenting with interviewing techniques of a clinical character. A cross-section panel of 300 men at Springfield, Massachusetts, was twice interviewed with the use of deep probing. The questions used had been derived from an intensive investigation of opinion in a very small sample by psychologists and psychiatrists at the Harvard Psychological Clinic. Interviewing of the Springfield panel led to a threefold classification of the psychological functions served by one's opinions: (1) as an attempt to simplify the world in terms of one's own value system; (2) as a means of working out individual personality problems; for example, the professional "aginner" in personal life is the professional "aginner" in public life; and (3) as a badge which serves as a means of indicating to one's group and oneself that one belongs and is not queer; for example, a man wants to prove to himself and to the boss that he is just like the boss.

Dr. Bruner held that the reasons or functions of

an opinion are important in analyzing the intensity with which opinions were held. A better picture of the intensity of opinion is obtained when it is known what relation opinion has to personal values, and how important the value is with which opinion is linked. He cited several examples to illustrate the functions of opinion in connection with the problem of what people think about Russia. Mr. F., an individual who had been kicked around all his life, regarded Russia as kicking the system that had kicked him. He saw Russia as the projected source of aggression which would strike back at those who had hurt him. In the case of Mr. N., his opinions were used as a vehicle for his own personality traits and problems. A rather "clerkish" sort of person, he viewed Russia as another source of instability threatening his already precarious psychological security. The function of opinion as a vehicle for social adjustment was illustrated by the case of Mr. K., who used his opinion to prove to his bosses that he was one of them. The opinions he held were those which would not make him appear queer in his own group.

Anxiety, said Dr. Bruner, plays a significant role in intensity of opinion. One hypothesis tested by the Harvard investigators was that opinion toward Russia was linked with anxiety. Responses of informants to a question on whether they worried more or less than other people were correlated with a simple interviewer rating on their intensity of opinion about Russia. It was found that those who worried more tended to rate higher on intensity than others. Among the worriers,55 percent rated high on intensity. Among the non-worriers, 36 percent rated high on intensity. An attempt made to validate the "worry" question showed that worriers also tended to feel "over-worked," which is usually regarded clinically as evidence of anxiety. There was no difference between the worriers and non-worriers in the direction of opinion toward Russia for both groups were typically anti-Russian and they also matched on demographic traits, such as age and sex. The Harvard investigators concluded that anxiety may predispose to greater intensity of opinion on issues which are social-

ly and politically unstabilizing.

In connection with the role of values in intensity of opinion, Dr. Bruner reported that when subjects of the study were given a list of different items and asked to rate their most important value and least important value, it was found that those who were concerned with community and national values rather than with business or family problems were more often intense in their opinions about Russia

The study also threw light on the relationship of direction of opinion to intensity. When informants were scored on a scale of attitude toward Russia and their positions on the scale were related to the intensity with which they held their opinion, a U-curve was obtained, but not an even U. The pro-Russian informants who were only moderately favorable toward Russia, had the greatest intensity of feeling. Dr. Bruner believed that intensity of feeling appeared to be characteristic of people who were bucking the popular current of opinion.

The mode of reaction to frustration, Dr. Bruner said, also bore on opinion. There were three types of reaction: (1) the intra-punitive, where one tended to blame oneself; (2) the extra-punitive, where one blamed the other fellow; and (3) the impunitive, where the blame is put on fate or other external factors. Extra-punitive people were strikingly more anti-Russian than intra-punitive people, who tended to blame the United States too.

Dr. Bruner declared that in order to change opinions it was necessary to work on a deep psychological level and to take the psychiatric complexes of people into consideration. The Harvard investigation showed that many people held strong opinions about subjects they knew little about. The deeper psychological main-springs of opinion could not readily be reached, Dr. Bruner believed, by the questions used in broad surveys. He felt that research could be greatly enriched by better liaison between public opinion agencies and the university clinical and social psy-

chologists, and he urged public opinion pollers to include personality questions on their ballots. Such questions are easy to handle, interest the respondent, and provide an opportunity for the establishment of good working relations between commercial organizations and university investigators.

William A. Lydgate:

HOW CAN A SYSTEMATIC MEASUREMENT OF INFORMATION AND INTENSITY BE MADE A PART OF POLLING?

Acknowledging the criticisms directed at poll-takers because of question wording and the need for more qualitative data, Mr. Lydgate granted that the multi-question and depth interviewing techniques were both valuable methods. But, he pointed out, for poll-takers who have to work quickly and inexpensively they were too time-consuming and expensive. Recently, Gallup had developed and put to use, a special question design to which the name "quintamensional" had been given, and in which questions of the following types are used: (1) filter or information, (2) open or free answers, (3) dichotomous or specific issue; (4) reasons why, and (5) intensity.

Although many researchers had used these types of questions at one time or another, Mr. Lydgate claimed uniqueness for the quintamensional techniques because it rolled them together into a single pattern. It provided a practical and highly flexible working device for avoiding the shallow, single question technique and at much less cost than the depth interview. It was simple enough to use week after week in ordinary polling operations. Each of the five types was a category of questions, not necessarily a single question. Mr. Lydgate offered two examples of the application of the quintamensional technique.

Example of 'Quintamensional' on Issue of Aid to Greece and Turkey

Filter questions: "Have you heard or read about

President Truman's speech to Congress asking for $400,000,000 to help Greece and Turkey?" "What do you think are the chief reasons for helping Greece and Turkey?" "What do you think are the chief reasons against helping Greece and Turkey?"

Open question: "What is your feeling as to what we should do about this?"

Dichotomous questions: "Would you like to see your Congressmen vote for or against the bill asking for $250,000,000 to aid Greece?" "Would you like to see your Congressmen vote for or against the bill asking for $150,000,000 to aid Turkey?"

Reasons why: "Why do you feel this way?"

Intensity: "How strongly do you feel about this, -- very strongly, fairly strongly, or not at all strongly?

Example of 'Quintamensional' on Issue of Filibusters in Congress

Filter question: "Will you tell me what a 'filibuster in Congress' means to you?"

Open question: "What, if anything, should Congress do about filibusters?"

Dichotomous question: "It has been suggested that the Senate change its rules so that a simple majority can call for an end to discussion instead of a two-thirds majority as is now the case. Do you approve or disapprove of this change?"

Reason why: "Why do you feel this way?"

Intensity: "How strongly do you feel about this -- very strongly, fairly strongly, or not at all strongly?"

In the quintamensional questionnaire on the Marshall Plan, respondents were first asked: "What is your understanding of the purpose of the Marshall Plan?" and were then classified into five groups.

Among those who had an essentially correct understanding of the Marshall Plan, 72 percent approved of the plan. Among those who were less specific and less correct in their understanding of the plan, but who said in effect that it sought to help Europe get on her feet, 69 percent were in favor of the plan. Among those who knew still less (saying, "Better understanding with Europe," and the like), about the same proportion, 68 percent were in favor of the plan. Among those who showed even less understanding (saying, "Give Europe supplies") 50 percent were in favor of the plan. And, finally, among those who had not heard of the plan or did not know its purpose, only 17 percent were in favor of the plan. The more people knew about the Marshall Plan, the higher the percentage in favor of it. Mr Lydgate also reported that there were instances where the more people knew about a subject, the less they were in favor of it. This occurred in the case of industry-wide bargaining. Those people who offered a correct definition of industry-wide bargaining were twice as often in favor of a Congressional curb on industry-wide bargaining as those who did not define it correctly.

Mr. Lydgate found that the quintamensional technique also shed light on open-ended and dichotomous questions. When the open question was asked: "In general, what is your opinion of the Taft-Hartley Law?" 36 percent were favorable. On a dichotomous question: "Do you think he (the congressman from your district) should have voted for or against the bill?" 42 percent were for the bill. This was a close correlation between an open-ended and a dichotomous question. The answers to a dichotomous question, he said, could serve as a guide on how to go about coding the answers to the open-ended question, and vice versa.

In closing, Mr. Lydgate reported that his organization had been using omnibus ballots with a large number of questions. One ballot had 171 questions, fourteen of which were about the United Nations, between 20 and 30 on attitude toward Russia, and the rest about the atom bomb and its control. Early in the war, Gallup used a ballot of 161 questions. Another on

politics had 51 questions. It was planned to use these long questionnaires perhaps two or three times a year.

DISCUSSION

Stuart C. Dodd (University of Washington) asked whether a new scaling technique reported to be simpler than the Guttman or Cornell techniques was being used in the United States. It involved a correlation table between two dichotomous questions. These scales could be discussed in terms of statistics, logic, or geometry. The statistical test was simply that there must be an empty, zero-frequency cell in the four-fold table of the two questions. The test in terms of symbolic logic was: Is the answer to one question included within the other? In geometric terms, the test was, could you draw a line and place one question so far up the line and the other question farther up on the same line. In this scale, one could go further and use a set of questions, generalizing the four-fold table to include all the items. Those items with empty cells could be said to fall into the scale. If all the cells for items were found to have positive frequencies, then the conclusion was that the items were qualitatively different. If the zero cell was present, then the items were qualitatively alike. Stock replied that this was exactly the kind of scaling he had attempted to describe and that the conditions mentioned by Dr. Dodd were the identical conditions for a perfect Guttman scale.

George Hausknecht (Consultant, Washington, D.C.) observed that an erroneous point had been made concerning the idea of a two-question scale. He maintained that in order to achieve transitivity at least three items were necessary for a formal notion of an ordinal scale. He also remarked that scaling was not as simple as Stock's extremely lucid presentation of the Guttman scaling technique. With respect to the area of job satisfaction, Hausknecht declared that job satisfaction was not a unitary variable because of individual emphasis on different sets of values. In the

attitude research done for the Navy during the war, no single scale had been found which would completely describe job satisfaction. Finally, he raised this question: Does "intensity" really divide people into pro and con on an issue or is it simply a test of peoples' verbal habits? Different people, he suggested, have different propensities for feeling intense -- and this may be just a peculiarity of personality.

Stock, after agreeing with Hausknecht's statement about job satisfaction, and pointing out that he was talking about one restricted area of job satisfaction for the sake of simplicity, directed a question at Bruner on the problem of opinion shift. The importance of a shift, Stock maintained, differed tremendously depending on the marginals. For example, a shift from 90 percent to 92 percent among "informed" people might be more important than one from 10 percent to 20 percent among "uninformed" people. Bruner replied he had no data on the problem of the importance of amount of shift among different groups. He reiterated that the problem should be seen in terms of the linkage of opinion with "deep" or "less deep" values. The less contemporary the attitude, the more difficult it was to change. Lydgate indicated that some tentative evidence was available on the relation between trends of opinion and intensity. There was a tendency for shifts of opinion to be in the direction of the side with greatest intensity.

Samuel A Stouffer (Harvard University) said it was quite encouraging to see the practical application of scaling techniques outside of the academic laboratories. He did not believe that individual questions would be supplanted by scaling, but thought that scales would help in determining the location of a question in a particular area. Stouffer described a quite different model of scaling on which Paul Lazarsfeld had been working. Starting initially, at least, with the Spearman technique, Lazarsfeld had developed a factor analysis for qualitative attitudinal variables. An attitude, according to Lazarsfeld, is a function of a latent attribute plus a residual. For example, responses to the question, "Are the British efficient?"

would be compounded of a general attitude toward the British plus a specific attitude toward their efficiency. Lazarsfeld's technique could be used to determine whether a latent attribute existed. At Harvard, Stouffer reported, using the same set of items, a Thurstone scale had been worked out, then a Guttman scale, and then a Lazarsfeld scale. One interesting thing discovered was that, unlike for the Guttman scale, to satisfy the Lazarsfeld criteria each item had to have many categories, and dichotomous items could not be used. Stouffer cautioned against freezing any particular technique at this stage of development. He called the present a period of flux, during which various scaling methods needed to be tested. If they turned out to be really good, they would facilitate the use of single questions.

Bruner noted one important use of scale analysis for psychologists. When a scale was found, it was the green light for psychologists to go in and see what was there. Contending that social science is of little use unless it can predict, Lydgate wanted to know what predictive values scales have. Could scales be used in the prediction of behavior in an official referendum? Hausknecht replied by pointing out that prediction and scaling were two separate problems. Scaling, he said, was an analytical device by means of which individuals are ordered according to a single factor X. Predictive utility had to be tested empirically. The real question, as Hausknecht saw it was whether or not scaling was more economical or efficient. Scaling was simply an application of the principle of parsimony in analysis. Scale scores could be shown to predict as well or better than multiple correlations of all factors with no re-weighting of factors necessary when the thing to be predicted was changed.

Robert C. Pace (Syracuse University) raised the issue of scale reliability. In work done at the Navy, he said, thirteen scales were devised which were used four times over a six-month period. Twelve of the thirteen scales held up well. Interested in the relation between attitudes and behavior, he tested the relation between scales of attitudes and participation in

various activities on a small sample of college graduates. He found the correlation to be encouraging -- in the neighborhood of .5, ranging from .4 to .6.

N. L. Gage (Purdue University) stated that the success of prediction of behavior from attitudes depended on what one was trying to predict. In some cases, attitudes were the main determiners of behavior, as in an election. Voting was symbolic behavior analogous to answering questions in a public opinion poll. But in other areas, such as buying habits, attitudes were not the only determining factors in behavior. Gage went on to ask whether anyone had developed a more suitable criterion for scalability than the one Guttman pointed out -- 85 percent reproducibility. He mentioned that Festinger * in a recent article showed that high reproducibilities could be achieved by chance. Hausknecht stated that the notion of chance scales has been thoroughly explored. Sheffield and Elinson had shown several years ago what scale patterns could appear by chance. But chance scales were not meaningful scales. Hausknecht suggested the use of the chi-square test to compare the proportion of scale types expected from the marginal distributions with the observed proportion of scale types.

Stouffer in response to a query by the Chairman on the role of the university in opinion research, stated that he conceived the function of Harvard to be that of developing methods and doing pilot studies. The objective was to put social psychology into operational terms. Emphasis would be placed on experimental work on communication in attitude formation and change. A group of mathematicians, experimental psychologists, and others would do the pilot studies, the results of which would then be turned over to the commercial organizations.

---

* L. Festinger, "The Treatment of Qualitative Data by Scale Analysis," Psychological Bulletin, 1947, Vol. 44, pp. 149-161.

V

ROUND TABLE

Psychological Errors in Polling

Daniel Katz, Survey Research Center
University of Michigan

Frederick F. Stephan, Princeton University

Don Cahalan, National Opinion Research Center

Chairman, Hadley Cantril, Princeton University

SUMMARY

Common weaknesses in research have to be overcome if investigations in public opinion are to produce the generalizations which distinguish other sciences. The variables under study must be more sharply localized and conceptualized; the measures of the objective variables must be more imaginatively considered and established; provision must be made for dealing with the particular psychological world in which the individual respondent moves; the value systems of respondents must be explored; more subtle differentiations among and independent checks on the variables must be developed. Interviewer accuracy is basic in public opinion research. The interviewer secures the information in a survey, and the consequences of his errors and bias may be crucial. Interviewing will always be marked by psychological error and bias. These are probably not serious in the light of the purposes of most existing surveys. With new purposes, they take on fresh importance, and their reduction becomes imperative. Bias does not exist in vacuo. It is always a function of the purposes of a study. The nature of the interviewing process makes it difficult to reduce bias, but this can still be achieved on the basis of existing knowledge and experience. Extended research on interviewer bias is essential, however and that now under way promises valuable

returns. The selection and training of interviewers bear directly on the problem of bias, and in this area the question of relevant criteria remains very much alive.

Daniel Katz:

PSYCHOLOGICAL ERRORS IN RESEARCH DESIGN

The goal of all scientific endeavor, said Dr. Katz, is the discovery of principles and laws which will make possible generalization and prediction. If public opinion research is moving in the direction of a science, and if its practitioners want to go beyond mere trouble-shooting and factual reporting, the goal of scientific polling must be to reach generalized findings which transcend the purposes of the immediate study. In the earlier stages of the development of public opinion research, Dr. Katz observed, the terrific pressure for applied research affected even academic studies, and sufficient systematic attention was seldom given to careful research design. If future studies are to produce scientific and generalized findings, those who conduct them cannot be casual in approaching the problem of research design. Hypotheses, the conceptual framework, are often loosely conceived in setting up a study. Too often a study is planned in terms of the most general set of hypotheses. For example, it is assumed that factual data items like age or education will be significantly related to the opinion questions.

Dr. Katz dealt with five weaknesses in polling today which keep many surveys from being truly scientific. The first common weakness lies in the failure to conceptualize and localize the variables under study. Science develops as its theoretic constructs remold or remake the universe. Surveys should utilize fully all the relevant sociological and psychological concepts. For example, a study of changing attitudes may fail to take account of the temporal dimension in the field of forces, the tendency for attitudes and opinions to return to an established equilibrium. Or again, while the influence of

formal group membership on attitudes and opinions is a factor to consider spontaneous "in-group" structure is often far more important.

The second weakness in polling treated by Dr. Katz is related to the first and consists in the prevalent neglect (or lack of imagination) in setting up measures of objectives or factual variables. Too often only the traditional face-sheet items are included in a study as the least difficult group of questions and as an after-thought of questionnaire construction, with no real previous consideration of their relation to the attitudinal questions. Face-sheet items, the objective information obtained about the respondent, should be determined in relation to the specific issues studied. For example, in addition to the traditional economic level rating, more significant facts to be considered in a given study may be the sources of income, whether from wages or ownership of stocks, or renting a house; family composition and number of dependents; past economic history, including the amount of savings and experience with depressions.

Most surveys, said Dr. Katz, tend to neglect the psychological world of the individual and this constitutes a third weakness in opinion research. There is a very real need for exploration of the mediating or intervening variables between the stimulus and the response -- variables which constitute the cognitive or collective perceptual structure of the individual. Dr. Katz referred to a recent article by MacLeod* regarding the importance of the way in which the individual conceives his social world. Yet, most polls rely upon an inadequate information question, such as "Have you heard or read about the Barton-Hadley Bill?" A consideration of the psychological world of the individual may help to explain, for instance, the difference between Gallup's findings that no significant bandwagon effect results from pre-election predictions and the findings of laboratory experiments which would tend to substantiate the existence of the bandwagon effect. The difference between the points of view may be due to lack of consideration of the

* R. B. MacLeod, "The Phenomenological Approach to Social Psychology," Psychological Review, 1947, Vol. 54, 193-211.

cognitive or perceptual factor. The individual, emphasized Dr. Katz, is affected by the universe with which he identifies himself. Coal miners identify with their own group and the way the rest of the country is voting is less important to them than the way their fellows are behaving. In this connection, he also pointed out that there are often discrepancies in evaluating the roles of the official (or theoretical) leader and the actual leader in attitude formation. Class identifications, particularly economic and racial perceptions, constitute an important part of the individual's cognitive perceptual framework, and exercise a potent influence on their attitudes.

The fourth weakness developed by Dr. Katz results from the inadequate exploration of the attitude value system of the respondent. The individual's thought patterns do not fall into discrete political segments, and, consequently, the use of single topical questions to explore an individual's value system is generally fallacious. A thorough investigation of attitudes demands the use of a series of questions. Findings on each question need to be interpreted in a context of the findings on other questions dealing with the same topic to give a real picture of the attitude value system.

Finally, to secure findings of greater validity, subtle differentiations, Dr. Katz declared, and independent measures of variables must be utilized by public opinion research to a far greater degree than heretofore. The relationships established may be fictitious or circular, if they derive from the same source of measurement. Whether one is trying to measure the effectiveness of a campaign to make people buy more soup or cars, or to predict the outcome of a political campaign, such factors as exposure and knowledge are basic to a study of preferences and anticipated behavior. Because a single approach and technique may tend to operate as a selective factor and determine the character of the response, it is best to begin with a sample of people of known degrees of attitude. At all stages of the study it is necessary to consult independent sources of information and to compare findings with all

independent data available which may serve as yardsticks. Dr. Katz added that it is, of course, far easier to describe what should be done than to approximate the ideal within a given practical framework.

Dr. Katz closed with a plea to the public opinion researchers to be less casual and more systematic in formulating survey designs. Shortcuts should come later in the development of a psychological science, and not at the present pioneering stage of survey design in public opinion research.

Frederick F. Stephan:

INTERVIEWER BIAS -- HOW SERIOUS IS IT AND WHAT CAN BE DONE TO REDUCE IT?

Studies dealing with sampling accuracy lead, said Mr. Stephan, to a consideration of interviewing accuracy, which, at the present time, is far more important, because further improvements in sampling will be fruitless unless the interviewing actually obtains the information for which the survey was undertaken. Surveys are made for a definite purpose, hence practitioners and clients need to know what kind of interviewing will be how accurate. Inaccuracy may also arise from errors in the survey design and in the interpretation of survey findings. Between these two, the crucial step of interviewing occurs.

Because the market is not prepared to pay interviewers high salaries or to offer them steady employment, and because the period of training would be long and relatively uneconomical, Mr. Stephan warned that performance of a clearly professional calibre should not be expected. Yet biases and discrepancies appear in fields of study where such handicaps are not present, and where more refined instruments of measurement have been developed and are in consistent use. Even physicians, after years of professional training and experience, do not

always agree on their observations and diagnoses. Starting with the assumption that interviewing will involve a large amount of psychological error and bias, Mr. Stephan noted that it is rather remarkable how accurate are many of the results obtained. When it is necessary to predict the outcome of an election, such a prediction must take into account not only opinions in terms of responses but the likelihood of those opinions being translated into action (actual voting behavior). Much of the accuracy of surveys is due to the fact that interviewing errors tend to some extent cancel each other out. But this will not always save one from very serious mistakes due to defective or inaccurate interviewing.

