

PROCEEDINGS  
of the  
Central City Conference  
on

*Public Opinion Research*

OPERA HOUSE  
CENTRAL CITY, COLORADO  
JULY 29, 30, 31, 1946

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER  
Denver, Colorado

Price \$5.00

In the Central City Conference -- the first comprehensive conference of public opinion experts ever held in the United States or elsewhere -- was realized a dream long held by Harry H. Field. This conference drew together from the United States and abroad experts in public opinion and allied fields to discuss problems common to all research organizations, and to "sharpen the tools in the workshop of democracy."

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Program .....	ii
Who's Who .....	vi
Foreword .....	xi
Panel 1 Public Opinion and International Affairs .....	1
Panel 2 Technical and Ethical Standards in Public Opinion Research .....	11
Panel 3 Interviewing Problems .....	19
Panel 4 Local (City and State) Survey Problems .....	30
Special Radio Broadcast .....	39
Panel 5 Validity in Public Opinion Surveys .....	46
Panel 6 Sampling Problems .....	53
Panel 7 Public Relations Research .....	64
Panel 8 Wording and Order of Questions .....	70
Panel 9 Use of Special Groups (Panels).....	81
Panel 10 Radio Research .....	90
Panel 11 Newspaper Research .....	97
Closing General Session .....	105

P R O G R A M

MONDAY, JULY 29

10:00--12:00 a.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Public Opinion and International Affairs

Welcome: Caleb F. Gates, Chancellor, University of Denver

Panel: Dr. George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion, Chairman  
Dr. Henry David, Adviser on American Affairs, British Broadcasting Corporation, Assistant Professor of History, Queens College  
Dr. Stuart C. Dodd, Former Director of Public Opinion Surveys in Sicily, Allied Force Headquarters; Professor of Sociology, American University, Beirut, Lebanon  
Wilfrid Sanders, Editorial Director, Canadian Institute of Public Opinion

Topics: Contribution to world peace of research on international affairs.  
Development of an International Barometer of Public Opinion.

2:30--4:30 p.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Technical and Ethical Standards in Public Opinion Research

Greeting: Mr. S. Arthur Henry, Member of Executive Committee and Trustee, NORC

Panel: Dr. George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion  
Dr. Clyde W. Hart, Special Assistant to the Administrator, OPA  
Dr. Julian Woodward, Research Department, Elmo Roper  
Harry H. Field, Director, National Opinion Research Center

Topics: The role of opinion research in the United States. Research ethics, including such elements as: selection of issues; reporting of results; the need for national research standards.  
Functions of proposed association of organizations engaged in public opinion research.

MONDAY, JULY 29 (continued)

8:00--10:00 p.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Interviewing Problems

Panel: Donald R. Murphy, Editor, Wallaces' Farmer and  
Iowa Homestead, Chairman  
John F. Maloney, Director of Research, Reader's  
Digest  
Paul Sheatsley, Eastern Representative, National  
Opinion Research Center  
Mrs. Nancy C. Cooley, Director, Chicago Certified  
Interviewers Association

Topics: Selection, training, and supervision of inter-  
viewers.  
Interviewer morale; the cheater problem.  
Interviewer pay, status, responsibilities.  
Interviewer bias in selection of respondents and  
in influence upon respondents' answers.

- A N D -

8:00--10:00 p.m.

TELLER HOUSE

Local (City or State) Survey Problems

Panel: Henry J. Kroeger, General Manager, The Iowa Poll,  
Chairman  
Joe Belden, Director, The Texas Poll  
Lloyd E. Borg, Director, The Minnesota Poll

Topics: Subject matter in local polls as compared with  
national polls.  
Report-writing and liaison with newspaper and  
other clients.  
Special sampling procedures.

TUESDAY, JULY 30

OPERA HOUSE

10:00--12:00 a.m.

Validity in Public Opinion Surveys

Panel: Dr. H. H. Remmers, Director, Purdue Public Opinion  
Poll for Young People; Director, Division of Edu-  
cational Reference, Purdue University, Chairman  
E. Palmer Hoyt, Editor and Publisher, The Denver  
Post  
Wilfrid Sanders, Editorial Director, Canadian  
Institute of Public Opinion  
Dr. Herbert Hyman, Special Analyst, National Opin-  
ion Research Center; Instructor in Psychology,  
Brooklyn College

Topics: Semantics and public opinion surveys.  
Determination of validity of survey results.  
Intensity, consistency of responses.

TUESDAY, JULY 30 (continued)

2:30--4:30 p.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Sampling Problems

Panel: Morris H. Hansen, Statistical Assistant to Director, Bureau of the Census, Chairman  
Dr. Norman C. Meier, Director of the Bureau of Audience Research, University of Iowa; Technical Consultant, Iowa Poll  
Dr. Lucien H. Warner, Associate Director, Research Department, Life magazine  
Elmo C. Wilson, Director of Research, Columbia Broadcasting System

Topics: Sample design and application.  
Relative validity and reliability of quota and area control methods.

- A N D -

2:30--4:30 p.m.

TELLER HOUSE

Public Relations Research

Panel: Dilman M. K. Smith, Vice-President, Opinion Research Corporation, Chairman  
Lt. Comdr. Paul Berkman, Officer in Charge, Evaluation Section, Office of Public Information, U. S. Navy  
Edward D. Whittlesey, Director of Public Relations and Publicity, University of Denver

Topics: Applications, implications of public relations research.  
Relationship of research firm to client.

8:00--10:00 p.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Wording and Order of Questions

Panel: Dr. Floyd L. Ruch, Professor of Psychology, University of Southern California, Chairman  
Dr. Theodore Lentz, Director, Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University  
Dr. Laszlo Radvanyi, Director, Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion  
Jack Elinson, Research Technician, Troop Attitude Research Branch, Information and Education Division, War Department

Topics: Proper use of open questions, categorical questions, battery of questions, "cafeteria" questions.  
Order of questions.  
Avoidance of stereotypes; other wording problems.  
The split ballot: problems of interpreting results.

- A N D -

TUESDAY, JULY 30 (continued)

8:00--10:00 p.m.

TELLER HOUSE

Use of Special Groups (Panels)

Panel: Mrs. Elizabeth Herzog, Head, Correspondence Panels,  
Bureau of the Budget, Chairman  
David Wallace, Director of Research, Time  
Robert E. Harvey, Sales Manager, National Ana-  
lysts, Inc.

Topics: Use of correspondence panels to complement quan-  
titative surveys.  
Advantages and disadvantages of surveys by mail  
ballot as compared with those by personal  
interview.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31

9:00--11:00 a.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Radio Research

Panel: Hugh Terry, Manager, Station KIZ, Denver, Chairman  
Allen Miller, Director, Rocky Mountain Radio  
Council  
Mrs. Jeanette Sayre Smith, formerly in radio re-  
search, Harvard and Columbia Universities  
Elmo C. Wilson, Director of Research, Columbia  
Broadcasting System

Topics: Validity of various methods of measuring radio  
audiences.  
Implications of new devices to measure listening.  
Presentation of research results -- technical vs.  
non-technical reporting.  
The potentialities of radio as a medium of adult  
education.

- A N D -

9:00--11:00 a.m.

TELLER HOUSE

Newspaper Research

Panel: Joe Belden, Director, The Texas Poll, Chairman  
Dr. Ralph O. Nafziger, Director, Division of Re-  
search, School of Journalism, University of  
Minnesota  
Donald R. Murphy, Editor, Wallaces' Farmer and  
Iowa Homestead

Topics: Validity of various methods of measuring readership.  
General patterns of readership within various  
sub-groups.  
Analysis of newspaper content -- quantity and type.

11:00--12:00 a.m.

OPERA HOUSE

Closing General Session

W H O'S    W H O  
Among Delegates Attending the Conference

Name	Association*	City
Bancroft, Miss Caroline	Writer and journalist	Central City
Baxter, Dick	Graduate student in psychology, University of Iowa	Seattle
Baxter, Robert E.	Director of Research, Los Angeles <u>Times</u>	Los Angeles
Beck, Mrs. L. Allen	Ex-secretary, Denver Branch, The American United Nations Association	Denver
Belden, Joe	Director, The Texas Poll	Austin
Bell, Dr. James W.	Chairman, Department of Economics, Northwestern University	Evanston
Bemis, Edwin A.	Managing Director, Colorado Press Association	Denver
Berkman, Lt. Comdr. Paul	Officer in Charge, Evaluation Section, Office of Public Information, U. S. Navy	Washington
Beville, H. M., Jr.	Director of Research, National Broadcasting Company	New York
Borg, Lloyd E.	Director, The Minnesota Poll	Minneapolis
Bowers, Dr. Raymond	Chief, Research and Statistical Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System	Washington
Cahalan, Don	Research Consultant, NORC; Associate Professor of Psychology and Social Science, University of Denver	Denver
Cervi, Eugene	Editor and Publisher, <u>Cervi News Letter</u>	Denver
Connelly, Gordon M.	Special Representative, NORC	Denver
Cooley, Mrs. Nancy C.	Director, Chicago Certified Interviewers Association	Chicago

\* As of August 1, 1946

Name	Association	City
Currie, Miss Keo	Vice-President and Director of Research, Needham, Louis, and Brorby	Chicago
David, Dr. Henry	Adviser on American Affairs, British Broadcasting Corporation; Assistant Professor of History, Queens College	New York
Dodd, Dr. Stuart C.	Former Director of Public Opinion Surveys in Sicily, Allied Force Headquarters; Professor of Sociology, American University, Beirut, Lebanon	Beirut
Elinson, Jack	Research Technician, Troop Attitude Research Branch, Information and Education Division, War Department	Washington
Field, Harry H.	Director, NORC	Denver
Flowerman, Dr. Samuel H.	Associate Director, Department of Scientific Research, American Jewish Committee	New York
Ford, Dr. Robert N.	Chief, Surveys Operations Section, Surveys Division, Research Service, Coordination and Planning, Veterans Administration	Washington
Forman, Lewis	Branch Manager, National Analysts, Inc.	San Francisco
Fuller, C. Dale	Commentator and analyst, <u>Journeys behind the News</u> ; Assistant Professor of International Relations, University of Denver	Denver
Gallup, Dr. George	Director, American Institute of Public Opinion	Princeton
Gates, Caleb F.	Chancellor, University of Denver	Denver
Halbert, Mrs. Olive	Head, Coding Department, NORC	Denver
Hansen, Morris H.	Statistical Assistant to Director, Bureau of the Census	Washington

Name	Association	City
Hart, Dr. Clyde W.	Special Assistant to the Administrator, OPA	Washington
Harvey, Robert E.	Sales Manager, National Analysts, Inc.	Philadelphia
Henry, S. Arthur	Member of Executive Committee and Trustee, NORC	Denver
Herzog, Mrs. Elizabeth	Head, Correspondence Panels, Bureau of the Budget	Washington
Hess, Richard	Research Manager, Columbia-owned stations, Columbia Broadcasting System	New York
Hoyt, E. Palmer	Editor and Publisher, The Denver <u>Post</u>	Denver
Hyman, Dr. Herbert	Special Analyst, NORC; Instructor in Psychology, Brooklyn College	New York
King, Dr. Arnold J.	Associate Professor of Research, Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State College	Ames
Kinney, Grover	President, Advertisers' Distributing Service	Denver
Kroeger, Henry J.	General Manager, The Iowa Poll	Des Moines
Laski, Dr. Vera	Interviewer, Audience Research, Inc.	Denver
Lentz, Dr. Theodore	Director, Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University	St. Louis
Maloney, John F.	Director of Research, <u>Reader's Digest</u>	Pleasantville, New York
McPhee, William	Co-director, Research Enterprises	Denver
Meier, Dr. Norman C.	Director of the Bureau of Audience Research, University of Iowa, Technical Consultant, Iowa Poll	Iowa City

Name	Association	City
Miller, Allen	Director, Rocky Mountain Radio Council	Denver
Miller, J. T.	Director of Research, Meredith Publishing Company	Des Moines
Miller, Dr. L. W.	Professor of Psychology, University of Denver	Denver
Moore, Dr. Harry E.	Professor of Sociology, University of Texas	Austin
Mosher, Miss Elizabeth	Head, Statistical Department, NORC	Denver
Murphy, Donald R.	Editor, <u>Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead</u>	Des Moines
Nafziger, Dr. Ralph O.	Director, Division of Research, School of Journalism, University of Minnesota	Minneapolis
Okkenhaug, Arne	Director, Radio Education Department, Norwegian State Broadcasting	Oslo
Pearson, George W.	Co-director and Eastern Representative, Research Enterprises	New York
Pearson, Mrs. Mary R.	Head, Interviewing, Supervising and Training Department, NORC	Denver
Radvanyi, Dr. Laszlo	Director, Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion	Mexico City
Remmers, Dr. H. H.	Director, Purdue Public Opinion Poll for Young People; Director, Division of Educational Reference, Purdue University	Lafayette
Ruch, Dr. Floyd L.	Professor of Psychology, University of Southern California	Los Angeles
Sanders, Wilfrid	Editorial Director, Canadian Institute of Public Opinion	Toronto
Schuetz, Miss Anne	Special Representative, NORC	Denver

<u>Name</u>	<u>Association</u>	<u>City</u>
Sheatsley, Paul B.	Eastern Representative, NORC	New York
Smith, Dilman M. K.	Vice-President, Opinion Research Corporation	Princeton
Smith, Mrs. Jeanette Sayre	Formerly in radio research, Harvard and Columbia Universities	Denver
Spurr, John C.	Director of Research, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Inc.	New York
Tamulonis, Miss Valerie	Graduate student in public opinion, University of Denver	Shenandoah, Pennsylvania
Terry, Hugh	Manager, Station KLZ, Denver	Denver
Van Patten, Mrs, Louise M.	Editor of Publications, NORC	Denver
Verner, Mrs. Helen W.	Graduate student, Pennsylvania State College	State College, Pennsylvania
Wallace, David	Director of Research, Time	New York
Warner, Dr. Lucien H.	Associate Director, Research Department, <u>Life</u> magazine, <u>Time</u> , Inc.	New York
Watson, Dr. Alfred	Assistant Manager, Research Department, Curtis Publishing Company	Philadelphia
Whittlesey, Edward D.	Director of Public Relations and Publicity, University of Denver	Denver
Willing, Jules Z.	Manager, Branch Operations, Confidential Reports, Inc.	New York
Wilson, Elmo C.	Director of Research, Columbia Broadcasting System	New York
Woodward, Dr. Julian	Research Department, Elmo Roper	New York

NORC Staff Assistants at Central City

Ruth Abercrombie	Bookkeeper
Rachel Beller	Editorial Assistant
Lucille Davis	Coder
Caroline Goetzel	Editorial Assistant
Isabel Guest	Assistant, Membership Department
Peggy Hewitt	Coder
Virginia G. Johnson	Statistical Clerk
Elizabeth Kilgore	Key Punch Operator
Shirley Kleis	Tabulator
Robert McCall	Assistant Bookkeeper
Jacqueline Pindell	Secretary, Department of Publications
Gertrude Stephens	Secretarial Assistant
Hazel Volkmar	Secretary to the Director

## F O R E W O R D

At the Central City Conference each panel session was "covered" by a committee of two or three NORC staff members, including a stenographer. In preparing the reports, the various committees endeavored to organize the records of the respective panels in such a way as to give a clear and comprehensive picture of the course of the discussions and to indicate the lines of group thinking -- the areas of agreement and disagreement. It was felt that this type of report would be more useful in evaluating and clarifying the proceedings of the conference than would an unorganized verbatim stenographic transcription.

In accordance with the understanding arrived at during the conference, the report of each session was reviewed by the panel chairman. In some instances other panel members were asked to review summaries of the sessions and the reporting of their individual presentations and participation in the discussion. NORC wishes to thank the panel chairmen and others for their excellent cooperation in helping to produce reports which give, we feel, an honest and understandable account of what actually happened at Central City.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 1

*Public Opinion and  
International Affairs*

**Panel Members:**

- DR. GEORGE GALLUP, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion, Chairman
- WILFRID SANDERS, Editorial Director, Canadian Institute of Public Opinion
- DR. HENRY DAVID, Adviser on American Affairs, British Broadcasting Corporation; Assistant Professor of History, Queens College
- DR. STUART C. DODD, Former Director of Public Opinion Surveys, Allied Force Headquarters; Professor of Sociology, American University, Beirut, Lebanon

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

**Price**  
**50 Cents**

## OPENING SESSION

Harry H. Field, Director of NORC, the sponsoring agency, welcomed delegates to this first conference on public opinion research, and remarked that the meeting was truly an international one, with delegates present from Mexico and Canada. A representative from Norway arrived later.

Caleb F. Gates, Chancellor of the University of Denver, in a brief speech of welcome commented on the fact that the University of Denver was the first university in the Rocky Mountain region, that NORC was the first non-profit research organization associated with any university, and that the present Central City Conference in Colorado was the first meeting of its kind.

Mr. Field read a letter from V. Darchambeau, Resident Envoy of UNESCO to the United Nations, which expressed Mr. Darchambeau's regrets that he was unable to attend the conference, as he was anxious to express to the delegates the keen interest being taken by UNESCO in polling developments throughout the world. In his letter, Mr. Darchambeau stressed the importance of public opinion polls in the construction of a lasting peace and said that UNESCO's activities must be built upon a scientific knowledge of world opinion.

Mr. Field then opened the first panel of the conference, "Public Opinion and International Affairs," by introducing Dr. George Gallup, Director of the American Institute of Public Opinion and its ten foreign affiliates.

PANEL ON  
PUBLIC OPINION AND  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

SUMMARY

Panel members and other conference delegates were in fairly general agreement on several points:

1. Public opinion research, intelligently used, can contribute much to international understanding.
2. In spite of the many practical problems involved, it is highly desirable that an international polling organization be developed, possibly in connection with the United Nations organization.\*
3. One of the most important functions of such an organization would be charting trends in world morale -- maintaining a barometer of international security.
4. At every phase of the polling process, from delineating areas of study to reporting the results of research, important judgments involving the possibility of individual bias must be made. These responsibilities are grave and their implications should be recognized.

Considerable difference of opinion was evidenced on other points in the discussion:

1. Some held that public opinion pollsters should be purposive, and seriously concerned with the uses to which poll results are put. Others felt that pollsters should maintain as objective an attitude as possible.
2. Some suggested that both the research and action functions of polling should be incorporated in the same agency. Others believed that parallel organizations separate but allied, would be most effective.

Dr. George Gallup spoke briefly of the remarkable growth of public opinion research in recent years. He pointed out that public opinion polls did not really start until 1935, when the American Institute of Public Opinion and the Fortune Poll began regular surveys.

---

\* See report of the Closing Session for resolution implementing this suggestion.

Since then the field has grown by leaps and bounds. Harry Field started the first polling organization abroad, when he hired Henry Durant to operate the British Institute of Public Opinion in 1936. The number of foreign research organizations has increased steadily ever since.

Dr. Gallup reported that a meeting of foreign research technicians is going to be held in England next spring. There are now one or two polling organizations in all democratic countries; at least twenty separate organizations throughout the world are carrying on polling activities. He spoke of Dr. Stuart C. Dodd's plans for an international barometer which would keep the world organization constantly informed of the state of public opinion in all countries.

Regarding his own foreign affiliates, Dr. Gallup stated that he had ten associate institutes of public opinion in operation in foreign countries. He spoke of the difficulties some of these groups had had, mentioning that the French Institute of Public Opinion had its files rifled by the Gestapo during the war, and that the Finnish Institute of Public Opinion is now being subjected to pressure by Russia. Dr. Gallup said it had long been his ambition to coordinate the work of his foreign affiliates, and that Wilfrid Sanders, Editorial Director of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, is the man responsible for this work, now underway.

Wilfrid Sanders pointed out that the spring meeting of Gallup affiliates and other interested persons in England will be the first step toward the solution of some of the many problems which arise in trying to coordinate polling work in different countries. One of the major problems is agreeing on the questions to be asked. At the present time, the foreign polls are asked several weeks in advance to submit questions they would like to see asked internationally; four or five of these questions are selected by the coordinating office in Canada, and the foreign polls are then cabled to vote on a final selection.

One question now being asked by all the foreign affiliates measures public satisfaction in the eleven countries with the progress being made by the United Nations. Efforts are being made to study areas of misunderstanding and lack of information which might have a harmful effect on international relations -- only one of many areas which deserve coordinated study.

Such coordinated work on an international scale is difficult, however, because of the many practical problems which arise. One obvious difficulty lies in the wording of the questions, for the same words frequently have different connotations in different countries. It was thought, for example, that a check on political sentiment in each country would be desirable and that measuring a tendency to the "left" or the "right" would provide a question-wording which would fit every nation. Yet in Australia the terms "left" and "right" in a political sense are unknown, so this wording could not be used. It was then thought that attitudes toward nationalization of industries would be a proper measure of "left"-vs.-"right" thinking; yet in England even the conservatives have accepted nationalization of the Bank of England and of the coal mines.

How to time the polls constitutes another problem in coordinating the work of the foreign affiliates. It has proved difficult to synchronize the send-out dates and the timing of the reported results. The American Institute of Public Opinion issues frequent polls, for example, whereas the Canadian Institute sends out a survey only once every three or four weeks.

Sanders declared that the war had been a tremendous stimulus to the growth of polling in foreign countries; Gallup Polls are now operating in France, Canada, Australia, England, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland, the Netherlands, and Brazil. He stressed the value of these polls in showing the real attitudes of the people living in foreign nations. As an example, he mentioned that Canadians are greatly interested in the welfare of the British, because Canada is rationing its food in order to send large amounts to England. The Canadian people want to know whether things in England are really as bad as they are painted. Some people return from England with word that the situation is desperate; others come back with contrary reports. The surveys of the British Institute can provide a firsthand, unbiased answer to such questions.

Dr. Henry David emphasized the fact that, although he comes from outside the world of opinion research techniques, he is greatly concerned with the utility of polling results -- the uses to which results are put: How are polling results to be communicated to the interested people? What meaning is to be given to the data? What is to be the role of such data in determining policy? (During the war Dr. David's main job as Advisor on American Affairs to the British Broadcasting Corporation was to promote better understanding between the Americans and the British and to help BBC do an intelligent job of explaining the British point of view to listeners in the United States.)

Leading up to his first major point, Dr. David stated that in most discussions concerning international polling programs, he hears only of the practical problems of organization, of the technical problems of question wording, etc., but nowhere does he hear a statement of the purpose of the program. The public opinion people, according to Dr. David, "kid themselves" about their own impartiality. Actually, they should not be impartial: they should be prejudiced in the sense that their work should have a purpose and that they should implement that purpose.

What, he asked, is the use of an international conference of ten polling organizations from as many different countries, to compare results and discuss problems, if they don't decide on the use to which their materials are to be put? What safeguards are to be set up to see that the results are not improperly used? What relationship is there between polling results showing how the public feels about Russia, and the editorials appearing in newspapers and radio on the same subject? What purpose do the results serve?

Up to the present time, Dr. David believes, the new field of opinion research may have been justified in concentrating on technical problems and the improvement of procedures, but it can no longer ignore its purposes. Techniques are not important from the standpoint of the layman, but purposes are.

Before making his second major point, Dr. David voiced a feeling that polling people lack sufficient background in social science, and proceed as if no academic studies had ever been made of the problems on which they question people. He suggested that the polls should concentrate more on how the people in any country regard themselves, on the stereotypes they have of themselves, since this is necessary in order to understand their feelings toward other nations.

Calling for a better preparation of the people who write up research findings, Dr. David stressed the important function of public opinion analysts in giving meaning to poll results and the responsibility such reporters bear to their readers. At the present time, results as reported are overwhelmingly empirical -- almost as if a conscious effort had been made to avoid any knowledge of the historical and sociological research in the area being studied.

Those who write up labor results, for instance, should be fully aware of the history of the American labor movement. If analysts had such a background, they might not interpret some of the findings in the way they do. Similarly, those who report the results of questions dealing with American attitudes toward Russia should know more fully how Americans look at themselves, what their own beliefs are. Only in this way can real meaning be given to the results.

Dr. Stuart C. Dodd. -- introduced by Dr. Gallup as the man who had given more thought than anyone else in the world to the problems of international polling -- expressed his conviction that without doubt the future would see some sort of world polling organization, perhaps attached to the United Nations. Such an idea has been given great impetus by the war. Dr. Dodd proposed to speak first of recent developments aimed at world polling coverage, secondly, of the functions which a world poll might have, and thirdly, of the specifications for such a world poll.

In speaking of recent developments, Dr. Dodd called attention to the ten foreign affiliates of the American Institute of Public Opinion, the fact that ten more were in preparation in other countries, and that there might be as many as 35 or 40 in the future. He pointed to the efforts to coordinate relations among them and to the fact that the Gallup Polls in various countries are now asking comparable questions simultaneously. In a few years from now, facilities will be available for reporting world opinion to the United Nations within a month's time; such polls will provide a much more scientific basis for international action than the present journalistic methods of coverage.

Dr. Dodd also stressed the need of scientific backing for the international polling movement. It has properly been felt that opinion research could not be extended too far until technical problems had been overcome, that polling must first meet scientific research standards. In conversation with Dr. Dodd, representatives of the Soviet Union have expressed distrust of any polls sponsored by commercial capitalist groups but indicated that they looked favorably on opinion research done under scientific non-commercial auspices. Social scientists have been greatly interested in the possibilities of such research, and the Social Science Research Foundation and the National Research Council have formed a joint committee which has embarked on three major research projects. Funds have been obtained also from such agencies as the Rockefeller Foundation, while in England the political and Economic Planning Committee, as well as several other groups, are busy developing research standards.

The work of the market research companies in improving their standards and the application of polling techniques by the military and by government agencies during the war have also given impetus to the movement toward a permanent international public opinion research organization. Dr. Dodd mentioned (1) the work of the Morale Branch of the War Department's Special Services Division, remarking that strategy was often based on poll findings; (2) the polls of enemy countries, which were instrumental in sounding out possible spots for invasion; (3) the polling of liberated countries by American occupation officials, which assisted in solving many administrative problems; and (4) the use of opinion research by government agencies on the home front during the war. In this connection, he remarked that there are records of more than 1,500 government-sponsored polls in the United States during the war.

Not all possible functions of a world poll are immediately practical, Dr. Dodd emphasized. He discussed at some length, however, the many worthwhile services such an organization might perform. A world public opinion poll could:

1. Sponsor research on techniques in order to improve standards all over the world. This end might be accomplished by granting funds to foundations, which would in turn set up projects in the various countries.
2. Improve standards by obtaining world-wide agreement on specific minimum standards to which all polls should adhere.
3. Publish an international journal which would review surveys made all over the world, provide a directory of approved agencies, supply an index of poll results, and publish special articles bearing on the field.
4. Establish a Records Office to provide a repository of all public poll results, which could be used for further research.

5. Develop international surveys on questions of world interest, charting trends in world morale -- maintaining a barometer of international security.
6. Develop polling agencies in countries not now having polls and furnish skilled organizers who could assist in building up native agencies.
7. Improve polling public relations with both the government and the public, educating these groups in how to use and interpret survey materials, and lessening the likelihood of polls' being misunderstood.
8. Service the United Nations organization and its various committees by providing an accurate intelligence service.
9. Sponsor local and international conferences of polling technicians.
10. Set up training centers where interested persons could be instructed in all phases of public opinion research.

Dr. Dodd then posed these questions to the conference: Is an international polling organization desirable? Is it desirable now? What form should it take? What are the first steps to be taken? He suggested the possibility of appointing a committee to work on the matter at the present conference. (Subsequently such a committee was named by the delegates.)

In discussing the specifications for a scientific world polling agency, Dr. Dodd said he regarded such an organization as a tool which would enable social scientists to study people, in the same way a telescope is a tool which enables astronomers to study the stars. This social scientist's tool (public opinion surveys) might well be called a demoscope, an instrument to study people. Obviously, certain scientific standards for the accuracy of the demoscope must be set up, and while not all of them may be immediately attainable, they should nevertheless be stated as goals.

In this connection, Dr. Dodd called attention to some tentative specifications he had recently drafted, which were available to the delegates and on which he would appreciate comments and suggestions. These specifications dealt with the following questions:

1. What proportion of the world population should be covered?
2. What should be the size of the sample?
3. What degree of representativeness should be the goal?

4. Who should be interviewed?
5. What standards should be set up for interviewers?
6. What reliability is desirable?
7. What validity standards can be established?
8. How can comparability among various countries be achieved?
9. What degree of precision is necessary in framing the questions?
10. How inclusive should the surveys be?
11. How much publicity should be given to the results?
12. What shall be the policy in preserving records of the poll?
13. How provide for certification of local polling agencies?
14. What standards of speed in polling will be reasonable?
15. How much would such world surveys cost?

#### DISCUSSION

In the ensuing discussion from the floor, Dr. Lucien Warner (Life) disagreed with Dr. David's opinion that polling people should be prejudiced, and expressed his own conviction that objectivity is essential. Dr. David replied that social sciences are purposeful areas of study and that to claim objectivity is to "fool yourself." Dr. Theodore Lentz (Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University) supported Dr. David's point by expressing disappointment in the morning's discussion because so much talk had been devoted to standards and so little to purposes.

Dr. Laszlo Radvanyi (Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion) suggested that opinion research is merely the first step in the development of a new social science which will enable us to have a complete picture of the attitudes, knowledge, and behavior of people all over the world. Sanders then asked Dr. Lentz who had expressed disappointment in so much talk of standards, what ideas or suggestions he had for purposes of opinion research. Lentz laid primary emphasis on predictability. He said science is science only when it can predict, that the purpose of research should be to develop the ability to predict future events and attitudes.

Elmo Wilson (Columbia Broadcasting System) agreed that there has been "too much research in a vacuum," but expressed the belief that the scientists themselves can do little to act on their findings. What is needed is a parallel organization to do something with the results of the scientists' research. Dr. Clyde Hart (OPA) pointed out that the research scientists must have some objectives in their research -- must know what they are going after in the first place. Perfection of techniques is of little help if the objectives are not defined or if improper objectives are the goal. Thus, the scientists themselves must actively participate in the necessary political decisions. Dr. Dodd said he felt the two organizations (action and research) should be kept separate, though allied. Otherwise, the research scientists could not maintain their scientific integrity.

Dr. David then issued another "plea for partisanship," in which he repeated his thought that there can be no division between the action agency and the measurement agency, that they are inextricably fused, and that both must act as fact-finders and also as policy-makers. Polling people, even if they claim objectivity, must nevertheless combine the two functions and if they are not aware of it, they are fooling themselves. They can not abstract themselves from the community.

Dr. Dodd asked where the line should be drawn, explaining that if the same people institute a research study to help them decide policy and then carry out that study themselves rather than calling in an independent impartial agency, their findings will be suspect. Dr. David said that the solution to this problem was to have more than one sponsoring agency and more than one measurement agency, that through competing agencies and competing "clients" the truth can be found. No one agency can keep its purposes and attitudes out of its research. He went on to say that such agencies as the Gallup Poll are "policy-makers" now, whether they realize it or not.

Sanders was of the opinion that the Gallup Polls do not affect policy any more than other fact-finding groups do. Facts turned up by anyone inevitably have some effect on policy, but it is unfair to categorize the fact-finder as a policy-maker. Dr. Hart commented that the polling organizations, when they select the issues to poll on, often know what facts they will find, and therefore influence policy. Dr. Norman C. Meier (University of Iowa) suggested that polling organizations could assist in achieving desirable social goals without losing their scientific integrity, to which point both Dr. David and Dr. Dodd agreed.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 2

*Technical and Ethical Standards  
in Public Opinion Research*

**Panel Members:**

- DR. GEORGE GALLUP, Director, American Institute of Public  
Opinion, Chairman
- DR. JULIAN WOODWARD, Research Department, Elmo  
Roper
- DR. CLYDE W. HART, Special Assistant to the  
Administrator, OPA
- HARRY H. FIELD, Director, National Opinion Research  
Center

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

Price  
50 Cents

PANEL ON

TECHNICAL AND ETHICAL STANDARDS -  
IN PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

SUMMARY

Members of the panel and other delegates present were in fairly general agreement on several points:

1. The next few years are likely to see a substantial expansion in the scope of public opinion research activities. As polling operations become more widely used, the possibility of mis-use and the need for some type of regulation will be increasingly apparent.
2. Self-regulation on the part of polling organizations is a basic need of the industry today.
3. Reasonably high standards of a quite specific nature need to be established regarding the technical and ethical aspects of public opinion research and also regarding the reporting of polling results.
4. The polling industry needs a public relations program to educate the public to recognize and demand good polling practices and high standards of reporting.
5. These ends may be achieved through the proposed association of polling organizations, the formation of which has been announced by Gallup, Roper, and Crossley, and by the establishment of an auditing committee in connection with the association.

The group was somewhat divided, however, regarding certain specific problems:

1. Whether or not commercial research organizations should be included in the association of polling groups, and/or come under the jurisdiction of auditing or regulatory activities.
2. The most satisfactory means of maintaining high standards of survey analysis and report writing and of insuring reliable handling of survey results released to newspapers.

3. Under what circumstances it is wise and ethical to withhold from publication survey results -- specifically in pre-election situations.

Dr. George Gallup in a brief opening statement defined the scope of public opinion research in broad terms. Most people think of polls as an instrument useful merely for measuring opinions. Today, however, polls are being widely used to measure -- through the use of "knowledge" questions -- public information or ignorance and -- through the use of factual questions on income, housing, and the like -- to secure data on living habits. Dr. Gallup suggested that research standards should be discussed in terms of the broadest definition of public opinion.

Dr. Julian Woodward began by presenting an analysis of the future of polling activities -- as a background for the discussion of technical standards. For the field of public opinion research he predicted a full and successful future marked by significant developments along a number of different lines. Dr. Woodward envisions a definite expansion of polling activities in four different areas, which he outlined as follows:

1. Clarification of public issues. Here Woodward foresees a new role for the polls within the next ten years. Polls would be recognized as an adjunct of the ballot box, designed to make government more responsible to the electorate and consequently more democratic. The ballot box is inadequate -- the privilege of voting is exercised only once every two or four years and then as much on men as on issues, whereas the poll is a continuing ballot box.
2. Increased polling under government auspices. The stimulus for such polling has grown largely out of war research activities. As a result of their frequent contacts with results of surveys made for government agencies during the war, administrators and Congressmen have now become accustomed to polls. Furthermore, present Congressional resistance to polls will probably wane; the Congressman will see the poll as a useful tool to be utilized in the selection of candidates, in handling campaign issues, and in observing public reactions generally.
3. An expansion of polling in the international field.

4. Much more extensive use of polls on public knowledge in relation to mass education programs.

Parallel to this widespread expansion of polling activity in the near future, Dr. Woodward pointed out, will be the increased danger of mis-use of public opinion surveys and survey results -- specifically:

1. The manipulation of polling organizations to serve private ends.
2. The use of poll results as clubs over public servants -- by the threat of saying, "This is what your constituents want. You must vote accordingly." The legislator and administrator, according to Dr. Woodward, are entitled to employ their own judgment; such a mis-use of poll results is a danger which may be obviated to some extent by special leadership polls.
3. The danger that polls may be satisfied with present-day technical standards. Here the problem is that improved techniques are available, but add to survey costs.
4. The possibility that private polls may by cutthroat competition endanger their own interests. Dr. Woodward regards polling, not as a purely private function, subject to its own controls, but as a "public utility," an industry of necessity involving the public interest. Consequently, polls must conduct themselves in such a way as to justify the responsibilities which will increasingly be theirs and to deserve the respect with which the public will regard them.

Dr. Woodward then referred to current attempts to formulate standards designed to meet these dangers. Thus far, he said, only very limited steps have been taken. Gallup, Roper, and Crossley have met and agreed to sponsor an association of public opinion reporters which would include agencies now engaged in reporting poll results through various media of communication. This association would include the nation-wide polls, the state polls, and certain community polls. No articles for the proposed association have yet been established, and Dr. Woodward proposed these matters for consideration.

He suggested that the association should work to extend the use of polling techniques. It should aim to maintain high standards of technical competence, and should promote research to this end. The association should conduct a public relations program to foster a more intelligent understanding of the uses and limitations of polls. Dr. Woodward gave special emphasis to the organization of a committee on standards which would insure that no poll which did not live up to the standards agreed upon should

have membership in the association. Such standards would include adequate sampling methods, competent interviewing staff, well designed questionnaires, and the observance of certain ethical, as well as technical standards. The committee would also work to improve the standards of the charter-member organizations. It would provide for a variety of simple rules of procedure to improve the quality of the work, such as the uniform presentation in published poll reports of the date of interviewing, the limits of precision of the statistics reported, the total number of interviews, and the calculation of per cents only to whole numbers. The committee and the association should also foster experiments and discuss critically methodological problems such as the use of scales and batteries of questions as compared with single questions. Other research problems mentioned were techniques for measuring the intensity of opinions and studies of areas of ignorance.

Dr. Woodward called attention to the fact that his suggestions constituted a summary picture of the possible activities of the association, since the proposal by the sponsors had been the only action to date. He closed by voicing his confidence that the association of public opinion research organizations is on the threshold of significant achievements -- that the group has almost unlimited opportunities to contribute in a very concrete way to the future of the entire polling industry.

Dr. Clyde Hart opened his remarks on ethical standards by indicating his strong agreement with Dr. Woodward's conception of polls as a "public utility." He cited as an example the use of polls by OPA to guide agency policy. OPA recognized that it dealt with such large numbers of people that no external means were sufficient to insure enforcement of regulations. To achieve compliance, OPA required mass support for its activities; public opinion surveys were used to measure attitudes toward compliance and as a guide to a continuing program of public relations.

Dr. Hart stressed the fact that his experience leads him to speak as a user of polls; he conceives of polls as a public utility, especially when their results are put into the area of public discussion or policy. Furthermore, polls have prestige and their results are accepted by large numbers of people. Consequently, the polling industry must either impose standards upon itself or must submit to the imposition of standards from outside the field. Such standards are particularly needed in view of the increasing number of fly-by-night polls which can bring disrepute upon the entire industry.

Dr. Hart subscribed to all the technical standards proposed by Dr. Woodward and added two suggestions growing out of his (Hart's) experiences as a client:

1. The research approach should be designed initially in such a fashion as to yield results which will be reliable and valid. In order for the results to be of value either to the organization or to a client, the objective of the survey must be considered prior to the collection of the results.

2. Ethical standards must be established covering the relationship between the client and the polling organization. Where the client is a private party, such standards are less important, but where the client is the government or some agent of the public interest, these standards are vital, because polling results are injected into public discussion and affect public policy. To illustrate the problem and need for such standards, Dr. Hart cited two instances in which he felt the status of OPA had been adversely affected by the reporting of invalid survey results. These surveys, according to Dr. Hart, involved questionnaires which biased responses against the continuance of OPA and were also based on biased samples. Yet their results were injected into public discussion while the OPA was under fire. Such unethical practices must be condemned, he said, and a way must be found to eliminate them. In the two instances cited, the polling organizations were unwilling to present their original sampling data and tabulations, which were needed to evaluate the results. To prevent further incidents of this type, which might bring the whole industry into disrepute, some effective self-policing is imperative.

To insure that such stated standards are actually effective in practice, Dr. Hart demanded an enforcement method with "teeth in it." An over-all organization must be established to administer the standards. Membership in this organization should be open only to groups complying with the standards. The organization should require that all polling results and data be accessible to an impartial committee so that the authenticity and reliability of the results can be evaluated. Furthermore, all clients should have the privilege of examining the data accessible to this committee, so that they can have the necessary facts to determine whether the polling organization has done an honest job.

Dr. Hart summarized his point of view by stating that unless some such organization is set up and standards made explicit and amenable to enforcement, the polling industry will face a difficult future and will fail to make the contribution of which it is potentially capable.

Dr. George Gallup then reported the suggestions made at the original sponsoring meeting for such an association, formed by himself, Roper, and Crossley, and including Harry H. Field of NORC, and the various state and city polls. Gallup indicated that no final action had been taken, but that it was recommended that an auditing committee be established with the authority to investigate all the activities of organizations having membership. Furthermore, it was suggested that this committee be given the election predictions of all polling organizations the night

before elections. This committee would evaluate the various predictions and determine the most accurate poll, in each election, in order to eliminate the welter of confusing claims. Dr. Gallup expressed the opinion that this association should be limited to public opinion organizations. Market research organizations strongly need such a committee, but Dr. Gallup felt it should be an independent one. Otherwise the number of organizations to be included in the association would be too large. Furthermore, it was Dr. Gallup's feeling that the need in the case of public opinion polls is more pressing since they have a greater responsibility to the public for the truth of their reports.

Larry H. Field offered several additional suggestions. He favored a stamp of approval by the association, which would be carried on the press releases of all member polling organizations. Releases would be audited after publication, and if they were not up to standard, the polling organization would be warned. Ultimately, standards of reporting could be maintained by the threat of removing the stamp of approval from the reports of any poll which repeatedly violated standards. Public relations programs could convince editors and the public of the meaning of the seal. Mr. Field further suggested that the auditing committee should include one or more well-known persons outside the field of technical experts to give the committee prestige with the public. Such persons might serve only nominally, while a secretariat could carry on the actual auditing function. He asked that a tentative committee be established at this conference to bring in a provisional report on the suggestions made by the panel.\*

#### DISCUSSION

The discussion at first centered around the problem of whether or not the organization on standards should include market research organizations. John Maloney (of The Reader's Digest) questioned Dr. Gallup's separation of the two groups because he said that polling organizations often do market research as well. He therefore recommended the inclusion of market research and suggested a full-time secretariat empowered to investigate market research as well as opinion research. He supported his recommendation by arguing that market research in the public mind is associated with polling and that the aura of bad market research would spread to affect the well-being of opinion organizations. Dr. Lucien Warner (of Life) gave qualified approval to Maloney's remarks, but suggested that market research be included in the purview of the auditing association only in instances where the use of such results affected the public welfare.

\* Subsequently, the conference designated a committee of three to work with the nucleus organization on standards already sponsored by Gallup, Roper, and Crossley. See the report on the final session of the conference.

The discussion then turned to the question of how standards might be applied to prevent newspapers and other media from distorting the findings of polls in publication. Dr. Henry David (of the British Broadcasting Company) broached this problem and Dr. Gallup remarked on the clauses in the contracts of the AIPO providing that the body of the release must be printed without any changes. Harry Field in this connection suggested that attempts be made to get the papers to print the full wording of the questions used. He said that some such attempts had, up to now, been ineffective. Joe Belden (Texas Poll) remarked that it had been the experience of the Texas Poll that, while the newspapers stood by their contractual agreement not to violate the sense of the release, they often omitted the technical details on sampling and the like which could not be construed as a violation of this clause dealing with distortion of meaning. Dr. Stuart Dodd (University of Beirut; formerly Director of Public Opinion Surveys in Sicily for the Allied Force Headquarters) suggested that the enforcement of standards of reporting could be achieved through a constructive public relations program conducted by the association. A reading public educated as to what constitutes good reporting and what constitutes bad reporting could demand the highest standards of newspapers reporting poll findings.

Dr. Gallup summarized this phase of the discussion by suggesting what he called "a minimum reporting requirement," which would require the paper to print at least the question wording and type and size of sample.

Joe Belden asked the group for comments on an ethical problem he had faced in connection with the recent primary in Texas, in which Negroes were permitted to vote for the first time. The Negroes were predominantly in favor of one candidate, and the question facing the Texas Poll was whether to publish voting preference separately for Negroes and whites. Such published data, it was felt, might increase racial tension in Texas and also affect the prospects of the candidate favored by the Negroes. Belden raised the issue of whether it was ethical to withhold such results from publication. Certain delegates supported Belden's position that it was ethical not to publish the data, but others argued that it was the responsibility of a polling organization to publish all information, and that in general more harm resulted from censorship than from publication. There was considerable discussion of this issue and no ultimate agreement on the problem.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 3

*Interviewing Problems*

**Panel Members:**

DONALD R. MURPHY, Editor, **Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead**, Chairman

JOHN F. MALONEY, Director of Research, **Reader's Digest**

PAUL B. SHEATSLEY, Eastern Representative, National Opinion Research Center

MRS. NANCY C. COOLEY, Director, Chicago Certified Interviewers Association

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**

**Denver, Colorado**

**Price  
50 Cents**

PANEL ON

INTERVIEWING PROBLEMS

SUMMARY

Presentations by panel members and discussion by the larger group centered on four problem areas important in working with interviewers both in public opinion and in commercial research. The main lines of group thinking may be summarized as follows:

1. Selection, training, and supervision of interviewers.
  - a. It was generally agreed that the best method of selecting and training interviewers is by personal contact.
  - b. In most instances, women make better interviewers than do men.
  - c. Close and effective supervision is necessary to maintain the standards of the individual's work, regardless of training received.
  - d. There was some difference of opinion as to whether or not the best interviewers are those with at least some college education.
2. Interviewer morale: the cheater problem.
  - a. Since cheating is most often a result of poor supervision and morale-building techniques, the home office should concentrate on improving -- and sustaining continuity in the use of -- methods of maintaining interviewer morale.
  - b. Personal contact, if and when possible, is the best means of obtaining and keeping high morale.
  - c. No general agreement was reached as to the desirability of an inter-organizational exchange of cheater lists.
3. Interviewer pay, status, and responsibilities.
  - a. In the United States interviewers are generally paid on an hourly basis rather than on the per-interview scale. A basic objection to paying

- "piece rates" is that where the plan has been tried the accuracy of quotas has tended to decrease.
- b. Part-time interviewers have generally proved to be more efficient than professional full-time interviewers.
4. Interviewer bias in selecting respondents and in influencing respondents' answers. It was agreed that every human being is biased in some way. Interviewer bias may be reduced to a minimum by:
- a. Good training.
  - b. Limiting number of interviews made by each interviewer.
  - c. Use of interviewer-screening questionnaire.
  - d. Careful supervision and checking of each interviewer's work.

John Maloney made a number of specific recommendations regarding the selection and training of interviewers. In his experience, the procedure outlined below has proved most satisfactory.

1. In hiring part-time interviewers, the first step is to contact, through correspondence, likely people in the town or area who can recommend interested people suitable for interviewing work. School officials are often "good bets" for this initial contact.
2. Necessary qualifications for an interviewer are:
  - a. She (or he) should be old enough to "know her (or his) way around."
  - b. She should have a permanent residence -- stability.
  - c. She should like people.
  - d. She should not be opinionated.
  - e. She should be able to understand written instructions.

The ideal interviewer, as Maloney sees her, is a married woman, 37 years old, neither adverse to nor steamed up about politics, and able to understand and follow instructions.

3. Proceed with training the prospective interviewers in this way:
  - a. At an introductory talk with the group of prospective interviewers, the trainer should present a general explanation of what public opinion research means, the importance of interviewing as fundamental to all other phases of such research, and the techniques and methods basic to successful interviewing.
  - b. After the group meeting, the trainer should talk with each trainee individually and go over a typical questionnaire with her.
  - c. The trainer should next take the trainees, two or three at a time, out for actual interviewing experience. The trainer should conduct the first interview, then have trainees interview. Errors made by the trainee should be pointed out and corrected at the time they are made. Although on-the-spot criticism may prove embarrassing to some people, it enables the trainee to grasp the "right way" of handling the situation or problem more quickly and more thoroughly.