For present purposes of surveying, to obtain average, over-all descriptions of opinion, interviewing errors do not constitute as serious a problem as they would if it were necessary to predict individual responses. A consideration of purpose leads to the question of why individuals hold the opinions they have, a field of study which public opinion research should explore increasingly in the future. As the objectives of research move beyond mapping out the geography of opinion into such areas as the study of causes and effects, the measurement of finer shifts of opinion, the analysis of the effects of different events on opinion, and the prediction of individual variations, higher standards of interviewing accuracy will of necessity be demanded, and can be achieved.

Mr. Stephan commented on the extensive direct and indirect evidence that interviewer bias does exist. Indirect evidence of the prevalence of psychological error has been furnished by various experiments and published studies. Since highly trained professional workers in other fields are found guilty of inconsistencies and discrepancies, one can infer that the less highly trained public opinion interviewers are subject to the same limitations. Direct evidence of interviewer bias is provided by the observations of supervisors in the field and the home office, results of repeat interviews, studies of cheating, and experience during training.

Interviewing is not a cut and dried matter of going through a set of particular motions. It is, Mr. Stephan observed, a highly complex psychological process in which the interviewer must establish rapport, a personal relationship with the respondent. The successful interview is a dynamic process marked by a constant interchange between respondent and interviewer. The successful interviewer is skillful in developing the interviewing situation and in the interplay of give and take. Interviewing cannot be standardized without destroying the skill of the interviewer or the spontaneity of the interviewing situation. Fixed techniques cannot be prescribed for this very human process of interaction. These facts automatically set a limit to the extent to which errors can be reduced by training the interviewers. For the same reason the process of observation cannot be standardized as it can be in the physical sciences. Too much restriction tends to destroy freedom of action and responses on the part of the respondent.

Research on bias and psychological errors in interviewing, urged Mr. Stephan, must take account of the respondents as well as the interviewers. Experiments must include both difficult respondents and those easy to interview. Respondents are being educated to an intelligent understanding of the interview through mass education and mass communications and specifically through publicity and survey reports in the public prints. There is evidence that psychological errors and interviewer bias are sizable on some surveys. Because of extreme difficulty of observing and recording interviewing situations, there is very little direct evidence regarding the influence of such personal, intangible factors as the voice, appearance, and attitude of the interviewer. Mr. Stephan pointed out that the seriousness of interviewer bias depends not alone on the amount of error, but on the purpose of the survey and the use made of the results. The nature of the decision that is to be made on survey results, in conjunction with other factors, determines what effect the errors and bias will have in the application of the findings.

Mr. Stephan set forth seven suggestions for reducing or eliminating interviewing bias. (1) Bias can be reduced through careful training of interviewers to correct the biases that are observed in the results of previous surveys. But this may overcorrect the biases. More may have to be learned about the nature and measurement of interviewer bias before it is possible to stop the pendulum and hold it at the exact zero point. (2) It is possible to select interviewers who have a range of different biases so that the results of these biases will cancel each other out. Sometimes this selective process develops naturally, but sometimes an entire crew has the same bias. This suggestion also presupposes the ability to define and identify biases. Characteristic tendencies of students, housewives, and other groups from which interviewers are frequently drawn must be taken into account at this point. (3) More interviewers, each assigned fewer interviews, may be employed to extend and emphasize the balancing out of biases. (4) The development of calibrating tests of interviewers through which individual biases can be measured may help. Once diagnosed, the interviewer can be trained to reduce his particular biases, or be balanced against other interviewers in the total pattern. (5) Study of the different ways in which the interviewer consciously or unconsciously reveals his own position, and of how such signals influence the respondent, or lead him to revise his statement must be part of any long range program for dealing with interview bias. Such studies would involve careful consideration of the social psychology of human interaction in the interviewing situation. (6) The study of attitudes of interviewers, sometimes by direct questions, sometimes by indirect questions designed to bring forth statements of attitude or opinion without specifically asking for them, can contribute to reducing interviewer bias. (7) Finally, the use of technical advances, represented, for example, by the scaling technique, tends to reduce interviewer bias.

In survey work as in most other practical activities, getting the job done is usually the primary consideration. But, urged Mr. Stephan, it is also

important to crystallize results of past experience and conduct experiments which will indicate how to do the job better in the future. He called for fruitful cooperation and exchange of information of mutual benefit among survey organizations that are engaged in getting work done and research organizations which are trying to get at some of the long-range research. He referred to the National Opinion Research Center project for studying interviewer bias, which is taking account of analysis of existing data, and is setting up experimental situations for new studies to determine how the errors and biases which occur can be reduced and brought under control.

Don Cahalan:

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION AND TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

The selection of interviewers, said Mr. Cahalan, is still more of an art than a science. Practically no time has been spent in an effort to determine, through scientific research, what does or does not make an effective interviewer. There are no studies postulating criteria which can determine in advance whether a person has any chance of being a good interviewer. No exact and objective set of qualifications has been developed, although interviewing is a very difficult job, requiring good judgment, the ability to meet people well, a good social science background, patience and understanding, genuine love for people, and a belief in the democratic process. It is easy to expect too much of interviewers, observed Mr. Cahalan, and office personnel may unwittingly make the field jobs too difficult.

In most survey organizations not enough care is taken in the selection of interviewers. This practice is expensive in the long run, as it means inferior personnel and a large turn-over. Actually it is cheapest not to hire a poor calibre interviewer in the first

place, because bad interviewing is the only step in the survey process that can be corrected only by re-sending the survey. Poor quality interviewing limits the type of work an organization can attempt to do. While survey organizations pay interviewers by the hour, good results have sometimes been achieved through payment by the job or through the use of volunteer interviewers.

Mr. Cahalan described the hiring and training procedures followed by the National Opinion Research Center. Every interviewer retained is seen and trained personally by someone from one of the national offices. Before the trainer goes on the trip, he prepares to utilize all possible leads for securing good interviewers, such as independent applications received through the mail, persons recommended by former interviewers, and possibilities suggested by educational and other community leaders. Newspaper ads, he reported, are seldom profitable in securing interviewers.

The actual training begins with a personal discussion between the trainer and the applicant, in the course of which the prospective interviewer is given material to review and study, including the manual Interviewing for NORC and two or three trial questionnaires especially prepared to bring to the fore most types of errors that can be made. After studying the background material and making practice interviews, the applicant returns for a period of discussion. Then the trainee may have a "phony interview" with the trainer, who responds with a set of routinized and purposely difficult answers. About five interviews in the field follow. Usually the trainer does the first interview for the applicant to observe, and then the trainee conducts several interviews with the trainer observing and making suggestions. If the applicant gives a promising performance during the training period, he is hired on a provisional basis. After all assignments, when the questionnaires have been processed, NORC rates the work of interviewers on a five-point scale. Interviewers whose work is consistently unsatisfactory are not retained.

According to Mr. Cahalan, the six most important qualifications for an interviewer are honesty, adaptability, intelligence, availability, accuracy, and personality. These terms are purely descriptive and general in character, however, and it remains true that the selection of applicants is dependent almost wholly on the judgment of the employer.

Declaring that there is a real need for an inventory of interviewer aptitude and competence, Mr. Cahalan described a plan for the development of such an inventory through testing items on present psychological tests for their relevance to interviewer performance. These batteries of items would be administered both to present interviewing staffs and to to prospective interviewers. After a period of two years or so, test records would be checked item by item against interviewer success or failure in the field in an endeavor to isolate test items providing a positive correlation with interviewer performance. Such a plan should eventually provide researchers wi with a condensed draft of inventory items which could be administered to prospective interviewers to secure a dependable indication of their aptitude for interviewing. Such an inventory would be continuously refined by testing against ratings of interviewers' work over a period of time and in a number of research organizations. Such a project would probably be a three-year job requiring foundation support and the cooperation of many active survey agencies. The proposed inventory, when developed, would serve as an invaluable tool to all. Further information on criteria for selecting and developing good interviewers should be available from studies on interviewer bias and from periodic check-ups on existing interviewing staffs. A real need exists for a scientific approach to the problem of selecting better interviewers, contended Mr. Cahalan, and he thought that the solution which he had proposed would save money for survey agencies, and would also help provide more adequate data for the work of social scientists.

DISCUSSION

Joe Belden (Joe Belden & Associates) opened the discussion by asking Don Cahalan what he meant by the "phony interview" in training of interviewers. Cahalan explained that he meant a type of practice interview in which the trainer, being interviewed by the trainee, gives a set of prepared responses designed to test the trainee's ability to probe and to handle a difficult interviewing situation. He described an experiment by Helen Verner Huth, graduate student in public opinion at the University of Denver, in which a number of interviewers were led to interview a previously coached respondent. Lester Guest (National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver) described an unreported experiment, in which he set up phony interviews with coached respondents and concealed wire recorders of which the interviewer was unaware. His tentative conclusion was that there is not much relationship between the length of interviewing experience and the ability to elicit good answers from the respondent. Guest observed that he was having difficulty analyzing his data because there is no general basis of agreement on the criteria of a good interview. In response to a question from Alfred N. Watson (Curtis Publishing Company), Cahalan stated that it is the NORC practice never to hire interviewers by mail but only on the basis of personal training, although applications are often received by mail and later followed up.

Arnold M. Rose (Washington University) asked Stephan how interviewer bias can be prevented without reducing the interviewer to an impersonal phonograph record. This would preclude good interviewing, and he posed the possibility of reversing the procedure and using extremely biased interviewers to see how this affects respondent opinion. Stephan declared that the interviewing situation cannot be made impersonal or be reduced to the phonograph level. The successful interviewer is essentially a real actor or actress who is playing a part that is not stereotyped.

He has to adjust his behavior, as in tennis, to meet the returns that come from the respondent. This type of continual adaption requires a great deal of skill on the part of the interviewer, and the successful interviewer, said Stephan, is one who interacts well. There is no single type of successful interviewer in terms of age, sex, national background, or psychological slant. The motivation of the interviewer and the respondent are very important and deserve more extensive study. In the investigation of the broad problems of human behavior on which the interviewing situation impinges, we must look to general research in psychology and to findings based on clinical interviewing experience.

Jane A. Shepherd (Washington Post) voiced her conviction that the people who are trying to solve practical problems in research are doing the most methodological research. She cited examples from newspaper readership research showing how, in the process of a study, various techniques were developed to meet direct needs. The measurement of readership has led further and further into study of and experimentation with methodological problems. Stephan concurred, mentioning examples of fruitful methodological experimentation in connection with practical field studies in India and in work by the Veterans Administration. Angus Campbell (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan) differed with Miss Shepherd on the competence of practical research organizations to handle theoretical problems. He termed the sampling survey a very, very practical service, a powerful instrument in the development of social science in general, and a device which makes it possible for data from the same respondents to be useful in various ways. Campbell maintained that theory must be built into a survey, and that it just does not come out of it accidentally. The more carefully a survey is planned, the more precautions are taken, the more likely will the results be of value on all levels. Knowledge of methodology often comes out of a practical survey, but not pure theory. Stephan underlined his conviction that active interchange of information and ideas between the so-called theorists

and the so-called practical people would be most fruitful and mutually stimulating. A major purpose of an association of public opinion practitioners should be to provide a meeting place for such contacts and interchange. Campbell agreed, and added that all researchers need both theoretical and practical experience, that ivory tower endeavors, or purely commercial ones, are apt to be slow and sterile.

Pauline Arnold (Market Research Corporation of America) asked for better definitions of practical and theoretical research. She believed that distinctions were being made that do not in fact exist. Katz asserted that the immediate job of getting more applied work of a trouble-shooting sort often limited the theoretical study it was possible for researchers, as very human beings, to undertake. Very often a body of theory is built up by doing experiments that seem to have no practical significance. In the development of science, progress comes through both applied and basic research. Because of the pressure of practical problems, the field of market research and applied work has outdistanced advances in theoretical work. The Chairman observed that academicians are often at a disadvantage in appraising the practical and theoretical work of commercial researchers because so little material is published on the methodological advances made in the course of market research. Papers by commercial researchers are done mostly on their own time, said Alfred N. Watson (Curtis Publishing Co.). He thought that there is a wealth of material in commercial research files which does not lend itself readily to publication, and believed that market researchers would welcome academic researchers who want to examine their results.

Charles H. Stember (National Opinion Research Center) noted that Cahalan had omitted one aspect of the NORC interviewer program, the maintenance of interviewer morale and interest. The ideal interviewer described by Cahalan, said Stember, would be the kind who would tend to lose interest after a

certain length of time. Cahalan agreed that it is of utmost importance to dispel the common assumption that interviewers are the "orphans of research." The best way to keep interviewer morale high is to make certain that every interviewer feels that the home office takes a genuine interest in him and his problems. Interviewers should be told repeatedly how important their work is, and should be frequently contacted both by letters and personal visits. Every effort should be made to relieve the pressures and tensions built up by steady interviewing. In the case of full-time interviewers, where the problem of satiation is most acute, rotation between office and field assignments and incentive rate increases are valuable practices. Belden reported that the Texas Poll had obtained very satisfactory results from a series of regional meetings for their part-time interviewing staff, planned for both training and morale-building purposes, and Teddy Burton (American Jewish Committee) mentioned the usefulness of house organs as a means of maintaining interviewer morale.

Referring to Quinn McNemar's article*, Leo P. Crespi (Princeton University) wanted to know what type of criticism related to theory and practice is most instructive and constructive in eliciting reactions from pollsters? In replying, Cahalan expressed the view that whatever the faults or virtues of the article, it served an extremely good end in stimulating discussion and self-examination. Trescott (Philadelphia Bulletin) described the steps taken by the Bulletin Poll to minimize bias through careful selection of interviewers within each social stratum. Better rapport and more honest answers seemed to result from using Negroes to interview Negroes, low income people to interview low income people, and so on. Cahalan agreed that such a practice could be highly successful for a local poll, but that its application on a national scale was limited and involved fresh problems. Belden, amazed that market and opinion organizations were still using white interviewers to interview Negroes, was convinced that good research cannot be done this way, and that Trescott's suggestion has national application. Stephan agreed that in many situations Negroes

* Q. McNemar, 'Opinion-Attitude Methodology", Psychological Bulletin, 1946, Vol. 43, pp. 289-374.

should interview Negroes, but pointed out that this practice does not necessarily insure good interviewing. There are a number of different strata within the colored community, and white interviewers may be more successful in obtaining certain types of information. Sometimes people will talk more freely to a stranger from an entirely different social sphere. Negro interviewers for Negroes may be needed in the South, said Nancy C. Cooley (Chicago Certified Interviewers Association), but they are not necessary in Chicago.

Stember asked what the War Department had found on the problem of rapport. Had bias resulted from using officers to interview enlisted men, or were enlisted men or civilians more successful? Ira H. Cisin (War Department) believed that it is the personality of the individual and not the rank on his collar that determines rapport with the respondent. John W. Riley, Jr. (Rutgers University) cited work done in Normandy shortly after the liberation, in the course of which no difference was found between the results obtained by uniformed British and American interviewers on the one hand, and French civilians on the other. He suggested that this might have been due to the unusual conditions under which the interviewing was done. Donald V. McGranahan (Harvard University) cautioned against the assumption that, because different responses are obtained by using different types of interviewers, what Negroes will tell whites is false and what Negroes will tell Negroes is true, or that what Germans will write on questionnaires administered by military personnel is false and that what Germans will write under the direction of civilians is true. Perhaps the only definition that can be made of real opinion, he stated, is that it predicts behavior in a given universe.

Trescott suggested that, particularly in a Negro-white interviewing situation, it is not a question of getting different answers but of getting any answers at all when a white is interviewing a Negro. Felix E. Moore, Jr. (U.S. Public Health Service) considered some of the research in the field constructive because

the findings of Negro interviewers interviewing Negroes more closely approximated results from self-administered questionnaires than did findings of white interviewers interviewing Negroes. Arnold J. King (Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State College) described two experiments in which the work of different teams of interviewers was not found to differ significantly, and maintained that bias depends more on training and the interviewing situation than on background and other personal factors. Stephan pointed out that any satisfactory analysis of bias depends on a sharp definition of the purposes of a survey and accurate delineation of exactly what information and attitudes are sought.

Belden asked whether any organization had had experience in measuring long-range fatigue in interviewers, and how long a maximum level of efficiency can be maintained. He said that his organization had yet to equal the accuracy record of the first survey when all the interviewers were doing their initial interviewing. Edward G. Benson (American Institute of Public Opinion) stated that the Gallup Poll had recently lost an interviewer who had been with the organization since early in 1935. The record for a full-time interviewer was twelve months. Frederick W. Williams (Opinion Surveys Section, Information Control Division, U. S. Office of Military Government for Germany) credited the unusual conditions and the high inducements for the excellent work of some of his German civilian interviewers over a three-year period. Pay and food incentives (one good, free meal a day) and the social prestige attached to this particular type of government service offered tremendous motivation. The more prestige, said Williams, the better the morale in almost any interviewer situation. Stephan pointed out that different kinds of interviewers are influenced by different motivations for taking on interviewing assignments. Fatigue may be accentuated by boredom or by such factors as overlong questionnaires and unreasonable assignments. When interviewing ceases to be spontaneous, when it loses its personal flavor, the interviewer is likely to quit.

VI

ROUND TABLE

New Fields of Use for Opinion Research

Louis Harris, Elmo Roper

Douglas Williams, Fred Rudge, Inc.

Marie Jahoda, American Jewish Committee

Bernard Berelson, University of Chicago

Chairman, Samuel A. Stouffer, Harvard University

SUMMARY

The wealth of available data and the application of polling methods now make economic forecasting feasible. Public opinion research can deal with a hitherto neglected factor, -- the influence of the consumer. To determine the effect of demand and expectation, a new survey program undertakes to measure the optimism-pessimism and the security-insecurity aspects of the public behaving as consumers. Insight into the demand side of the economy is a major step in the exploration of a new field and toward valid economic forecasting. Public opinion survey techniques can be applied for employee attitude studies to secure information about the worker's point of view. Employee attitude research provides a reciprocal channel of communication between management and labor. It can serve to audit employee relations practices, demonstrate management's interest in the labor force, and indicate to the former what the latter does and does not know about the firm for which it works. Prejudice against minority groups is not readily disclosed by traditional public opinion research methods. In this area no correlation can be taken for granted between what people say and what they do. Discrepancies between stated

attitudes and actual behavior necessitate other approaches. These include intensive informal interviewing; the investigation of the correlates of prejudice; psychiatric investigation of the sources and function of prejudice; and the use of biased questions in interviewing. Opinion and communication research are closely related. There are at least eight ways of evaluating the efficiency of the major media of communication: extent of use; diffusion among diverse groups; distinctiveness of service; transmission of information; extent of comprehensibility; public attitudes toward the media; influence upon opinions; and evaluation against standards.

Louis Harris: ECONOMIC PREDICTION

Mr. Harris began with a brief account of the history and theories of economic forecasting, which at first was not economy-wide, but was done for particular sections of the economy. Estimates for various businesses, crops, and the like were made, but there was very little done of a general nature. Later, pat theories of forecasting, such as the business cycle and so-called "building cycle" theories, were formulated which allegedly covered the total economy. The main obstacle to forecasting, said Mr. Harris, had been the lack of data, and modern forecasting began with the New Deal under which the systematic collection of information necessary for planning and forecasting was enormously expanded. "The figure factories" of Washington are of recent vintage, however, and researchers still have a long way to go to compile the material necessary for accurate forecasting. Another difficulty faced by forecasting has been weighting and correlating of the various elements which affect economic conditions. When these are treated differently, widely different results are secured. For example, after VJ Day there were eight or ten different forecasts of what was likely to occur in our economy. These ranged from predictions of full employment to estimates of many millions of unemployed.

Heretofore, Mr. Harris observed, forecasts always stressed the producer side of the economy and neglected the influence of the consumer. Capital expansion, investment, stock values, and physical and dollar volume of inventories have been the primary basis for economic prediction. Public opinion techniques have been used, but only on the producer side. The Dun and Bradstreet surveys for the Department of Commerce is an example of such surveys. The demand side has been rarely touched largely because of the inability to develop techniques for measuring consumer expectations. Market research has used public opinion techniques to measure the demand side for particular commodities, but only recently have general studies about demand and expectation been made.

Dr. Likert's studies in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the Federal Reserve Board on liquid assets are recent investigations of the shifting financial position of consumers, their purchases and plans to purchase durable goods, and their attitudes toward savings, liquid asset holdings, and investments. These surveys, said Mr. Harris, have helped considerably in making for balanced economic forecasting. The Federal Reserve studies have helped to measure specific percentages of liquid assets, and have, thereby, provided an objective measure of the state of consumers.

Mr. Harris announced that the Elmo Roper organization was undertaking a new kind of economic survey in determining the economic mood of the country on a trend basis. This new kind of survey measures the optimism-pessimism and the security-insecurity of the public in its economic life. By finding out how secure or insecure parts of the consumer public are, the temper of the entire demand side of the economy can be determined.

Obviously, remarked Mr. Harris, the survey does not ask people whether they are optimistic or pessimistic. By sampling five thousand people representing all kinds of consumers, the survey seeks to secure information which falls into three categories: (1)

information showing the general outlook on prices, quality of goods, and likelihood of depression and unemployment; (2) information on more specific items, not in dollar terms or specific percentile breakdowns (as Dr. Likert did), but in trend terms -- "more or less" on income, job security, present and potential buying intentions, individual investments, savings, and net worth; and (3) information from specific broad consuming groups revealing their attitudes toward the future of the most crucial elements in their economic life. The survey will give, therefore, not specific dollar and cents results, but the attitudes which sooner or later will translate themselves into concrete economic activity. For example, in asking about the future of prices, it can find out where the "toughest pull" is and ascertain how many consumers are being "priced out of the market."