In regard to differences of performance between the sexes, Maloney feels that women are much less inclined to cheat than men, and that women prove to be better for part-time interviewing, especially on readership studies; men, on the other hand, are better interviewers for crew jobs. The ideal interviewing staff, he believes, should include no more than 20 per cent men.

Paul Sheatsley began his remarks on interviewer morale and the cheater problem by referring to the widely discussed article by Leo P. Crespi: "The Cheater Problem in Polling."\* In Sheatsley's opinion, interviewers "are made and not born." A person is generally honest when hired, but he may develop cheater characteristics through lack of encouragement and supervision from the home office or the local supervisor.

\*Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 9, No. 4, Winter, 1945-46 (pp. 431-45).

Sheatsley named five ways in which the home office can contribute to the morale of interviewers. These suggestions were made for organizations having a national, part-time staff which is scattered over the country and, therefore, difficult to contact personally.

1. Give the interviewers the best questionnaires possible. To achieve this end, extensive pre-testing of questionnaire drafts is necessary. Effective pre-testing and questionnaire construction will give the interviewers the feeling that the home office understands the problems which arise in the field.
2. Send thorough instructions with each assignment. Even though the interviewer has been personally trained, said Sheatsley, NORC believes that assignment specifications should be complete. The instructions should (a) state the purpose of the survey, (b) describe any particular problems encountered in pre-testing, and (c) give any necessary information regarding the subject matter of the questionnaire. The value of sending specific instructions with each assignment lies in the belief that if the interviewer knows what the survey is all about, she will do a better job of handling it.
3. Rate and inform interviewers about their work. This personal touch is important and interviewers appreciate both criticism and praise, in Sheatsley's opinion. The home office can do much toward building interviewer morale by writing interviewers specifically about both the weaknesses and strong points found in their work.
4. Publish a newsletter for the field staff. People like to see their names in print, and a newsletter is a matter of interest to most interviewers.
5. The most important morale-building technique is personal contact between the home office and field staff. With a scattered national staff, however, this proves to be the most difficult contact to make. NORC is gradually establishing a regional supervisory staff in order to help solve this personnel problem. The supervisors make the personal contacts, consulting the individual interviewer about her problems, building up her enthusiasm for interviewing, and creating a friendly feeling for the organization. The regional supervisors also train new people when additions to the field staff are needed in their area.

Nancy Cooley described (1) her reasons for establishing a certification for interviewers, (2) methods of organization and training, and (3) points in favor of developing such a certification system.

1. As an interviewer, Mrs. Cooley found that local supervisors were lacking basic background essential to good interviewing. She said that few Chicago supervisors for various agencies understood quotas, verbatim recording, etc. For this reason, she decided to institute a certification system in that city.
2. The method for training is based on two primary activities:
  - a. Group meetings of interviewers for discussion of general interviewing techniques.
  - b. Individual training and instruction for each assignment.
3. Points in favor of certification of interviewers are:
  - a. An expedient and efficient way for agencies or supervisors needing interviewers to obtain them. Instead of phoning a number of agencies having interviewers, or calling many independent interviewers, the agency or supervisor could call the Chicago Certified Interviewers Association and be assured of getting efficient, well-trained, closely supervised interviewers.
  - b. Mrs. Cooley feels strongly that her method of certification will raise the standards and quality of interviewing.

Donald Murphy stated that he had found interviewers for the poll conducted by Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead overly conscientious -- that they sometimes tried to make a case for whatever they felt the organization or the poll wanted.

Valerie Tamulonis (graduate student in public opinion at the University of Denver) presented some of her findings in a research study on interviewer bias. In one experiment, four WORO questions were chosen on which to make comparisons between interviewers' opinions and the responses they obtained. It was found that:

1. There is a correlation between interviewers' opinions and the opinions of respondents they interview.
2. Interviewers holding a middle-of-the-road view on an issue are less likely to bias their respondents than interviewers holding an extreme view on a question.

The questions chosen for the experiment varied to cover a range of issues. The data seemed to indicate that there was a more or less uniform degree of bias independent of the issue, with the exception of one question where a prestige factor was involved -- which seemed to result in a considerably greater degree of bias.

In another experiment conducted by NORC, using a split ballot, the degree of interviewer bias on a categorical question with answer boxes was compared with the degree of bias where verbatim responses to the same question were recorded. On the form where a categorical answer was recorded, there was a high correlation between the interviewer's opinion and the answers of his respondents. On the other hand, when a verbatim response was recorded, there was no real correlation between the interviewer's opinion and the respondents' answers. The conclusion drawn from this experiment was that when the interviewer had to check an answer box, his own opinion tended to influence his classification of vague or borderline responses. The free response question did not offer this opportunity because the coding department classified the answers independently.

#### DISCUSSION

Commenting upon the qualifications for interviewers outlined by Maloney, Dilman M. K. Smith (Opinion Research Corporation) said that he was particularly impressed with Maloney's statement that interviewers must breathe "neither hot nor cold" on political questions. Smith suggested "screening" extremists on political and religious subjects. ORC submits a typical questionnaire to the interviewer applicant to determine that person's viewpoint. The "screening questionnaire" is sent before the applicant is seen in person.

ORC recruits through the mail. About 500 of their 900 interviewers have been hired through recommendations of other interviewers. In addition to the recommendations of good interviewers, Smith said they felt lawyers and newspapers proved good contact groups.

Smith and Maloney disagreed as to the amount of education they preferred an interviewer to have. Maloney cautioned, "Don't get them too intellectual," basing his opinion on the fact that people having only a high school education are generally not as opinionated as college-trained interviewers. Smith prefers that interviewers have at least two years of college work, and disagreed sharply with an opinion expressed by Mrs. Cooley that the "type of interviewer depends on the type of job."

Dr. Laszlo Radvanyi (Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion) also disagreed with Maloney on the question of the degree of education and intelligence preferred in an interviewer. He said that his best interviewers are students of the University of Mexico, who have a keen enthusiasm for polling as well as a scientific interest in research. Most of these students work on a volunteer basis. Radvanyi has found that if, after two or three years of very satisfactory interviewing as volunteers, students are put on a paid basis, the calibre of their work declines. About one-third of the staff of the Mexican Institute are paid, and two-thirds are on a volunteer basis.

Speaking in regard to different methods of paying interviewers, Maloney stated that in the United States interviewers are generally paid on an hourly basis, while in surveys abroad, payment is usually by the interview -- on a "piece-rate" basis. The main objection to using piece-rates is that under this system less accurate quotas are usually obtained, and it is much more difficult to control the sample. The piece-rate system can be used successfully if the job is under close supervision. Piece-rates should be staggered in accordance with the difficulty of the questionnaire. It was suggested that one way of controlling quota and sample accuracy when paying piece-rates is to tell interviewers that you are conducting studies on rates and to ask them to keep itemized time accounts, e.g., actual interviewing time, time spent locating respondents, etc. This approach impresses the interviewer with the very scientific way the job is being done!

In the course of the discussion of full-time vs. part-time interviewers, John C. Spurr (Director of Research, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company) gave his reasons for preferring a part-time staff. During the war, said Spurr, McGraw-Hill trained a staff of full-time people. They found costs ran considerably higher than those incurred in the training and supervision of a part-time staff. Their experience convinced them also that the work of part-time interviewers was of a higher calibre than that of a full-time staff -- and cost less. Use of a full-time staff allows for less selection of interviewers or localities; a part-time staff generally involves more people; therefore, a better cross-section can be obtained. Because of their experience with a full-time staff, Spurr said, the organization had gone back to employing resident supervisors and part-time interviewers.

In support of using full-time interviewers, Mrs. Cooley suggested that full-time professional interviewers ran less risk of interviewer-fatigue when their jobs were varied. Interviewers who interview full-time are generally part-time staff members of several different organizations. On her Chicago staff, for example, certified interviewers are "on call" full time but their work for each individual client is on a part-time basis. Morris B. Hansen (Statistical Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Census) agreed with Mrs. Cooley that a permanent, well trained, interviewing staff is essential for satisfactory field work. He said that the Bureau of the Census employs full-time supervisors, a policy which makes possible close contact both with the home office and with the individual interviewers.

In the exchange of opinions regarding building interviewer morale and solving the problem of cheaters, emphasis was placed on the importance of checking carefully all work done by interviewers and informing them of their strong as well as their weak points. The observation was made that interviewers should be given "a pat on the back when needed, and farther down when necessary," but that the "pats" should be tactfully administered!

Asked what NORC does when they find a cheater among their interviewers, Sheatsley replied that, if sure -- or fairly sure -- of their suspicion, NORC drops that interviewer, and the suspected person is notified by mail that her work is no longer satisfactory. Smith who posed the question, disagreed with this policy, saying that he thought cheaters should be rehabilitated, if possible, rather than fired. Elmo Wilson (Research Director, CBS) said that a rehabilitation program would necessitate many call-backs, and consequently much time and expense.

A proposal was made by Mrs. Mary Pearson (NORC Interviewing read) that there be an exchange of cheater lists among organizations. This could be done with the provision that interested organizations could agree on bases for judging cheaters. Objections to such a plan were two-fold: (a) that it would be next to impossible for agencies to have a standard plan for judging cheaters, and (b) such an exchange of "black lists" would entail much legal counsel since the possibility of libel suits would be imminent.

Lewis Forman (National Analysts, Inc.) observed that it is "amazing what a \$25 prize will do to improve work," if, on every survey, such a prize is given to the interviewer turning in the best job. Not only will it improve the calibre of work, in Forman's opinion, but he thinks interviewers will give a job priority rather than accepting an assignment from another agency. To do an interviewing job properly, he pointed out, it is necessary to (a) supervise, (b) organize, and (c) deputize.

Dr. Stuart C. Dodd (former Director of Public Opinion Surveys in Sicily for Allied Force Headquarters, now professor at the American University, Beirut, Lebanon) said that the English Wartime Social Surveys organization called week-end conferences once a month to discuss techniques, etc. Dr. Dodd observed that such a program encourages and sustains accurate work, gives the interviewer pride in the work she's doing, and all in all, is tremendously valuable to acquiring and maintaining good work and high morale. He suggested that this same idea could be worked out in the United States by having interviewers of different organizations, but living in the same area, meet periodically.

Smith mentioned that the Opinion Research Corporation see personally very few of their field staff, except those working on crew jobs. He estimated that out of a total of perhaps 900 interviewers only about 160 had ever been seen personally by any of the ORC supervisory staff.

Morris Hansen stated that, in his opinion, interviewing errors, like sampling errors, can often be minimized if the organization wants to pay the

price. Interviewing errors can be reduced by means of a thorough and efficient training program; but the organization has to be willing to assume the added expense of such a program.

John Maloney agreed with Hansen on this point, but added that it would be impossible to maintain a continuous training program for interviewers such as would be necessary if bias is to be avoided at all times. New subjects which arise constantly in polling cannot help but be accompanied by new biases.

Dr. Herbert Hyman (NORC and Brooklyn College) suggested that the new NORC interviewers' manual, Interviewing for NORC, was designed to help interviewers with their problems, to answer the most common questions, and to explain the importance of following directions, etc. Dr. Hyman believes that this manual, if used as a constant reference, should result in a definite improvement in interviewers' work. Don Cahalan (NORC and the University of Denver) mentioned his teaching experience with Interviewing for NORC, which he has used successfully and effectively in the classroom (and have other professors in public opinion courses in other universities).

In the exchange of views on various aspects of interviewer bias, it was agreed that, since every human being is biased in some respect, the basic problem lies in discovering ways to discount the effects of bias in interviewing situations. John Maloney feels that by hiring interviewers personally, by using screening questionnaires, and by supervising all interviews carefully, it is possible to reduce interviewer bias to a great extent. He pointed out the difficulty of trying to remove bias after it has started to develop; however, although an interviewer's work must be observed before bias can be detected, some education against allowing bias to creep in can, and should be, included in the training program.

Paul Sheatsley suggested that the detailed data on the interviewer's application should be referred to in judging which interviewers would be least inclined to be biased in doing surveys on certain political or social issues. Murphy, commenting on this suggestion, said that such a routine could help some, but that manifestations of bias varied with the individual. Some interviewers who are staunch Democrats, for example, would influence their respondents, while other interviewers who are equally ardent Democrats, would not let their political views affect their interviewing. Sheatsley stressed the value of having interviewers, on each survey, fill out a copy of the questionnaire before beginning to interview respondents. On a survey on alcoholism, on which NORC has been working, reactions of interviewers to the questions on the ballot may give clues as to their personal bias on the particular subject.

The Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion, according to Dr. Radvanyi, tries to discount interviewer bias by trying to select as interviewers an equal number of extreme "leftists" and "rightists" to obtain a political balance in the staff.

Dr. Theodore Lentz (Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University) suggested another source of interviewer bias. Some interviewers, after interviewing several respondents, notice what the trend of responses seems to be and tend to develop a bias which was not present at the start of the assignment. When this phenomenon occurs, an interviewer can unconsciously be guilty of influencing the remaining respondents interviewed. The tendency toward this type of bias is more marked with categorical than with verbatim answers.

David Wallace (Time magazine) suggested limiting the size of individual quotas as a means of discounting interviewer bias. After a magazine readership study made in 80 cities, Time decided that the best results were achieved with quotas of 20 interviews per interviewer. Consequently, Time now limits its quotas to no more than 20 interviews for any one interviewer.

A study on interviewer fatigue and respondent fatigue, being done by National Analysts, Inc., was reported on by Robert Harvey (Sales Manager, National Analysts). Readership surveys are being used for the study, since it is comparatively easy to determine bias on a continuing study such as a readership survey. Although no definite conclusions have as yet been reached, a satisfactory amount of evidence is being accumulated on the fatigue study.

Harvey also commented on the use, to combat interviewer fatigue and speed up interviews, of the wire-recorder system used by the Army. It was felt that the wire recorder might fluster and confuse the interviewee far more than a questionnaire or a blank piece of paper on the interviewer's clipboard, and thus make the interview of little or no value.

The findings of a study on respondent-fatigue were described by Elmo Wilson. On a three week call-back panel study, made over a period of six months, he found that the fatigue problem was much less difficult than anticipated. He had planned on giving premiums, but found that this inducement was not necessary. Only about 60 respondents of the original 600 cases were lost over the six months period. Wilson emphasized the importance of retaining a high number of the original panel members if the survey is to be valid. To have this retention, the subject matter should be of extraordinary interest. This particular survey was concerned with voting expectations and attitudes. The panel members were checked on vote intention from the beginning of the political campaign until the election. When people shifted their views, interviewers made long and detailed interviews, in which much probing was necessary, in the endeavor to discover the reason for the shift. Consequently, respondent fatigue was increased.

In Wilson's opinion, this panel study proved (1) that respondent fatigue will not noticeably affect the validity of such a survey, and (2) that call-back interviews provide an excellent training and experience for an interviewing staff.

Further discussion of the respondent-fatigue problem led to the consensus that people were generally willing or even eager to be respondents in a survey. As one delegate expressed it, "They'd rather give their opinions than do their washing."

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 4

*Local Survey Problems*

**Panel Members:**

HENRY J. KROEGER, General Manager, The Iowa Poll,  
Chairman

JOE BELDEN, Director, The Texas Poll

LLOYD E. BORG, Director, The Minnesota Poll

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

Price  
50 Cents

PANEL ON  
LOCAL SURVEY PROBLEMS

SUMMARY

Local polls have been a relatively recent development in the field of public opinion research. While many polling problems face both local and national organizations, the state polls have both advantages and disadvantages resulting from the more limited scope of their operations. Local polls can often maintain a closer relationship with interviewers and retain a more satisfactory continuity of interviewing staff than can national polls.

The problem of establishing prestige is a very real one for the local and state polls. The first step in promoting prestige is to convince the public through education that reliable polls are actually scientific and that their results are valid. Explanation, in easily understandable terms, of the particular methods and processes used does much to increase the public's confidence in public opinion research. A good public relations program, including in some cases, advertising, can also be effective.

Through experiment and research, both local and national polls can contribute to a more complete understanding of polling problems and a refinement of many survey techniques. Areas in which more study is particularly needed, it was suggested, are: (1) area vs. quota sampling, (2) multiple question technique, (3) questions and question-wording, and (4) the uses of polls in a democracy.

Lloyd Borg reviewed the history of the Minnesota Poll, started in February, 1944, under the sponsorship of the Minneapolis Tribune. The sample was set up with the assistance of Dr. Ralph O. Nafziger of the University of Minnesota School of Journalism. Most of the interviewers were Minnesota University graduates with experience in research work.

To establish a prestige factor, which Borg considers very important, an advisory committee of 18 members was set up, including farm, labor union, and civic leaders. The committee helps to determine poll policy largely through assisting in the choice of questions and question topics. Since readers of the Tribune were already acquainted with the work of national public opinion polls, they were ready to accept the Minnesota Poll and became intensely interested in its findings.

City and state polls must cope with many problems peculiarly their own, reflecting the smaller scope of the local agencies, and different from

problems of national polling organizations. Because the territory it must cover is relatively small, the Minnesota Poll often finds the use of the telephone a simple and economical way to keep in contact with interviewers, to discuss special interviewing problems, and to report results on election polls where time is of the essence. Judicious use of the telephone not only expedites the polling process, but also makes for a much smaller turnover of interviewers. The bulk of communication with interviewers is carried on by mail, however.

The Minnesota Poll uses the following three types of questions:

1. Current opinion. These questions are similar to those asked in national polls and are used to check local opinion against that reported by national polls.
2. Knowledge of respondents. The purpose of this type of question is twofold: first, it is used to measure the information and knowledge of the public, and second, it provides the newspaper editor with some criteria by which he may decide what topics he may discuss with the certainty that the average person will know what he means.
3. Buying preferences and habits. This type of question, which is not to be confused with those used in market research, is used to indicate buying habits.

The services of the Minnesota Poll are offered at no charge to various interest groups, and have been used to excellent advantage by such groups as the Inter-Racial Committee on Housing. Other service research projects have included a study on banking habits for a bankers' group, a survey on popular information regarding tuberculosis, and studies on nursing and other health problems.

The Minnesota Poll, established in a state famous for the political independence of its voters, has gained prestige through the accuracy of its election results. On recent elections the Minnesota Poll has out-predicted even the most famous of local political sages -- in a state which has always been difficult to gauge politically. Minnesota has often elected a Republican governor and a Democratic electoral college delegation. A continuous survey has shown one-third of the voters avowedly Republican, one-third Democratic, and about 23 per cent "Independent."

However, Borg cautioned, too many people judge the validity of polls by election results rather than by over-all findings. It is the responsibility of polls to encourage a wider popular appreciation of their social and economic as well as political value. "The true function of all public opinion polls is not to predict elections but to discuss current topics of the day."

The public needs to be educated concerning the operation of public opinion polls. The Minnesota Poll feels that the sampling procedure is not understood by the public, which consequently does not understand what an adequate sample is. It is the policy, therefore, to further the reader's understanding of polling by printing in the Minneapolis Tribune a brief explanation of how the poll is conducted. Borg avoids publicizing the exact number of interviews, a practice which he considers dangerous, because the uninformed layman may feel the number of interviews too small to be significant and discount the results accordingly.

Joe Belden pointed out that the Texas Poll, of which he is director, differs from most other state and local polls in that it is not directly connected with a single newspaper, but sells publishing rights to 25 newspapers on a basis similar to that of the Gallup Poll.

Another basic difference between the Texas Poll and the Minnesota and Iowa Polls is that the latter use social cross-sections, while the Texas political sample is based on poll tax records. By controlled sampling of poll tax books -- avoiding names falling at either the top or bottom of a page -- complete information on race, age, sex, and population of registered voters is secured. For example, 8.5 per cent of the Negro population in Texas are eligible to vote, according to latest poll tax data. The minimum sample used is 1,000 cases, and the general operation is similar to that of other state polls.

The Texas Poll has done less than the Minnesota Poll in the field of public service, but has on occasion cooperated with the University of Texas (where poll headquarters are located) by asking special questions without charge.

Henry Kroeger began by expressing the basic viewpoint of the Iowa Poll -- accruals of prestige and promotional value are good, but validity is more important. Prestige is secondary to establishing the fact that polls are valid, but of course establishing the validity of a poll gains prestige for that poll.

The Iowa Poll devotes a substantial part of its budget to prestige promotion, currently through a series of one-column advertisements in Time. "Most effective," seems to be the verdict regarding these ads, which feature the most significant points of the Iowa Poll release for the week, and also include a plug for the Des Moines Register and Tribune, sponsor of the poll. Because newspapers have sometimes suffered through a popular tendency among the advertising fraternity to distrust newspaper survey results, it is a good idea to advertise a poll which has consistently shown its validity.

Another factor which has contributed to the prestige of the Iowa Poll has been the recognition by the state legislature, in connection with pending legislation, of poll results on various state issues.

Since its inception, the Iowa Poll has made every effort to speed up all phases of operation -- without, of course, sacrificing accuracy -- because of the conviction that the time element in polling is all-important. The significance of much public opinion research material is easily lost if the results are not printed at the peak of interest. Kroeger pointed out that, because the organization of the Iowa Poll is very compact, it can move very quickly in case of necessity.

Iowa Poll ballots are mailed out on Wednesday evening of each week, four days are allowed for interviewing, and the ballots are tabulated and computed by the following Wednesday. Ten days after the interviewing began, the first release appears in the Des Moines Sunday Register and in Time the following Thursday.

Some of the ballot questions, particularly the "openers," touch on lighter and more popular topics such as movie attendance, psychological differences between men and women, and other "human interest problems." One question which aroused considerable local interest found men reacting more favorably than women to Iowa men growing beards to celebrate the state Centennial.

A survey on the increase of rural electrification in Iowa -- from 52 per cent in 1940 to 65 per cent in 1946 -- proved so useful that the poll is now doing a study on land ownership in the state to determine the trend in that field.

Because the Des Moines Register and Tribune has state-wide circulation and must compete with local newspapers throughout the state, the Iowa Poll faces a definite public relations problem. To promote additional good will, the poll issues some findings in mat press-release form, with illustrations, as a free service to weekly newspapers.

The Iowa Poll is interested in studying and perfecting the various polling techniques used by all research organizations. Dr. Norman C. Meier of the Department of Psychology, State University of Iowa, technical consultant of the Iowa Poll, collaborates -- sometimes with the assistance of his students -- in the research program of the organization. Kroeger believes that all opinion research organizations should be working on several types of research in polling techniques.

1. Area vs. quota sampling. The Iowa Poll has completed plans to make two area sampling surveys, to follow the regular Iowa poll surveys of the week previous, using the same questions. Thus, a comparison of the two methods in the area of public opinion will be possible. The findings will be the basis of a doctor's thesis by a young man working under Dr. Meier at the State University of Iowa.

2. Multiple question technique. More studies are needed to find out what effect multiple questions have on responses, as compared to that of separate questions. It is Kroeger's belief that it is frequently not possible to measure the state of opinion on an issue through the use of a single question.
3. Questions and question-wording. Further study could be made in this area as to how best to eliminate various possible biases and to put responses on a more valid behavioral basis.
4. Uses of polls in a democracy. The use of public opinion surveys as an adjunct to the democratic process is a broad and promising field for study. Studies in this area might have vast implications and be of great benefit in making our governmental system more efficient and representative in operation.