Mr. Harris emphasized the cautions which must be observed in evaluating this new survey and in interpreting its results. It is a forecast only insofar as the layman can himself predict his own economic future. By furnishing data on the economic mood of the consumer group, it does fill a gap. Up to now the stock market was depended on for signs of optimism-pessimism, but the survey indicates what all the people are thinking. From what is known of stock market prognostication about the future of our economy, the sampling of one hundred and forty million Americans should be many times more accurate than the views of a few thousand brokers. The survey does not duplicate Dr. Likert's work. It measures trends of attitudes toward the economic future, not in specific savings or spending but in general, relative terms. The real value of this will be known only after it has been used several times, and has been tested in a period of sharp economic change. The data provided by the survey cannot be used alone. It has to be employed in conjunction with other data made available by the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and similar organizations. Finally, Mr. Harris made it clear that this survey is not regarded as the terminal point of research into the consumer demand side of the economy. It is not viewed

as the means of providing a hard and fixed index, but as an instrument for exploring a new field.

Douglas Williams: LABOR RELATIONS

Employee attitude studies, declared Mr. Williams, were of particular importance today, because the worker's viewpoint has largely been ignored by management, particularly in contrast to the extent to which business has used opinion polling to determine consumer preferences. The technological progress made by industry along mechanical lines has not been matched by advances in knowledge of the human factor in industry -- how workers feel about their jobs, working conditions and supervision, and what they understand or misunderstand about the company's practices or policies.

Mr. Williams suggested that employee attitude research be visualized as one channel of a two-way channel of communication between the management and the worker. The opinion survey is a new way to establish an effective channel from the bottom up. One reason that the channel from the top down has been so ineffective in the past is because management has not understood the worker's viewpoint. Training and supervision by foremen, employee magazines, handbooks, indoctrination procedures, letters from the president of the company, and other means whereby the management can communicate with its employees are apt to be "off the beam."

Three main uses for employee attitude surveys were discussed by Mr. Williams. First of all, they could serve as an audit or appraisal of employee relations practices. This involves finding out what is wrong and the mode of correction, either in terms of adjusting and modifying various practices, or through a better informational program for employees enabling them to understand the reasons for particular procedures. He urged that surveys should not be restricted to audits of past practices. Employee attitude surveys could also serve as a basis for learn-

ing how best to initiate new employee practices in the future so that these will be in accord with employee ideas and understanding. By enabling management to keep itself informed on employee feelings and reactions, they constitute an aid to effective leadership. Finally, such surveys are a concrete demonstration of management's interest in its people. They are evidence of the importance which executives attach to the worker's ideas, and the employee, feeling that they give him voice, appreciates the interest exhibited and the opportunity for self-expression.

In describing the operation of the surveys, Mr. Williams stressed the importance of the preliminary, exploratory work because of the newness of the field and the consequent lack of information. Less is known about attitude patterns here than for radio listeners, magazine readers, or product-users. Free-hand interviews yield much useful information. Because a person's job is such an important and immediate part of his life, he can talk quite extensively and articulately about it. Group interviews are particularly valuable to a researcher, because they give him a "feel"of the important employee attitudes in the plant. One person stimulates another in these group interviews and the interviewer usually just sits and listens. Of course anonymity of the respondents must be assured throughout.

When the questionnaire method is used for surveys they may be administered at home, in a classroom situation, or by mail. The first is the same as that used by the typical public opinion poll. In the classroom situation, the class leader announces the purpose of the study and the employees themselves fill out questionnaires. This is economical and involves no interviewer bias, because everyone answers under the same conditions, and those with little education can be helped by assistants. Interviews done by mail have disadvantages in incomplete returns and the lack of control over the conditions under which a question is answered. This technique, said Mr. Williams, is basically supplementary and should be used only in specialized situations. It should never

be used exclusively where an accurate gauge of employee attitudes is required.

In public opinion research generally, increasing emphasis is being given to what people know, and this is particularly important in employee attitude research. It is surprising, reported Mr. Williams, how much people do not know about the companies they work for. This, of course, is not their fault, for it is up to management to give them the facts.

Management, declared Mr. Williams, has given a surprisingly encouraging response to this type of survey, which, in some respects, enables management to become familiar with the worker's viewpoint for the first time in an objective way. Survey results do change executives' thinking, and leads them to regard their employees as people, not as units of work in a production plan. Labor relations are of central importance in the domestic future of the U.S., concluded Mr. Williams, and opinion research has a great deal to contribute to a better solution of labor-management problems.

Marie Jahoda: MINORITY GROUP PREJUDICE

Pointing out that minority group prejudice is hard to measure because of the reluctance of people to reveal their genuine attitudes, Dr. Jahoda reported that the Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee was convinced that new techniques were necessary in this area. The techniques of market research and public opinion polling are not generally applicable because of the discrepancies between genuine and expressed attitudes on minority group problems. In voting behavior there is an assumption of correlation between what people say and what they do. In the area of minority group problems no such correlation can be assumed. Two kinds of discrepancies between attitudes in this area have been noted: the difference between what people say and what they do; and the difference between what they say to a stranger and to a friend and what

they say in a normal and in an emotional situation. The American creed teaches people to pay lip service to equality while they may be behaving in quite a different fashion. This makes it extremely difficult to unearth real attitudes, because the discrepancy between ideology and behavior is so much a part of training.

Dr. Jahoda noted that the discrepancy between verbalized attitude and behavior in minority group prejudice is similar to the findings of a study on corporal punishment done in Austria. When parents were asked whether or not they believed in corporal punishment for children, they replied overwhelmingly that they were not. But when their behavior was observed, it was found that most of them administered corporal punishment to their own children. There is no check on the discrepancy in the field of minority problems comparable to that done in the corporal punishment study, inasmuch as investigators do not precipitate race riots in order to discover diffences between peoples' expressed attitudes and their behavior!

In one attempt to get at real attitudes discussed by Dr. Jahoda, the interviewers were instructed to put the questionnaire away after the interview and to conduct an informal intensive interview immediately after, under the guise of "just talking." It was found in this case that differences in attitude toward minorities showed up in 20 - 25% of the cases. Public opinion polls in this whole field have been rather unsuccessful, and new approaches are obviously required. To this end, the Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee has been conducting studies in order to find an indirect approach to the measurement of prejudice. One such study, carried out in Berkeley, California, by Adorno, Brunswick, Levinson, and Sandford, started with the assumption that prejudice is not an isolated phenomenon, but part of a syndrome of attitudes. Although not yet completed, the results so far show that it is possible to ascertain the correlates of prejudice and measure these, instead of attempting to measure

attitudes toward minority problems directly. It was found that certain general attitudes correlate highly with minority group prejudice. These may be categorized as ethnocentrism, politico-economic conservatism, and fascist character traits.

About forty questions have been devised, said Dr. Jahoda, which show a high correlation with prejudice. Requesting respondents to indicate agreement or disagreement with a series of statements has proved a useful research tool enabling people to answer with more truth and no fear of social condemnation. Some of the findings reveal that the prejudiced person is superstitious, has a tendency toward rigidity, is generally self-satisfied, and cynical about human relations. He is also apt to be conventional and authoritarian.

Two further crucial questions must be posed, declared Dr. Jahoda.--What purpose does prejudice fulfill for the individual, and how does the prejudiced individual get that way? In order to answer these questions a study was devised which enlisted the cooperation of thirty psychiatrists. This attempted to get a detailed history of patients who were found to be prejudiced against minority groups. This investigation involved major methodological difficulties. Psychiatrists do not all speak the same language, and communication between psychiatrists and research people is not all that it should be. It does not help in research to be told that a man is prejudiced because he has an Oedipus complex. The tentative results of this study have provided some insight into the prejudiced person. He is discovered to be the victim of an identity conflict and a weak ego. For him, the Jew is a living Rohrschach inkblot upon whom he projects his conflicts and frustrations. Everything he does not like in himself, he is likely to project onto the Jew. He is not quite clear what he himself is, and these conflicts make him potentially hostile to other groups. These studies have enabled researchers to gauge the extent of prejudice and the potential danger, but they have not provided a program of action.

What has been learned for public opinion polls through other research into minority group prejudice, Dr. Jahoda summarized under four main points. (1) Biased questions must be used in order to overcome the effect of the American Creed. (2) It is necessary to suggest in interviewing what is normally not stated in polite society. (3) Questions on prejudice must be spread over a wide area of subjects. (4) Verbal attitudes must be checked against action.

Bernard Berelson:
EFFICIENCY OF COMMUNICATION MEDIA

Communication research and opinion research are natural cousins in the development of social science. Not only do they deal with the same or related problems, such as the effect of the communication media upon public opinion, but in addition each has contributed research techniques to the development of the other. For example, opinion research has developed sampling procedures which can be put to good use in communication research, and the latter has developed techniques of content analysis which can be applied to the analysis of open-end interviews.

Dr. Berelson discussed eight different ways of evaluating the efficiency of the major public media of comminication -- newspaper, radio, films, magazines, books. The different methods of evaluation really amount to different definitions of the term "efficiency."

(1) Extent of use: The media can be evaluated simply in terms of the numbers of people they reach. We already have fairly good data on this gross measurement of efficiency which indicate, for example, that most people read newspapers and listen to the radio and that relatively few people read books.

(2) Diffusion among diverse groups: This standard refers to the effectiveness of the communication media in reaching various groups within the community. In these terms some media are more restricted

than others; thus, for example, books are read much more by the better educated groups within the community. "Efficiency" thus might be defined in terms of the extent to which the media reach all segments of the population.

(3) Distinctiveness of service: To what extent does the medium supply a kind of communication material not available from other media? For example, the community has set up the public library to supply material not usually available through commercial media, and thus this institution can be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness in performing this function.

(4) Transmission of information: To what extent are the media collectively or individually effective in producing a given level of informedness on the part of the population. One qualification is necessary here. The media may provide the information, but the people may not take it. Even so the efficiency of the media can be judged in terms of the level of information of the population. It may be, for example, that the population is well informed on political affairs, but not on matters of public health, and thus the efficiency in that area would be low.

(5) Extent of comprehensibility: This criterion of efficiency refers to the degree to which the communication is understood in the sense in which it was meant to be understood. Studies have shown that a good deal of communication content is not comprehended readily or at all, and the various media could be evaluated against this standard.

(6) Public attitudes toward the media: the efficiency of the communications media might also be defined in terms of the extent to which they have gained public acceptance and approval. Recent studies of the radio industry have indicated the high degree of favor in which the general public holds radio programing, and it has also revealed a sizable, important and influential group within the community which is critical of radio. In such studies a distinction must be made between evaluating the media for oneself as against for

the community. For example, a study of people's attitudes toward the public library revealed that whereas a large group felt that the library meant a great deal to the community, only a small group indicated that it meant a great deal to themselves personally.

(7) Influence upon opinions: The actual impact of the media upon public opinion is a basic factor in evaluating efficiency. Only the beginnings of research have been done in this critical and difficult area. Since the communications media generally intend to modify attitudes and behavior, it is relevant to define efficiency interms of their success in doing so.

(8) Evaluation against standards: Finally, efficiency may be judged in terms of the extent to which the media realize certain objectives or standards. Such standards may be of various kinds. For example, they may refer to the intentions of the people who produce the communications; to what extent did they actually do what they wanted to do? Or the standards might refer to certain values set up by other groups for the performance of the media or to certain kinds of improvements for the media. Evaluation could then be done in terms of the indicated standards.

These, concluded Dr. Berelson, are some ways in which the efficiency of the communication media can be defined and subsequently determined. They obviously range from the simple to the complex and from the immediate to the remote. But together they represent a variety of definitions for the term "efficiency." Which of them would apply in a given situation would depend upon the problem at hand.

DISCUSSION

Joseph Kenas (British Broadcasting Corporation) questioned the usefulness of Mr. Harris's economic forecasting. He felt that the inconsistencies in our economy make it impossible to forecast economic conditions. We are neither a free nor a planned

economy, he held, and our economic future is so largely governed by administrative actions that the expectations or predictions of the layman about the future may be completely overturned by administrative action. As examples, he cited the lifting of price controls despite the desire of the people for their continuance and President Truman's veto of the tax bill, both of which had an important effect on our economy, and neither of which corresponded with the wishes or expectations of ordinary people. Who knows what will happen to the two billion dollars worth of terminal leave bonds being cashed in by veterans? How can you determine how and at what rate these will be used? Harris replied that the new type of survey was not a forecast in itself, but should be used in conjunction with other data as part of a larger technique for getting at the economic future. He admitted that the technicians were still a long way from forecasting exactly what will happen on the economic scene.

Angus Campbell (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan) expressed surprise that the type of surveys being done by Mr. Harris and the Roper organization should be described as new. On behalf of Dr. Likert's organization, he stated that Likert and his associates have been doing this sort of survey work for about five years. He also described the kinds of surveys in the general area of economic behavior and motivation of behavior which had been done by the Likert organizations.

Otto Klineberg (Columbia University), commenting on Dr. Jahoda's remarks, suggested that prejudice which does not actually exist is frequently verbalized, and cited a study in which members of a minority group, who wrote to hotels for accomodations, were informed by certain hotels that they were not acceptable. Upon appearance at the hotels, however, they were frequently able to obtain accomodations without difficulty. In Brazil, he observed, there was considerable verbalization of minority group prejudice but little actual prejudiced behavior, and he asked Dr Jahoda under what conditions such a situation is likely

to arise. Dr. Jahoda replied that she had no data on this subject, but that she felt that anxiety situations tended to increase prejudice, but not necessarily the expression of it. During the war, she felt that prejudice against minorities was rising, but due to the ideological climate of the time its expression was restricted.

William Yoell (marketing consultant) spoke of surveys on employee morale and described a technique which he thought has been successful in unearthing areas of dissatisfaction among employees. By finding out exactly what a worker did during the day, it was possible to isolate certain areas which cause difficulties to arise. By this technique one company discovered that the use of tokens for bus fares would be advantageous and that it was necessary to move a particular newsstand to allow employees to purchase newspapers conveniently. He suggested that it might be possible to use this technique to discover the existence of minority group prejudice.

Henry David (Queens College) addressed questions to Mr. Harris and to Mr. Williams. Pointing out that any system of economic forecasting involved the postulation of some system of economic theory, he asked the former what economic theory he was using. He observed that Mr. Harris implied that he was accepting some form of marginal economic theory, and suggested that this might constitute a fundamental weakness in a system of prediction. He asked Mr. Williams what happened to the kind of employee survey which he described when it is conducted in a unionized plant. Is it conceived in the same terms, and does it serve the same ends as those described by Mr. Williams. To Dr. David, it appeared that Mr. William's survey merely performed a service for management, fulfilling the purposes of what is known as welfare capitalism, and was not designed to service the needs of the larger community in contributing to a fruitful solution of labor-management problems. Mr. Williams replied that the field was still too new for him to offer many examples of the use of the technique in unionized plants. However, in a few

instances in which it has been tried, the researcher worked with the union in planning the survey. Where unions are suspicious, he said, agencies have not been able to conduct surveys, because it is usually the practice to seek the union's acceptance and cooperation before proceeding. One such situation arose recently, and that survey has not yet been initiated. One of management's suggestions to allay the unions's fears was to have a minister in the town do the analysis of the data, since it was felt that he would be a neutral party. Mr. Williams emphasized his conviction that management usually makes so many wrong decisions with regard to employee relations that a survey is very useful to them in pointing up the problems in the area.

David Glass (University of London) wanted to know from Mr. Williams what would happen if the problems in a plant were fundamental in nature. He was willing to assume that where the causes of poor morale were of a minor sort surveys could be useful. But what would happen, he asked, if a survey revealed that the workers believed the industry should be nationalized? Mr. Williams replied that it is not customary to refer such matters to employees in a survey. He stated that it was his conviction that no surveys should be done if management was not prepared to implement their findings by action. Stuart Chase thought that the problem of nationalization was not an issue, and that such surveys could be done in industries already nationalized. Mr. Williams concurred, and pointed out that surveys have been done among the employees of the War Department. Don Cahalan (National Opinion Research Center) expressed the view that industrial surveys were one-sided, because they were done by and for management, which, in contrast to the unions, could afford to pay for them. Frank M. Surface (Standard Oil Company of New Jersey) pointed out that in his experience the results of surveys have been given to the unions as well as to management. Mr. Williams commented that he knew of no surveys done by unions through an agency, and that industrial surveys would be more advantageous if they were sponsored jointly by labor and management.

Arnold M. Rose (Washington University) thought that Mr. Harris had underestimated the importance of the stock market in determining economic conditions. In the field of economics, one man was not one vote and the operators on the stock market had a disproportionate share of power in determining economic conditions. Philip Hauser (University of Chicago) argued that surveys such as Mr. Harris outlined could be useful in pointing up the difference between what was expected and what happened. Mr. Harris felt that the use of polling among consumers for purposes of economic prediction was still new and could be developed a lot further. He reported that only one study has been completed so far on a trend basis by the Roper organization, and that its results were not yet ready for release. He agreed with Mr. Hauser that such surveys would prove useful to those engaged in economic education.

VII

PANEL DISCUSSION

Coding, Validity and Reliability

Angus Campbell, Survey Research Center
University of Michigan

Richard Crutchfield, Swarthmore College

Hans Zeisel, McCann-Erickson, Inc.

Chairman, Albert B. Blankenship
National Analysts, Inc.

SUMMARY

The coding of narrative material of intensive, open-ended types of questions gives rise to significant problems affecting procedure, reliability, and validity in coding. A practical measure of reliability is found in the amount of agreement between different coders independently coding the same material. The level of reliability differs from code to code because of the types of areas covered, the kinds of questions asked, and the coding technique used. Poll analysts should know the reliability of each particular code employed on a questionnaire. Reliability can be improved through the combination of steps on a scale where distinction has caused confusion, through the use of multidimensional codes, and by the careful training of coders. Reliability is affected by coder bias and coder morale. The validity and reliability of a code are inextricably bound up with the validity of the original interviewing. A balance between validity of interviewing and consistency of coding must be found, but this will vary according to the type of survey. Careful prior planning for the types of breakdowns expected on a particular survey helps reduce the severity of the coding problems subsequently encountered. By and large, trained coders rather than interviewers should be responsible for

interpretation of the replies of respondents.

In his opening remarks, the Chairman defined coding as the bringing together, classification, and analysis of answers obtained in surveys. Coding may occur at almost any point in the scale from the field work to the final analysis, and Dr. Blankenship noted that the accuracy of field coding as against coding done in the office was one of the major questions to be discussed by the panel. In commenting on the importance of coding operations, which account for about one-third to one-half of the expenses involved in commercial surveys, he said that this was the first time that a gathering of this character had scheduled a discussion of coding problems. He drew attention to the bearing of coding on the accuracy of survey results and to its significance for many kinds and areas of research in the social sciences.

Dr. Campbell dealt with "General Problems in Classifying Open-Ended Questions," and began with the question of the actual degree of freedom in open-ended interviews used by Dr. Likert's organizations. He reported that some people think a highly unstructured type of interview is used, in which the interviewer tries to prod the interviewee into verbal action without any direction, an interview in which the ideal question would be "Good morning, Madam. I am very much interested in what you are about to say." There are occasions, said Dr. Campbell, when a loose structure of that kind is desirable, -- for example, in the case of a social case worker. But such pure, free association is not very practical in the study of public opinion, because it is costly and because it is difficult to derive comparable data from a series of interviews unless they have some sort of consistent structure. Therefore, an interview must be written with objectives in mind, whether they are merely enumerative data, or detailed information sought for theoretical purposes or to test hypotheses. Dr. Campbell emphasized the fact that all members of the sample must be included in the arrays of data obtained in order to preserve the sample structure. In an unstructured, free answer questionnaire it is probable that the interviewee will discuss subject X

but not mention subject Y, and that all topics will not be covered by all respondents. Therefore, all open questions used by the Survey Research Center are designed with a certain structure, so that the information obtained will fulfill an objective.

There are two general points of view, said Dr. Campbell, as to how narrative material should be coded. One is that coding should be left pretty largely until all the interviews have been collected, so as to find out what is in them before coding. The weaknesses of this procedure, however, are threefold. In the first place, it tends to create a large proliferation of categories. It is difficult, he said, to make order out of the countless ways of saying things unless there is some preconception of the possible categories. Secondly, and more serious, such a posterior approach to coding is apt to result in dicoordinate codes, -- a continuum which turns into two continua with the sample divided between them. The Division of Program Surveys ran into a problem of this sort when it asked people whether they thought their incomes would be higher, lower, or the same the following year. The question was on expectations, but part of the sample was lost by confusion with hope of what would happen. The third and most important objection is that it tends to result in a failure to meet the objectives of the study, because it loses sight of the original plan of the survey.

The second point of view on coding of narrative material posits a planned attack on the analysis problem. This method requires a detailed statement at the beginning, before the questionnaire is written, as to what data are expected to come out of the study. From a broad statement of objectives one proceeds to a detailed statement of the expected arrays of information. It is possible, Dr. Campbell asserted, to bring out ahead of time a written plan which will anticipate 90% of the arrays which will eventually be obtained. Categories within arrays, of course, are not so easily anticipated, and may have to be added the work progresses.

In conclusion, Dr. Campbell compared the value of the free answer questionnaire and the check list questionnaire. The latter, he said, has the appearance of being precise in that there is relatively little error in converting check list responses into punched cards. However, estimates of reliability of coding the actual answers given by the respondents are only possible if the interviewer gets down the verbatim answer and coding is done by trained analysts at a central office. Ordinarily, there is no way of standardizing the interpretations made either by the interviewer or by the respondent himself.

Dr. Crutchfield limited his remarks on "The Accuracy of Coding and How to Improve It" to the coding of intensive material from open-ended questions. This, he said, presents problems quite unlike those encountered in coding other types of interviews. The magnitude of the narrative material which must be read and analyzed by a coder is enormous, and it is essential to establish the possibility of coding the interview material with a high degree of reliability. However, in any survey, the critical question is not whether a reliable code is possible, but whether the particular codes used for each question are reliable. The standard practice, said Dr. Crutchfield, is "check coding", which is independent coding of a random sample of the interviews by a second coder. It is then possible to compare codes and establish some measure of agreement, although embarrassing technical problems arise when non-dichotomous questions are being coded on a five-step scale or by reasons. In every survey, an acceptable percentage of agreement must be established in a standard way for every code.

Dr. Crutchfield pointed out that the level of reliability will differ from code to code for at least three reasons. In the first place, there are differences in the types of material or areas covered. For example, information on consumer habits is likely to be fairly explicit, while attitudes on international affairs are less straightforward. Secondly, types of questions may affect reliability; it makes a difference whether

a question involves an opinion, or an action, or a plan, etc. In the third place, there is the matter of coding technique itself. Sometimes coding is done in terms of individual questions and sometimes in clusters and by reading the entire interview. Other things being equal, said Dr. Crutchfield, one would usually be better off using large parts of an interview, for answers to some questions are sometimes given in other parts of the questionnaire. The more material available, the more valid the information obtained, and for a breadth of relevant material the coder should preferably read the entire interview. However, since the coder must now make a variety of judgments on the same set of materials, a "halo effect" may arise. It is possible that the ideal intensive interview construction would be a number of questions for certain variables, which would all be read. For other variables, other questions should be designed, without any overlap.

In dealing with the reliability of the coding of intensive material, Dr. Crutchfield asserted that all types of material and questions and all types of coding technique can be brought to the point where they will yield remarkably high coding reliability. He found evidence for this in the high agreement between coders, and noted that the bulk of percentage agreements is above 85%. Many disagreements are not large, especially on a five-point scale, where most of them are likely to be one-step disagreements. These disagreements look greater percentage-wise than in terms of correlation. In general, coding of intensive material can be highly reliable. To improve reliability, Dr. Crutchfield declared, the initial agreement between the coders is very important. He advised discussion by the group of coders at the outset and round robin coding of a certain batch of interviews using the same standards, definitions, etc., to give a basis of understanding within the group. Other measures to avoid large disagreements in coding might be the combination of categories to correct one-step disagreements, better study design and pre-testing, and better training of coders. This last is important because there is a wide difference of

ability when it comes to coding intensive material. Difficult, subtle psychological judgments are involved. A standardized test could be developed to train coders, using intensive material already coded by experts, but training would not entirely eliminate individual differences in ability and temperament.

Dr. Crutchfield's final point dealt with validity in coding. He queried whether there really is an issue of validity in coding: Does the coder code what he is supposed to code? This problem, he said, cannot be examined apart from interviewing. There can be invalid interviewing or invalid coding. Some light may be thrown on the question of validity by comparing interviewers' judgments (as shown in post-interview write-ups) with the judgments of office coders. Another approach to the problem lies in a comparison of coders' judgments with those of skilled experts and highly trained professional workers. For example, in the U. S. Strategic Bombing Survey in Germany the judgments of interviewers and coders and of a small corps of social scientists, on interviews with German civilians, showed an extremely high agreement of 95% on very difficult material.

Hans Zeisel, discussing "Some of the Problems and Procedures in Coding," noted that coding is comprised of two parts: making good classifications and putting them economically and properly onto sheets or cards. He confined his remarks to the problems of machine tabulation. The first problem he raised was the relatively simple one of putting categories in final order. It will usually help, he said, to plan sub-groups ahead and leave columns free for subtotals and combinations. In open-answer questions it is wise to leave space for unforeseen answers in setting up the final code. It is good practice for the coder to keep a separate list of unclassified replies for possible later inclusion or tabulation.

One of the major problems in machine tabulation is the question of column arrangement. Dr. Zeisel's experience indicated that it is advisable not to be

stingy with cards. Spread out as far as possible, even to a second card, he said, because it is more accurate and punching is cheaper, even if tabulation may be more expensive. In general, use a column for one thing only. But if you really must save columns, you can cram 4,095 codes in one column by using additive codes 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, up to 2,048 in the twelfth hole.

Dr. Zeisel made a plea for the extended use of composite codes. They make possible the obtaining of summary information in one run instead of many, as well as special cross tabulations, and generally improve the survey by widening its scope. They are essential in hand tabulations and convenient on machines, where they permit gang punching of information found in the initial sort. In operations of this kind, the IBM Multiplier should be used more often to show, for example, such things as "How many times do you buy how much?" Use more gang punching, he urged, to combine several variables into one.

In The Technique of Marketing Research, Paul Lazarsfeld said that good classifications must be logically correct; they must pertain to the same dimension, be mutually exclusive, and be pertinent to the inquiry. For example, in classifying answers to the question "What kind of hobby do you have?", hobbies may be grouped according to whether they are carried on alone or in groups, require exercise or are sedentary, use expensive equipment, or are run on a shoe-string, etc. The real problem, said Dr. Zeisel, is how to tell what are pertinent classifications. A doctor making a verbal and a non-verbal analysis of a patient has a theory and can predetermine by his theory what is relevant. Similarly, in public opinion research one can construct a theory as to what is pertinent. There are cases where a theoretical structure is not necessary because information is available on certain predetermined points. But, if no theory for investigation is at hand, classifications must be made all around to see what rudimentary groups exist. In closing, Dr. Zeisel declared that the more we know or can guess about the structure, or the more we have

the design planned, the better off we are in our analyses.

DISCUSSION

The discussion was opened by William A. Yoell (Marketing Consultant) who observed with reference to Dr. Crutchfield's remarks that the coding of depth interviews must be standardized, if it is to be feasible. Coding must not overlook the problem of responsiveness to personality or rely too much on the judgments of the investigator in a write-up after the interview. He called attention to the danger of calculating percentage agreements on recoding for the 50-100 interviews used in most depth interviewing. Dr. Crutchfield replied that his comments had been meant to cover not all depth interviews but only intensive interviewing, as Dr. Campbell had discussed it, particularly the interviews used by the Division of Program Surveys of the Department of Agriculture, the Survey Research Center, and the Morale Division of the U. S. Strategic Bombing Survey in Germany and Japan. He referred explicitly, he said, to open-end interviewing involving a standard schedule of questions asked in a standard way and differing from polls by not giving the respondent definite categories of answers but allowing him to talk about the questions. This method of interviewing is non-directive, he said. Ideally, the function of the interviewer is to ask the general question, to urge the respondent to talk by non-directive means -- contentless probes-- and to write answers verbatim at the moment of interview. This technique has been used in some 100,000 interviews. There were 4,000 used in the U. S. Strategic Bombing Survey, which asked Germans and Austrians some 60 intensive questions -- about one and a half hours apiece -- with a booklet required for each interview. In this kind of survey the same size sample is used as in other surveys. Mr. Yoell said that there are many people who are inarticulate, and that sometimes the interviewer must answer for them. Dr. Crutchfield, however, reported that his experience pointed to the readiness of people to talk. The inter-

viewer is not supposed to enter actively in the interview, but if personality does affect the interview, he said, it should not affect intensive interviewing any more than any other kind.

Herbert Hyman (National Opinion Research Center) said that his organization had run into "anti-coder" personalities -- person who won't accept the established code and say it isn't right, and that some kind of selective test is needed to guard against this. On the point of reliability, Dr. Hyman observed the problem is not so much one of getting reliable measures as of making them useful in the analytic process. The analyst should know what confidence can be placed in his material. Dr. Campbell reported that the Survey Research Center now requires the assistant study director to prepare a full statement of disagreements on every code and a note as to how the proportion can be reduced by a combination of codes. It does not accept any code with differences over 20 per cent.

Mrs. Malcolm Crusius (Elmo Roper) asked whether it might not be better to classify a sample of the replies to open-end questions like "Why don't people like Truman?" instead of setting up classifications in advance. Dr. Campbell replied that the Survey Research Center attempts to anticipate the arrays of data needed, but not necessarily the different categories. The method used is to lay out a mimeographed plan of column headings to start a round robin of ten interviews to be coded by the group, and then to fill in the categories within the columns. If a new answer comes along, it is tabulated on a blackboard until there are a sufficient number of recurrences for inclusion.

Leo P. Crespi (Princeton University) then remarked that the validity of coding cannot be approached separately from the reliability of the response. In this respect the yes-no question is pretty advantageous. He had made a study of yes-no questions which showed people giving identical responses in 85% of the cases. He reported that he was working on a study of open-

end questions and asked whether any members of the panel had any information of that type. What good is there in coding responses, he asked, without knowing their reliability? In this connection, Dr. Campbell commented that the consistency of a respondent's answer to the same question twice is quite different from two coders' interpretations of the same answer. Dr. Crutchfield agreed with this point of view, saying that in intensive interviewing the respondent is not categorizing himself, and there is no way of comparing interviewing techniques. Validity, he said, is more important than reliability.

Lester Guest (University of Denver and National Opinion Research Center) wanted to know whether probed answers are coded differently from unprobed. For example, he said, babblers vs. reticent people -- sometimes one must probe a reticent person, in a question such as "From what you have either read or seen, what type of work does a psychologist indulge in?" The answer might be "Students' counsel". There is a difference, said Dr. Guest, between probed and unprobed answers; when probed, the respondent feels that he is expected to give more. Dr. Campbell replied that when probes are used, they are used unequally. The interviewer should indicate when he probes, but it is difficult to be rigid and these responses are not coded separately.

Howard Mandel (Bureau of Agricultural Economics) commented that one is always running into the dilemma of consistency vs. validity, interviewer vs. coder. The interviewer has the intensity of response and the manner of speech to go on. Parts of the country differ. Vermonters, for instance, may give a very brief response which is equivalent to lengthy responses by others. Should the code be consistent, he asked, or should one get the most meat out of one's answers? Dr. Campbell did not know the answer to the problem, but he observed that there is apt to be more inconsistency when interviewers do the coding. Interviewers may be well trained, but there is no assurance that the man in California will have the same bases of judgment as the man in the Middle West.

Supervised groups of coders eliminate this difficulty, he said. Dr. Crutchfield, by way of reconciling the opposed views, noted that if there are going to be violent discrepancies of interviews around the country, it may be better to sacrifice greater validity to achieve a higher degree of consistency. A balance of these factors, however, is always required, he said. Chairman Blankenship added that reliability is impossible without high validity. He also observed that differences of opinion are caused by the fact that we do not know what validity is in this sort of work, and that we should press for a clearer definition of the concept.

Paul Lazarsfeld (Columbia University) directed questions at each of the speakers. First he remarked to Dr. Zeisel that it seemed to him essential to emphasize the "multidimensional" classification mentioned in the first chapter of Say It With Figures, since many psychological survey answers require it to cover various classifications. He cited the classification of hobbies mentioned by Dr. Zeisel as in illustration of the necessity for seeing that one dimension correlates with another. Dr. Zeisel replied that a one-dimensional answer is often insufficient to give the whole story. Usually there are three dimensions to consider, he said. In the case of product purchases, there is the respondent's situation, the product's characteristics, and the source of information about the product. For example, on a question like "Why did you buy a certain hand cream?" possible answers might be: "I needed a cream"; "It is a fine cream"; "It was recommended to me." Altogether one gets a complete answer. Dr. Crutchfield added that double coding of a sample, done by different persons, could be used to define the second dimension.

Dr. Lazarsfeld's next question was addressed to Dr. Crutchfield. He said that validity was undefinable and made no sense to him. It is possible, he argued, for two codes to have little reliability and a low correlation, but to be very helpful in interpreting a third group. For example, classification of people by social status (A-B-C-D) and by occupation would have

a low correlation. But if you take the two codes with 60% agreement to find out, for instance, whether poorer people or richer people are more against the Russians, the results would be the same with either code. Not the validity but interchangeability is the criterion of the acceptability of codes. Dr. Crutchfield agreed, saying that there could be validity greater than reliability.

Dr. Lazarsfeld then asked Dr. Campbell, about his his experience in coding long open-ended answers. Dr. Lazarsfeld recommended a two-step procedure to check through the answers for different elements of opinion and add them. For example, look for expressions of fear, distrust,aggression in opinions on Russia. This makes coding more reliable and permits discussion between coders where there is disagreement. Dr. Campbell commented that in Survey Research Center surveys, a respondent is given a rating on an attitude scale and his reasons are coded. In addition, a "sieve" code may be used to find the presence of different specific items. Dr. Hyman added that the problem of validity was involved in coder bias, as, for example, in interpretations by coders with pro- or anti-Russia opinion. In further reference to the question of probing, Mr. Yoell said that a question was once asked, "Which of five companies would you like to work for and why?" Replies such as "it's a nice company", "do good for employees", "give periodic wage increases" all mean the same, but they are different to different people. He wanted to know the first reaction and others unearthed by probing where they were inconsistent. Dr. Crutchfield replied that it required a definition of dimensions to get the whole picture and enable exploration of all possible areas.

In connection with the coding method suggested by Dr. Lazarsfeld, N. L. Gage, (Purdue University) asked whether uni-dimensionality was important in building up scores through adding different elements. Dr.Zeisel said that for adding purposes it was. Robert Williams (Elmo Roper) asked whether coder fatigue or monotony had any effect on results, and

whether there had been any laboratory experiments on its effect on reliability. Dr. Campbell said that this was a difficult problem because coders are usually intelligent, college-trained people, confronted with a series of difficult judgments, but the work is repetitive and wearing. In his experience the best procedure is the one used by Survey Research Center, that is, to hire people on a temporary, month-on, month-off basis. Dr. Zeisel added that it is essential to see that coders get enough of the questionnaire to interest them and little enough to be able to memorize it in part and retain their efficiency.

VIII

PANEL DISCUSSION

What Is the Effective Public Opinion Universe?

Henry David, Queens College
David B. Truman, Williams College
Richardson Wood
Julian Woodward, Elmo Roper
Chairman: Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago

SUMMARY

The concepts "public" and "public opinion" still stand in need of clarification, and have received relatively little attention from pollsters in recent years. There are weighty reasons for dissatisfaction with accepted operational definitions by which the public becomes those polled and public opinion the poll findings. These key terms are more meaningfully conceived of in pluralistic terms, but this approach raises fundamental sampling problems. The effective public opinion universe must always be defined with respect to specific issues and survey purposes. What is called public opinion does not, for the most part, now play a dominant role in deciding what public action is to be taken on public policy issues. The problem of leadership opinion and the weight of pressure group opinion need further investigation. Part of the current dissatisfaction with polls arises from the way their findings are reported. This facet of the pollster's activities is generally not handled as well as his other operations. Consequently, the meanings assigned by readers to poll results are frequently in error.

Philip Hauser, calling attention to the fundamental nature of the problem before the panel, first sought to determine whether its members could agree upon what is meant by public opinion. David Truman held

that there was no general agreement on what the public is and on what public opinion is. What obtains, he said, is in effect a crude operational concept, so that the public comes in fact to be those people covered in a given study. If, he maintained, the public is the particular group or elements in a given social situation with attitudes relevant to the topic under discussion, then there is no one public opinion universe, but rather a series of universes.

Henry David observed that twenty years ago people stopped fighting about the concept of public opinion and decided, broadly speaking, that the public is whatever one chooses to consider it. He recalled that at last year's Conference there was no session devoted to the nature of public opinion, principally because there is agreement when people don't talk about it and disagreement when they do. He thought the question turned on whether one meant by public opinion the judgment estimates of people or the measurement of already ascertained knowledge. He claimed that what is involved in public opinion is an area in which people attempt to control other people. There are, thus, as many publics as there are purposes of control. Public opinion, he held, exists when the exercise of control is desired, and consists of the judgment estimates people make when they feel they are being affected by such controls. Julian Woodward looked with favor on Harold Lasswell's definition: the public is a group of people who take a position with relation to some debatable issue requiring action. Thus, wherever an issue exists, a public exists.

Richardson Wood urged amending that definition by the use of three words: attitude, opinion, judgment. Where there is no active interest or motivation, no stable or clearcut opinion, results show a high proportion of "Don't Know" answers. There are attitudes in this case, he said, but no interest, and therefore, no opinion. One might have an area of opinion where the most important thing is motivation rather than degree of information. On the other hand, among the well-informed, one finds people who have worked

out a judgment in much the same way that a jury would. What exists, said Wood, is a continuum, ranging from attitude to opinion to judgment.

With Hauser pleading for a common universe of discourse, David then asked Wood if he thought that what passes for public opinion polls should carry some other label. Wood thought that they should be labelled differently, and added that the old criticism of polls, that people "don't know what they're talking about," still stands. Hauser pointed out that the "public" is a pluralistic concept, and that if one thinks in terms of a gradient, the nucleus will be those most concerned in terms of interest and information with regard to a given issue. In terms of this view, he suggested that the speakers deal with the problem posed by David, the relation of public opinion and public opinion polls to social action, social decision, social control. Woodward saw an important point of democratic theory involved in this issue. Who is entitled to have his opinion count? What of those who have no basic interest or understanding? Traditional democratic theory, he said, assumes all should be counted. Truman objected to Woodward's use of the word "entitled." He felt it was not a question of being entitled in legal or moral terms, but one of analyzing and describing the potential influence which could be brought to bear by those determined to act. Woodward replied that there were two points of view which could be taken. One was descriptive and the other evaluational. Truman referred to a survey done in Washington which found that Farm Bureau membership was against the subsidy program although it was known that a large number of farmers were in favor of subsidies, but did not like the term. He said that we are led astray in the job of explaining political events if we use polls on issues the way we do those on election predictions, where one equals one. David suggested that if one assumes the dignity, intelligence, and knowledge of people, as is done in democratic theory, the conclusion follows that broad policies in society should be decided by people who make up the community. Woodward agreed that one has to have a philosophy of

polling which relates to the democratic philosophy, but he felt that we would have to explore the purpose to which the poll would be put. David maintained that in so far as it is possible for the social scientist to examine the society in which he lives, public opinion is at best peripheral to action taken within the society. It is still to be shown, he held, that social action is a function of public opinion. And if it is not a function of public opinion, the question of how to make it so remains to be answered. The evidence did not demonstrate that at the point of social action what is being decided is positively related to public opinion.

Hauser indicated that the discussion of the main question was being sidetracked, and suggested that to define the public opinion universe we would have to start off with some concept of purpose or of the function of the poll. Purpose and the pluralistic concept of the public, he stated, are basic to a definition of the public opinion universe. Wood felt that the discussion of the points raised should be continued; that it was important to explore how much the ordinary citizen has to say in deciding issues. His view was that it is impossible for the common man to keep up with all the things on which he should have a considered opinion. At best only four or five major topics can get the required attention, yet hundreds of problems have to be decided upon every few months. He pointed out that this dilemma has been solved in the governmental structure by a representative system in which authority is delegated, and in the legal system where a man is given a trial by his peers. He argued that public opinion work has much to learn from legal practice. Instead of tapping a man on the corner and asking his opinion, he should be told he is on jury duty, and that he has to arrive at an opinion on the basis of the evidence presented. Thus certain people would be delegated for the rest to arrive at a sound judgment. The only way people at large can be brought in is to use a small sample which will study the issue and render an opinion. David strongly objected to Wood's thesis, saying that it advocated the idea of a democratic elite. When

Hauser observed that a discussion of democratic theory was out of order, David disagreed on the ground that it entered into Wood's conception of an effective public opinion universe. Truman also objected to Wood's jury of peers as unrealistic in terms of social action. Wood answered that issues requiring social action are limited, and that on these issues one could poll the whole population. But that if one wants opinion on a large number of issues, a small, selected sample of the population must be used. Hauser summarizing the area of agreement, said that if prediction of behavior is desired, then one sort of universe is necessary; if opinion, then another. He added that the speakers were also agreed that the public opinion universe is dependent on the purpose or function of the survey.

Truman pointed out that what is called public opinion survey is only a partial picture of what must go into the process of ascertaining opinion and David noted that if one sticks to purpose and function in determining the effective public opinion universe then one runs into real and practical difficulties in polling. If one polls a sample of the adult population of the U.S. and finds out that 70% give "Don't Know" answers, what is the effective universe? Is the 30% who answer "yes" or "no", the effective public opinion universe? Hauser answered that it depended on your purpose -- on whether you are interested in prediction or opinion. David and Woodward felt that opinion rather than prediction was at issue. Hauser, to sharpen the discussion asked for a definition of the effective universe. What population, he queried, should the polls seek to report in a national sample? Woodward expressed the view that in interpreting the results of a national sample those who don't know or were not interested should be eliminated. If they don't know or have no interest, they cease to be members of the effective public on that issue and they should be so reported. Wood held that the "Don't Know" percent is highly important as a "tip-off." Before Munich, he said, nobody cared about international affairs. What the minority with opinions thought didn't matter. As the "Don't Know" percent was high, the force of held

opinion was low, and this fact was extremely important. Woodward agreed that it would be a tip-off on opinion, and that the decision makers would know what group they have to deal with. Yet, he insisted that the "Don't Knows" are not citizens with regard to this issue. Effectiveness consists of interest and knowledge of the issue. Wood pointed out that a sample is not a static cross-section. The person who is not a citizen on Monday may be one on Friday on the same issue. With this Woodward agreed. David declared that the crucial point in Woodward's remarks was the indication of the general tendency among pollsters to concentrate on the beginnings of a study, and to neglect the method of reporting the findings. He stressed the importance of the interpretation of the findings -- of the reporting job of the pollster -- and argued that what happened at this point was a function of the purpose of the investigation and the sample. It should not be merely a final flourish. Truman criticized Woodward's suggestion that for the person who has to deal with the issue, only the proportion of people who have opinions are important. He felt that the political action role of the "Don't Knows" is as important as describing their frequency, and that this is where the danger of the analogy to polls on voting occurs. Hauser and Woodward agreed that the percent which does not know may be the most significant thing about the results.