To illustrate the work of the Iowa Poll, Kroeger cited several specific examples. Surveys on the question of the soldiers' bonus showed a significant shift of opinion. Multiple questions were used and opinion divided almost 50-50 on the question of whether a state bonus should be given to veterans. On the issue of a national bonus, only 57 per cent were in favor, as compared to 94 per cent during the war. Increased publicity given benefits received under the GI Bill of Rights was probably responsible for the shift.

An interesting example of polling used to measure opinion on an existing situation was cited: a survey on the liquor situation in Iowa, where liquor may be sold by the bottle only, and under a state monopoly. In violation of the law, many establishments sell liquor by the drink -- a practice which residents of cities and large towns would like to see legalized, but which small towns oppose. In exploring opinion on the issue, the Iowa Poll gave people an opportunity to answer either that they knew firsthand of a place where the law was being violated or that they had heard of such violations. The second possible answer was given much oftener than the first, since it did not force the respondent to admit that he had personally broken the law, but allowed him to indicate secondhand knowledge of violations. The two types of answers combined constituted a large majority aware of violations of the liquor law. The results of the poll gave state officers and legislators a clear picture of the extent of law violations and of the measure of demand for a change in the law.

#### DISCUSSION

J. T. Miller (Meredith Publishing Company) asked how Minnesota Poll questions are formulated. Mr. Borg replied that questions are drafted on topics of current interest and sent to the advisory board where any desired

changes are made. The questions are then pre-tested and either eliminated or revised and pre-tested again. Questions are also suggested at the periodical meetings of the advisory board.

In answer to a question from Dr. George Gallup (AIPO), Borg stated that usually only one pre-tester is used by the Minnesota Poll. Most of the time the Iowa Poll also uses only one interviewer to test questions, according to Kroeger. Dr. Gallup suggested using more pre-testers who would make fewer interviews apiece but bring in more suggestions and represent more viewpoints. "There is a certain value in getting everyone in the office to go out and interview. We send out at least six different persons including the head of the interviewing department." Harry Field (NORC) remarked that it might be a good idea to send out one pre-tester and discuss the questions in the light of the initial test; then send out five or six pre-testers.

Dr. Alfred Watson (Research Department, Curtis Publishing Company) asked whether the Iowa Poll ever checked reader reaction. Kroeger replied that the poll findings had a high percentage of readership, according to readership surveys conducted by the department. Questions are also asked as to what issues readers would like to have discussed. The biggest problem is projecting survey plans into the future, anticipating trends and developments. For example, during the OPA holiday the Iowa Poll was able to release very timely results on questions regarding OPA policy.

A comparison of the readership of releases as against that of lead editorials was made by Henry Kroeger in answer to an inquiry by William McPhee (Research Enterprises, Denver). Kroeger stated that the readership of releases is lower than the readership level of first page news, but is higher than the level for editorials. The readership of releases, however, is also determined by the timeliness and type of subject discussed.

Certain types of public opinion articles have a relatively high readership. J. T. Miller commented that regular features such as "The Farmer Speaks" are widely read. Dr. Gallup added to this his own observation that no feature, excluding cartoons and pictorial features, has a higher readership than the "inquiring reporter" columns appearing in many newspapers including the New York Daily Tribune. Designed to arouse reader interest are such questions as "When did you first use lipstick?" or "Should women dye their hair?"

Readership of public opinion poll results might be higher, Gallup suggested, if press releases were written up more enticingly. It would increase readership if the comments were written first in a release and then followed with the percentages. In other words, make more of a feature story out of it. Lots of people, especially women, are frightened by percentages and figures, and avoid reading the releases. If you put out a release on the public's favorite movie stars, you make the first page. If you take a subject like the loan to Britain, your release ends up under the ads for rupture cures.

In answer to a question from Watson, Dr. Norman C. Meier (Department of Psychology, University of Iowa, and consultant to the Iowa Poll) explained that the cross-sections used by the Iowa Poll are made up from statistics obtained from such sources as ration book issuances and out-migration figures and adjusted to the proper distribution. In reply to an inquiry by Lucien Warner, Kroeger added that the cross-section used by the Iowa Poll represented not just the newspaper subscribers but the whole population of the state.

McPhee asked if the problem of REA increase correlated with education and income figures. Kroeger replied that controls show the sample to be representative, and remarked that voting habits reflect factors of education and income. Meier commented that, while Iowa has a high degree of literacy and a large percentage of college students, those respondents with little education readily admitted their lack of schooling. To eliminate misrepresentation from respondent's answers concerning their education, Kroeger explained, interviewers from the Iowa Poll ask for the name of the last school which the respondent attended, following up this question with an inquiry about how far they got in the school which they mention. Educational level, although never assigned, serves as a check on other quota criteria.

Gallup remarked that, in area sampling, the same bias is picked up on education. Very few people over 50 or 60 have gone to high school, but these people are seldom interviewed because they do not answer the door. The education question is discussed a great deal. "I have yet to find any survey that has been held in the country where the sample has come out all right."

Replying to a question from Watson, Belden explained how the Texas Poll makes use of poll tax records to check the accuracy of its cross-section. The middle name listed on every eighth page of the poll tax record is taken, including also information on race, age, sex, and occupation, to the extent of 5,000 cases. These statistics are used as control figures and are compared with cross-sections used by the Texas Poll in its surveys.

In checking election statistics, the Minnesota Poll, according to Borg, has followed up 1,500 cases of persons who said they were going to vote to check on whether or not they did actually vote. Also, they have used loaded questions, trying to get respondents to say they would not vote in the primaries.

In reply to a question from Watson, Kroeger stated that the Iowa Poll increases the size of its sample for election surveys in order to lessen the margin of error.

The ethics involved in releasing or withholding the results of pre-election surveys -- whether or not they affect voting and the possible dangers of such an influence -- concerned Joe Belden. Belden cited, as an example

in which pre-election results may have influenced the actual outcome of the voting, the circumstances of a recent Texas primary.\*

A clear-cut contest of liberalism versus vested interest, the election involved issues with which the public was generally aware. In initial surveys, much to the surprise of his opponents, Rainey was found to be leading. However, Jester showed a definite trend for the better (11% -- 15% -- 22% -- 31%). At this point, the poll published a prediction that Rainey and Jester would lead in the primaries, with Rainey ahead of Jester. The preliminary results of the primary showed that these two were leading but that the predicted percentages were reversed. According to Balden, this situation probably indicated that the publication of pre-election survey results actually influenced voting. The survey showed that Jester was the only candidate who could beat Rainey. Knowing this, those people who wanted to defeat Rainey, but who had not decided for whom they wished to vote, cast their ballot for Jester.

Gallup stated -- in answer to a question by McPhee -- that he could get election predictions as late as the day before. However, the last-minute survey on the 1944 Presidential election threw AIPJ figures off one point, perhaps as a result of "band wagon" influence. It is often hard to tell exactly what factors throw election predictions off. A pre-election survey by the French Institute of Public Opinion was invalidated because on the day before the election the Pope made a public statement urging all Catholics to vote for the candidates of a given political party. This action naturally threw off all tabulations. Gallup agreed with Balden that the most carefully planned and conducted pre-election surveys may err because those persons making the survey did not and could not take into account all outside factors that influence the voting trend.

\*The circumstances of this election were discussed to illustrate another point in an earlier session. The two candidates, Rainey, who was a liberal, and Jester, were running for the Democratic nomination for governor of Texas.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

**SPECIAL ROUND TABLE BROADCAST**  
by Station KOA, Denver

**Participants:**

DR. GEORGE GALLUP, Director, American Institute of Public  
Opinion, Chairman

E. PALMER HOYT, Editor and Publisher, The Denver **Post**

H. M. BEVILLE, JR., Director of Research, National  
Broadcasting Company

HARRY H. FIELD, Director, National Opinion Research  
Center

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

**Price**  
**50 Cents**

Script of  
SPECIAL ROUND TABLE BROADCAST

By Station KOA, Denver

from

PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH CONFERENCE

Torland:

Good evening from Central City, Colorado, the scene this week of the Public Opinion Research Conference. To colorful Central City have come nearly two hundred of the world's leading Public Opinion Research experts to discuss every aspect of their unusual profession.

This is Tor Torland speaking and sitting with me now in the famous opera house here in Central City are four well-known figures in the field of research and opinion. We have Dr. George Gallup, Director of the highly successful Gallup Poll; Harry Field, director of the National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver; E. Palmer Hoyt, Editor and Publisher of the Denver Post; and Hugh Beville, Jr., Director of Research for the National Broadcasting Company, and formerly of the G-2 Staff of General Hodges' First Army in Europe. Now, to the purpose of this evening's round table -- as you all know, the men seated with me are engaged in the business of asking questions of the average man. Right now, we're going to change that position and put them on the receiving end. I'm going to take the part of Mr. Average Citizen and bat a few questions around the board and then we'll get the ball rolling. First of all, we have a question for Dr. Gallup. Dr. Gallup, why have I never been interviewed if you've been polling people all over the country? I've read all about your polls, but I've never been polled myself.

Dr. Gallup:

I'm glad you asked that, Mr. Torland. I suppose that of all the questions that come to us and have come to us through the course of the last eleven years, that question, "Why haven't I been interviewed?" is the one that crops up most persistently. The reason for that is that many people confuse accuracy in polls -- they base their opinions of the accuracy of polls on the number of people interviewed,

whereas, as a matter of fact, accuracy is achieved by the proper selection of people to be interviewed. If we interviewed 10,000 persons per week, which is actually more than the scientific requirements, it would take just 150 years to get around to all the people in the country once, so the chances aren't very good that even your grandchildren will be interviewed.

Torland:

Thank you very much, Dr. Gallup. I guess that explains it. Another question, Dr. Gallup, before we move around the round table here -- perhaps this is a question we might ask all of you gentlemen, and you might all react with answers as they occur to you -- a question that perhaps the public has in mind -- what good does polling do?

Dr. Gallup:

I have some very definite opinions on that. I believe that polls perform a great service in this country in revealing at all times what the people think about the important issues of the day. Elections only come at infrequent intervals, every two years -- Presidential elections every four years, and there is need to know what the people think in between election times and, as a matter of fact, elections themselves do not always indicate clearly the will of the people. Some of the greatest mistakes in the history of this country have been made in trying to read the will of the people from election returns and I need only cite the 1928 elections, when Herbert Hoover believed that his great majority was a mandate to continue prohibition, or 1920, when Harding assumed that his great majority was a mandate against the League of Nations. I could go on and cite other instances where the will of the people has been mis-read in election victories.

Torland:

Mr. Hoyt, do you concur with Dr. Gallup?

Hoyt:

I think he raised a very interesting point, and I'd like to ask Dr. Gallup this question -- do you think if the Gallup Poll, Doctor, had been in use in 1928 and '20 it might have saved these gentlemen from their folly?

Dr. Gallup:

I think so. I'm not certain it would have saved them, but it would at least have indicated the will of the people. They wouldn't have made the mistake of mis-reading it.

Hoyt:

In other words, they would have known what the people thought. It is very interesting to note in 1946, against 1920, that every poll shows an over-all agreement of the principle of the United Nations. Do you think that a poll in 1920 might possibly have shown the same thing?

Dr. Gallup: I think so, in 1920.

Torland: What do you think about that, Mr. Beville? What's the radio viewpoint on that?

Beville: The question of public opinion isn't directly applicable to our radio research, but I think that polls in general have accomplished a great deal in the political field in keeping all who interpret public opinion, including radio commentators, abreast of the thinking of the American public.

Torland: Mr. Field, I think it's your turn now, sir.

Field: I think I recall, Dr. Gallup, in 1936 when Roosevelt was elected, he thought it was a mandate from the public -- his election -- to pack the Supreme Court. I think you showed that at no time a majority of the people favored the packing of the Supreme Court.

Dr. Gallup: That's right.

Field: I think that was an actual case in point.

Dr. Gallup: Mr. Hoyt, you were in Washington, and I'd like to ask this question of you. I think one of the services which polls can perform is to deflate the claims of some of the pressure groups who prey upon Congress. I mean it is natural for a pressure group to claim that all of their three million members of that particular group demand a certain piece of legislation. Polls, of course, can come along and prove that that isn't true at all. I'd like to have your opinion about that particular service which I think the polls can and are performing.

Hoyt: I think that's well said. The typical lobby operation today speaks for hundreds of thousands of people as to farm-blocs, labor-blocs, and so on. I think the polls have done a useful service in proving that what the leaders tell our Congressional and other political leaders isn't necessarily the fact. I think a very recent example of that is in the strike crisis. There were three of them -- the strike crisis, the draft crisis, and the OPA crisis -- and I'd just like to ask this question -- one of the charges that you gentlemen are very sensitive to, I'm sure, is that we now have government by polls. It is interesting to note that just before the House passed its first restrictive bill which was to put OPA out of business, some three months ago, that the Gallup Poll showed 73 per cent of the people of the United States were for the OPA and the MORC of Mr. Field showed more than 80 per cent, I think 83 per cent were for OPA; and yet the House of Representatives, deliberately,

with malice of forethought or with reason, voting, passed a measure which by any method of thinking was against what the people wanted and that, it would seem to me, is one of the answers to government by polls. I'd be interested in your reaction, I'm sure everybody would, Dr. Gallup, and Mr. Field, both.

Dr. Gallup: I can say this -- that it isn't the purpose of the polls to influence legislation. It is our purpose merely to report the facts of public opinion. That, since we look upon ourselves pretty much the way the Associated Press, the United Press and the other press agencies regard themselves -- as fact-finding agencies, we don't care what happens -- what is done about the results of our polls. Of course, being good citizens, we hope that they will provide useful information and valuable information to our Congressmen. I would be interested in Mr. Field's ideas on that.

Field: I think that polls can show what the people are thinking, and whether the legislators or administrators agree with them does not concern me, but I do think they should know what the people think, and if they don't agree with them, they should go out and win the people to another point of view. Polls do show that people have a great deal of ignorance on a lot of questions -- well, then, they should go out and educate the people and tell them. If this polling mechanism is to be what I hope it will be, a new tool in the workshop of democracy, then it won't guide legislators necessarily. It will tell them what the people are thinking so that they can go and talk and guide the people in the way they want them to go.

Torland: Mr. Field, I imagine then the people might well be forewarned about polling, about statistics, that are compiled and presented to them by prejudice groups.

Field: Yesterday, one of the main things that we brought up at this conference was self-regulation of the polling organizations. Dr. Gallup is setting up with Roper and Crossley and NORC an organization to police polling so that legislators and the people can know which are the reliable, valid polls, and which are not.

Torland: Here's a question that I think might be interesting for our people to learn about. What help can modern polling be in helping nations to achieve permanent peace?

Dr. Gallup: Well, it is possible for us today to know how the common people, how the plain people of some eleven democracies think.

It is possible to poll these people within a period of hours, nearly. I think that polls could be undertaken in these nations in a matter of a couple of days, so it is possible to find out on many great international issues what the people think and it is my belief and it has been my experience that the people of these different countries tend to think pretty much the same way. They all want peace and I believe that polls, by reducing areas of ignorance, by helping the people of one country to understand the point of view of the people of another country, can contribute greatly to the peace of the future.

Beville:

Dr. Gallup, I think that probably a few of the listeners want to know of the amount of polling that is already being done in foreign countries. You told us something about that at the conference here yesterday morning. I think it might be interesting to the listeners to hear more about that.

Dr. Gallup:

It is true that a great deal of polling is going on throughout the democratic countries of the world. There are polling organizations today in Australia, Canada, England, France, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland. There are polls about to be established in Switzerland, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and there are polling organizations in South America; and all of these organizations, interestingly enough, use the methods which have been developed in this country and they have used them as successfully as we have. They've predicted elections -- in fact the most accurate election prediction ever made in the history of polling was made by the Swedish Institute of Public Opinion.

Hoyt:

I'm fearful of some confusion on the part of ourselves and our listeners, Dr. Gallup. I'd like to ask this question -- free polling must follow some kind of press freedom. However, an opinion poll in Russia, for example, or the Argentine wouldn't be in any way conclusive, would it?

Dr. Gallup:

Absolutely not. In fact, we are having our problems in one country today -- Finland. We have a Finnish Institute of Public Opinion which is having a terrific struggle trying to do a job of polling. In fact, all political issues have already been excluded and I might also say that the very first thing that the Germans did when they got to Paris in 1940 was to rifle the files of the French Institute of Public Opinion, so a free press is absolutely essential to this whole polling operation.

Torland:

Mr. Field, the public is particularly interested now in the reactions in occupied countries -- in Japan and in Germany. What effort is being expended to test and to estimate the

reactions of the occupied countries to our government and to our methods, other than military?

Field: There is a polling unit in Germany, but it is primarily to help our occupation forces. So far as I know, only the government has gone into Japan and Germany to make studies, and there again most of their findings are not being made public. They are for the guidance of the administrators. It is very important to get to know what the German people and the Japanese people think about our occupying forces. That's the only work that's being done at the present time. NORC polls the American people on their attitudes toward the German people and the Japanese people, and they've found that since the war was over, Americans are becoming much more tolerant toward both the Japanese and the German people.

Torland: What's your reaction on that, Colonel Beville? You just returned from Europe.

Beville: The poll operations that were conducted during the war by OWI and other government agencies were exceedingly valuable to the occupation forces and military government. The attitudes of the general populace toward the occupying troops and their attitudes toward the various steps taken in setting up local governments were exceedingly helpful. I might here mention the fact that recently there was a group sent to Greece representing some of the outstanding people in the field of sampling and opinion research to assist the authorities in conducting the Greek elections several months ago. It was part of the State Department's plan, as I understand it, to assure a completely democratic election in Greece during a period when serious charges were being made back and forth by various political parties, that the Greek elections were not being conducted on a completely unbiased basis. That was certainly one contribution, I think, that has been made by the opinion research people.

Torland: Thank you, Colonel Beville. Gentlemen, I'm sorry, but our time is up for right now, and we have to get off the air. Thank you very much for joining KOA in this informal round table discussion of public opinion polls. On our program this evening were Dr. George Gallup of the famed Gallup Polls; Palmer Hoyt, Editor and Publisher of the Denver Post; Hugh Beville, Jr., Director of Research for the National Broadcasting Company; and Harry Field, Director of NORC, University of Denver. This is Tor Torland speaking. This program originated in the Central City Opera House at Central City, Colorado.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 5

*Validity in Public Opinion Surveys*

**Panel Members:**

DR. H. H. REMMERS, Director, Purdue Public Opinion Poll  
for Young People; Director, Division of Educational  
Reference, Purdue University, Chairman

E. PALMER HOYT, Editor and Publisher, The Denver **Post**

WILFRID SANDERS, Editorial Director, Canadian Institute  
of Public Opinion

DR. HERBERT HYMAN, Special Analyst, National Opinion  
Research Center, Instructor in Psychology, Brooklyn  
College

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

**Price**  
**50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
VALIDITY IN  
PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS

SUMMARY

Members of the panel and delegates were in rather general agreement that, although the validity of established polls has been demonstrated, there is a continuing need to perfect procedures, and to guard against any efforts to use polls for selfish purposes.

Semantics was recognized as a real problem. The importance of avoiding "loaded" words and those not generally understood was stressed, together with the necessity of watching the wording of questions on issues which have no widespread interest or understanding.

The major part of the discussion, however, centered on the best ways to determine whether or not the results of a survey are valid. A number rallied to the support of the school of thought holding that polls are valid to the extent that they enable one to predict future phenomena. More specifically, some held that one of the best checks of validity is a comparison of the respondent's later behavior with his verbal attitudes.

The director of one poll said, for instance, that he regarded elections and referenda as the perfect test of validity. And in reporting an issue, this poll states, "This is how the people would vote on this issue if it were put to them today."

On the other hand, several delegates questioned whether prediction of behavior should be considered a measure of validity. One believes instead that the true test is "whether you get the same verbal response if you re-interview the person the next day." Another believes that the problem of validity arises only in relation to the interpretation put upon the results. By cross-tabulation and careful internal analysis it is possible to give a valid interpretation.

Palmer Hoyt opened the panel on "Validity in Public Opinion Surveys" by stating that validity means truth, and that the validity of polls is frequently questioned because they have often been used to serve selfish interests. He quoted what he regarded as a common saying among newspaper editors that "You can prove anything by the polls."

This same attitude, Hoyt said, had been frequently expressed by government officials during the time that he served as Director of the Office of War Information's Domestic Branch. In spite of the frequent use and great

value of the polls conducted for OWI by the National Opinion Research Center and others during the war, there was nevertheless a tendency among some public officials to regard the surveys as a propaganda tool rather than as a valid instrument of fact-finding.

There is also heard the complaint that this is becoming a "government by polls," that public opinion surveys are becoming so carelessly regarded as the voice of the majority that the average legislator no longer feels free to vote according to his best judgment. As an answer to this charge, Hoyt pointed to the Congressional inaction on continuance of military draft and on effective price control in spite of an overwhelming body of evidence from every major poll that the people favored both measures.

Polls have now become regarded as a tool in the workshop of democracy, said Hoyt, and much credit is to be given them for the consistent progress they have made in improving their techniques. Their validity is becoming more and more accepted, but the polls must be constantly on guard against efforts to use them for selfish purposes and they must continue unceasingly to perfect their procedures.

Dr. H. H. Remmers then quoted the following definition of validity: "The problem is essentially that of supplying evidence that the device used measures or classifies the attitude or opinion it was designed to measure."

He pointed out a number of ways in which validity can be checked, citing first a comparison of the respondent's later behavior with the verbal attitude he expressed in the poll. But this kind of check, according to Dr. Remmers, is not always a perfect measure of validity. Election polls, for example, may quite validly reflect the will of the people, but if, on election day, large numbers fail to vote or are somehow induced to vote contrary to their actual attitudes, the election results may be quite different from the poll results. Similarly, the fact that a man attends church every Sunday does not necessarily mean that he is honest.

Another check on the validity of polls is to see whether they properly differentiate the views of opposing groups whose attitudes are definitely known. A valid poll, for example, should, according to the logic of common sense, reveal consistent differences between the opinions of Republicans and Communists. Another check might involve follow-up interviews to determine whether the previous attitudes are consistently held.

The whole area of validity, however, is bedeviled by many difficulties, chiefly semantic. Take the phrase, "public vs. private attitudes." One frequently hears that people may express certain attitudes publicly and hold quite different ones privately. Which is their "real" attitude? Social scientists, according to the speaker, would say that both are real in their context. The "public" attitude may be quite as important as the "private" in its effect on behavior.

Other problems of validity arise in connection with sampling and with the wording of questions. There may be twenty ways of asking the same question, and you may get twenty different percentage answers. Which one is correct? The answer to the problem seems to be that polls are valid to the extent that they enable you to predict future phenomena of the sort you are interested in.

Wilfrid Sanders stated his belief that, if polls are open to criticism at all, it is from the standpoint of validity. Polls are getting past being vulnerable on other technical grounds so that validity, he feels, is the "one remaining problem to lick."

One difficulty lies in the occasional use of words which the public does not understand. Sanders commented that the Gallup Institutes of Public Opinion have prepared a glossary of 500 words which are ambiguous or frequently misunderstood, and suggested that the polling agencies pool their experiences in this respect.

"Loaded" words are somewhat easier to detect, though even here mistakes are sometimes made. It has been found, for example, that, in the work of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, the word "British" produces a strong emotional reaction; in Ontario it produces a favorable reaction, in Quebec an unfavorable one.

Question wording is another problem in the realm of validity. The wording of a question is especially important on "so-what" issues -- issues in which the public has not yet achieved any real interest or understanding. In such cases, only slight changes in the wording of the question can produce significant shifts in opinion.

In spite of these difficulties, however, the speaker challenged anyone to cite cases where the validity of established polls has not been demonstrated. He mentioned the fine record of scientific polls in forecasting elections and referenda. He also maintained that, on such matters as acceptance of higher income taxes, rationing, wage-price controls, and conscription, the expressions of public opinion reported by the polls have been confirmed in actual practice by the actions and attitudes of the people.