Hauser then asked if the polls can measure effective support for pressure groups. Woodward thought they might be able to do so eventually as the polling art develops, and David added that polls have in the past been misused in that respect. He wanted to know how one could protect against misuse. Woodward replied that this could be done only by proper reporting. The polls could be interpreted both honestly and disinterestedly by interested parties, but the most important thing is that the facts themselves be correct.

Hauser addressed a fresh question to the panel

about leadership opinion, asking whether it was possible to construct a good sample for its measurement. Wood indicated that he disliked the whole concept of leadership polling. He stated that polls had started out as a journalistic stunt, and were a "peeping-Tom" operation, now best known for election predictions. Serious issues have been neglected in favor of elaborate "peeping Tom" operations, and leadership polls, said Wood, are one of the worst offenders. He pointed out that a person is a leader for one thing at one time and not for others at other times. It was nonsense to think that there is a list of ministers or congressmen who represent the others. The term leadership opinion, declared Wood, is misleading and obscures serious study of how public opinion is formed. Woodward felt that his was too pessimistic a view, but agreed that many of the things Wood spoke about had taken place. He did think that leadership could be explored, -- that there are people whom others look up to. Wood asked if this was true in all things at all times. David replied that if it could be demonstrated that there are members of a community from whom others take a lead, the answer is yes. Wood felt that to do it at all correctly is a problem of infinite complexity. Woodward claimed that rural sociologists have defined leadership for rural communities, and that it can be clearly defined in many other areas. He agreed, however, that the problem becomes more difficult when it is not as clear-cut as in the case of a political leader like Huey Long.

In closing, Hauser noted agreement on two major points. Around any one issue a number of publics were centered, starting with a nucleus of the interested and informed and fading out to other publics on the periphery of the issue. A survey has many purposes, and the effective public has to be defined with respect to the purpose of the survey and with respect to the issues. Therefore, the question of what population is effective depends for its answer on the purpose and the issues. Only then does the technical, statistical problem of the sample emerge. In proportion as the "public" is conceived as

pluralistic and overlapping, said Hauser, the problem of a good sample becomes more important. With this duality of pluralistic concepts it becomes possible to measure support for pressure groups. Finally, he noted that the panel members doubted whether there is adequate basis for sampling leader opinion.

Theodore Lentz (Washington University) opened the discussion from the floor with a strong protest against the contention that the "Don't Knows" do not count. He urged consideration of another pluralistic element, the "purposers," and maintained that the effective public consists in the effective cooperators. If people in the U.S. are cooperating in the preparation for war then the people in the U.S. belong in the universe. He took exception to Wood's statement on "attitude" as opposed to "opinion," maintaining that the people who have no opinion are tremendously concerned with the outcome, and if they do not have an opinion, the blame lies with the pollsters, who should learn to ask questions where people are vitally concerned. He stated that the purpose of the public opinion poll is to determine the will of the people on a given issue. The problem is then how to get the voter to wiggle himself to get the candidate who stands for what he wants, rather than to inform the candidate whom he should wiggle in order to get the vote. David replied that policy should be a function of public opinion, but what worried the panel members was this; they did not know how to show casual relevancy between public opinion and the decisions taken. He felt that within our community public opinion lies on the outside of policy decisions; and that one of the problems is to demonstrate how public opinion can bear directly on decision making. Hauser added that while it appeared to be philosophical, the discussion was essentially methodological in character.

Donald V. McGranahan (Harvard University) thought that the question considered by the panel was meaningless. He criticized the assumption that public opinion is opinion that is effective. He felt that what is effective in public opinion is independent of public opinion research, and that this depends on the

political process. He suggested separating the problem into two parts: what is public opinion in a given universe, and how is it effective. He believed that the answer to the second cannot be solved by public opinion polls alone. Hauser observed that the question considered by the panel can be interpreted as purely methodological and statistical, and the panel members had taken it to mean what is essentially an effective universe. David added that McGranahan really agreed with what had been said but still asked for a definition of effective opinion. The panel members, he believed, had in effect been saying: You tell us what your purpose is, then we can say what the universe will be. The difference was that McGranahan had tackled the issue from an operative point of view.

Avery Leiserson (University of Chicago) felt that the discussion had failed to underline sufficiently what is meant by effective public opinion universe in two respects. There had been too much emphasis on precise measurement and too little on what is really public opinion. The problem is, what combination of elements in the population makes for genuine public opinion. It was assumed, said Leiserson, that if the instrument for measuring public opinion is perfected, the answer as to what policy should be would be provided. He felt that public opinion organizations should avoid the notion that what the public wants should be public policy. Their emphasis should be on describing what the public thinks about a problem.

Frederick Stephan (Princeton University) pointed out that the discussion had dealt with how to put a fence around the group one wants to study, but that much more is involved. If one has a continuing picture of function, then fences are less important. One could weed out appropriate segments for given purposes and question them, and then add relevant supplementary background material in interpreting the data. Thus, one has to pool survey material in the light of information from other sources. With the development of polling, the problem of marking out boundaries may become a technique of analyzing

results. It is necessary that opinion people work with sociologists and social psychologists rather than statisticians alone.

Harold R. Isaacs (Newsweek Magazine) said he was appalled to discover how grossly misleading the manner of reporting poll results has been, and how provisional, partial, and fragmentary the results are, except where long trend studies have been made on a given issue. He felt that one job of the new association in the field was to place opinion research in its proper setting, -- to indicate that it was the first stages of experimentation. Lucien Warner (Life Magazine) offered his experience with mail questionnaires where there are two universes, the one he tries for and the one he gets. In his work, he said, the number of people really represented is always stated. Wilfrid Sanders (Canadian Institute of Public Opinion), William A. Lydgate (Gallup Poll), and Elmo Roper all declared that in their work the percent who have no opinion or don't know is always stated.

Robin M. Williams, Jr. (Cornell University) reported an experiment made by rural sociologists in which it was found that different individuals functioned as leaders for different activities in a community. He felt that the problem was simple enough in a hierarchical society but impossible in our own.

Joe Belden (Joe Belden and Associates) thought that some of the fragmentary reporting of polls is due to editors rather than to pollsters. Raymond Franzen (Consultant) pointed out that the "no opinion" group changes with time, and that it was important and vital, and not just something that had to be reported.

Arnold M Rose (Washington University) held that leadership polls should not be wholly condemned; that polls of selected respondents are often opinion reflectors and are valuable. Don Cahalan (National Opinion Research Center) asked Richardson Wood if he would support the polling of specialists rather than leaders. Wood replied that it was perfectly all right if they were called specialists and not leaders.

Frederick W. Williams (Opinion Surveys Section, Information Control Division, U.S. Office of Military Government for Germany) asked for a definition of a national sample, and observed that too often certain elements are excluded. Hauser answered that it would be a sample of the nation, but may actually be the population of 21 or over, or it may be the white population only. A description of the sample should, he urged, be given in the report.

The Chairman then invited the speakers to comment on some of the questions raised. Woodward replied to Leiserson that polls have grown out of the idea of being a substitute ballot box, and that the change from this approach has to be slow. He felt that others should do the weighting and decide whether people who are interested count more than those who are not interested. Leiserson remarked that perhaps he had misstated his point. What he meant to drive home was that the purpose is to discover what public opinion is, rather than what its distribution is. David Glass (University of London) pointed out to Woodward that too little emphasis had been placed on the "Don't Knows." In areas of prejudice, for example, they might be highly important because their answer may be the easiest way to avoid sounding prejudiced. In this case they would be just as important as the answerers. Woodward said that he did not intend to identify the "Don't Knows" with the little interested. His point was that the polls should weed out the uninterested. Shepard S. Jones (Department of State) added that in addition to separating those who are not interested from those who are, one must also distinguish the varying degrees of interest. Woodward agreed that this should be done but that the cutting off points would be difficult to determine. Disturbed by Woodward's remarks, David asked how and for what reason the differentiation should be made. Did Woodward think the "Don't Knows" should be discarded? It had not been assumed that public opinion polls are the only way to study public opinion, and the question of the "Don't Knows" had immediate relevance to democratic theory. Woodward felt that the "Don't Know" response should merely be reported, and that those

who answer may be entitled to greater weighting. The congressman is free to act as he pleases with people who don't answer, but has to take into account the group which does. Charles H. Stember (National Opinion Research Center) reminded Woodward that the difference between conscious and unconscious interest must be recognized. One could not say that there is a sizeable group which does not have an interest in the atom bomb. The function of the pollster is to develop techniques to get at attitudes. He must not assume his questionnaire technique was infallible. Cornelius Dubois (Time, Inc.) felt that Woodward's viewpoint was dangerous and undemocratic, and could lead to a great deal of pressure group activity.

Truman observed that the remarks made by panel members had been misunderstood. He said the intention was not to weight in any normative sense, but to recognize the extent to which certain groups do have weight in decision-making, and by such means to provide a more adequate picture of the role of public opinion. Ruth Glass (Association for Planning and Regional Reconstruction, England) pointed out that if one assumes that only certain people should be reported then one has to say that only certain issues should be reported. One can't assume that a poll knows which issues are important. One has to assume that all issues vital to the public are issues with which public opinion polls ought to be concerned. Then the sample would be the universe. Roper called attention to the confusion in the discussion. He did not think it was the pollster's job to weight individuals. His job was to report pro and con, strong and mild, information or no information. Ruth Glass held that it was also his job to tell everything he possibly could about the opinions and about the reasons given for holding them.

McGranahan stated that he did not agree with David about the effective public opinion universe. He granted that the disinterested are not part of the effective public opinion, but pointed out that one has to have a poll in order to find out who the uninterested are. Wood agreed with Isaacs that series of polls tell

more than one, but blamed the editors for incomplete reporting, not the pollsters. Isaacs said that the function of the poll was to get information as Roper had indicated, but he felt that the pollsters have to tackle the problem of putting material together in such a way that damage done by editors would be minimized. He felt this was a great responsibility of polling organizations and very important to the democratic process. Wood thought that editors do fairly well, and that the difficulties are generally due to space limitations.

Hauser stated that although the panel had kept to problems related to the effective universe, it was obvious that these things could not be discussed segmentally. He felt that the comment by Isaacs made early in the discussion raised a fundamental question. He believed it was a mistake to be appalled. Thinking in terms of where we would like to be makes it easy to be appalled. But in terms of the alternatives of information or no information, the record is not too bad. He added that self criticism was a healthy sign and pollsters should be able to pool their experiences. Norman C. Meier (Bureau of Audience Research, University of Iowa) maintained that the damage ascribed to editors was extremely exaggerated. Wood agreed that they do not emasculate the data. They do as well as they can, but they do not give the trend material referred to by Isaacs. Martin Kriesberg (Council on Foreign Relations) pointed out that the purpose for which a poll is made will determine the type of report. The nature of the majority of communications between the pollster and the client shows the tendency to give back to the sponsor the type of information most valuable to him. David agreed with Wood and Meier that the emasculation of copy by editors was not as crucial as the job done by pollsters, and he underwrote the plea for a better level of reporting. Woodward agreed with Roper about the function of pollsters, -- to report what they find. What he had suggested was that they report certain things useful to know, and not that they should weight or determine how findings should be used.

IX

PANEL DISCUSSION

Polling and the Political Process

Archibald M. Crossley, Crossley, Inc.
George H. Gallup, American Institute of Public Opinion
Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Columbia University
Elmo Roper, Elmo Roper
Chairman, Stuart Chase

SUMMARY

Public opinion polls validate the basic assumption upon which democratic theory is erected, and contribute to the actual working of political democracy. They demonstrate the essential wisdom of the common people, provide professional politicians with much needed information, accelerate democratic action, sharpen debate over public issues, balance pressure group strength, and focus attention on areas of ignorance. The pre-election poll is criticized for performing the service of a dope-sheet and injuring democratic processes. Poll showings determine the selection and rejection of candidates. Having served its purposes in validating polling procedures, the pre-election poll should be abandoned. It is defended as a valuable research instrument and as the most severe test of the pollster's methods and judgment. If the polls are correctly understood and properly used, they constitute no danger to the political process. Public opinion polling by the government is recommended for technical research and public service reasons. Such polling could make a rich contribution in charting areas of ignorance, information, and misinformation. Government polling could produce a better informed body of law-makers. Polls are used for action and argumentation purposes. Their psychological meaning is crucial in their use. The

extent to which poll findings underwrite the existing social situation is insufficiently understood by poll users. To prevent misuse of polls on public issues and future action, new polling techniques have to be developed.

Stuart Chase, describing himself as a layman among distinguished public opinion researchers, reported on his chain and compass survey, undertaken in co-operation with the Social Science Research Council, of developments in the five outstanding social sciences. Questionnaires addressed to representative members in each discipline asked what they believed were the major accomplishments in the whole social science field. Easily the first choice was the cultural concept in anthropology. Public opinion research was listed as the second major accomplishment, and with its practitioners thus placed in the forefront of the social sciences, Chase said that he came to the Williamstown Conference to look them over at first-hand.

Paying what he described as a familiar tribute to the public opinion researchers, Chase declared that the polls have proved the validity of political democracy by establishing that the people know best. Mr. Lydgate's book, What The People Think, and Mr. Roper's polls on social security indicate that the public is about two light years ahead of Congress. The people, said Chase, are not always right, but they are right enough to prove the validity of democratic ways for all time. If the public opinion researchers had done nothing else and were to do nothing more in the future, history would still give them a crown of laurel for demonstrating the essential wisdom of the people.

Chase followed this tribute with a warning about pre-election polls. They are losing their significance, he said. To him, the 1948 polls will mean no more than so much advanced dope on a horse race -- exciting and entertaining dope, perhaps, but nevertheless, completely meaningless. Pre-election polls once were very important. Nothing else was equally significant in establishing the status of opinion research as a

science, but now, he concluded, to continue with the pre-election polls -- to operate as tipsters -- was to waste valuable and sorely needed time.

George Gallup, in dealing with the contributions of the public opinion polls to democracy, observed that in the years since the Fortune and American polls were started in 1935, polling has been adequately tested in every conceivable circumstance. The theoretical discussions of the dangers and merits of public opinion polls can now be replaced by an assessment of their achievements on the basis of the evidence consisting in the results of thousands of polls on major and minor issues.

Gallup credited the polls with ten major achievements in connection with democracy. (1) They have provided political leaders with a more accurate gauge of political opinion than they had prior to 1935. Congressmen did, and still do, place a great deal of confidence in letters from the public and in the views of political experts and the editorial writers, but the polls, said Gallup, provide a better way of measuring public opinion. (2) Public opinion polls have speeded up the process of democracy. Today a cross-section of the voters of the country can be polled by telegraph in forty-eight hours, with results about as accurate as those given by an election. The same speed in polling is also achieved in a half-dozen foreign countries. (3) The polls have shown that the common people do make good decisions. Majority opinion is not always right, said Gallup, but the people do demonstrate an amazing amount of insight and foresight in dealing with current problems. The results of the polls since 1935 have settled decisively for Gallup the issue of whether the common people can be right. (4) In doing this, public opinion polls have rekindled, restrengthened and fortified the basis of democracy. (5) Public opinion polls have helped to focus attention on major issues, and thus have increased interest in public affairs. (6) At the same time, said Gallup, they have uncovered areas of ignorance. In so doing, they have brought out fundamental weaknesses in our educational system and have pointed to shortcomings in the whole system of

keeping the public informed on social and political questions. The polls regularly indicate how poorly informed people are on issues of the day. (7) Polls have helped administrators of government departments and local officeholders to make better decisions. (8) Public opinion polls have made it more difficult for political bosses to pick political candidates in "smoke filled rooms." Gallup took issue with Mr. Chase's condemnation of pre-election polls. He thinks we make a great mistake if we assume that because we know we can make accurate predictions, we believe anyone else can do it. Making election predictions is one of the most exacting disciplines anyone can experience, declared Gallup, and virtually guaranteed ulcers. Gallup added that he also has to make predictions in other fields, and that the only reason he is still in business is because they come out pretty well. He thought that if everyone in this field had to face up to the job of predicting an election, it would perhaps be beneficial. (9) Public opinion polls have shown that people are not motivated solely by self-interest, as most politicians have assumed. It is most gratifying to find, for example, that people in the lower income levels want to pay some taxes on income and bear their share of the burden. (10) Finally, and most important of all, in Gallup's view, public opinion polls constitute almost the only check-rein on the growing power of pressure groups in this country. They do show what support organizations have in contrast with that which they claim. The Federal Council of Churches was reported to represent the views of twenty million voters when it spoke out against universal military training. The polls indicated that this claim was not valid.

Archibald M. Crossley, discussing the possible dangers of polls to the political process, recalled that just about four years ago, George Gallup, Elmo Roper, and he were sitting at a table in Washington. In answer to a question from the first, he said that he was going to do pre-election polls in 1944, and then Elmo Roper asked "Why?" Crossley's reply to this query ran along the following lines: People don't run election polls for money or for publicity. Election

polls are run partly to contribute to a new form of scientific research and partly to secure the information they can provide. In particular, they constitute a guide to the operation of market research and other researches. Election polls provide an opportunity to make a check against the accuracy of an organization's work. He agreed that no assignment was more tough. It is easier to predict the sale of products than votes, said Crossley. Manufacturers sell a product which is pretty definitely known, but an election out-come depends upon who is going to bother to vote.

When they met four years ago, the three of them, confessed Crossley, were thinking more about the danger of election polls to themselves than of their danger to the political process. Many editors, not realizing that it is difficult to come within a couple of percentage points, are ready to cut the pollster's throat if he is a little off. A figure only a few tenths out of the way on the wrong side, say in the State of Michigan, makes his name mud. Yet, a larger error, provided it is on the right side, is all right. Some of the danger to the political process lies in the fact that the polls are misunderstood and that too great demands are made of them. The dangers in polling derive partly from the fact that people do not yet know how to use them. This, said Crossley, is partly true in the government. Modern polling is a very great science, from which a great deal is expected, but, said Crossley, it is too much to expect to predict a presidential election consistently within better than a couple of percentage points.

Crossley observed that the so-called band wagon influence was considered for a while one of the great dangers of polling, and pointed out that the Literary Digest's prediction of a Landon victory in 1936 did not lead people to jump on his band wagon. There are two band wagons, said Crossley. This means that if people do not like one they jump on the other. Because there are two band wagons -- a Republican and a Democratic -- there is an increased interest in voting, and an increased number of votes. Crossley did not

know whether it is possible to prove that the polls have actually increased the number of voters in the United States, but he thought it should be very gratifying to the American citizen to realize that in these days, when democracy is attacked abroad and at home, that Americans are voting in larger percentage than then did before. In eight years since modern scientific pre-election polling began in 1936, the number of voters has increased over 11 million. The chief problem in pre-election polling is to find out who cares enough about voting to take trouble to vote.

Crossley did not feel that the charge that the polls exert undue influence on conventions in selecting a candidate was valid. On the contrary, he was inclined to believe that they did a service by providing a substitute for "smoke filled rooms". He did, however, see a danger in the failure of the public to know the individual candidates well, and thought that the poll taker had an important job to do in making certain that his figures on individual candidates take into account the relative degree of the voters' familiarity with the candidates. Not only do people vote for candidates about whom they know little, they are also poorly informed about the issues on which they are asked to vote. In closing, Crossley spoke of the keen awareness of the pollsters of the responsibility attached to their work and of their desire to do a good job.

Elmo Roper prefaced his remarks about government conducted polls with two observations. One made the point that the optimistic treatment by his fellow speakers of the dangers in polling induced a rosy glow, but that he was impelled to explore those dangers further. The other noted that the polls did not start in 1935, or even one hundred years ago. They began with Confucius, who used a stratified sample.

Roper held that there should be government operated public opinion polls. Because such polls would have to have full public confidence, it would be necessary to secure people of Supreme Court stature to run them. He did not claim that such people can be secured

easily, but he pointed out that what is needed is intellectually honest people to hire good technicians to operate the polls. The private pollsters are too busy predicting elections and arguing about area versus quota sampling, and government operated polls could do some of the things that they are not doing so well.

The existing polls, declared Roper, are not doing a very good job exploring the areas of ignorance. government operated polls could systematically go about blue-printing the areas of ignorance. Who has what kind of information and misinformation? The first step is to learn where the areas of ignorance are. Then the common man can be made more articulate than he ordinarily has the means to be. Let him "fireside chat" with his congressman. Chase had declared the common man is two light years ahead of Congress. If that, said Roper, is not a precise measurement, it is an acceptable one. He maintained that a certain amount of prestige was lost by our 80th Congress and Truman's stock went up because no adequate opportunity was provided for the common man to correct Congress. Congress mistook a lack of information for a mandate from the people. Roper thought government operated polls should concentrate on those things which would result in a better informed body of law makers.

Turning to the possible dangers of polls, Roper declared that he is very much worried about the part polls play in our country today. In the first place, Chase was right in saying polls validated themselves three times. Not just one poll was right, but all have been right over a period of three elections. We do not need them any more for validation. Polls are so well accepted in business, that every once in a while someone calls up about having a poll done, when what he really needs is simply a less overworked or more resourceful vice-president.

The effect of polls upon delegates to conventions was another reason for worry. In the Republican Convention in 1944 in Chicago, all but two members of a state delegation wanted Mr. Bricker for the

nominee, but the state delegation voted for Dewey. Roper reported that he had asked, "Why?" The answer was: "The Gallup Poll says Dewey can beat Roosevelt." They were there to pick a man they thought could win. Suppose the polls show that any candidate of a particular party could win. It might occur to some politician that, if they could win with almost anyone, the thing to do is pick the man who can be most easily controlled.

There is still another kind of danger, said Roper. Sometime ago, Chester Bowles wanted to be Governor of Connecticut. Someone called Roper and asked if he would make a poll of what the situation was like. The poll results showed not only that Mr. Bowles could not be elected Governor, but that no other Democrat could be elected Governor. Let us assume that Mr. Bowles is a politically ambitious man. Why run for Governor and suffer a setback, when he knows he can't win? Bowles was not that kind of fellow, and he went after the nomination only to lose in the Democratic convention. It was a very severe political setback to him. Roper warned that there was a serious danger that the polls might discourage people of first-rate quality from entering politics by showing the likelihood of defeat. If they had these consequences would it not mean that another kind of evil was being substituted for the traditional "smoke-filled room"? This, emphasized Roper, was a danger that had to be faced.

Paul F. Lazarsfeld, pointing out that psychological work in attitude measurement preceded public opinion polls by many years, stated that the great achievement, of the latter was to settle sampling problems. By questioning a few thousand people, one can predict the outcome of an election, but how, he asked, does one really get is what an opinion is? How does one deal with complicated issues? As soon as one looks into the use or possible misuse of polls by public agencies, said Lazarsfeld, the importance of the kind of problems which involve the psychological meaning of polls becomes apparent. With this by way of introduction, Lazarsfeld addressed himself to the question of how

polls are actually used.

He noted first the distinction between the use of polls by an agency for action and the use of polls for argumentation or testimonial in its public relations, and observed that the very great degree to which polls are conducted for argumentative or testimonial purposes is frequently underestimated. By way of simple illustration, he cited the case of the soap manufacturer who finds out that the majority of people use his soap, and then may broadcast such poll results in ads for testimonial purposes. If polls are used for argumentation purposes there is the danger that they will always have a tendency to approve what exists. Lazarsfeld emphasized the general rule that people are likely to favor the existing social situation. Polls cannot be conducted about something about which people know nothing. Moreover, to the layman's belief, experience shows that people are always over-kind,-- it is difficult to get them to criticize. On questions of government ownership, for example, if the government already operates an enterprise, there will be a tendency for people to approve government ownership of that enterprise, even though experts may have conclusive data justifying a change. Similarly, if people have no experience with government ownership, there will be a tendency to disapprove a change although informed judgment may be in favor of it. All this poses a serious problem: What polling techniques can be developed which will make people judge a new possibility?

Lacking time to consider in detail the difficult question of how to interview on something future rather than on a past experience, Lazarsfeld suggested the probable development of a new technique which would list the detailed implications of an issue in concrete terms. For example, on the question of power ownership by government, one would ask whether people would favor it if it meant lower rates? He also called attention to another important question, -- the importance of minorities. He thought that it might be found that the more educated people approve new ideas, and therefore a breakdown of the result has significance, as well as the result itself.

Liberals, said Lazarsfeld, always damn an unfavorable report, instead of trying to get some valuable leads from it. Business men are often less obtuse He recalled doing a survey for a department store which wanted to know whether they should keep open one night a week, and found that the majority who had voted against keeping the store open bought at the store anyway, and that the kind of persons who wanted the store to stay open were the ones who would be new customers. Farmers, he noted, have always been against labor organizations, and thought that labor ought to find out who the farmers are who favor unions. In concluding, he called attention to the danger implicit in the use of polls as a device to provide moral support to the status quo.

DISCUSSION

William T. Gaskill (Hawaiian Economic Foundation) opened the discussion with a question on the relation of Gallup's new quintamensional technique to the points Lazarsfeld had made. Lazarsfeld thought it constituted a step in the right direction, but that its use in analysis is still to be seen. Much depends, he said, upon the correlation between the people who are fairly well informed against the people who are very well informed.

Francis M. Waters, Jr. (A. S. Bennett Associates) asked Roper, who together with Chase and Gallup thought that the common man is ahead of Congress, whether he did not think that people would recognize bad candidates and consequently do something to correct that situation. Eventually, said Roper, people are going to be represented by persons worthy of them, but what worried him is the fact that there are periods when people are not aware of what is going on. Roper, observed George Hausknecht (Consultant) warns of the danger of misinformation and no information, and Crossley observes that users of polls are ignorant. Gallup, on the other hand, asserts that the common man is right. Is ignorance divine, he queried, and if it isn't, how does it turn out that way? He wanted to know whether everybody or anyone knows what he is

doing. Gallup's answer was that all of the speakers were trying to say that polls do work, and that the poll results show that the mass of people are generally right. At the same time, all of them recognize that the polls can be improved and interpreted and used to better advantage. The Chairman added that the cumulative effect of the polls certainly gives the impression that ordinary people frequently display a high degree of wisdom.

Harold R. Isaacs (Newsweek) wondered whether there was any disposition to abandon the pre-election polls in the light of their dangers, noted by Roper, and their capacity for causing ulcers, cited by Gallup. If not, he wanted to know why the pollsters continue to make them. The next best thing to having no pre-election polls, said Roper, is to have so many of them that the politician and everyone else is utterly confused. Crossley disagreed, and declared that pre-election polls should not be abolished. They may not serve a particularly useful purpose in so far as the election is concerned, he said, but they do have a larger value. If polls are going to take their place in a democracy, it is more or less essential that as many people as possible be familiar with them. Gallup observed that the hardest people to sell on polls are politicians, because they are all self-appointed experts. But the election polls will sell them on the value of polling. About four or five years ago, a very public spirited gentleman, very worried about the calibre of men in Congress, asked Gallup what could be done about it. He suggested that people in the polling business could make it their business to discover the men or women in each state who have greatest possibilities for making great legislators. Claude Robinson (Opinion Research Corporation) thought that the speakers were laboring a little too hard to rationalize pre-election polls, which are, in the final analysis bought as news by publications. Roper did not hold that this justified pre-election polling, and added that murder and rape are also fertile sources of news.

Philip Hauser (University of Chicago) argued that

the pollster should not be really concerned about uses or abuses that may be made of polls. Census material, he said, is continually misused, but this does not make knowledge dangerous. The only way to avoid misuse of census statistics is to abolish the census. Roper saw a difference between the kind of knowledge that people use in production and tipping-off the people two weeks in advance as to who might be elected. The latter amounts to announcing who is best known, and he did not think that it could be argued that that kind of knowledge is worth the time given to it. Dan E. Clark (Dan E. Clark II and Associates) thought that Roper was contradicting himself, because Gallup's and Roper's accurate predictions was what explained the public's growing interest in polls. Gallup agreed with this point, and called attention to how much technical knowledge had been learned in making forecasts. Looking back at the history of his own work, he was certain that the impetus, the motivating power, to improve techniques had come from the knowledge that his organization had to be right in the next election. Lazarsfeld thought that other issues on which polls can be made should be considered, and that public opinion researchers should apply their methods as widely as possible. The Chairman added that in the so-called major sciences, the chemists and the biologists have worked out disciplinary codes, and that if the pollsters have been criticized they ought to think about doing something in that direction.

Louis H. Bean (U.S. Department of Agriculture) thought that pre-election polls should be tried at least once more, because 1948 may offer a more challenging test of the ability of the speakers. He disagreed with Crossley's statement that polls apparently had an influence in stimulating the number of voters in elections, holding the number of voters has increased because the population has increased. Bean was surprised nothing has been said about the dangers that are implied in the discussions regarding standards. He added that if pre-convention polls show the same results, no increased danger is involved, and Roper's contention that doing a great number of them is one way of abolishing them falls to the ground. Roper

replied that Bean had missed his point about pre-convention polls. He had maintained that pre-convention polls are creating confusion because different polls come out with different conclusions with respect to the strength of candidates. Bean said that if he were running a National Committee, he would be interested in knowing which way the poll was going, and therefore, it seemed to him that there is another area of activity that had not been discussed. He and the Chairman indicated that the polls were a stimulus to the voter.

Some questions still remained unanswered in connection with national election predictions, declared Raymond Franzen (Consultant), among them, the question of turn-over. Data for New York indicates that changes in turnover make practically no difference in predictions from one year to another. Therefore, there is a great deal of misunderstanding today about what the turnover does. He urged that a problem of that kind merits further investigation. Theodore F. Lentz (Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University) protested against the waste of time involved in defending election predictions. He thought that there were more serious issues facing public opinion research, and called on Chase to indicate in what direction he thought polling should move. The Chairman said that he wanted to suggest one problem that he had been turning over in his mind. How can we keep people, not only in the United States, but all over the world, informed of the colossal and diabolic effects of new weapons?

X

PANEL DISCUSSION

Surveys of World Opinion

Mark Abrams, Research Services, Ltd.
(London, England)
Stuart C. Dodd, University of Washington
S. Shepard Jones, United States Department of State
Karel Naprstek, United Nations
Chairman, Elmo C. Wilson,
Columbia Broadcasting System

SUMMARY

Surveys of world opinion are possible, if the key term is properly understood. Where the range of opinion differences is small and common value systems exist, the determination of world opinion becomes feasible. Because there are basic similarities among peoples of the world, the results of national public opinion polls can be aggregated. The assumption of such similarities must be carefully qualified, and the technical difficulties which arise when the same question is posed in different countries must be recognized. Problems basic to the life of all peoples, such as housing, income, and human rights, as well as common international issues, lend themselves to world surveys. International poll data can provide a better basis for international understanding as well as more intelligent national policy. Research on international tensions might well be a function of UNESCO, and international polling should, in any case, be a concern of the United Nations. Public opinion surveys not only measure opinion, but they may also play a vital role in creating it. What issues a polling organization surveys are, therefore, of vital significance. A world survey agency would have to be distinguished by specific characteristics to operate successfully.

Mark Abrams declared that careful qualification was imperative to give meaning to the notion of "world opinion." The concept of public opinion implies the possibility of aggregating individual opinions where the range of these opinions is comparatively small, and where the people concerned behave within a scale of possible actions in which the alternatives are related to one another in the sense that they are bound by a common standard of values. If, for example, the action choices on a problem of labor-management relations range all the way from the issuance of tokens to the nationalization of the industry, then the arithmetic of throwing opinions together has little usefulness. So far as world opinion is concerned, said Dr. Abrams, these two conditions are in fact fulfilled in a variety of situations because of the basic similarities among peoples. One can speak meaningfully of world opinion, therefore, when the results of national polls can be aggregated.

Essentially the same advertising copy, observed Dr. Abrams, is effective for mothers or for young girls the world over; the British and the German people reacted in essentially the same way to air raids during the last war; the psychology of the British miners at the present time is essentially no different from the psychology of American miners. There is much more in common between an English coal miner and an American or French coal miner than between and English coal miner and, say, a cabinet member in England. Together with these basic similarities, however, serious difficulties appear when the same question is asked in different countries. These difficulties, said Dr. Abrams, derive from different linguistic habits, different patterns of ignorance and knowledge, different cultural traditions, etc. For example, the term "monopoly" has a different meaning in England from what it has in the United States: it embraces political organizations in England, while in the United States it is largely confined to economic organizations. Similarly, the concept of "monarchy" does not have the same significance in both countries. Questions obviously must be recast to fit the special conditions of a given country.

Dr. Abrams maintained that while world wide public opinion polls which attempt to deal with fundamental political and social values which differ significantly throughout the world are of little value, world opinion surveys are feasible if they deal with problems which in one form or another obtain in all countries. Among these are problems of housing, incomes, treatment of minorities, human rights, and the like. Also feasible are polls on international policies of common concern to many different countries, such as the Marshall Plan. He noted, however, that opinion polls in England have revealed wide-spread ignorance regarding the machinery of world peace, so that one cannot, unfortunately, even speak of "national opinion" in this connection.

In summing up, Dr. Abrams pointed out that there is a proper but limited use of the term "world opinion" and that there is a real possibility of promoting international relations by carrying out surveys in several different countries, provided there is an international outlet for utilizing their results.

As a user rather than a taker of polls, Shepard Jones expressed his conviction that poll data from countries throughout the world can provide a basis for better international understanding. He suggested that it might be desirable for UNESCO to consider a program of research on international tensions. Mr. Jones also stressed his concern with the existing ignorance of the character of opinion in certain countries. Is it solid or ephemeral? It is desirable to get a clearer picture of who the people in a given country are who know something about a subject and whose opinions are firm and lasting. In short, said Mr. Jones, it is essential to know who stands where and where he will stand tomorrow. When this is known a significant step will have been taken in the direction of ascertaining what effective public opinion is. In closing, Mr. Jones noted that we also need more knowledge on the relation between public policy and public opinion in different countries.

At this point, the Chairman invited comments from

the audience, and Fred Williams (Opinion Surveys Section, Information Control Division, U.S. Office of Military Government for Germany) observed that a two-way relation should obtain between policy-makers and poll-takers. The pollsters should be advised on what interests the policy-makers, and on what type of information is desired. In connection with Abrams' remarks, Williams reported that poll data from the French, British and American zones of occupation in Germany indicate that Germans tend to think alike in the different zones, in spite of different circumstances of occupation.

Stuart Dodd suggested that the question of what is the most useful type of information in public opinion polling might be answered by systematically polling the users of the information themselves, -- the legislators, administrators, educators, newspaper men, etc. Henry David (Queens College) noted that Dr. Dodd's proposal might provide the pollsters with an obvious device for relieving themselves of responsibility for serious thinking about what they were doing. It is their function to determine what public issues needed polling, and what was needed was greater imagination and more serious thought in this area of their work.

Laszlo Radvanyi (Scientific Institute of Mexican Public opinion) took issue with Dr Abrams' emphasis upon the basic similarities among different peoples. While it is true that mothers the world over may take the same emotional attitudes toward the bombing of their children, he declared that when more "rational" factors enter into the formation of opinion, serious divergencies appear. Radvanyi pointed out that it has been often said that people everywhere dislike war, but that opinion polls in certain Latin American countries show that many ordinary people like the idea of war. For them war has meant greater exports, more jobs, higher pay, and not devastation and misery. Radvanyi hoped that systematic public opinion polling would help to transform politics from an art into a science and thought that a tremendous step in this direction could be taken by creating a continuous

psychological barometer of opinion in different countries.

Karel Naprstek supported the view that personal experiences in connection with the war significantly influence opinion. He reported that a recent poll in Sweden revealed considerable public optimism about the effectiveness of the United Nations in preventing another war, while the people of Norway and Denmark on the same question were much more skeptical and pessimistic. Different experiences in the war, he held, explained the difference in opinion. Abrams, disagreeing with Radvanyi and Naprstek, expressed doubts about the alleged direct relationship between rational self-interest and opinion. He stated that the Germans suffered more and profited less from the first World War than did the Americans, yet were more ready than the Americans to enter a second World War. It would be a mistake to imagine that as students of international opinion we should interest ourselves only in areas where rationality prevails, because there are no such areas.

Dodd introduced the second topic on the panel's agenda: "Can and should public opinion surveys help in the creation of public opinion as well as in the measuring of it?" Asserting that polls do help to crystallize social and political action, he said that the mere phrasing of questions may aid in the definition and clarification of issues. Dr. Dodd warned that it would be a serious mistake for public opinion pollers to operate as pressure groups and go in for organized activity of that kind. He urged that they confine themselves to the scientific function of observing and collecting facts. Otherwise public confidence in their work will be undermined. If as individuals the pollsters desire to exercise public pressure, they should act through other agencies and organizations and not through the polling institutes. Naprstek agreed with Dodd, and added that on many international issues where people have only vague emotional reactions but no specific attitudes -- the problem of the methods of control of the atom bomb, for example -- the direct asking of a question may force the

individual to think and formulate an attitude which he otherwise would not do.

Theodore Lentz (Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University) objected to Dr. Dodd's emphasis upon disinterestedness, pointing out that the physicists who built the atomic bomb were not disinterested and their reputations were not ruined. He urged public opinion pollers to take an active interest in trying to create a more cooperative world and to try to find out what the people -- all the people affected by an issue -- really want.

Charles H. Stember (National Opinion Research Center) also rejected the notion that a public opinion poller should operate like a clerk in a grocery store who passively provides what a customer orders. He should model himself on the scientist who puts a microscope up to an object and explains in detail what he finds and what it means. The atomic scientist both discovered the bomb and considered its implications, said Stember, and opinion pollers should follow this policy in dealing with public opinion. Julian Woodward (Elmo Roper), declaring that the freedom to poll is a great freedom and the responsibility thereto attached is also great, held that it would be naive to assume that an opinion poller can maintain complete detachment and objectivity. The very selection of topics for study is biased, and by selection the type of results is influenced. Pollsters must not manipulate their results, and must recognize the social responsibility attached to the practice of their profession.

Paul Lazarsfeld (Columbia University) reminded Dr. Dodd that measurement of the position of an atom by the physical scientist influences its position. How much greater, he asked, is the influence of the investigator upon the human subject investigated? The plea by Herbert Hyman (National Opinion Research Center) for fewer studies of transitory issues in international opinion and more studies of deep, permanent issues, such as the influence of knowledge on behavior and the role of ideologies behind attitudes, brought from Abrams the observation that the discussion about the

use and scope of polling was an American discussion. It was quite unreal for Europeans, whose chief problem is to get polls started, to convince people of their value.

Naprstek considered the limitations placed on polling in different countries from the point of view of a possible polling operation under United Nations auspices. The major difficulties in the way of a United Nations polling operation were lack of money, lack of polling machinery, and the principle of national sovereignity. In any event, it would be necessary in each case to obtain the prior permission of the country concerned since, otherwise, it might be construed as interference in domestic affairs contrary to Article 2, Paragraph 7 of the Charter. Naprstek held that there would be better prospects for a poll conducted under the auspices of one of the specialized agencies, such as UNESCO, rather than under the Secretariat of the United Nations. UNESCO would have more facilities because it is cooperating with educational and cultural institutions in different countries, and it might use teachers or scientists to administer or supervise the poll. Furthermore, the questions in which UNESCO might be interested are not so "ticklish." Te Lou Tchang (United Nations) thought that the United Nations was probably not ready to undertake polling operations at the present time, but he suggested that a program carefully planned now might pave the way for future action. Tchang said that while the Secretariat could not initiate action on a public opinion poll, the General Assembly and the Social and Economic Council could. Perhaps the best procedure might be for a national representative to move a resolution in the General Assembly along these lines. In adopting the resolution, the Assembly would also provide the means for carrying it out. Bernard D. Feld, Jr. (Birmingham News-Age-Herald) proposed that at the next public opinion conference, an item be placed on the agenda to the effect that the conference recommend that the United States delegation introduce a resolution of the character suggested by Mr. Tchang.

Dodd discussing the agencies which can most

effectively carry on international polling, pointed out that there are several different kinds of agencies now engaged in international polling of a limited nature. These include the Scandinavian Opinion Institute, the Gallup Affiliates, Roper's Latin American group, the J. Walter Thompson Company, and U. S. military groups in Germany and Japan. He set forth the desirable characteristics of an effective world survey agency: (1) wide coverage; (2) centralized coordination, to ensure that comparable techniques would be used in different countries; (3) full-time directors and specialists at the central level; (4) adequate financing which meant that the operation should not be started until essential funds for a modest beginning are available; (5) guarantees of integrity in keeping with high professional standards, otherwise world confidence could not be maintained; (6) gradual development over a period of years so that the difficulties facing an international polling agency could be conquered. Dodd thought that the agency would not need its own field force, if it could sub-contract, and held that government agencies did not appear to be usable. He felt that a practical beginning could be made with an organization of private agencies.

In closing the session, the Chairman contrasted the intense interest in world opinion with the deplorably small amount of work being done. The situation, Wilson declared, placed an obligation upon people like those attending the Williamstown Conference not only to participate actively in developing the tools, techniques, and facilities of public opinion research, but also to provide more help to governments interested in preserving world peace.

MINUTES OF PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING
WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 3, 1947

The meeting convened at 5:00 P.M., with Clyde W. Hart, Chairman of the Conference, presiding.

Paul B. Sheatsley, Secretary of the Executive Committee, reported briefly on the planning and organization of the conference, and Elmo C. Wilson then described the work of the Standards Committee which had been appointed at Central City. He announced that copies of a proposed constitution for a national association of individuals interested in public opinion research, would be circulated to conference members that evening. On Mr Wilson's motion, it was voted that action on the adoption of this constitution be made the first order of business at the regular business meeting on the following day.

Stuart C. Dodd then reported for the International Committee appointed at Central City, and announced that agreement had been reached on an informal world association of individuals which would be strengthened later. He promised a tentative draft of a constitution for such an association on the following day,

and on his motion, it was voted to make consideration of this constitution the first order of business at the Friday business meeting.

It was pointed out that if the proposals for national and international associations were adopted, an agency to supply nominations for the various offices would be required. On motions from the floor, it was voted that the chairman appoint a five-man Nominating Committee to canvass the field and to submit two names for each of the proposed offices for the national association and that the present International Committee prepare nominations for the international association. Cornelius DuBois was appointed chairman of the Committee on Nominations for the national association, with Daniel Katz, William Lydgate, John Riley and Henry Kroeger as the other members.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P. M.

MINUTES OF ORGANIZATION MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH HELD THURSDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 4, 1947

The meeting convened at 9:15 A.M. with Clyde W Hart, Chairman of the Conference, in the chair. Paul B. Sheatsley, Secretary of the Executive Committee, acted as secretary for the meeting. Scheduled for discussion was a proposed constitution for a national organization on public opinion research, drafted by the Standards Committee (comprising Elmo C. Wilson, Henry David and Morris Hansen) which was appointed at Central City.