Commercial research provides further evidence of the validity of polls. Corporations have found that surveys give them a true picture of customers' attitudes, and research is actually being used successfully to forecast the box office receipts of motion pictures.

Dr. Herbert Hyman is convinced that validity problems arise only in relation to the interpretation put upon the results. A survey question supposedly refers to something, and the answers are meaningful or valid only to the degree that they measure what the

question was ostensibly designed to measure. To decide this involves interpretation, and the problem arises whether the polling agency itself makes the interpretation, whether the interpretation is implied, or whether the reader or client makes his own interpretation. Since the people who framed the question are best qualified to interpret its results, the duty is theirs.

(One instance of the validity problem arising in interpretation occurs when the apparent meaning of the question is not its true meaning. As an example, Hyman cited a question which, before the war, had proved to be a valid measure of ideology: "Should labor have the right to strike?" Before Pearl Harbor, this question had always differentiated sharply the attitudes of "left" and "right" groups. But after Pearl Harbor, Communists agreed with Republicans that labor should not have the right to strike. The question was no longer a valid measure of ideology.) Validity, he said, can be demonstrated empirically in point of time, but attitudes are dynamic. Because a question was once valid does not mean that it will always remain so.

(A similar situation arose in a question which sought American attitudes toward Franco Spain. The obvious interpretation appeared to be in ideological terms: "left" groups were thought to oppose Franco, "right" groups to be tolerant of his regime. But internal analysis by means of cross-tabulations revealed that ideology had no effect on attitudes toward this issue. Pro-Communists and anti-Communists had virtually identical attitudes toward Franco; those who trusted Russia reacted in the same way as those who distrusted Russia. Instead, it developed that attitudes toward Franco were correlated highly with attitudes toward other United States actions abroad. Those who favored an active international policy also favored strong measures against Franco; those who favored a passive or isolationist policy opposed such measures. By such internal analysis it was possible to give a valid interpretation of the results.)

A second validity problem arises when there is uncertainty over the "cognitive structure" of the expressed attitude. In a study made among Austrians last year, for example, a large majority said they favored "democracy." But when the "cognitive structure" of their attitude was uncovered, it was revealed that their ideas of democracy were quite different from those commonly understood in this country. To report that Austrians at that time favored "democracy" as we understand it, therefore, would be an invalid interpretation of the results.

Similar instances arise when the public is asked its attitude toward the State Department or toward the country's atom bomb policy. Only a minority have a correct understanding of what the Department does or what the policy is; the remainder answer in unknown terms, and the validity of the interpretation is consequently in doubt. The solution to this type of validity problem depends upon the purpose of the study. If the objective is to discover the public's attitude toward the issue in terms of their stereotypes, such a question provides it. If, on the other hand, you want

their attitude toward the real issue, you must define the subject more precisely. In either case, there should be an independent measure of their knowledge of the issue, so that the uninformed group may be sorted out in the analysis.

Finally, validity problems arise, even when the question itself is a good one, when the tabulated results are reported. These results purport to describe public opinion in the area under examination. But frequently they present misleading figures which encourage invalid interpretation.

As an example, Dr. Hyman cited the common practice of sorting opinions by such common factual characteristics as age, sex, political preference, etc. He pointed out that differences of only 5 per cent or 10 per cent are often treated as significant, although such differences may be caused by otherwise uncontrolled factors within these heterogeneous groups. Apparent differences according to political preference, for example, may be due entirely to the differing educational levels within the two major groups. Furthermore, such factual breakdowns group people heterogeneously, without regard to the psychological and sociological differences within each group, which may be tremendously important factors.

The solution to this type of validity problem, according to Dr. Hyman, lies in adequate conceptualization and design of the survey, and in careful analysis of the results, to the end that the actual or implied interpretation is truly valid.

#### DISCUSSION

Dr. George Gallup (American Institute of Public Opinion) stated that his agency was interested in elections and referenda, and that he regarded such devices as a well-nigh perfect test of validity, in that they provide an objective measure of accuracy.

He believes, he said, that "A lot of thinking in this field goes wrong because of a misconception of the job we're trying to do." Indeed, he felt it might be more accurate to describe his work not in terms of "public opinion" or "attitudes," but in terms of sampling referenda. When we report an issue, we say, "This is how the people would vote on this issue if it were put to them today." To do that, it is necessary to pose a dichotomous question rather than an attitude scale. Scales and ratings are helpful in sounding out public opinion in the early stages of an issue, but at some point people have to decide whether they want to vote "Yes" or "No."

Dr. Samuel Flowerman (American Jewish Committee) agreed that polls have established the fact that they can predict elections within a reasonable degree of error, but raised the problem of other attitudinal situations. When you try to measure anti-Semitism, for example, the individual may not be fully aware of his own attitude or he may try to hide it from the interviewer. Dr. Remmers, in reply, pointed out that there are always

discrepancies between verbal and actual behavior, that the objective should usually be to reduce them to a minimum, but that in fact it may frequently be valuable merely to obtain popular stereotypes on the subject without reference to the overt behavior which may conflict with the stereotypes.

Dr. Henry David (British Broadcasting Corporation and Queens College) asked why so much emphasis was placed on prediction of behavior as a measure of validity. He contended that there is validity in other fields of science where there is no way of measuring the accuracy of the prediction. Dr. Julian Woodward (Elmo Roper, Inc.) supported the same view by pointing out that polls frequently measure things which cannot be checked, such as belief in an idea. The true criterion of polling validity, according to Woodward, is "whether you get the same verbal response if you re-interview the person the next day."

Dr. Hyman agreed that the measure of validity is not always the amount of agreement between verbal answers and overt behavior. Such a measure applies, he said, only when that is the express purpose of the study. But there are other situations where such prediction is of no concern. When the objective is to measure attitudes, the problem of validity arises only when you interpret the results of the poll.

Dr. Theodore Lentz (Attitude Research Laboratory, St. Louis), in upholding predictability as the measure of validity, pointed out that all polling results are useful only in their implications. It is not only a question of predicting elections, but of predicting all future events. Poll findings on public attitudes toward Russia, for example, are valid only to the extent that they shed light on our future course toward Russia. Our goal, he said, is to improve the validity of opinion research, so that we may make more meaningful predictions.

Llizabeth Herzog (Correspondence Panels, Bureau of the Budget) suggested the possibility of using the intensive interviewing technique as a check on the validity of the quantitative material obtained by the regular poll. Dr. Hyman agreed that problems of fabrication and "prestige answers" can often be controlled by means of supplementary intensive interviews.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 6

*Sampling Problems*

**Panel Members:**

MORRIS H. HANSEN, Statistical Assistant to Director,  
Bureau of the Census, Chairman

DR. NORMAN C. MEIER, Director of the Bureau of Audience  
Research, University of Iowa; Technical Consultant,  
Iowa Poll

DR. LUCIEN H. WARNER, Associate Director, Research  
Department, **Life** magazine

ELMO C. WILSON, Director of Research, Columbia  
Broadcasting System

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**

Denver, Colorado

**Price**  
**50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
S A M P L I N G   P R O B L E M S

SUMMARY

The question is: WHAT IS THE RIGHT WAY TO SAMPLE IN THE FIELD?

Morris H. Hansen argued the point for using random sampling methods and stated his reasons for supporting the random methods on the basis of economically achieving objective results of measurable precision; he stressed the merging of theory and practice into one in appropriately designed random methods, and questioned the measurability of reliability of results in quota and other purposive methods.

Dr. Norman C. Meier, on the other hand, questioned the validity of the assumption that, although area methods seem well suited for census use and crop estimates, they are necessarily adaptable to public opinion measurement. Area methods guarantee only that the sample is random, not that the sample is necessarily representative of the universe. Quota sampling has certain aspects such as flexibility and adaptiveness which the more rigid area methods lack, and this feature alone can and has yielded more precise results in public opinion work.

Dr. Lucien H. Warner reported the development of a method of local sampling procedure in the research projects of his organization which he believes is a sound compromise between area and the usual quota sampling.

Elmo C. Wilson reported experiments using both techniques of sampling and compared the results from each type. He felt that more research and more experimenting should be done before any definitive decision can be made as to the relative worth of either technique for all purposes and thereby raised the question of whether one method is preferable for some purposes than the other.

CONCLUSION: It was agreed that there is great need for intensive and extensive study of sampling methods, what the limitations are of each, and whether there is a difference in the value of one type as against the other for specified purposes.

Morris H. Hansen

believes attitude or opinion surveys involve three main problems:

1. Sampling
2. Problems of reliability of response including question and questionnaire design, and interviewing relationships
3. Interpretation of results

This session was concerned with sampling only. Hansen suggested that in determining what sample design to use for a particular purpose one must have in mind some basis for comparing the merits of alternative methods -- that for those surveys in which a high degree of accuracy is important only those sampling methods be used which satisfy each of the following three criteria:

1. Methods used should be such that, if the procedures specified are followed and if reasonably large samples are used, the precision of estimates can be measured. In other words, it should be possible, first, to make estimates of certain population characteristics and, second, to derive approximate measures of the precision of those estimates -- indicating the maximum error that may reasonably be expected in the results.
2. Methods and procedures must be sufficiently simple and straightforward that they can be carried out substantially as specified, so that the sampling theory and the sampling practice are in fact the same. When the methods actually followed are precisely or substantially those specified in the theory, then the available sampling theory not only provides the measure of precision but in addition it guides in important aspects of efficient sample design.
3. From among the various methods that meet the above two specifications, that method is chosen which produces the maximum "information-per-dollar" expended. Available sampling theory provides powerful tools for selection of relatively efficient methods from among the various alternative methods that might be used.

It is, of course, necessary that the sample designer have in mind the objectives of the problem and then design his sample so as best to achieve those objectives. He must consider in his planning his available resources and facilities, the restrictions of time and cost, the mathematical and statistical tools available, the known characteristics of the population to be sampled, and the way in which these various factors may best be assembled for his purposes.

To insure the fulfillment of the three basic requirements stated above, it is necessary to use methods in which the final selection of individuals to be interviewed involves a random, or chance, selection, without injecting the element of personal judgment into the determination of the particular individuals to be included in the sample. Results from such a sample may be evaluated objectively without depending upon judgment. Random, or chance, selection of respondents in the sample gives each individual in the population a known chance, or probability, of being included in the sample. Random sampling may and ordinarily does involve stratification and other devices for increasing the efficiency of the sample; and judgment may be used in many aspects of the sample design without any risk of biasing the results, and if the judgment is good the efficiency of the sample will be increased. The only requirement in order to achieve results of an objective character and whose precision can be evaluated objectively is that the ultimate selections be with a known probability of including each individual of the population in the sample. Two classes of sampling methods that it will be useful to distinguish are: random and purposive. There are many types of random sampling, of which area sampling is one; and there are many types of non-random methods, of which the quota method, as widely used, is one.

Hansen remarked that there seems to be an assumption by many that all area sampling methods meet the three criteria of good sampling he mentioned, and that all quota sampling methods do not, and therefore that the consequence of his remarks would be that he would advocate the use of area sampling instead of a quota-sampling method. Actually, this assumption reflects confusion in terminology. Area sampling may be either random or non-random; and if random, may be either efficient or inefficient. Similarly, while the quota sampling approach as commonly used is a purposive or non-random sampling method, quota sampling can and has been carried out in such a manner that the probability of inclusion in the sample of each individual in the population is controlled and known. Area sampling is often used because it frequently is an economical method of carrying out random sampling but this is by no means always the case.

With random methods, statistical theory is available to guide the sample designer in producing the most reliable information at the least cost. The most "information-per-dollar" is measured by reliability of results, and does not necessarily mean the most "interviews-per-dollar." Lack of recognition of this distinction has led to confusion.

In the quota-sampling approach, the element of judgment is introduced when quotas are set up on the basis of estimates of unknown precision, and when the interviewer has an opportunity to exercise his personal judgment in selecting his respondents. Both of these elements of judgment may introduce an unknown and immeasurable bias, and such methods do not meet the criteria of sampling mentioned earlier.

During the early years of the war, the Bureau of the Census used a quota sampling method in the monthly Labor Force survey, a method that in effect involved the use of judgment in estimating quotas on the proportion of rural

and urban dwellings, based on data available from the last census. An objective method was used for selecting the dwellings where interviews were to be made. Quotas were set on the number of schedules to be taken in urban and in rural areas. In the rural areas, it was assumed that the number of dwelling units did not shift as between incorporated and unincorporated areas or minor civil divisions. These quotas were based on past knowledge plus judgments as to how they reflected the current situation. It was recognized that these assumptions were not exactly right, but it was hoped that they were good enough. Now one may, with present knowledge, wonder why such assumptions were made. However, they represented the best judgment of those responsible for the project. No one knew what assumptions to make concerning the changes that had taken place, and this approach looked pretty good -- at least good enough; therefore the survey was designed on this basis.

During this critical period farm employment was estimated to be continuing at about a constant level for a period of a year or two. Finally, however, it was possible to introduce unbiased sampling methods. When this was done, it was found that agricultural employment had actually gone down by about 20 per cent instead of holding at an even level as had been estimated. This instance illustrates how the best judgment available may sometimes not be good enough. When it is important to be right it seems important to use methods that have the insurance already referred to.

Quota-controlled sampling stresses the significance of proportional representation, or stratification. While stratification is a very useful device in sampling and is used in almost all sampling by either random or purposive methods, many misconceptions as to its importance seem evident. It is often assumed that stratification or the use of certain appropriately selected controls to insure a proper "cross-section" is absolutely essential if the sampling is to be representative of the characteristic being measured.

It is not suggested that stratification is not useful, as usually the best design makes extensive use of it, but only that use of stratification is not essential to obtain a representative sample (provided random sampling is used). Stratification alone is not sufficient to insure a reliable result, as is often assumed -- in fact, in many situations stratification results in very little improvement in reliability of results.

Purposive methods often have been found to work very well in many instances in practice; this experience lends confidence to the use of the usual quota method. However, there have been instances when carefully applied quota-controlled or other purposive methods have gone bad, because such methods lack insurance of reliability of results. These methods have demonstrated their usefulness for many purposes, and where only approximate results are desired, and where the loss involved if an error is made is not too high, quota or purposive sampling methods may be the best to use, even though such methods do not meet the criteria of good sampling mentioned earlier. Where highly reliable results are needed, however, a random method may be

the one that will provide the most "information-per-dollar." When opinion surveys are conducted to provide policy-making information on significant national or international problems, the method of sampling used should be the one that produces results of measurable reliability, even if the cost is higher than that of judgment methods.

Dr. Norman C. Meier agreed that area methods seem to satisfy users for Census projects, crop estimates, and related uses. But to jump to the conclusion that area methods per se are "better" for public opinion measurement than quota methods properly administered is pure assumption, Meier believes.

No one has yet demonstrated by actual operational tests under identical conditions that one method is superior to the other. Statistical theory has been invoked to lend credence to claims of area superiority such as "elimination of bias," "guaranteed degree of precision," "insurance of reliability of results," and "scientific sampling design."

Yet all these claims boil down to just this: All that can be "guaranteed" is that the sample so derived is a random sample on the one basis of geography. Theoretically, population (or anything) can be the basis, but geography (area) is the actual means, and the two do not, in studies made by Meier's staff, always coincide.

For public opinion sampling, it is by no means clear as to just what "peculiar magic" inheres in the mechanically derived random sample based on land areas. In polls designed to measure social and political matters, area methods per se may lead to considerable error wherever social or political stratification does not coincide with geographical stratification. On the other hand, quota methods, such as those used by the Iowa Poll can, by virtue of their flexibility and adaptability, be redesigned for any special type of social or political universe (as for example a primary-voter population); and quota methods, when so adapted, can and do produce re- results of increasingly greater precision, as the history and record of election predictions show. This trend toward increasing precision has recently been exemplified in the 1944 election, the 1945 Swedish-Gallup election predictions, and the very recent two-tenths of one per cent error of the Iowa Poll's primary election forecast. Such results have never been achieved by area methods.

In our present stage of knowledge, it can hence be seriously questioned that there is any one method or particular methodology which can be proved "better" for all types of sampling. Anyone may make a plausible case for either type of method by citing presumed mishandling of assignments, presumed weaknesses of one kind or another, or by citing practices of early stages, since corrected or improved. It can be pointed out that the human element must be reckoned with in both, that even area methods require good judgment (as in locating bounded areas correctly), faithfulness and utter honesty in reporting, explicit and foolproof directions. In any method,

inadequate training, poor office work, laxness in pre-testing questions, dishonesty or inefficiency of field personnel will militate against maximum efficiency. But there are checks on proficiency available, and good management, training, and supervision tend toward greater efficiency in both types of method. It is not unlikely that "better" public opinion measurement will come out of constant improvement of methods now in use rather than from any one factor such as random sampling on an area basis alone.

The proof of a method's worth for public opinion measurement should be in results produced, not in statistical theory based on grounds not necessarily appropriate for the purpose. Precision of measurement is the sole objective. By precision is meant just what psychological science means by validity: namely, how closely the sample results approximate the known characteristics of the universe sampled. The term as used by area samplers seems to mean merely how closely the sample results (areas sampled) approximate a random sample of the total area by standard error tests, considering only the geography-universe. By reliability one should mean how consistently on repeated use the method produces consistent results. Repetition by area methods has usually meant using the same areas over and over (thereby hoping to amortize a high initial cost). Quota methods use entirely different respondents for each succeeding poll. Among polls ably administered using quota methods, the record for reliability even under this severe test has been steadily good.

Recently, an occasion was presented in Iowa City to test the two methods under identical conditions for both precision (validity) and reliability. By virtue of a house-to-house survey, practically complete data on the Iowa City universe became available. Thus was provided for use in these studies the known characteristics of this particular universe, as to income classifications, home ownership, rental brackets, and occupational classifications.\*

Five samples of the universe -- of 15, 20, 25, 50, and 100 cases respectively -- were drawn by a competent quota sampler in accordance with standard quota methods. On the basis of areas derived by a competent area sampler, five area samples of identical sizes were available. All the work -- planning, coding, IBM analyses, sample identification -- was done by persons of unquestioned competence.

Here was now an opportunity to measure the precision of each sample drawn, by comparing the characteristics of the sample with the known characteristics of the universe. Thus was eliminated the human element, leaving just the question of how closely the sample represents the universe. There were 25 points of comparison. In 16 the quota samples were closer (more precise); in five there was little or no difference; in four, area samples were closer.

This is only the first stage of the study, the only portion completed. Further aspects of precision will be tested by varying the area samples; increasing their number and decreasing their size. Reliability of each method will be measured by repeating the process with drawing of new samples.

---

\*Dictionary of Occupational Terms

This is offered as a test situation closely paralleling routine public opinion sampling. It conforms to the requirements of scientific methodology in that all conditions except identification of respondents (the variable) are under control.

A far more significant study is under way at present, using the facilities of the Iowa Poll, and running polls alternately by the two methods. This should throw some light on the general question of adaptability of the area method for public opinion work.

It should thus be obvious that much research is in order -- disinterested, thorough-going, competent -- before any conclusions may be drawn regarding the especial suitability of any method for any particular type of public opinion measurement.

Dr. Lucien Warner began by saying: "The organization with which I am associated has been conducting experiments for the past two years and has interviewed many thousands of persons in an effort to develop a questionnaire and a sampling technique suitable for studying magazine readership and circulation. New types of gauges or tests have been developed as have techniques in local and national sampling procedures which are a sound compromise between quota and area types."

Life conducted simultaneous surveys, one on a rigid quota system and one on an area system, applying rotation to individuals within the selected households.

On a national scale, using the nine census divisions, a sample of only 35 counties is used which is representative of the nation as a whole within a reasonable margin. This sample is based on the use of regression formulas which, in turn, were based on a multiple correlation of factors related to magazine readership.

In setting up the national cross-section and in selecting the 35 counties which were finally chosen as representative, the population was stratified by the following factors:

1. Housing characteristics, such as ownership, mechanical refrigeration, and electrification.
2. Economic factors, such as retail sales per family, telephone rental, and per capita tax returns.
3. Social characteristics, such as cultural or educational levels.
4. Degree of urbanization and type of city (industrial, market center, balanced, and institutional).

Dr. Warner described the process of validation of the 35-county sample against circulation of various magazines and a number of socio-economic criteria (home ownership, per capita retail sales, etc.). He listed four conclusions from the Life research to date:

1. That the 35-county sample is representative of degree of urbanization, type of city, and of the social correlates of Life circulation.
2. That the 35-county sample is representative of important social factors other than those on which the sample was planned.
3. That the variance in the social factors and urban concentration in the 35 counties is sufficient to yield a high multiple correlation with circulation of magazines.
4. That national predictions are possible and satisfactorily accurate with the 35-county sample.

Elmo C. Wilson expressed the opinion that more research is necessary before any definitive statement can be made as to which method -- area or quota sampling -- is the better method for all types of work. There appears to be some doubt as to whether any one type of sampling is better for all types of work.

In research on radio attitudes, the best procedures of both techniques are being used. In a fairly recent study, both techniques were used and the results compared. The attitude or opinion responses on the quota-control sample were almost identical with those on a Bureau of Agricultural Economics area-control poll on identical questions; however, there was a large variation in the factual data obtained. As an example, the BAE area sample was fairly close to Census figures on education of head of household and telephone ownership, while the quota-control sample showed considerably higher percentages on such factors. The fact is that on many opinion studies, a high degree of accuracy is not required -- relativities being what is sought. Thus, consideration of cost and speed may recommend quota sampling over the area method. It is certain that further studies will be made on the basis of using both techniques, and that the assets and liabilities of each will be clearly outlined for the prospective user of surveys.

#### RECAPITULATION

Morris H. Hansen added a number of comments in regard to Wilson's study. It is Hansen's belief that identical sampling principles apply to procuring both factual and opinion data. The fact that quota sampling does at times produce unsatisfactory results is an indication that there "is something wrong." A random method does insure

what degree of reliability may be placed in the results on the sample returns themselves; the other method does not offer this insurance. As to methods of testing, random sampling, appropriately applied, makes theory and practice identical. Where high precision is demanded, random methods give the desired result economically.

On important questions of a national or international nature, occasional misleading results are serious. Quota sampling has worked reasonably well in many instances in the past but has sometimes missed badly. There is no way of insuring, in any particular instance, when it will produce satisfactory results or when it will fail.

Perhaps a good rule is: If high-precision results are desired, random sampling methods should be used; if the tolerances of precision may be fairly wide, quota-sampling methods will probably be satisfactory -- and may be definitely superior when cost is considered. As stated before, too much confidence is ordinarily placed in the element of stratification in quota-control.

In all sampling, there arises another problem which must be met -- call-backs. This question is one of great importance. The Census Bureau follows the practice of making call-backs as necessary until, at most, only a relatively small part of the designated sample has not been covered. Costs are reduced by calling back on a sub-sample of non-respondents. It has been found that those persons who are "not-at-home" often differ in many ways from those who are "at-home"; unless one is willing to gamble on an assumption about non-respondents, it is imperative that call-backs be made.

As to Dr. Meier's comparison of area- and quota-control methods in his Iowa City study, with the particular type of random sampling used, even larger chance variations might have been expected, since one can have area samples of all kinds. The design used was not well adapted to the situation. Another area sample could have been designed that would have been superior.

#### DISCUSSION

Dr. Julian L. Woodward (of Elmo Roper) questioned whether "psychological errors" which make precision measurement of many important questions impossible are not much more important than sampling errors. Hansen's stand was that the sampling error should be the least per unit of cost regardless of what amount of psychological error may be present; while the psychological errors may be of great significance in many instances, they are not the topics for discussion in this session.

Dr. Ralph O. Nafziger (University of Minnesota) asked to what degree stratification is currently used in random sampling. Stratification is used in both methods, with gains resulting therefrom, according to Hansen. Stratification, whether good or bad, will introduce no bias; it may improve the

sample, but it cannot make it worse. Stratification is not so important as is generally thought.

Dr. A. J. King (Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State College) expressed the view that, in the marketing field, too little research has been done, and more research is needed. Market research people have used area methods on some occasions. It is true that, in area sampling, it is not possible to do an efficient job without planning, maps, and so on. More surveys using area methods are needed in order to study their efficiency. As more information is gathered, the costs are being lowered. The facilities of the Statistical Laboratory at Iowa State College are now available for those desiring to use area-sampling methods.

Harry H. Field (NORC) stated that at one time NORC considered a city-wide experiment based on area methods, but when the cost estimates for setting up the sample were received, it was not possible to go ahead with the experiment, particularly on a one-time use basis. In reply, Hansen said it is granted that, for use for a single experiment or survey, the cost for setting up the material may be high if reasonably good facilities in the form of a directory, maps, etc. are not available; for continued use the cost of "information-per-dollar" should be low.

Don Cahalan (NORC) before the close of the meeting, brought to the attention of the group a brief description of an experiment run this spring, parallel to, and contemporaneously with the regular monthly study made by the Census Bureau on the Labor Force. Preliminary comparisons with a number of Labor Force items indicate very close agreement despite the differences in sampling methods.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 7

*Public Relations Research*

**Panel Members:**

DILMAN M. K. SMITH, Vice-President, Opinion Research Corporation, Chairman

LT. CMDR. PAUL BERKMAN, Officer in Charge, Evaluation Section, Office of Public Information, U. S. Navy

EDWARD D. WHITTLESEY, Director of Public Relations and Publicity, University of Denver

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**

Denver, Colorado

**Price  
50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
P U B L I C R E L A T I O N S

SUMMARY

The correlation of public opinion polls and public relations has elevated public relations to a level of scientific accuracy and the public relations man to a leading position in the policy-making councils of his clients. By making use of public opinion research, a public relations body can anticipate a trend and build a propaganda program to cope with it. The responsibility of public relations has become two-fold -- to interpret the public to the client and the client to the public.

The position of respect and responsibility which commercial research holds today has made a careful selection of clients even more important than in the past. To render the best possible service and to maintain his own good standing, the wise public relations research director chooses only clients with both a high degree of integrity and specifically defined objectives. Moreover, a representative of the research organization should deal directly with client executives and share in policy making at the highest level.

Dilman M. K. Smith introduced the panel by pointing out the growth of a new and broader concept of public relations, beyond publicity level where the main objective was to erect a pleasing facade between a client and the public. Today, public relations has achieved professional status, with a two-fold responsibility to interpret the public to the client in order to interpret the client to the public. Public relations at the policy-making level means participation by the public relations practitioner (who must be acceptable to the top policy makers in the client group) in long term planning and in the execution of public relations programs recommended on the basis of research.

A useful definition for public relations, which, like charity, begins at home, is "doing good deeds and getting credit for them." Any approach to a public relations problem must be broken down to fit the multiplicity of "publics" -- consumer, labor, employee, government, and others. In the new concept of the profession, no clear line can be drawn between pure market research on merchandising and advertising problems on the one hand and pure public opinion research on public relations problems on the other. The several aspects are usually too closely inter-related to be dealt with except in connection with one another.

Later in the session, Smith discussed at some length the various problems of commercial polling, with emphasis on his belief that successful research depends not on getting a client, but on picking the right client.

The "right client" is characterized by:

1. Willingness to accept the research analyst into management councils, to share in policy making at the highest level: the planning of research, the interpretation of results, and their application to the solution of the problem, with follow-up analysis leading to further research.
2. A high degree of integrity.
3. Well defined objectives. (A research group can and should help define a client's objectives.)
4. A firm belief in the value of continuity in research, and the intention of planning a program on a long-time basis.

Smith stressed his conviction that a research group should deal directly and on a footing of equality with client management. A research organization attached to a firm only as an appendage is doomed to failure. If research is ordered and paid for by an intermediary and the research group reports to the intermediary only -- the advertising agency which audits the account, or a public relations counsel -- reports seldom reach the top management of the client corporation without being subjected to the interpretive biases of the intermediary.

Only through a lasting connection based on client conviction that continuity of research is indispensable will the research group have maximum opportunity to interpret results and so do the client a real service. And the successful researcher must so conduct himself that he will not only be accepted but welcomed into management councils.

In working with a client, a research organization must fulfill definite functions and assume specific responsibilities:

1. The research analyst must assist in the definition of issues.
2. The researcher must take full responsibility for questionnaire development. To hazard losing a client is preferable to allowing a management group to write questionnaires. "You give me the issue, I'll write the questions," should be the unbreakable rule.
3. The researcher; as the technical expert, should take full responsibility for the development of survey plans.

4. In preparing his report on the survey results, the researcher should give as clear and complete an interpretation as possible. The analyst, as a true scientist, should send the client his report only after putting limitations on his data by indicating the validity of the results and their probable error. The point beyond which interpretation cannot go must be made crystal clear.
5. Lastly, the researcher must discuss the report with the client management responsible for policy making and again make clear the limitations of interpretation to which the data are subject.

Ed Whittlesey believes that the development of scientific polling has given the public relations field its greatest assurance of continued success as a profession increasingly useful to business, industry, and education. The only hope for the successful continuation and expansion of the usefulness of the profession is a more scientific analysis of its work, results, and methods. The approach should be made in two directions simultaneously. The techniques of opinion polling and method analysis represented by the deliberations of this conference should be the basis of a concerted effort to achieve truly professional standards in the public relations field.

As an example of the value of public opinion research applied to a public relations problem, Whittlesey described an experience of the National War Agencies (publicized as a result of a hearing before the Sub-Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate on the budget of the Office of War Information). A survey conducted by NORC revealed that a poster distribution plan, originally operated through the cooperation of the Boy Scouts had become ineffective. By a change in program, the distribution of government posters to retail merchants was made more efficient, and a substantial financial saving was effected.

Whittlesey then discussed the use of a public relations activity chart as a "self-evaluation, media analysis check-up." The purpose of such an evaluation is (1) to restate public relations problems, as revealed by utilizing public opinion research methods, in terms of definite objectives -- listed at the top of the chart; and (2) to restate the problems again in terms of the desired goal to be achieved by the application of public relations techniques -- listed at the bottom of the chart. At the side of the chart are listed all media which are used regularly in the public relations program. The squares in the middle of the chart (where problems and media meet) are colored, the color covering sometimes part and sometimes all of the square. The keyed use of color indicates the effectiveness of the media in helping to solve the particular problem listed at the top. The percentage of the square colored shows to what extent the media is used in the public relations program at any given time to the end of solving the problem.

Paul Berkman began by saying that, in the earlier part of the war, the attitude of the Navy towards public relations could best be described in terms of the "silent service" tradition. The Navy, in other words, would do its job but would not concentrate on publicizing its accomplishments. As the war progressed, however, increased attention was paid to the Navy's public information program, and late in 1944, the Evaluation Section was established in the Office of Public Information to provide systematic measures and indices of how the Navy stood, public-relations-wise, in terms of trends and with reference to the other services.

Two complementary approaches were used: (1) public opinion surveys, and (2) analyses of armed service content in various media of mass communications. In 1944, a survey of armed forces content appearing in a sample of 104 nationally distributed newspapers revealed that only 6 per cent of all newspaper space was devoted to the armed forces, and less than 1 per cent of all newspaper space related to the Navy. Furthermore, Berkman said, the Navy was considerably under-represented in terms of the proportion of news devoted to the individual serviceman.

To help remedy this situation, the Fleet Home Town News Center was established in Chicago to furnish home town newspapers with stories of local Navy men. Concurrently, the Evaluation Section designed a survey of newspaper editors to determine whether they wanted this service, and if so, what kind of material they wanted to receive. The responses to the survey, conducted by NORC, proved that editors wanted as much news as possible about their home town boys and also indicated definite preferences for certain kinds of copy about the local boy. These indications were utilized extensively in the preparation and distribution of stories from the News Center. Following the initial findings of the Evaluation Section's research program, a continuing study of armed forces press content showed a definite improvement in the placement of news about the Navy.

Among problems facing the Navy that could be attacked through the use of public opinion surveys, was the question of whether stories of individual ship damage (such as the USS FRANKLIN) could be released without adversely affecting public morale. A survey conducted to answer this question found no decrease in public morale or in public confidence resulting from the release of such news. This evidence gave the Navy a green light to relax security restrictions on such types of public information material.

Another Navy Evaluation project concerned the readability of Navy press releases. In this study, the "Flesch Formula" was applied. The variables considered included: (1) length of sentences; (2) word complexity and abstractness; and (3) frequency of personal references. The study, which showed that Navy press releases were frequently difficult to read (for the average newspaper reader), focused attention on the necessity for increased effort to make releases as readable as possible despite the technical subject matter with which many Navy releases deal.

All in all, the experience of the Evaluation Section adequately demonstrates the usefulness of public relations research for providing, as Mr. Whittlesey has pointed out, a "yardstick to measure public relations problems and objectives." The Navy's public relations research program, combining public opinion surveys with media analysis, has proved to be effective both as an attention-focusing instrument and as a continuing measure of progress in meeting public relations problems.

#### DISCUSSION

From the public relations panel discussion there came specific requests for including in the program of the next conference sessions on:

1. Coding problems, categorizing, and the semantics of coding and code construction.
2. Analysis and report writing.
3. Graphic presentation of results of research.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 8

*Wording and Order of Questions*

**Panel Members:**

- DR. FLOYD L. RUCH, Professor of Psychology, University of Southern California, Chairman
- DR. THEODORE LENTZ, Director, Attitude Research Laboratory, Washington University
- DR. LASZLO RADVANYI, Director, Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion
- JACK ELINSON, Research Technician, Troop Attitude Research Branch, Information and Education Division, War Department

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

**Price**  
**50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
WORDING AND ORDER  
OF QUESTIONS

SUMMARY

The panel members agreed that the problem of wording questions merits the most earnest consideration of all polling organizations. Although there is still need for a great deal of experimentation in this field, studies made up to this time point to certain practices that are considered as sound, and others that are regarded as unsound.

Dr. Ruch pointed out the different reasons questions may be bad, giving examples of "bad" questions. Valerie Tamulonis presented some of the preliminary findings of her M.A. thesis which deals with question-wording. Then Dr. Radvanyi told about some of the difficulties that polls face in Latin American countries, where a high degree of illiteracy prevails. Dr. Lentz described a continuing study he has made in which he aimed to determine the full meaning of a certain opinion by studying the correlates of the opinion. In conclusion, Jack Elinson was requested to describe some of the experiments the War Department has made in opinion scale analysis over the past few years.

Dr. Floyd L. Ruch opened the panel by telling the story of Mr. Ziegfeld who predicted to his writer that a certain gag wouldn't go over. As the audience rolled in the aisles, Ziegfeld admitted, "They're laughing, but they don't mean it." In other words, behavior is a pretty satisfying concept, but it is not always regarded as valid when the judge wills not to believe it.

Polling is 50 per cent a bag of tricks -- empirical knowledge gained the hard way -- and 50 per cent principles, according to Dr. Ruch. The formulating of question wordings is a job which cannot be approached in isolation, since almost every other phrase of the polling process is dependent upon or conditioned by question wordings. John J. Jenkins' blueprint for writing questionnaires\* presents the thesis that a question can be bad for one of four varieties or groups of reasons. A question is bad if it:

1. Biases the answer through leading and loaded wording.
2. Fails to determine sufficiently the direction of response through use of ambiguous wording.
3. Directs the response into artificial categories.

\*"Characteristics of the Question as Determinants of Dependability," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1941.

4. Exceeds ability or willingness of respondents to answer.

Dr. Ruch cited this example of a biased question: "In order better to enjoy the scenic splendor of California, it is proposed that legislation be enacted to remove all highway bill boards and signs. Do you approve or disapprove of this action?" It's not surprising that 65 per cent approved and 35 per cent disapproved.

Election predictions and studies on social issues are quite different matters, Dr. Ruch pointed out. It is obvious that an election question should be dichotomous, that it be stated in categories that are going to prevail on election day. But, in studying social issues, it is necessary to get background and descriptive information in order to have general insight into the entire situation. The check list is the chief means of providing this needed information.

Any check list used on a ballot must be complete. If some of the categories are left out, the respondent tends to read into the remaining categories certain areas he would regard as otherwise taken care of if he had the total list. In preparing the check list, it is necessary to walk the tight rope to avoid over-determining and under-determining categories. If you mention a series of categories and ask people to select from the given alternatives, people will choose from one hierarchy of categories. However, if a couple of the alternatives are left off, the responses would be based on a different hierarchy.

In discussing questions which do not sufficiently determine the direction of the response, Dr. Ruch gave as an example: "What kind of soap do you like best?" The word "soap" is not sufficiently directed. What kind of soap is meant -- laundry soap, facial soap, or what?

A good illustration of the ambiguous term is one Jenkins mentions. A study was being made of photographic film. No difficulty was encountered with the question, "Do you take many colored pictures?" until Negro respondents were interviewed.

To avoid exceeding the respondent's ability to answer a question it may be necessary -- according to Dr. Ruch -- to give the question cognitive structure -- to more-or-less brief the respondents on the issues involved. But this briefing has to be done with delicate hands, he warned, because at some point, establishing cognitive structure gives way to leading respondents to answer in a particular way. Perhaps one of the best ways to be fair about this would be to call in eloquent antagonists, asking each to sell his point of view as well as he can.

Another way to keep the question within people's range of understanding is to watch the words used. How necessary this is can be seen from the fact that the largest number of "No opinion" answers is almost invariably found among the less educated groups. A person who doesn't understand a question

is likely to take cover in this category, as it is less embarrassing to say, "I haven't made up my mind," than to say, "I don't know what you're talking about."

Some of these difficulties can be overcome by such means as defining terms or helping a person to recall a certain concept by formulating the questions in logical or time order, etc. A valuable reference in wording the questions is Thorndike's list of the 10,000 words most frequently used in the English language. Perhaps a working principle could be -- if a word doesn't appear in the first 5,000 it should be explained.

In closing, Dr. Ruch commented on questions which exceed people's willingness to answer. If answering a question honestly would be embarrassing for a person, if he should fear reprisal, the results would be invalidated. One way to make it easier for a person to give his honest opinion is to present, in one of the alternatives, a rationalization for what otherwise might be an unpopular answer. Another way is the use of secret ballots.

Valerie Tamulonis, a graduate student, University of Denver, was then asked to present her preliminary findings on her M.A. thesis dealing with the problem of question wording.

In analyzing some sixty questions from AIPO and fifteen from NORC that were asked on split ballots between January, '45 and March, '46, Miss Tamulonis said that her study is pointing in these directions:

1. Order of questions  
When two inter-related questions are asked, any influence that order and placement of questions might have on people's responses is due mainly to people's tendency to comply with a previous answer given.
2. Choice of words
  - a. Prestige names. A prestige name has a decided influence on the responses when opinion is not solidly structured, and if the name carries high prestige-value. For example, two questions were asked about whether or not the War and Navy Departments should be combined and run as one department. One of the questions read, "General Eisenhower says the Army and Navy should be combined..."; 49 per cent of the people approve of "one department" when Eisenhower is mentioned as favoring the plan, but only 29 per cent approve of the idea when he is not named.
  - b. Stereotyped words. Such words as "trusted," "politics," "big business," and "labor union" often carry derogatory connotations, and if included in a question affect the answers.

3. Stating the alternatives

- a. Expressed and implied alternatives. There is a suggestive element if a question is asked in terms of one alternative and it is not made evident that other alternatives exist. This is especially true when there is little information on the issue.
- b. Argumentation in favor and against an issue. A question which states the issue and, in addition, states a negative (or positive) aspect of the issue, tends to lead the respondent in the direction the argument points -- unless the person holds his opinion very strongly.
- c. Order of the alternatives. The alternative placed last in a question generally receives the higher percentage of affirmative responses.
- d. General vs. specific alternatives. If a question is phrased in terms of a specific, concrete situation, rather than in a general way, it will have more meaning for the respondent. For example:
  - (K) "If a young single woman is doing exactly the same kind of work which she is doing as well as a married man with children, do you think she should receive exactly the same rate of pay?"
  - (T) "Do you think women should or should not receive the same rate of pay as men for the same work?"

In the specific question, (K), 66 per cent answer "Yes," as compared to 77 per cent answering "Yes" to the more general question.

Dr. Laszlo Radvanyi gave a brief history of the Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion, of which he is director. The organization has been making regular surveys since 1942. When the poll first started, surveys were made only in Mexico City. Operations were later extended to include the Federal District. Today, the sample includes all cities having over 10,000 inhabitants. By 1947, the Institute hopes to be able to make a complete national survey. The staff is already advising groups in Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, and Cuba on organizing public opinion polls in their countries.

When the Institute was founded, some of Dr. Radvanyi's friends wrote to him suggesting that a poll among Mexicans would be impossible because the people would be unwilling to answer. But this fear proved to be unwarranted. On

the contrary, some people who are interviewed write seven or eight-page letters saying how glad they were to have been able to give their opinions.

Two years ago, a second institute was organized, the Institute for Studies in Social Psychology and Public Opinion. The first study this Institute made was among social scientists, journalists, and other persons known for their special interest in public opinion measurement. Questionnaires were sent to people in the United States, England, Canada, and other countries where public opinion research organizations were operating. Reporting on the results, Dr. Radvanyi stated that a small majority of those polled consider public opinion measurement as a science, and nearly one-fourth believe that, if it is not yet scientific, it has the possibilities of becoming scientific in the near future.

Turning to the working problems of public opinion institutes in Mexico and other Latin American countries, Dr. Radvanyi said that he believed that the problems there are different from those that polls have in Canada, England, the United States, and certain other countries. The difference is due chiefly to:

1. The high percentage of people who do not read newspapers in Latin American countries as compared to newspaper readership in other countries.
2. The high percentage of people who do not read and write at all.

When people do not read newspapers, they not only lack information, but they also lack an understanding of the meaning of words, Dr. Radvanyi explained. To illustrate his point, he described the case of several Mexican students who were asked to make a little study of public opinion while they were on an excursion in Guatemala during 1944. They asked people their opinion about the war. The respondents asked, "What war?"

Because of these facts, it is nearly impossible to formulate questions that don't need explanations. But this creates two problems:

1. How to word the questions.
2. How to word the explanations.

Wording the explanations is particularly dangerous because of the possibility of influencing respondents to answer in a certain way. Also, the length of explanations is something that needs watching. For this reason, the Institute avoids the use of "cafeteria questions." Consider how long a question would be if each of five possible categories carried with it a 250 word explanation of what the category meant. If this type of question is used, each alternative is put on a different card, and the interviewer shuffles them to avoid bias insofar as possible.

Commenting on the chapter on question wording in Harry Field's book, Midien-do La Opinion Publica, Dr. Radvanyi said that he completely agreed with all of Mr. Field's points except one -- that expressions such as "dying of hunger" influence emotions and should be avoided. If we would avoid all words that arouse emotions, we would not get opinions of real persons, but of people like academicians. We need to find out what the whole person thinks, Dr. Radvanyi pointed out.

The different meanings of words presents another serious problem. Words mean different things to different social and educational groups and even to the same person at different times in his life. The Institute has made several surveys on the meaning of words. In a study made in two Central American countries, it was found, for instance, that in one country, the expression "good employment" meant working six days. In the other it meant working one day and playing the next.

Dr. Theodore Lentz Director of the Attitude Research Laboratory at Washington University, began his discussion by saying that he would attempt to:

1. Illustrate an effect of wording when the change of wording is quite pronounced.
2. Illustrate that the full meaning of any question or item of opinion can be developed by the process of item synonymization, that is, by determining the correlates of the opinion.
3. Suggest the need for recognizing the relationship between opinion studies at the two levels: the psychological (study of the individual -- his attitudes, personality, etc.) and the sociological (the study of society, communities, nations, etc.)
4. Illustrate that opinion study might operate under a hierarchy of purposes without surrendering scientific objectivity, but, on the other hand, laying claim to a relatively large measure of humanistic utility.

Dr. Lentz described one of the studies he made among 400 high school seniors and college freshmen and sophomores. These students were asked to express their opinions on the following two items, which will hereafter be referred to as "key items":

1. I prefer to be a citizen of the world rather than a citizen of one country.
2. World patriotism should be second to national patriotism.

The answers fell into the following four groups:

- A. The consistently international -- 37 per cent, endorsed the first item and negated the second item.
- B. The consistently national -- 29 per cent, negated the first item and endorsed the second item.
- C. The inconsistent, but consistently "acquiescent" -- 17 per cent, endorsed both items.
- D. The inconsistent, but consistently "negative" -- 17 per cent, negated both items.

Mentioning that some might interpret the inconsistency of 34 per cent of the population in groups C and D as evidence that the poll is unreliable, Dr. Lentz said that interpretation of these so-called inconsistencies could be made against a background of other items and other populations.

Then Dr. Lentz explained how he selected the students for his study. He chose a group of "World Citizens" (WC) and "National Citizens" (NC). The WC's consisted of 150 cases from group A above and the NC's consisted of 100 cases from group B above.

Then, the WC's and NC's were asked their opinions on 59 other items. These items were of three types:

1. Those obviously related to the two key items, those involving the issue of nationalism vs. internationalism.<sup>1</sup> For example:

<u>Difference</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>World Citizen</u> <sup>3</sup>	<u>National Citizen</u> <sup>4</sup>
-51	7	58

"I am not willing to surrender my allegiance to the United States in order to give it to a World Government."

1. The fact that none of these items correlate 100% with the key items, along with the fact that the two key items do not correlate 100% with each other, constitutes a measure of the effect of change of wording with more or less inevitable change in meaning, Dr. Lentz stated.
2. Percentages in this column are the differences between the "World Citizens" and the "National Citizens."
3. This column shows the per cents of World Citizens endorsing the item.
4. This column shows the per cents of National Citizens endorsing the item.

<u>Difference</u>	<u>World Citizen</u>	<u>National Citizen</u>	
+46	73	27	"I would be more willing to serve and support an international police force than the military force of my own nation."
-45	38	83	"I would not want to pay more income tax to UN than to the United States."

2. Items less obviously related to the issue of internationalism vs. nationalism, and bearing on the matter of inter-race or inter-group tolerance.

<u>Difference</u>	<u>World Citizen</u>	<u>National Citizen</u>	
-31	18	49	"The Japanese race is, on the whole, crafty and treacherous."
-28	13	41	"Would you mind working with a Negro?"
-17	31	48	"The Jews usually get the best of the bargain."

3. Items frequently referred to as blind or invisible, and which may eventually prove useful where accuracy necessitates the reduction of the factor of "fakeability," which in turn is a function in part of invisibility. These are illustrated by the following:

<u>Difference</u>	<u>World Citizen</u>	<u>National Citizen</u>	
+31	55	24	"Our courts should be in the hands of sociologists rather than lawyers."
-29	49	78	"The age of six is the logical age to start to school."

<u>Difference</u>	<u>World Citizen</u>	<u>National Citizen</u>
-26	45	71

"Cleanliness is a more valuable human trait than curiosity."

The above study finds that the World Citizen is not only more internationally minded but more racially and inter-group tolerant and more liberal on matters of religion, sex, and education, Dr. Lentz said.