Copies of the draft constitution had been circulated in advance among those attending, and Mr. David, speaking for the committee, moved the adoption of the document. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilson.

Claude Robinson suggested that before the constitution was adopted, there should be a thorough discussion of the proposed Board of Standards described in the constitution. He therefore moved that Mr. David's motion be tabled while this question was

discussed, and his motion was seconded by Alfred Blankenship. On a standing vote, the motion was defeated.

Stuart Dodd then proposed that the question of standards be made the first point of discussion under Mr. David's motion, and Mr. Robinson suggested that the Standards Committee describe their thinking on the subject. In reply, Mr. David recalled that his committee had been appointed to meet the issue of standards and had merely set up a mechanism within the proposed organization to deal with the problem. He emphasized that under the proposed constitution the Standards Board itself has no power to impose standards upon members. Mr. Wilson concurred, adding that the Standards Board would merely provide an instrument for thorough discussion of the question.

Mr. Robinson argued that higher professional standards should be achieved through the processes of free debate, and that the proposal for a Standards Board was "authoritarian" in that it offered opportunity for a small group of men to assume authority for the whole membership. He warned that attempts to

impose standards upon the association might cause disruption of the organization.

Alfred Watson requested clarification of just what the Standards Board would do, and Mr David replied that it would attempt to codify the underlying principles governing scientific method in this work and to submit them to the membership. Mr. Dodd said some mechanism was needed to encourage debate on standards. Alfred Lee said some such agency was needed to "do the spadework" on the problem, and Julian Woodward and Charles Stember expressed the belief that free debate could be achieved through the proposed board.

Cornelius DuBois, however, pointed out that the American Marketing Association's Committee on Standards could never agree, and Norman Meier and William Yoell expressed the belief that the "underlying principles" of opinion research, mentioned by Mr. David, were still largely unknown and subject to experimentation.

William Lydgate moved that the entire Section 4 of Article VI, dealing with the Standards Board, be

deleted, and his motion was seconded by Mr. Watson. John Riley pointed out that Mr. Lydgate's motion was a far-reaching one, that the question of standards was basic to the association's declared purpose of encouraging the development of the field of opinion research, and that a vote against a Standards Board would be tantamount to a vote against the entire association. Mr. Wilson concurred, stating that any omission of the question of standards would be a step backward. He emphasized that his committee had been constituted as a "Standards Committee" and that to ignore the problem completely would be to invite unfavorable reaction from critics of opinion research. On a standing vote, Mr. Lydgate's motion was defeated.

Solomon Simonson pointed out that the proposed constitution distinguishes between boards and committees, with the boards apparently under somewhat less control by the membership. He proposed that the group dealing with standards be constituted as a committee, rather than as a board. Mr. David replied that the committees are appointed and the boards elected.

Mr. DuBois stated that the Nominating Committee

feels that all boards should be appointed, with the chairmen only subject to election. On motion of Jane Shepherd, as subsequently revised, it was voted to change the Standards Board to a Committee on Standards, with an elected chairman and a rotating membership of six appointed by the Executive Council.

The meeting then proceeded to discussion of Article I, Section I, dealing with the name of the organization. Two motions proposed by Theodore Lentz were defeated, the first proposing the substitution of the word "International" for "American," the second proposing deletion of the word "American." The article was then adopted as proposed.

Article II, Section I, was adopted as proposed.

On motion by Avery Leiserson, Article III, Section 1, was amended to read "All persons professionally engaged in the field of public opinion research or teaching in the field of public opinion . . . ." On motion of Mr. David the reference to United States residence as a qualification for membership was deleted. The section was otherwise adopted as proposed. Section 2 was adopted without change and the proposed Section 3, dealing with non-American members, was

deleted. Section 4 was adopted as proposed except that a reference to "non-resident" members was deleted. The proposed Section 5 was adopted without change.

The first five sections of Article IV were adopted as proposed. Section 6 was amended to remove the Editor from the Executive Council and to change all reference to "boards" and "board members" to "committees" and "standing committee chairmen". A Section 7 was added to the article, providing for the election of the Editor by the Executive Council.

Article V, Section 1, was amended by changing all reference to "boards" to "committees", by making the Editor a non-voting member of the Executive Council, and by adding the chairmen of the other two standing committees (on Publications and Public Relations) as non-voting members. Sections 2 and 3 were adopted without change.

It was voted to combine Articles VI and VII, with Section 1 reading "There shall be five standing committees . . ." All former references to "boards" in the proposed Article VI were changed to "committees". It was further voted that the chairmen of the

Conference, Standards, and Nominations Committee should be elected by the membership, with the other members appointed by the Executive Council.

The proposed Articles VIII and IX, now Articles VII and VIII, were adopted without change.

On motion by Jules Willing, the meeting voted that the elected chairman of the Standards Committee should serve for one year.

The constitution as a whole was then adopted as amended.

The meeting then proceeded to elect officers of the new association. Mr. DuBois, reporting for the Nominating Committee, presented two nominees for each office except that of president. For the office of president the committee nominated only Mr. Hart, and Mr. Hart was elected by acclamation.

With unanimous consent, the chair ruled that all voting would be by secret ballot. Charles Stember, Alfred Blankenship, and William Lydgate were appointed to act as tellers.

For vice-president, the committee placed in nomination Samuel Stouffer and Elmo C. Wilson. Mr. Wilson was elected. For Secretary-Treasurer, the

committee nominated Julian Woodward and Frederick Stephan. Mr. Woodward was elected.

For chairman of the Nominations Committee, the committee named Jane Shepherd and Jerome Bruner. Daniel Katz was nominated from the floor and was subsequently elected. For chairman of the Conference Committee, the committee placed in nomination Hadley Cantril and Lucien Warner. Mr. Cantril was elected. For chairman of the Standards Committee, the committee proposed Philip M. Hauser and Arnold King. The name of Alfred Watson was added from the floor, and Mr. Hauser was elected.

The Nominating Committee offered the following names for the three elected members of the Executive Council, the one receiving the largest number of votes to serve for a 3-year term, the next largest to serve for a 2-year term and the third largest to serve for a 1-year term: Archibald Crossley, George Gallup, Paul Lazarsfeld, Rensis Likert, Claude Robinson and Elmo Roper. Theodore Lentz and Laszlo Radvanyi were nominated from the floor. Mr. Likert was elected for the 3-year term, Mr. Lazarsfeld for the 2-year term, and Mr. Gallup for the 1-year term.

Lucien Warner offered a resolution calling for the chair to appoint a conference committee to study personnel problems in the field of public opinion research. The resolution was carried and Mr. Warner was named chairman of the Committee.

Elizabeth Herzog presented a resolution thanking the various groups and individuals who had made the Second International Conference successful, and this resolution was unanimously adopted.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH ADOPTED AT WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS. SEPTEMBER 4, 1947

Article I

Section 1. The name of this society shall be the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Article II

Section 1. Its purposes shall be to stimulate creative research and study in the public opinion field; to encourage the development of the highest professional standards in public opinion research; to facilitate the dissemination of opinion research methods, techniques and findings through annual conferences and an official journal and other publications; to promote the utilization of public opinion research in democratic policy formation; and to serve as a representative national organization in international opinion research meetings and associations.

Article III

Section 1. All persons professionally engaged in the field of public opinion research or teaching in the field of public opinion, without regard to race, color, creed or national origin, may become active members of the Association. Active membership shall be certified by the Executive Council on receipt by the Secretary-Treasurer of the payment of dues, which shall be $10.00 a year. Annual dues shall be payable at the beginning of the year for the year to which

they apply. Members in arrears for one year shall be deemed inactive and may be dropped from the rolls, after notification, by vote of the Executive Council. Only active members shall have the right to vote and hold office.

Section 2. Dues for active life membership in the Association may be established by the Executive Council.

Section 3. Active members shall receive the publications of the Association.

Section 4. The membership of the Association is responsible for establishing its basic policies.

Article IV

Section 1. The officers of the Association shall be a president, a vice president, a secretary-treasurer and an editor.

Section 2. The President shall serve for one year. He shall be responsible for fulfilling the purposes of the Association. He shall serve as Chairman of the Executive Council, and as the official representative of the Association in its relations with other organizations and the public.

Section 3. The Vice President shall serve for one year. When the Executive Council rules that the office of the President is vacant, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 4. The Secretary-Treasurer shall serve for two years. He shall, in fulfilling the purposes of the Association, be responsible for administering its funds, for communicating with the membership, and performing such duties in connection with elections as are described in Article IV, Section 6.

Section 5. The Editor shall serve for three years. He shall be responsible for the preparation and issuance, with the advice of the Committee on Publications, of the official journal of the Association and its other publications. He may receive such remuneration as the Executive Council authorizes.

Section 6. The President, Vice President, Secretary-Treasurer, and elected Executive Council and Standing Committee chairman shall be chosen by the membership in the following manner. The Committee on Nominations shall, at such convenient time prior to the annual business meeting of the Association, invite each member to designate a nominee for each of these offices. On the basis of these suggestions, the Committee on Nominations shall prepare a slate of nominations, which shall be mailed to each active member one month before the annual business meeting. The Committee shall present this slate at the annual business meeting, together with any other nominations for elected offices submitted to the Committee by an active member, on the day preceding the annual business meeting, endorsed by twenty active members of the Association. The elections of officers shall take place at the annual business meeting, and the Secretary-Treasurer shall certify and announce their results.

Section 7. The Editor shall be elected by the Executive Council.

ARTICLE V

Section 1. There shall be an Executive Council consisting of (a) the President, (b) the Vice President, (c) the Secretary-Treasurer, (d) the Chairman of the Committee on

N

Nominations, (e) the Chairman of the Conference Committee, (f) the Chairman of the Committee on Standards, (g) one Council member elected by the membership for a three-year term, (h) one Council member elected by the membership for a two-year term, (i) one Council member elected by the membership for a one-year term, (j) the retiring President, serving for one year, (k) the Editor, (l) the Chairman of the Committee on Publications, (m) the Chairman of the Committee on Public Relations. The last three shall be non-voting members of the Executive Council.

Section 2. The Executive Council shall conduct the business and care for the general interests of the Association. It shall carry out the policies adopted by the membership in fulfillment of the Association's general purposes. The Council may create such committees as it deems necessary.

Section 3. The Executive Council shall hold no less than two meetings annually, and shall submit to the membership a report of its activities one month before the annual business meeting.

ARTICLE VI

Section 1. There shall be five standing committees of the Association: the Committee on Nominations, the Conference Committee, the Committee on Standards, the Committee on Publications, and the Committee on Public Relations.

Section 2. The Committee on Nominations shall consist of five members serving for one year, a Chairman elected by the membership and four appointed by the Executive Council. The Committee shall prepare the slate of

nominations for the elected offices of the Association.

Section 3. The Conference Committee shall consist of seven members serving for one year, a Chairman elected by the membership, four appointed by the Executive Council, and the President and Secretary-Treasurer of the Association. The Committee shall be responsible for planning and organizing the Annual Conference of the Association.

Section 4. The Committee on Standards shall consist of seven members, a Chairman elected by the membership and six appointed by the Executive Council. The elected Chairman shall serve for one year; three of the appointed members shall serve for three years; two for two years; and one for one year. The Committee shall be concerned with fulfilling the declared purpose of the Association to contribute to the elevation of professional standards.

Section 5. The Committee on Publications, consisting of five members appointed by the Executive Council, shall advise and assist the Editor. One member shall serve for one year, two for two years, and two for three years.

Section 6. The Committee on Public Relations, consisting of three members appointed by the Executive Council, shall serve for one year and shall be responsible for assisting the President and the Executive Council in dealing with the information and publicity policies and activities of the Association.

ARTICLE VII

Section 1. The constitution may be amended by a majority vote of the membership of the Association either at the annual business meeting or by mail ballot conducted by the

Secretary-Treasurer. Amendments may be proposed for submission to the membership by the Executive Council or by any active member at the annual business meeting. Approval by a majority vote of the active membership at the annual business meeting shall be necessary before amendments may be submitted for adoption by the membership.

ARTICLE VIII

Section 1. The annual business meeting shall be held on the next to the last day of the annual conference. The Executive Council may call other business meetings and conferences during the year.

MINUTES OF AN ORGANIZATION MEETING ON AN INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH HELD AT WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS FRIDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 5, 1947

The meeting convened at 11:10 AM with George Gallup, Co-chairman of the Committee on International Organization appointed at Central City, in the chair.

Stuart Dodd, Co-chairman of the Committee, presented its report to the meeting in the form of a set of recommendations for an international organization. The recommendations had previously been distributed in mimeographed form to members of the audience.

After outlining the history of the committee and explaining the basis on which he was making the recommendations, Mr Dodd moved the adoption of recommendation I. In connection with the discussion of this recommendation, Mr. Gaskill asked that it be noted on the record that the proposed new association wasn't to itself engage in actual polling operations.

After further discussion, the recommendation was finally approved with one change. In paragraph A, the

word " information" was substituted for the word " ignorance."

At this point, a question was raised as to the meaning of the action which had just been taken, and discussion ensued on the question of whether the recommendations were to be regarded as provisions of a constitution for a new organization or merely as a set of proposals to be referred, with the meeting's approval, to a Continuing Committee. Mr. Crespi moved that the recommendations be regarded as constituting a provisional constitution for a new organization; and that a paragraph be added to the recommendations providing that at a meeting next year, the provisional constitution could be amended by a simple majority vote before its provisions were to be regarded as permanent. After further discussion, this motion was approved.

Mr. David moved that the meeting proceed to discuss subsequent recommendations of the committee one by one, making such amendments as desired and then vote on the group of recommendations as a whole. This motion was carried.

The meeting, thereupon, proceeded to a discussion

of Recommendation II: and by vote, substituted the single sentence, " The provisional name of the association shall be The World Congress on Public Opinion Research" in place of the entire recommendation.

Recommendation III was passed without amendment. The text of Recommendation IV was stricken and the single sentence "Membership dues shall be $10 per annum" was substituted.

Recommendations V and VI were passed as proposed by the committee.

Recommendation VII was amended to add a second committee entitled " A Technical Committee on Opinion Research and World Peace."

Recommendations VIII, IX, and X were passed without amendment.

Following upon this discussion of individual recommendations, Mr. Glass moved that the provisional constitution be adopted as amended and it was voted.

The meeting then turned to the election of officers of the new association. It had before it a set of nominations made by the committee, and the chair announced that additional nominations would be accepted from the floor. Mr. Roper moved that in the election

of vice-presidents the names proposed by the committee be considered as a single list and not paired as they were in the report of the committee, and that no more than two individuals from the same country would be eligible to the election of vice-president. Mr. Roper's motion was carried.

In a motion from the floor, it was decided to take up the election of candidates for each office separately and in sequence with the election return for one office made available to the meeting before nominations were entertained for subsequent offices.

For president, the name of Laszlo Radvanyi was placed in nomination by Mr. Lee. Jean Stoetzel's name had previously been placed in nomination by the committee. In voting by secret ballot, Mr. Stoetzel was elected president.

For vice-president, the committee had placed in nomination the names of Mark Abrams, Henry Durant, Laszlo Radvanyi, Alberto Castelli, Wilfrid Sanders, Julian Woodward, David Glass, Theodore Lentz, Wahl Asmussen and Rensis Likert. Henry David and Roy Morgan were put in nomination from the floor. On ballot the following were elected: Mark Abrams,

David Glass, Laszlo Radvanyi, Theodore Lentz, and Julian Woodward.

The committee nominated Stuart Dodd and Fred Williams for the office of secretary-treasurer. On ballot, Mr. Williams was elected.

It was voted to authorize the Executive Council to appoint the 5 members of the Advisory Council.

Mr. Feld moved " That the Executive Council of the new organization on behalf of the conference petition the proper bodies of the United Nations to increase the use of polling on international questions." The motion was adopted.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 P.M.

PROVISIONAL CONSTITUTION FOR THE WORLD CONGRESS ON PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Article I

Section 1. Broad purpose of the Association shall be as follows:

(a) To serve as an international meeting ground for individuals engaged in sample polling, as applied to the opinions, information, and needs of people, or in teaching and to act as a clearing house for ideas and results of its members.

(b) To maintain a level of ethics, and the progressive development of scientific standards of members, and to foster, in every practical way, improvement of current techniques and the development of new techniques, in this field.

(c) To promote professional interests.

Article II

Section 1. The provisional name of the Association shall be The World Congress on Public Opinion Research.

Article III

Section 1. Eligibility qualifications shall be as wide as practicable, in order to permit membership from all groups and persons interested in the broad field of sampling as applied to people. Such groups and persons shall include the fields of:

Opinion and attitude studies
Publication and radio research
Market research
Social Sciences

and such other fields as may develop.

Section 2. No one shall be ineligible because of his or her race, color, creed or nationality.

Section 3. Essentially, the Association shall be regarded at present as an association of individuals, and not an association of agencies.

Section 4. For the time being at least, there shall be only one class of membership.

Article IV

Section 1. Membership dues shall be $10 per annum. (Payment in currency other than U.S. dollars may be arranged.)

Article V

Section 1. Pending the possible creation of a new class of membership, each registered member shall be entitled to one vote.

Article VI

Section 1. The Executive Council shall comprise a president, five vice-presidents, an executive secretary and not more than five advisory counsellors, all of whom shall hold office until the Third International Conference meets. The Council shall have powers to fill vacancies as they occur.

Section 2. The President's duties will be to administer the broad policies of the Association, and to be ultimately responsible for the functioning of the various committees, and other officers.

Section 3. The Vice-Presidents shall comprise the chairmen of committees and shall act as advisers to the President.

Section 4. The Executive-Secretary shall be responsible for keeping the records of the Association; collection of annual dues and other responsibilities usually associated with this position.

Article VII

Section 1. Among the committees to be immediately appointed by the Executive Council shall be:

(a) A Constitutional Committee for Third International Conference.

(b) A Technical Committee on Opinion Research and World Peace.

Article VIII

Section 1. The Constitutional Committee shall consider establishing the following standing committees:

1. On Membership
2. On Professional Ethics and Standards
3. On Public Relations
4. On Publications
5. On Conferences

The Constitutional Committee shall circulate a proposed constitution at least

three months before the Third International Conference meets.

Article IX

Section 1. The Association shall meet at least once every two years, in either Europe, Latin or North America.

Article X

Section 1. The constitution may be amended by a straight majority vote, either at the annual meetings, or by mail ballot conducted by the Secretary-Treasurer.

Appendix A

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

on

PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

at

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Williamstown, Mass.

PROGRAM

September 2-5, 1947

****

Conference Registration Desk, Jesup Hall

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2ND

2:00-7:00 P.M.-Registration and Assignment to Rooms — Jesup Hall

7:00-10:00 P.M. - Opening Dinner — Currier Hall

Chairman: CLYDE W. HART, National Opinion Research Center

Welcome by JAMES P. BAXTER, President of Williams College

Introduction of International Delegates
Address by WILLIAM BENTON, Assistant Secretary of State

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3RD

9:00-11:45 A.M.-Round Table — Jesup Hall

PROBLEMS OF POLLING IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Chairman: RENSIS LIKERT, Survey Research Center, Univ. of Michigan

Respondent Reaction in Different Countries
HERBERT HYMAN, National Opinion Research Center

Sampling Problems in Different Countries
R. J. JESSEN, Iowa State College

Asking Comparable Questions in Different Countries
JEAN STOETZEL, Institute Francais d'Opinion Publique

9:00 - 11:45 A.M. - Round Table
Adams Memorial Theatre Studio

PROBLEMS OF STATE AND LOCAL POLLING

Chairman: RALPH O. NAFZIGER, University of Minnesota

How the Local Poll Can Be of Service in Assessing Community Opinion
ALFRED M. LEE, Wayne University

How the Local Poll Can Help in Community Research and Planning
JANE SHEPHERD, Washington Post

How the Local Poll Can Help in Improving Newspaper Practice
PAUL H. TRESCOTT, Philadelphia Bulletin

2:30 - 5:00 P.M. - Round Table Jesup Hall

MEASUREMENTS OF INTENSITY AND INFORMATION

Chairman: CLAUDE ROBINSON, Opinion Research Corporation

Measurement by Scaling Technique
J. STEVENS STOCK, Opinion Research Corporation

Measurement Through New Types of Interview
JEROME S. BRUNER, Harvard University

How Can a Systematic Measurement of Information and Intensity be Made a Part of Polling?
WILLIAM A. LYDGATE, American Institute of Public Opinion

2:30 - 5:00 P.M. - Round Table
Adams Memorial Theatre Studio

"PSYCHOLOGICAL ERRORS" IN POLLING

Chairman: HADLEY CANTRIL, Princeton University

Psychological Errors in Relation to Research Design
DANIEL KATZ, Survey research Center, Univ. of Michigan

Interviewer Bias: How Serious Is It and What Can Be Done to Reduce It?
FREDERICK F. STEPHAN, Princeton University

Criteria for Selection and Training of Interviewers
DON CAHALAN, National Opinion Research Center

5:00 - 5:30 P.M. - Preliminary Business Meeting
Adams Memorial Theatre

5:30 P.M. - Reception by President and Mrs. Baxter
Faculty House

8:00 - 10:00 P.M. - Round Table
Adams Memorial Theatre

NEW FIELDS OF USE FOR OPINION RESEARCH

Chairman: SAMUEL A. STOUFFER, Harvard Univ.

Economic Prediction
LOUIS HARRIS, Elmo Roper

Labor Relations
DOUGLAS WILLIAMS, Fred Rudge, Inc.