This line of research illustrates the possibility of pursuing opinion study from a point of view of a major over-all purpose. Lentz suggested that first there be a highly-agreed-upon general purpose, such as that of peace -- the elimination of war. As a supporting purpose there could be that of internationalizing the government, developing a World Sovereignty with the correlative development of loyalty to a world government ideal -- what might be called world-mindedness. The correlational approach presented here is proposed as a procedure for answering these questions:

1. What is world-mindedness? What are the opinions of a World Citizen -- his mental and emotional characteristics -- his distinguishing psychological marks?
2. To what extent does the population of a given area or class consist of individuals who measure up to various standards of World Citizenship?

In summary, Dr. Lentz stated:

1. The effect of change of wording depends upon the degree of meaningful change in the question wording.
2. The real meaning of any particular item can be best sensed through studying the correlates of opinion.
3. This involves intensive study of small samples of individuals in which we get increasingly clear pictures of the personality of persons who do or do not hold a particular opinion.

Jack Ellinson was asked to tell about some experiments in scale analysis that the Information and Education Division of the War Department\* (with which he is connected) has been making among soldiers.

---

\*The surveys were made by the Research Branch, Information and Education Division, Army Service Forces.

He spoke primarily of the experiments concerning the measurement of the intensity of feeling with which a particular attitude is held. After each attitude question, an intensity question was asked. Then each man was scored on an attitude content scale (degree of favorableness) and intensity scale (strength of feeling). When related to a scale of content, such a scale of intensity produces a U or J-shaped curve. The lowest point of this curve indicates the zero point on the scale of content and the point of lowest intensity. This analysis permits the separation of the population into groups with positive and negative attitudes.

The general theory behind this kind of scaling is this: If people have extreme attitudes, they will feel intensely. Thus, people with higher content scores to the positive side of the zero point would also have higher intensity scores. On the other hand, people with neutral attitudes will not feel strongly on the question.

If a scale pattern exists for a set of items for a given population, it makes it easy to make predictions from these items, Elinson pointed out. If a scale exists, then people can be assigned simple scores, and each score will represent a distinct type of person.

Another advantage of the scale analysis method is that it avoids so many "question-wording" problems. Regardless of the specific wording of questions asked, a series of questions which form both a content and an intensity scale will produce an invariant U-shaped curve, that is, a curve that will stay put regardless of the particular sample of questions used.

So, if two investigators started out with completely different sets of questions in a single attitude area, or with different wordings of the same questions, they would end up with the same distribution of the population into favorable or unfavorable groups on the attitude universe studied. In other words, no matter what questions are asked, biased or loaded, if they come from a scale, one will always meet the same zero point, and come up with the same shaped curve.

However, the scale is relative to the population, Elinson stated. For example, certain questions on attitudes about army life "scale" for air force technical schools, but do not "scale" for air force ground crews. Also, if the same items and the same procedures were used with upper and then lower income groups, the curve may not look the same, and the zero point may not be the same. It has been found that men who have attended college feel very strongly about certain things, and men in the lowest educational group feel slightly less intense about things.

When asked how many interviews are adequate to pre-test questions to see if they "scale," Elinson said that 100 are usually considered adequate, but he preferred 200. Testing can be done by re-phrasing questions, and then re-testing them to see if they still scale.

A delegate from the floor then asked if this method is more realistic or better than the Thurstone scale of procedure. Elinson replied that it was a much more simple method -- 100 judges are not needed to judge questions.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 9

*Use of Special Groups*

**Panel Members:**

MRS. ELIZABETH HERZOG, Head, Correspondence Panels,  
Bureau of the Budget, Chairman

DAVID WALLACE, Director of Research, **Time**

ROBERT E. HARVEY, Sales Manager, National Analysts, Inc.

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**

Denver, Colorado

**Price  
50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
USE OF SPECIAL GROUPS  
(CORRESPONDENCE PANELS)

SUMMARY

Panel members pointed out the functions and usefulness of correspondence panels to complement regular polls in showing intensity of interest and of feeling, loss or gain of interest in current problems, emotional reaction toward problems, extent of information about subjects, reasons for the opinions reported, qualification of attitudes, the basis for shifts and trends in attitudes, and differences in the reactions of various groups.

In the discussion concerning mail ballots, it was concluded that the group questioned must be homogeneous, and that the mail ballot can be used successfully if confined to certain groups and certain subject matter. The advantages of the mail ballot over the personal interview are: it removes chance for interviewers' bias, provides more informative and qualified answers, and cuts down the percentage of "No answers" on individual questions.

Elizabeth Herzog opened the session by describing the method used by the "Correspondence Panels," a public opinion unit now in the Government Information Service, Bureau of the Budget. These panels, set up in 1942, were first used by the Office of War Information as a guide in shaping information programs. They soon showed their value for other purposes. Today, the correspondence panels unit serves any and all governmental agencies. The findings are restricted to government use.

The method used by the Correspondence Panels is qualitative, in contrast to the quantitative methods usually followed in opinion polling. It is like the "mass observation" technique used in England, at least in recognizing the advantage of employing more than one method; the qualitative findings of Correspondence Panels throw light on the quantitative findings of opinion polls, and vice versa. In other words, the Correspondence Panels service employs a stereopticon approach--bringing together and synthesizing the two different types of data. About 50 per cent of the work done by this unit consists of correspondence panels studies. The remaining 50 per cent is devoted to maintaining a clearing house for public opinion polls and surveys, and to analysis and synthesis of these public opinion materials.

Correspondence panels are flexible, speedy, and inexpensive. The time taken for a survey varies from two days for a telegraphic "quickie" to two months for a "full dress" study. Questions are sent to six groups, or

panels, divided by occupation: editors, labor spokesmen, housewives, social workers, clergymen, and small businessmen. It has been difficult to maintain the ideal panel size -- two members of each occupational group in each of 68 sample areas worked out by the Bureau of Census.

Aside from occupation and location, the chief requirements are that the correspondents be reasonably articulate and reasonably free from special bias. The correspondents represent a wide range of background, from nationally known editors to country parsons and small town housewives.

Correspondents are used as informants rather than respondents. They are asked to report, not their own personal opinion, but opinion as it stacks up among the people they know and meet. Accordingly, they are not regarded as a sample, but rather as "coverage." For present purposes, the advantages of this usage outweigh the disadvantages.

Open-ended questions are used almost exclusively, and results are presented in words rather than in figures. Full discussion is invited, and all relevant material is used in the analysis -- including the many volunteered comments on points not specifically covered by the questions.

Answers and discussion are carefully coded to provide a basis and check for analysis, but the quantitative findings are the means to the end rather than the end product. Content analysis is used to catch significant repetition of words, phrases, or names. Results are reported in terms of "majorities" and "minorities" or rough proportions -- never in percentages or number of cases falling into a certain code classification.

Correspondence panel analysis can make a valuable contribution in:

1. Providing a rounded picture of popular opinion on an... issue.
2. Indicating degree of interest.
3. Revealing the kind and degree of emotion with which the public regards an issue.
4. Indicating the general level of information, and the areas of confusion or misunderstanding.
5. Showing quality of attitudes -- doubts, qualifications, contradictions.
6. Suggesting bases for attitudes -- reasons for and against.
7. Indicating shifts and trends in attitudes and opinions.

For the most part, the Correspondence Panels show agreement with the findings of public opinion polls and surveys in the relative emphasis of opinion for or against an issue. Published findings of other public opinion organizations are regularly used either as footnotes to the Panels studies, or in a separate supplement which brings together available public opinion materials on the subject.

In the two or three cases where the Panels findings have differed significantly from those of other public opinion organizations, the difference has seemed to arise from the fact that open-ended questions permit greater qualification of opinion. As an example of such difference, Mrs. Herzog cited the question of the British loan. AIPO findings showed a majority opposed to the loan. The Panels found less absolute disapproval of the loan, since many people qualified their answers; many showed a readiness to accept alternative forms of payment, and many said that the United States would have to lend England the money anyway. Panels analysis also revealed the reasons why people favored or opposed the loan. Most of all, however, this study revealed (1) a degree of ambivalence, confusion, and contradiction that defied capture by a simple yes-or-no question; (2) a prevailing lack of information on the subject; and (3) a correlation between information level and opinion. Consistent with this last point, an NORC study showed that a bare plurality of those who knew about the loan expressed disapproval, but that when the purpose and the advantages were mentioned, a larger plurality approved.

On the question of whether the United States should send food to Europe, the Panels found less readiness to help than the opinion polls showed -- again because of strong qualifications which at times negated the avowed willingness to share this country's food supply.

Correspondence panels also disclose whether or not a question evokes a strong emotional reaction. The studies on the San Francisco Conference and on the housing situation revealed unusually intense emotion associated with these problems.

As a further function, Panels analysis can indicate shifts in opinion. OPA was once generally condemned; later it was generally favored, though often with qualifications. Formerly the OPA in Washington, D. C., was most heavily criticized; later the local OPA was judged more harshly. Another example of shifts in opinion is found in the use of the phrase "socialized medicine." This phrase was once a hostile label, used only to denote disapproval. Now, however, some people use the term even in reporting approval of government-sponsored medical care.

Through the use of the Panels, certain stereotypes have been revealed. For instance, small businessmen tended to describe "The Worker" as a shiftless type that never worries so long as he has a job. But labor spokesmen reported a great deal of concern among employed workers as to the future of the employment situation.

Panels have shown certain group reaction tendencies. Businessmen and labor spokesmen, for example, often report exactly opposite viewpoints as the opinion of the general public. These contrasts are most sharp on domestic -- particularly economic -- issues. Moreover, businessmen as correspondents tend to report opinion as unanimous, while editors and labor spokesmen are more apt to indicate divided opinions and to report group biases.

David Wallace reported that the Time magazine mail ballot experiment had proved to the satisfaction of the research staff and their special consultants, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Raymond Franzen, that:

1. Mail questionnaires can secure valuable material (much more than people think) and results which "check out" with other sources.
2. The use of the mail ballot is entirely justifiable if confined to certain groups and certain subject matter. Wrongly used, the mail survey can become a dangerous instrument.

Properly used, the mail ballot offers certain definite advantages over the personal interview. The mail ballot:

1. Eliminates the possibility of interviewer bias.
2. Elicits much more information and many more qualified answers than does the personal interview.
3. Minimizes the number of "no answers" to questions.

Wallace described the experiment which Time magazine conducted to find out what types of persons would reply to a mail ballot and to compare the amount and type of information secured by mail ballot and by personal interview. Lists of Time subscribers\* were sent a series of questionnaires with covering letters purporting to come not from Time but from other "front" organizations with "prestige-bearing" titles printed on attractive letterheads. A satisfactory percentage replied by returning at least one questionnaire. Several weeks later, data secured on the mail ballot were checked by personal interviews with the subscribers to whom questionnaires had been sent. (Interviewers were not told which respondents had replied on the mail survey and which had not.) Time obtained a representative sample of personal interviews among both groups: those who had returned one or more mail questionnaires and those who had returned none.

---

\*At one stage of the experiment, for example, 3,000 Time subscribers with surnames beginning in "Fa" were used. For additional details, see Tide, March 29, and August 16, 1946.

In both sets of comparisons (1) between persons who replied to the mail ballot and those who did not, and (2) between the data secured by the mail ballot and the data secured by personal interview -- the validity of the entire experiment, in fact -- depend on the homogeneity of the sample. Time subscribers as a group are characterized by incomes in the upper brackets and by a high level of education. (70% have attended college, and more than half of these -- 40% of all subscribers -- are college graduates.) "For most practical purposes," Wallace stated, "the mail questionnaire sample was a good sample of the universe of Time subscribers."

On most questions used in both mail and personal interview surveys Time found no significant differences between the answers of those who replied to the mail questionnaire and those who did not. Respondents themselves were found to differ in several respects:

1. Persons who had attended or graduated from college replied more often than those with less education.
2. Residents of the Midwest were more likely to answer than those living in New England.
3. Persons living in smaller cities replied oftener than those living in large cities.
4. Many who returned questionnaires were typical "opinion givers" -- people who hold club offices, write letters to newspapers and to congressmen. A number of these were persons of importance in their communities.

In comparing data secured by the mail ballot with that obtained by personal interview, replies by mail were more satisfactory in that they provided:

1. More detailed and probably more accurate information on education. Respondents consistently reported a higher degree of education in interviews than by mail. The incidence of "some high school" or "some college" was considerably higher in mail answers than in the interviews, while "completed high school" or "completed college" occurred oftener in personal interviews.
2. More accurate information on economic factors such as income and purchasing power. Mail answers showed a wider spread; people were more willing to report extremes of incomes -- particularly in the over \$10,000 a year bracket, or ownership of expensive refrigerators. Personal interviews find respondents tending to approach a "middle class" stereotype.
3. Much more qualified and much more informative answers. A mail reply is filled out at leisure and thus produces a more thoughtful answer.

4. Fewer refusals. People answer personal questions more frequently in an anonymous mail reply when the bias that comes from the respondent's desire to impress or conceal from the interviewer is eliminated. Five times as many persons refuse income data to an interviewer, for example, as refuse to answer the same question by mail. One reason for this, Wallace pointed out, is that the type of person who will take the trouble to answer a mail ballot will usually answer all the questions.

In conclusion, Wallace reiterated his warning as to the limitations of the mail ballot technique. Among certain types of groups which are more or less homogeneous, it is thought that the mail questionnaire can be used to a greater extent than it is now. This type of mail questionnaire cannot be used for regular polls, but must be used for homogeneous groups such as Time subscribers.

Robert Harvey emphasized his belief that no one research technique is adequate for all types of problems -- that experimentation and development along all lines are vitally needed. It is of utmost importance that the purpose and ultimate objective of a project be defined with care before the actual research is begun.

Surveys, especially market surveys, include too many "post-mortems," too many questions like "What radio did you listen to?" "What magazines did you read?" There should be more studies based on questions looking to the future, such as "What are you planning to do?" "What would you like to hear?" More research is needed along the lines followed by the automobile industry before the war in their "styling" and "convenience" studies.

Harvey feels that business needs to know more about the buying tastes and habits of "average" people. As an experiment, National Analysts, Inc., has made lists of their own interviewers who are "average" (but possibly biased and supercritical because of their interviewing experience). These people, about whom all possible information has been secured, form the nucleus about which an "average" consumer cross-section is being built. The first experimental panel project, a readership study on tastes in literature, has found a high degree of correlation between panel and interviewing techniques. As yet, these efforts are experimental and not worthy of documentation, Harvey believes, but later this panel may become a yardstick to furnish valuable editorial guidance.

#### DISCUSSION

John F. Maloney (Reader's Digest) wondered whether, after the present critical period, correspondence panels like the one maintained by the bureau

of the Budget would not go out of operation because of lack of informants. Elizabeth Herzog expressed her belief that the so-called "critical period" would last longer than Maloney apparently anticipated.

How can informants be secured without compensation? What motivation is used besides emotional appeal? To these points raised by Lucien Warner (of Life magazine), Mrs. Herzog replied that, at least in a government-sponsored operation, the emotional feelings of importance and interest associated with panel membership appear to be compensation enough for most informants, but that these feelings must be stimulated by careful application of the personal touch. Miss Keo Currie (Vice President and Research Director, Needham, Louis, & Brorby, Chicago) agreed with Mrs. Herzog and commented that it was surprising how many able informants were glad to volunteer for commercial panel work. Dr. Clyde Hart (of the OPA) mentioned that one Republican Congressman has a correspondence panel of his own, including as informants both Republican and Democratic residents of his home district.

In consumer panels, Harvey suggested, cost must be recognized as a factor. Such a panel is organized on a premium basis, and members get points toward premiums for the number of questions returned and answered. Later in the discussion, Lewis Forman (National Analysts, Inc.) mentioned a trick in motivation -- capitalizing on the tenacity of children -- which has proved successful with consumer panels of housewives. To insure the careful daily recording of the data desired, gift premiums are offered to the children in the households, who see to it by constant reminders that their mothers remember to keep their panel records conscientiously.

Lucien Warner raised an important point: "Do panel members improve with age, or do you eliminate a certain percentage each year?" Mrs. Herzog answered that the Correspondence Panels have a very small turnover and that informants tend to become more observant with experience. A more rapid turnover would probably be desirable, however, if panel members were used as respondents rather than informants.

David Wallace asked whether correspondence panel members were strictly informants or whether they used their own opinions more than the ideas of other people. Mrs. Herzog finds that answers divide about 50-50. Many informants give both their own opinions and those of others, and it is very easy to tell by the answers which is which. Editors usually report public opinion as they see it, not their own editorial opinions.

"Do respondents tend to exaggerate their incomes when they are interviewed by mail?" and "Is there any way to check the honesty of their replies?" were questions directed to Wallace by Ed Whittlesey (Public Relations Director of the University of Denver). Time has found that, when asked what class they belong in, respondents sometimes tend (though less often on mail ballots than in personal interviews) to "compress at both ends." People in both the upper and lower income groups tend to put themselves in the middle income brackets. There is no way of checking the honesty of the replies except by rule of thumb, and a certain percentage of error is assumed.

In response to a further question by Whittlesey, Wallace stated that, while a specific call-back on a given percentage of respondents to check on factual statements (such as the value of refrigerators) had been considered, such an experiment had not yet been actually tried.

Maloney commented that, in personal interviewing, refusals often run high on questions regarding education, income, and other points. To a question raised by Hart, Harvey reported the same satisfaction that Mrs. Herzog had felt with results obtained from open-ended questions.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 10

*Radio Research*

**Panel Members:**

HUGH TERRY, Manager, Station KLZ, Denver, Chairman  
ALLEN MILLER, Director, Rocky Mountain Radio Council  
MRS. JEANETTE SAYRE SMITH, formerly in radio research,  
Harvard and Columbia Universities  
ELMO C. WILSON, Director of Research, Columbia  
Broadcasting System

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:  
**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

**Price**  
**50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
RADIO RESEARCH

SUMMARY

Members of the panel and others who participated in the discussion indicated fairly general agreement on several points:

1. Commercial radio has a very definite social responsibility to render constructive service to the public.
2. To what extent and under what circumstances radio can be used to change people's attitudes constitutes a fundamental problem concerning which further and more definitive research is vitally needed.
3. The possibilities of radio as a medium of adult education have, to date, been only partially realized.
4. Radio research financed by private foundations has in many cases proved more valuable than research projects supported either by commercial groups or by the government. A permanent foundation with a well-rounded continuing program might provide a continuity of research and other advantages heretofore unobtainable.

Considerable difference of opinion was expressed on two issues:

1. The most satisfactory means of presenting the results of radio (or other) research -- the relative merits of reporting data in rather technical, as against popular, non-technical terms.
2. The most reliable method of measuring program preferences.

Allen Miller opened the panel by emphasizing the need of more adult education through the medium of radio. Most people stop being educated too early; although reasonably well informed when they leave school, to too many individuals the end of formal education means the end of creative thinking. To meet the needs of our democracy, adult education through radio and other media must reach a much larger proportion of the people of the United States.

One of the functions of radio research should be to increase the usefulness of radio as a means of further educating the public. Whether radio can help create a public with generally improved attitudes depends upon the tools which research can give the artist who designs radio programs. Without these tools or with only rusty tools, the program designer, as well as the radio advertiser, must try to "get by" with guessing as to what the American people like, want, and need.

Radio looks to research to give the industry a clearer understanding of people and what it is that moves them. Then radio can make greater contributions -- first, to general public information, and, second, to more effective advertising. It must be recognized that American radio is and will continue to be commercial radio.

Posing a question of unlimited importance to radio men, Miller asked: "Can radio, through the medium of emotional stimuli, reach people so that they will react rationally?" Research, he implied, can give the answer. Tentatively, however, radio professionals believe that people react emotionally the greater part of the time. Hitler's successful use of emotional tools for his anti-social ends seems to verify this viewpoint. Consistent with the hypothesis that the American people, as well as the German or any other people, are touched more by emotion than by logic, Miller stated that he is more concerned with what radio research can reveal about changing attitudes than with merely cold statistical facts -- the apparent end-all of many studies.

Regardless of the comparative pull of emotion and logic, research should indicate to radio how its social message can be put across more effectively. Paul Lazarsfeld's audience research project was mentioned in this regard.

Finally, research must answer the question as to whether or not attitudes can really be changed and, if so, for how long a period of time. Miller is eager to learn the residual when attitude is seemingly changed by radio. Although he sees it as a most difficult task, he believes it imperative to solve this problem. Finding when and how attitudes can be changed by radio is important not only to organizations especially interested in adult education, but also to the entire broadcasting profession. He expressed optimism that research along these lines may become practicable in the not too distant future.

Jeanette Sayre Smith critically reviewed the history of radio research, outlining its various problems and shortcomings.

Because most people hesitate to bite the hand that feeds them, the type of report prepared on radio research depends upon the employer and the source of the financial remuneration -- a primary difficulty in all radio research.

In the early days of radio research, post card ballots used the recall method to determine the size of the audience, a device employed primarily by advertisers who were anxious to invest their money wisely. Then in the period of university research, Dr. Hadley Cantril wrote The Psychology of Radio (1935), an analysis of radio content and of experiments with listeners. Early radio research was limited by lack of funds and was frequently characterized by inconsistent laboratory methods and conditions.

At Ohio State University, several studies were made of radio broadcasts designed for public schools, and the actual classroom use of such programs. The Princeton Radio Project concentrated on studies of radio and the social context, notably The Invasion from Mars, an analysis by Hadley Cantril, and Radio and the Printed Page, an analysis by Paul Lazarsfeld. The Princeton project also produced two research volumes on the panel technique, methods of asking questions, and similar problems.

Radio research projects have been sponsored by various foundations, the chief of these being the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. A typical small study sponsored by the Foundation was of the program, "America's Town Meeting of the Air," which was found to "educate only the educated." A dozen studies of this nature were never published. Reliance upon foundations for future radio research, however, is unwise, because their interest often runs out. Another objection to foundation projects is the fact that reports are too often written up in highfalutin' language.

Because radio research is too expensive, as well as being out of their field, government agencies have done almost no surveys among radio listeners. Often private foundations finance the research studies which are necessary to enable the Federal Communications Commission to carry out Congressional mandates.

There have been two outstanding exceptions to the practice of no radio research on the part of government agencies. During the war, when special considerations made study of information and propaganda operations by the government acceptable, the Office of War Information conducted a great many surveys to ascertain the effectiveness of domestic radio programs; OWI also made a study of programs broadcast to troops overseas. Recently the Division of Program Surveys of the Department of Agriculture -- headed by Dr. Rensis Likert -- was able, by planning the project in conjunction with its own research program, to undertake a study to help FCC solve certain problems involved in handling channel broadcasting.

A great drawback in research done by government agencies, Mrs. Smith feels, is the lack of cooperation among them and their failure to inform one another concerning their research or their findings. For effective research, far more cooperation is needed among government bureaus. Again, lack of funds sufficient to finance adequate research is a serious handicap.

The fear of divulging trade secrets lies back of much of the unwillingness on the part of commercial researchers to pool their findings. The net

works test audiences constantly, but results are not revealed because the companies wish to keep the information for themselves. Outstanding commercial studies include one on daytime serials made by the National Broadcasting Company, and another on Kato Smith programs by the Columbia Broadcasting System. The National Association of Broadcasters, Mrs. Smith believes, suffers from paranoia and feels that everyone is against it. This feeling may limit the usefulness of the NORC-Lazarsfeld study for NAB on what the American people think of radio.

Additional specialized research is needed on special problems, such as children's programs; experimental work on types of programs is also needed. Since such studies require interpretation, Mrs. Smith thinks they should be sponsored by universities and foundations rather than by commercial interests. Such research could be done by a radio research institute, as proposed by Seipman, but financing such a program is difficult. The government cannot support it, and support by the radio industry would tend to limit the acceptance of the findings.