Minority Group Prejudice
MARIE JAHODA, American Jewish Committee

Efficiency of Communications Media
BERNARD BERELSON, University of Chicago

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4TH

9:00 A.M.-12:00 P.M.-Business Meeting and Discussion of Policy — Adams Memorial Theatre

Report of the Standards Committee Apointed at Central City
The Committee will present a plan for a new national organization
Action on the Report
Election of Officers

Discussion:
- Policies and Program for a New Organization
- What Should be the Nature of the Official Journal
- Standards Control by the Organization - The Desirability of an "Approved List" of Polls

12:30 P.M.-2:00 P.M.-Self-organized Luncheon Groups to Discuss Special Problems — Currier Hall

2:30-5:00 P.M.-Panel Discussion
Adams Memorial Theatre Studio

CODING VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Members of the Panel:
ALBERT B. BLANKENSHIP, National Analysts, Inc. Chairman
ANGUS CAMPBELL, Survey Research Center, Univ. of Michigan
RICHARD CRUTCHFIELD, Swarthmore College
HANS ZEISEL, McCann-Erickson, Inc.

Discussion Topics:
- How Reliable Are Present Coding Operations?
- Office Coding vs. Field Coding
- Relations Between Coding, Study Design, and Analysis
- Coding and Analysis of Depth Interview Material

2:30 - 5:00 P.M.-Panel Discussion Jesup Hall

WHAT IS THE EFFECTIVE PUBLIC OPINION UNIVERSE?

Members of the Panel:

PHILIP M. HAUSER, U.S. Department of Commerce, Chairman
HENRY DAVID, Queens College
DAVID B. TRUMAN, Williams College
RICHARDSON WOOD
JULIAN L. WOODWARD, Elmo Roper

Discussion Topics:

What Population Should the Polls Seek to Represent in a National Sample?
Can a Sample to Measure "Leader Opinion" be Constructed?
Can Polls Measure the Effective Support for Pressure Groups?

8:00 - 10:00 P.M. - Panel Discussion
Adams Memorial Theatre

POLLING AND THE POLITICAL PROCESS

Members of the Panel:

STUART CHASE, Chairman
ARCHIBALD M. CROSSLEY
GEORGE H. GALLUP
PAUL F. LAZARSFELD
ELMO ROPER

Discussion Topics:

What Have Polls Contributed to Democracy?
Possible Dangers of Polls to the Political Process
Should the Government Itself Conduct Polls?
Administrative Use of Polling Materials by Government Agencies

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 5TH

9:00 - 11:00 A.M. - Panel Discussion
Adams Memorial Theatre

SURVEYS OF WORLD OPINION

Members of the Panel:
ELMO C. WILSON, Columbia Broadcasting System
Chairman
MARK ABRAMS, Research Services, Ltd.(England)
STUART C. DODD, American University (Beirut, Lebanon)
S. SHEPARD JONES, U.S. Department of State
KAREL NAPRSTEK, United Nations

Discussion Topics:

Is There Such a Thing as "World Opinion"?
Can Public Opinion Surveys Help in the Creation of Public Opinion as Well as in Measuring It?
What Limitations Are Placed on Polling in Different Countries?
What Agencies Can Most Effectively Carry on International Polling?

11:00 - 12:30 P.M. - Organization Meeting for an International Association
Adams Memorial Theatre

Chairman: GEORGE H. GALLUP

Report of the Committee on International Organization Appointed at Central City
Action on the Report

12:30 P.M. - Adjournment of the Conference

Appendix B

REGISTRATION LIST[1]

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE on PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Williamstown, Mass.
September 2-5, 1947

ABRAMS, MARK
Research Services Ltd.
110 St. Martin's Lane
London, W.C. 2, England

ACKER, MARTIN H.
University of Chicago
591 Bradford Street
Brooklyn, N.Y.

ADAMEC, CENEK
Czechoslovak Institute of
Public Opinion, Bubinska F,
Prague VII, Czechoslovakia

ANNIS, A.D.
Audience Research Inc.
Princeton, N.J.

ARNOLD, PAULINE
Market Research Co. of
America,
444 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N.Y.

ASTIE, JULIA W.
Student
140 East 28th Street
New York, N.Y.

AXTEN, RICHARD P.
Earl Newsom & Co.
597 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y.

BABCOCK, LT. COL.
JACK E.
Industrial College of the
Armed Forces
4154 S. 36th Street
Arlington, Virginia

BATO, ANDREW G.
Fortune Magazine
342 West 71st Street
New York 23, N.Y.

BEAN, LOUIS H.
U.S. Department of
Agriculture
3714 N. Randolph St.
Arlington, Va.

BELDEN, JOE
Joe Belden & Associates
(The Texas Poll)
Mexico City, Mexico

1 All addresses are those listed on the Conference registration forms. Some are home address, some are office addresses. Where two addresses were given on the form preference has been given to the office address.

BENNETT, ARCHIBALD S.
A. S. Bennett Associates
93 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y.

BENSON, BARBARA
Ladies Home Journal
RD #1
Skillman, N.J.

BENSON, EDWARD G.
American Institute of
Public Opinion
Princeton, N.J.

BENSON, LAWRENCE E.
Gallup Poll
16 Chambers Street
Princeton, N.J.

BELZ, MAURICE HENRY
University of Melbourne
667 Burke Road
Upper Hawthorn, Victoria
Australia

BERKING, MAX
259 East Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, Conn.

BEVILLE, H. M., JR
National Broadcasting Co.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y.

BLANKENSHIP, A.B.
National Analyst, Inc.
1425 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

BOOCHEVER, LOUIS C.
American National Red
Cross -17th and E.St. N.W.
Washington, D.C.

BOWEN, LEWIS H.
American Institute of
Public Opinion
110 East 42nd Street
New York 17, N.Y.

BOWERS, RAYMOND V.
U.S. Public Health Service,
Mental Hygiene Division
3887 Rodman Street, N.W.
Washington 16, D.C.

BRENNAN, ELLEN E.
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York 21, N.Y.

BRUNER, JEROME S.
Harvard University
78 Larchwood Drive
Cambridge, Mass.

BULL, EDYTHE F.
C. E. Hooper, Inc.
10 East 40th Street
New York, N.Y.

BURTON, TEDDY
American Jewish Committee
725 Stone Avenue
Brooklyn, N.Y.

CAHALAN, DON
Opinion Research Center
at Denver
1840 S. University
Denver, Colo.

CAMPBELL, ANGUS
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan

CANTRIL, HADLEY
Princeton University
Box 429
Princeton, N.J.

CAPT, J.C.
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C.

CHASE, STUART
Georgetown, Conn.

CHOUKAS, MICHAEL
Dartmouth College
Hanover, N.H.

CISIN, IRA H.
War Department
2938 S. Columbus
Arlington, Va.

CLARK, DAN E., II
Dan E. Clark II &
Associates, Box A
Stanford University, Calif.

CLARK, HARRISON
Facts & Figures, Inc.
4 Cottage Row
Cambridge 39, Mass.

CLEMENTS, FORREST E.
Bureau of Agricultural
Economics
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
6302 Ridge Drive
Washington 16, D.C.

CONNELLY, GORDON M.
National Opinion Research
Center
4901 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago 15, Ill.

COOKE, DOROTHY S.
Statistical Laboratory
Iowa State College
Box 85, Station A.
Ames, Iowa

COOKE, JOHANNA B.
Stewart, Dougall & Assoc.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, N.Y.

COOLEY, JACK
Commercial Artist
2225 Winnemac Avenue
Chicago 25, Ill.

COOLEY, NANCY C.
Chicago Certified Inter-
viewers Assoc.
2225 Winnemac Avenue
Chicago 25, Ill.

CRESPI, LEO P.
Dept. of Psychology
Princeton University
Princeton, N.J.

CROSSLEY, ARCHIBALD M.
Crossley, Inc.
21 Battle Road
Princeton, N.J.

CROSSLEY, HELEN M.
University of Denver
21 Battle Road
Princeton, N.J.

CRUSIUS, MRS. MALCOLM
Elmo Roper
145 W. 55th St.
New York, N.Y.

CRUTCHFIELD, RICHARD S.
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pa.

DANIELS, ARTHUR C.
Institute of Life Insurance
60 E. 42nd Street
New York, N.Y.

DAVID, HENRY
Queens College
41-08 42nd Street
Long Island City 4, N.Y.

DAVISON, W. PHILLIPS
Public Opinion Quarterly
50 Morningside Drive
New York 25, N.Y.

de GRAZIA, SEBASTIAN
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois.

DERBY, R. STAFFORD
The Christian Science Monitor
80 Boylston Street
Chestnut Hill 67, Mass

DIGNAM, WILLIAM F.
Tide Magazine
232 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y.

DODD, PETER C.
Princeton University
Princeton, N.J.

DODD, STUART C.
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington.

DOODY, EDWARD G.
Edward G. Doody & Co.
911 Locust Street
St. Louis 1, Mo.

DUBOIS, CORNELIUS
Time Inc.
9 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y

ELINSON, JACK
War Department
1820-23 St. SE
Washington, D.C.

FELD, BERNARD D., JR.
Birmingham News-Age-Herald
Birmingham, Ala.

FOSTER, LeBARON R.
Opinion Research Corp.
90 Nassau Street
Princeton, N. J.

FRANZEN, RAYMOND
Consultant
10 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y.

FREIBERG, ALBERT D.
The Psychological Corp.
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

GAGE, N. L.
Purdue University
Lafayette, Ind.

GALLUP, GEORGE
Gallup Poll
Princeton. N. J.

GASKILL, WILLIAM J.
Hawaiian Economic
Foundation,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

GATES, CALEB F.
University of Denver
1640 East 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colo.

GLASS, D. V.
University of London
10 Palace Gardens Ter-
race, London, W.8, England

GLASS, MRS. D. V.
Association for Planning
& Regional Reconstruction
10 Palace Gardens Ter-
race, London, W.8, England

GOULD, HARRY H.
This Week Magazine
420 Lexington Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

GUEST, LESTER
University of Denver
(National Opinion Research
Center)
614 East Foster Avenue
State College, Penna.

HAND, BAYARD R.
Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N. Y.

HARRIS, LOUIS
Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N. Y.

HARRIS, NATALIE
University of Illinois
Extension
Urbana, Illinois.

HART, CLYDE W
National Opinion Research
Center
4901 S. Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois.

HAUSER, PHILIP M.
University of Chicago
5729 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois.

HAUSKNECHT, GEORGE
Consultant
2114 N Street N.W.
Washington 7, D.C.

HEIL, ETHEL
Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y.

HERRINGTON, WILLIAM
International Public Opinion
Research, Inc.
350 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

HERZOG, ELIZABETH G.
Columbia University
396 Bleecker Street
New York, N. Y.

HERZOG, HERTA
McCann-Erickson, Inc.
252 W. 85th Street
New York, N. Y.

HOCHSTIM, JOSEPH R.
Opinion Research Corp.
213 Nassau Street
Princeton, N.J.

HYMAN, HERBERT
National Opinion Research Center
280 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y.

ISAACS, HAROLD R.
Newsweek Magazine
152 W. 42nd Street
New York, N.Y.

JAHODA, MARIE
American Jewish Committee, 253 W. 16th St.
New York 11, N.Y.

JESSEN, R. J.
Statistical Laboratory
Iowa State College
216 S. Riverside Drive
Ames, Iowa.

JONES, S. SHEPARD
Department of State
4404 Maple Avenue
Bethesda, 14, Md.

JOYCE, JEAN
Conference Press Relations
55 West 11th Street
New York, N. Y.

KATZ, DANIEL
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan
Saline Valley Farms
Saline, Mich.

KATZ, EUGENE
The Katz Agency, Inc.
500 Fifth Avenue
New York 18, N.Y.

KENAS, JOSEPH
British Broadcasting Corp.
5445 Netherland Avenue
New York 63, N.Y.

KING, ARNOLD J.
Statistical Laboratory
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa.

KLINEBERG, OTTO
Dept. of Psychology
Columbia University
New York, N.Y.

KRAKAUER, EMMA JANE
National Opinion Research Center
280 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y.

KRAMER, BERNARD M.
Harvard University
12 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, Mass.

KRIESBERG, MARTIN
Council on Foreign Relations
116 D Holden Green
Cambridge, Mass.

KROEGER, HENRY
The Iowa Poll
715 Locust St.
Des Moines, Iowa.

LAHODNY, GEORGE L.
Detroit Edison Company
2000 2nd Avenue
Detroit 26, Mich.

LASEAU, L. N.
General Motors Corp.
15-167 General Motors Building
Detroit, Michigan.

LAZARSFELD, PAUL F.
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

LEE, ALFRED McCLUNG
Wayne University
164 East Cady St.
Northville, Michigan

LEISERSON, AVERY
University of Chicago
1309 E. 50th Street
Chicago, Illinois.

LENTZ, THEODORE F.
Attitude Research Laboratory,
Washington University
St. Louis 5, Mo.

LIKERT, RENSIS
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan.

LISSNER, WILL
New York Times
New York 18, N.Y.

LUDEKE, H. C.
The Curtis Publishing Co.
Philadelphia, Pa.

LYDGATE, WILLIAM A.
Gallup Poll
110 E. 42nd Street
New York, N. Y.

McCANDLESS, C. F.
Inter-American Research Service
11 Sunnybrook Road
Bronxville, N Y.

McCARTY, LOUISE P.
Time, Inc.
1737 York Avenue
New York 28, N Y.

McDONALD, MARGARET L.
Bureau of Applied Social Research
130 West 57th St.(c/o Miller)
New York, N.Y.

McGRANAHAN, DONALD V.
Harvard University
68 Snake Hill Road
Belmont, Mass.

MacLEAN, MALCOLM SHAW, JR.
Student, University of Minnesota,
637 Erie Street, S.E.
Minneapolis, Minn.

MALONEY, JOHN F.
The Reader's Digest
St. John's Place
Chappaqua, N. Y.

MANDEL, HOWARD
Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture,
1440 Chapin Street, N.W.
Washington 9, D.C.

MANHEIMER, DEAN
American Jewish Committee
139 West 80th Street
New York, N.Y.

MARION, JEAN HARVEY
Stewart, Dougall & Associates, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N. Y.

MATTOX, GEORGE W.
Central Surveys
706 West Street
Shenandoah, Iowa.

MEIER, FREDERIC
Attitude Research Laboratory, 59 Jefferson St.,
New York, N.Y.

MEIER, NORMAN C.
Bureau of Audience Research
University of Iowa.
Iowa City, Iowa.

MOLGREN, ELVINA
Minnesota Poll
3400 Penn Ave., North
Minneapolis, Minn.

MOORE, FELIX E., JR.
U.S. Public Health Service
1820 S. Quincy St.
Arlington, Va.

MURPHY, DONALD R.
Wallace-Homestead Poll
1912 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Ia.

NAPRSTEK, KAREL
United Nations Secretariat
c/o United Nations
Lake Success, L.I. N.Y.

NORTHROP, M. STARR
Opinion Research Corp.
R.D. #2
Princeton, N.J.

OSBORNE, JAMES M.
Ford Motor Co.
Dearborn, Michigan.

PACE, C. ROBERT
Syracuse University
123 College Place
Syracuse, N. Y.

PARKER, KATHERINE G.
Stewart,Dougall & Assoc.
755 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y.

PEAK, HELEN
Connecticut College
New London, Conn.

PENCE, OWEN E.
National Council of Young Men's Christian Assns.
347 Madison Avenue
New York 17, N.Y.

PETERSON, ELDRIDGE
Printer's Ink
205 E 42nd Street
New York 17, N.Y.

PLATTEN, JOHN H., JR.
Ross Federal Research Corp.
2 West 45th Street
New York, N.Y.

POHLY,JURGEN G.(Capt.)
U.S. Army
119-14 Union Turnpike
Kew Gardens, N.Y.

PRICE, CHARLTON R.
Student, Princeton University, 34 Springbrook Road
Morristown, N.J.

RADVANYI, LASZLO
Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion
Donato Guerra 1, desp. 207
Mexico City, Mexico.

REED, WILLIAM P.
Ross Federal Research Corp. 2 West 45th Street
New York 19, N.Y.

REEVE, EDWARD G.
Columbia Broadcasting System, 107 Lake Street
Englewood, N.J.

RIECKEN, HENRY W., JR.
Dept. of Social Relations
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RILEY, JOHN W. JR.
Rutgers University
535 E 88th Street
New York 28, N.Y.

ROBINSON, CLAUDE
Opinion Research Corp.
44 Nassau Street
Princeton, N.J.

ROPER, BURNS W.
Elmo Roper
RFD 4
Ridgefield, Conn.

ROPER, ELMO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, N.Y.

ROSE, ARNOLD M.
Washington University
St. Louis, Mo.

ROSLOW, SYDNEY
The Pulse, Inc.
110 Fulton St.
New York 7, N.Y.

SANDERS, WILFRID
Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, 38 King St. W.
Toronto, Canada.

SCHMIDT, HENRY, JR.
Box 827
New Canaan, Conn.

SERENO, RENZO
University of Puerto Rico
922 Lincoln Avenue
Peru, Illinois.

SERRANO, RAUL GUTIERREZ,
Alvarez Perez-Pages
Publicidsa
Calle 2 #15
Miramar, Havana, Cuba.

SHEATSLEY, PAUL B.
National Opinion Research Center, 280 Madison Ave.,
New York 16, N.Y.

SHEETZ, SHELDON W.
Ross-Federal Research Corp.
2 W. 45th St
New York, N.Y.

SHEPHERD, JANE A.
Research Dept.
The Washington Post
Washington, D. C.

SHERE, LOUIS
U. S. Treasury
3000 39th St., N.W.
Washington 16, D.C.

SILVEY, ROBERT
British Broadcasting Corp.
Broadcasting House
London W. 1, England.

SIMONSON, SOLOMON
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colo.

SIRKIS, RUBIN
300 Salkirk Ave.,
Winnipeg, Canada

SMITH, DILMAN M.K.
Opinion Research Corp.
44 Nassau St.
Princeton, N.J.

SNYDER, PAUL L.
Philadelphia Bulletin
Old Arch Road
R.D. #3
Norristown, Pa.

SPURR, JOHN C.
McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.
330 W. 42nd St.
New York 18, N.Y.

STAR, SHIRLEY A.
Social Science Research Council,
6125 Kenwood Avenue
Chicago 37, Illinois.

STEMBER, CHARLES H.
National Opinion Research Center, 280 Madison Ave.
New York 16, N.Y.

STEPHAN, FREDERICK F.
Princeton University
Room 300
20 Nassau Street
Princeton, N.J.

STERN, ERIC
Analyses Sociales et Economiques,
Lausanne, Switzerland
760 West End Ave.
New York 25, N Y.

STEWART, FRANK A.
Time, Inc.
9 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, N Y.

STOCK, J. STEVENS
Opinion Research Corp.
44 Nassau St
Princeton, N.J.

STOUFFER, SAMUEL A.
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

STRUNK, MILDRED
Office of Public Opinion Research, Box 429
Princeton, N.J.

STUART, DOUGLAS E.
Curtis Publishing Co.
3 Lothian Place
Philadelphia 28, Pa.

SURFACE, FRANK M.
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y.

TAMULONIS, VALERIE
323 E. Center Street
Shenandoah, Pa.

TCHANG, TE LOU
United Nations
202 Riverside Drive
New York 25, N.Y.

TOBENKIN, PAUL
Herald Tribune
230 W 41st St.
New York, N.Y.

TRAGER, FRANK N.
Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith
212 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

TRESCOTT, PAUL H.
Evening Bulletin
Philadelphia, Pa.

TRUMAN, DAVID B.
Williams College
Williamstown, Mass.

TWOHEY, JAMES S.
James S. Twohey Associates, Inc.
118 C. St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

TYSON, JAMES
Time-Life International
Time & Life Bldg.
Rockefeller Center
New York, N.Y.

VAIL, C. R.
C. R. Vail Co.,
745 Fifth Ave.,
New York 22, N.Y.

VAN PATTEN, LOUISE M.
National Opinion Research Center,
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado.

VICARY, JAMES M.
551 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y

VIDEN, IVAN
Czechoslovak Institute of Public Opinion
Prague II, Narodni 10,
Palais Dunaj
Czechoslovakia.

WALLACE, DAVID
Time, Inc.
9 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, N.Y.

WARNER, LUCIEN
Life Magazine
Time & Life Bldg.
New York 20, N.Y.

WATERS, FRANCIS M. JR.
A.S. Bennett Associates
93 Park Avenue
New York 16, N.Y.

WATSON, ALFRED N.
Curtis Publishing Co.
Philadelphia 5, Pa.

WILLIAMS, DOUGLAS
Fred Rudge, Inc.
475 Fifth Ave.,
New York 17, N.Y.

WILLIAMS, FAY
Central Surveys
Shenandoah, Iowa.

WILLIAMS, FREDERICK W.
U.S. Office of Military Government for Germany
Information Control Division, Opinion Surveys Section, OMGUS, ICD
Opinion Surveys, APO 742
c/o Postmaster,
New York, N.Y.

WILLIAMS, ROBERT
Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y.

WILLIAMS, ROBIN M. JR.
Dept. of Sociology & Anthropology, Cornell University,
Ithaca, N.Y.

WILLING, JULES Z.
Confidential Reports, Inc.
1270 Avenue of the Americas
New York 20, N.Y.

WILSON, ELMO C.
Columbia Broadcasting System
485 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N.Y.

WOLMAN, SHEPARD
Rosenwald Foundation
1502 Decatur St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

WOOD, RICHARDSON
551 Fifth Ave.,
New York 17, N.Y.

WOODWARD, JULIAN L.
Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza, N.Y.N.Y.

YOELL, WILLIAM A.
214 E. 17th St.
New York, N.Y.

ZEISEL, HANS
McCann-Erickson, Inc.
50 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y.

ZUCKER, HELEN
Time, Inc.,
9 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, N.Y.

INDEX

(All references are to pages)