Elmo C. Wilson first commented on the exchange of research findings among various government agencies. As an example of the difficulties obstructing intra-governmental cooperation, he cited an instance which occurred when he was with an agency which conducted a study among German war prisoners to ascertain musical preferences. This study was used for purposes of guiding broadcasts to the German people and fulfilled a genuine need, yet another government agency declared such an expenditure wasteful. As a result, the operation was threatened with a Congressional investigation of "improper use of government funds."

As a recent entrant into the field of radio research, following a background of experience of a number of years devoted almost exclusively to opinion measurement, Wilson has found the new field disappointing in some respects -- as compared to the broader area of public opinion research -- and stimulating in others. The Columbia Broadcasting System's program of research is planned primarily to ascertain station and network coverage -- which people can and do listen to the radio, preferences of the radio audience, and reactions to the radio product. CBS is interested not only in the popularity of a given program in terms of the number of people listening to the program at a given time, but also in the contribution which the public believes certain programs make to the general cultural standards.

Yet, Wilson believes, much of the research used in the industry up to the present has been inadequate. Many methods are archaic, and some of the techniques used in the past and at the present seem ridiculous. The telephone coincidental survey, for example, is not an effective instrument to measure the popularity of any program, he contends. Within certain limitations, such methods have applications, but none of them today give a real definition of radio program popularity.

There are other problem areas, Wilson added, in which radio research, up to this time, has not contributed enough to effect changes. One problem -- the amount of public dissatisfaction with radio commercials -- is pointed up very strongly through the results, not only of one or two questions, but through a series of correlations in the NAB study prepared by NORC. Criticism of radio in general is closely related to criticism of commercials.

CBS is continuing research on what constitutes not only good, effective, selling commercials, but also is studying what kind of commercial will not irritate the public and thus affect its attitude toward radio in general. One of the tools being used in this and other types of program research is the Lazarsfeld-Stanton Program Analyzer -- one of the most significant developments in radio research today.

The Columbia Broadcasting System does a great deal of research the results of which are not published. The company feels justified in keeping these findings confidential since CBS is in a competitive field and because the results are made use of by CBS as soon as the study analysis is completed.

A program to study the effect of radio programs on attitudes has been launched by CBS. Wilson feels that this area of radio research must be enlarged. He believes that radio has a definite obligation to bring a message of public service to the people, and, furthermore, that radio should be obligated to find out whether or not it is doing a good job in fulfilling this responsibility. CBS recognizes this responsibility, and is planning and carrying out a research program with this in view.

#### DISCUSSION

Dr. Herbert Hyman (Brooklyn College and NORC) questioned Mr. Wilson concerning the issue of competitive, private use of research. He asked why CBS should want to keep for its own use the educational research accomplished. Wilson replied that CBS was trying to do the best network job and consequently kept its results confidential.

Hugh Terry (KLZ, Denver) referred to the problem of reporting research in so-called highfalutin' language. He said that this again brought up the problem of "who is doing research for whom." Dr. Hyman explained that in many cases the language was designed to dignify the research copy in order to sell it within the industry. Dr. Arnold J. King (Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State College) added that the reporting was kept more or less technical to keep the respect of technicians in the field. He suggested that each research organization set up a department to popularize their data. Wilson, however, pointed out that much radio research was designed to be used by fairly sophisticated radio administrators, and that it is not generally necessary to popularize research analyses presented to such administrators.

Mrs. Elizabeth Herzog (Correspondence Panels, Bureau of the Budget) commented that the ability to present technical material in popular language is a gift, and it is not to be expected that all persons engaged in any field of research should have mastered the difficult art. Dr. Norman C. Meier (Department of Psychology, University of Iowa) mentioned as an example of a book well written yet scientific, Psychology for the Fighting Man, an account of 20 years of accumulated psychological research.

Along the same line, Dr. Samuel Flowerman (American Jewish Committee) mentioned a further point. He believes that all social science material should be translatable to the general public. What to retain and what to toss overboard in the interpretation and use of technical language in a report constitutes a problem often encountered in handling data within any and all of the social sciences.

Another viewpoint was advanced by David Wallace (Time). He pointed out that different types of audiences require their own types of material, and that it is impossible to accomplish all purposes with any one style and pattern of reporting.

All radio research is designed to assist the industry in accomplishing one or both of two important objectives -- to make radio pay and to help society -- according to Dr. Henry David (British Broadcasting Corporation and Queens College). In his opinion, research becomes important at the point where radio and people come together. How are people's listening habits affected by marriage, by having a baby, by other important events in life? If research could answer such questions in anything like concrete terms, the radio industry would be able to approach on a totally different basis the problem of what radio should do for people. Mrs. Smith remarked that studies cannot be done to find out what the radio should do because that is social theory. It is only possible to find out how the audience reacts to the current product. Dr. David added that some assumptions must be made about "what makes people tick."

The study of attitudes, thinks Mrs. Smith, provokes the question of why people have such attitudes. So why not read psychology books? Dr. Hyman expressed the viewpoint that to demonstrate empirically that certain general psychological principles apply to particular behavior situations, specifically to behavior associated with radio listening, would constitute a valuable contribution to radio and other fields of research. Then the radio researcher would have at his disposal a body of general psychological knowledge and principles which could be applied to dealing with radio problems. For instance, general psychological principles have shown that minority group (racial and religious) prejudices are general attitudes, that resentment tends to be directed impartially against members of more than one minority group -- that such attitudes are not based on specific experience with any single group. Knowledge of this general principle would be of great value to a person planning a radio program designed to educate the public away from race prejudice. Similarly if the radio researcher knows the general psychological principles which apply to race attitudes

in, for instance, their growth in relation to specific age groups, radio programs designed for audiences of different ages can be handled in different ways. Likewise information about the rigidity or change of attitudes is of significance to the designer of radio programs. All this goes to show that general theories about such kinds of behavior are very valuable in the specific case of radio: The mere demonstration that radio behavior is based on the same principles as "human behavior" would make available to radio people a whole arsenal of principles already tested by the psychologists.

The radio industry has sabotaged every effort to develop sound radio research, in the opinion of Dr. George Gallup (American Institute of Public Opinion). According to him, CAB (Cooperative Analysis of Broadcasting)\* has done the best job of measuring program preferences. Yet the higher Hooper (C. E. Hooper, Inc.) and Nielson (A. C. Nielson Co.) ratings are almost always quoted rather than the CAB figures which are usually lower. The higher figures represent poor research, Gallup believes. If good research is not supported, how can better research develop? Wilson, on the other hand, disagreed with the statement of CAB's superiority, and thinks that Neilson's figures are closest in fact. Though holding no brief for either CAB or Hooper methods, he pointed out that the industries' preference for Hooper was related not to the size of the ratings, but to the quality of the device offered by Hooper. Dr. Gallup, however, maintained that CAB coverage of cities was more complete and that its methods were superior to those of Hooper or Nielson. The accuracy of automatic machines which run a month needs to be established, he pointed out, suggesting the mechanical difficulties to be considered in the use of even short range devices.

Dr. Meier commented that the University of Iowa has the facilities for doing certain types of radio research of public value. Richard Baxter, a graduate student in psychology at Iowa, added that because it is hard to secure money from universities, research has had to turn to commercial interests -- an unfortunate alternative, particularly when social issues are concerned. Baxter described a study in which 30 short news stories were transcribed and played before certain groups. The only variable was the story content. Interest scales were used to measure reactions to the various stories, and questions were asked to reveal attitudes on several aspects of radio news presentation and coverage. Persons cooperating in the experiment did not constitute a definite cross-section, but reactions to each news story were studied through correlations with occupation, sex, age, and other individual data.

---

\* The organization suspended its rating operation July 31, 1946.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Panel 11

*Newspaper Research*

**Panel Members:**

JOE BELDEN, Director, The Texas Poll, Chairman

DR. RALPH O. NAFZIGER, Director, Division of Research,  
School of Journalism, University of Minnesota

DONALD R. MURPHY, Editor, **Wallace's Farmer and Iowa  
Homestead**

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:

**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**

Denver, Colorado

**Price  
50 Cents**

PANEL ON  
NEWSPAPER RESEARCH

SUMMARY

Five different types of newspaper research were discussed. These included studies on the following: readership ("reader interest"), readability of copy, content, attitudes (toward newspaper policy and services), and call-backs on news sources. The emphasis of the discussion centered around readership and readability research.

There was general agreement that, in order to progress, the newspapers should use a number of closely coordinated types of research to learn more about their market and their product. It was also agreed that the responsibility lies upon the researchers to inform editors and publishers on the advantages and limitations of various research tools in the situation of a specific publication. It was conceded that research can be a useful tool in the formation of editorial judgment but should not be considered as supplanting judgment.

Another point winning general assent was that research must be tailored to the needs of the individual newspaper, that one must use caution before assuming that the findings of one survey apply to all newspapers. Concern was also voiced over the necessity for developing new research techniques, especially in attempting to measure intensity of readership.

Readability research was generally recognized as a useful tool to promote simplicity in writing in order to tailor news reporting to the level of the reader. It was pointed out that readability tests increase in value when tied in with research on readership.

Joe Belden opened the session with a quotation from an article by Dr. George Gallup, Director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, in Advertising Age. The main contention of the article was that, while most large enterprises in the country have turned slowly but surely to research as a basis for sales and important policy decisions, one large enterprise -- the newspapers -- have not done so. Supporting this view, Belden added that most newspapers have usually followed the "hunch" method in selecting and rejecting features.

A "packaged research service for newspapers" was described by Belden, who, as Officer-in-Charge of the Navy Evaluation Section, Office of Public Information, developed such a project during the war. The service, which he believes would be of value to many publishers, involves these four elements:

1. Readership research -- the study of what people actually read.
2. Content analysis -- a survey of what material the newspaper actually prints. (There is a connection, Mr. Belden pointed out, between readership and content research.)
3. Readability research -- the analysis of the readability of any given material through the application of the Flesch Reading-difficulty Formula. (As with their content analysis studies, Belden stated, the Navy Office of Public Information made some effort to coordinate readability studies with readership research.)
4. Opinion research -- what readers think of the newspaper as an institution and a purveyor of news and entertainment.

The Flesch Reading-difficulty Formula, while not the first to be developed, is the simplest method yet evolved. Dr. Rudolf Flesch, a Viennese lawyer and semanticist, earned his PhD. at Columbia University by working out the readability formula and the procedures for its application. As criteria for measurement, the formula takes into consideration the following factors:

1. Sentence length. Longer sentences are harder to read.
2. The number of difficult words. Difficulty is determined here in terms of the number of prefixes and suffixes built onto a given word-root.
3. The number of personal references. This category includes personal pronouns and words such as mama, papa, aunt, uncle, etc., which make reading more understandable.

The Flesch formula, Belden explained, is simple in application. Samples of the material to be graded are checked for average sentence length and tallied for the number of prefixes, suffixes, and personal references. Long sentences and difficult words make for a higher readability score, personal references for a lower score. The readability of the article may then be graded according to one of the several scales that have been evolved. It may be compared, for example, with the general reading level of specific magazines such as True Story, Reader's Digest, and The Scientific Monthly, or it may be scaled according to the reading level of school grades. In this connection, it was pointed out that the grade levels of readability are arbitrary and do not, in themselves, denote intelligence.

Dr. Ralph O. Nafziger (of the Journalism Department at the University of Minnesota) added that a correction formula for Flesch's grade levels had been worked out. According to the new formula, the "sixth grade" is translated into an age level of about 15 years. This means that tested material scaled to the sixth grade level would be of moderate difficulty for the average fifteen-year-old.

Dr. Ralph O. Nafziger during his portion of the panel discussion, described a newspaper research program conducted by the School of Journalism at the University of Minnesota. The organization, which has been in operation for about three years, works under contract to individual newspapers. The contracts specify the purposes of the studies and require the newspaper to obtain the school's consent before using survey results in promotion. (The program is financed by funds from newspapers using the service and by a small yearly grant which the university provides for background research and experiments in methodology.) According to Dr. Nafziger, this service has enjoyed excellent cooperation from the Minnesota papers, including their two principal clients, The Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune and the St. Paul Pioneer-Dispatch.

Some thirty or forty surveys have been completed thus far. The following four types of studies have been employed:

1. Readership studies -- Some of these studies involved a comparison of the relative readership in small towns with a fairly heavy newspaper circulation and that of readership in larger cities. For some newspapers these studies are conducted on a continuing basis, while others are on a short-term contract.
2. Newspaper content studies -- These analyses of what material may actually be found in a newspaper are conducted in connection with readership surveys for purposes of comparison.
3. Attitude studies -- These studies are conducted to determine public attitudes toward newspaper services, and personnel, specifically, and toward the newspaper as a whole.
4. News-accuracy check -- News sources are checked, by interview, to determine whether or not they have been accurately quoted in the newspaper and to check whether or not the paper generally reports the news as it is received.

On readership studies, Dr. Nafziger has found that the percentage of reader confusion (false recognition of some news items which the respondent says he has read when he has not) is much smaller than would be expected: "We have as much evidence that readers under-rate what they have read, as we have evidence that they over-rate things they have not read."

Editors and publishers might well be educated to make better use of the information derived from readership studies. There is a tendency among the men in the newspaper business to expect too much from the studies and to be disappointed in the low level of readership for specific stories which the survey results reveal. Editors and publishers must be taught to attach more importance to the trends and relationships revealed by the research rather than to compile readership figures on individual items in the paper.

#### DISCUSSION

In the general discussion following, Dr. Nafziger drew on his experience with the University of Minnesota research program to answer the questions posed by other conferees during the session.

Wilfrid Sanders (Canadian Institute of Public Opinion) raised a question regarding the types of stories over-rated and under-rated on readership surveys. Dr. Nafziger replied that respondents are really quite frank in their answers as to what they have read. From the limited findings of the Minnesota research program, it appears that the lighter types of story often rate higher in readership than more significant stories. The banner story, which only occasionally gets the top readership over all the other items in the city papers, receives even less attention in smaller dailies and weekly papers. Readers are generally faithful to fixed features such as columnists, sports stories, or specific comics like Dick Tracy.

The question, "In what types of research are editors most interested?" asked by Joe Belden, brought an impromptu comparison of the separate interests of Texas and Minnesota publishers in newspaper research. Texas publishers, according to Belden, are concerned with opinion surveys on general policy, and some do not want minute breakdowns on readership studies. Minnesota publishers, Dr. Nafziger has found, are very interested in straight public opinion research on what the readers think of their papers. They are more interested in finding out what their public thinks of them, than in determining what articles are most read.

Ed Whittlesey (Public Relations Director, University of Denver) asked how readership studies have benefited newspapers and newspaper readers. Dr. Nafziger emphasized his conviction that such studies, if misinterpreted or misused, may be harmful instead of beneficial. Publishers sometimes take results of readership surveys so literally that they toss out good material. For example, many publishers have cut out such features as book

reviews, which, though they have a small following, are read by the people who are opinion leaders, thus lending an importance to the column not associated with the bare readership figures.

Another related instance cited by Dr. Nafziger concerned a serial story which had been running in the newspaper for years with a very low readership as revealed by survey results. The story was dropped from the paper and the response was immediate and emphatic. It was found that the few who read the serial followed it with intense interest. The dilemma was finally solved by putting the serial back into the paper.

On the positive side, Dr. Nafziger stated, newspapers have derived extra benefits from newspaper research by checking the results of back surveys constantly for such things as details on readership of advertising. There is always more material to be obtained by reworking readership data.

The problem of readership intensity, which has been previously mentioned, is one that would be emphasized more than it is if it were possible to obtain a greater number of trained interviewers. Lloyd Borg (Minnesota Poll) suggested that a more complete report of group breakdowns would help to measure the intensity of interest in such features as the crossword puzzle, which is low in readership but of intense interest to those who work them. Dr. George Gallup (AIPO) pointed out that interviewing might be spread over two or three days to determine how much was remembered the first, second, and third days after reading. Dr. Nafziger explained that the Minnesota research program is unable to carry out such studies because a shortage of trained interviewers makes it difficult to obtain the greater number of interviews required for detailed group breakdowns or for continuing surveys within the limited time allotted for the survey.

Following the question-answer portion of the discussion, conferees offered random suggestions based on their experience with newspaper research.

J. T. Miller (Meredith Publishing Company) expressed the view that research is not a substitute for editorial judgment but rather a tool to sharpen judgment. Editors, while they accept readership research, need to be reminded of this in order that they may make better use of the survey results.

The need for more and better-utilized newspaper research was generally recognized by those attending the session. It was pointed out, however, that newspapers are beginning to become aware of the need to modernize through research.

Henry Kroeger (Iowa Poll) suggested that readership surveys might be of great value to advertising departments, providing them with some objective basis for knowing just what circulation their ads might expect, depending on size, position, etc.

He called attention to the fact that the published circulation of a newspaper does not necessarily indicate the readership of any specific page

of that paper. Readership research can determine the true circulation of a newspaper. Published readership results are used more often by national advertising departments than by local advertising agencies. Packaged advertising, which does utilize research, should encourage more newspaper studies.

William McPhee (Research Enterprises, Denver) directed the following question to Dr. Gallup: "What would advertising men see in a program of promotional research on public service questions as well as on brand preferences, shopping habits, and other items directly concerned with advertising problems?" Dr. Gallup replied that, through the use of such research, newspapers should be able to feed copy ideas to their advertising departments.

In a comparison of the two services, Dr. Gallup pointed out that the radio industry is far ahead of the newspaper business in the utilization of research. Radio has several types of audience measurement which keep personnel on their mettle. Newspapers, on the other hand, tend to doubt the utility of research. Advertising men, when purchasing radio time, know what they are getting; when buying newspaper space, they are insecure. More newspaper research actually would help newspapers to get more national advertising.

Readership surveys might perform an added service to the community at almost no extra cost by including on the questionnaires used for the studies a number of questions dealing with topics of the day, according to Henry Kroeger.

Lloyd Borg suggested that readership research among the younger generation (including persons from twelve to eighteen years of age) would be valuable to newspapers, providing them with data which might be used to chart newspaper policy in the future.

Donald R. Murphy in final discussion of the panel described the application of the Flesch readability formula to Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead, of which he is editor. In order to determine whether simpler language made for a higher readership, the following experiment was conducted. An article, originally written on the eighth-grade level, was re-written down to the fifth-grade level. The two versions were then printed in different runs of the magazine, and the readership checked on both articles. Contrary to expectations, the fifth-grade version, which it was assumed might be too simple to hold interest, ran from about 15 per cent to 13 per cent higher in readership than did the eighth-grade version.

On the basis of this and other experiments, Murphy wondered whether or not the readability level of articles in farm publications might well be maintained on about a sixth-grade level of reading difficulty.\* He cautioned,

---

\*According to the 1940 Census, the median educational level for adults 20 and over is 8.3 years; for adults 25 and over 8.4 years.

however, that the experiment should be repeated on a variety of topics, since subject matter is usually more important than style in determining reader-interest.

The subject matter of an article written down to the sixth-grade level need not necessarily be confined to the elementary, Murphy added. One can take very complicated material and, by dealing with it in down-to-earth, specific terms, manage to keep it at a low readability level. An additional benefit in the conducting of readability studies is the salutary effect they have on writers of copy, who, when they know that the studies are being conducted, strive to write more clearly and simply.

#### DISCUSSION

Over-simplification may be just as bad as a too difficult style of writing. Dr. Floyd Ruch (University of Southern California) raised this problem which he encountered in revising an elementary psychology text. Publishers tend to feel that if one simplifies beyond a certain point, the effect is to create resentment because readers feel they are being patronized.

To support this contention, Donald Murphy submitted evidence based on a readership study of a rewrite in a farm educational bulletin concerned with the treatment of swine diseases. In an attempt to be concrete, the bulletin was written in a narrative style similar to this: "Johnny had a sick hog, and this is what he did...." The low readership of this simplified version indicated that the patronizing kind of treatment tended to alienate the reader. The organization of material which is associated with a higher readability level is often more coherent than the so-called "simpler" writing style.

"Is it permissible to use figures of speech rather than concrete examples in writing copy at a low reading level?" Answering this question, also asked by Floyd Ruch, Murphy stated his belief that figures of speech are not in themselves in conflict with readability -- most people are familiar with them in the form of clichés.

Commenting on readability, Allen Miller (Director of the Rocky Mountain Radio Council) remarked that most textbooks are written to impress the writer's colleagues and, therefore, often are not at all readable. Teachers tend to feel that an enjoyable book will not teach well -- they unfortunately feel they are lowering themselves when they simplify.

Joe Belden added that most best-selling novels are written on a low readability level, which fact should point a moral to anyone who writes for a large public.

1946  
Central City Conference  
on  
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

**CLOSING GENERAL SESSION**

**Presiding:** DR. JULIAN WOODWARD, Research Department,  
Elmo Roper

Compiled and Published by the Sponsors of the Conference:  
**THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER**  
**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
Denver, Colorado

## CLOSING GENERAL SESSION

The closing session of the Central City Conference might well be described as a beginning instead of an ending, since it not only marked the conclusion of the first national public opinion research conference ever held, but it also initiated positive action to implement the purposes and ideals for which the conference was held.

A set of resolutions, designed to set in motion a campaign to promote public opinion research as a tool for furthering democratic processes throughout the nation and the world was presented to the delegates attending the session. The resolutions were prepared by a volunteer committee, revised according to suggestions made during the conference, and introduced by Dr. Stuart C. Dodd. After discussion and modification, the resolutions, as listed below, were approved unanimously:

1. It is the sentiment of this conference that a second conference on public opinion research be held in 1947, and that a Continuing Committee of five, elected by this conference, be empowered to make all arrangements for the 1947 meeting.\*
2. This conference favors the creation of a national association of opinion research organizations, dedicated to the improvement of research standards and to the wider employment of opinion research techniques.
3. This conference delegates to a Committee on Standards, the responsibility of representing it in working with the nucleus committee.\*\*
4. This conference favors the ultimate establishment of an international organization for the encouragement of opinion research on a world-wide scale. This conference expresses its hope that foundation subsidies can be obtained to aid in establishing this world organization. This conference further asks its Continuing Committee to appoint a committee to implement this resolution.

---

\*Harry A. Field, Dr. George Gallup, Dr. Julian Woodward, Dr. Clyde W. Hart, and Lloyd E. Dorg were elected to serve on the Continuing Committee.

\*\*Named to the Committee on Standards were: Morris H. Hansen, Dr. Henry David, and Elmo C. Wilson. The nucleus committee referred to consists of Dr. George Gallup, Elmo Roper, and Archibald Crossley, who have announced plans for organizing an association of polling agencies.

5. The participants in this conference hereby record their earnest appreciation for the pioneering vision of Harry H. Field in creating this first conference of workers in the field of public opinion research and for the effective way in which he and his staff of NORC have planned and carried through the conference program.

Dr. Henry David suggested that the conference resolutions might include an explicit statement regarding the purposes to be achieved through public opinion research. Dr. Theodore E. Lentz urged that emphasis be placed upon the need for further scientific research on all phases of the polling process itself. It was the sentiment of the group that the appropriate committee should consider these suggestions but that they need not be incorporated specifically into the general resolutions.

David Wallace pointed out that, since most of the resolutions were concerned primarily with operational and technical procedures, some provision might be made for putting the conference on record as favoring activity to promote high standards and to further the purposes of public opinion research. His proposal for a public relations program to clarify and publicize the purposes of public opinion research was formally approved by the conference group. The Continuing Committee was delegated to assume the responsibility for formulating a statement of the principles which this conference believes in and principles relating to public opinion research for purposes of publication. It was also decided, upon a second motion by Wallace, that the Continuing Committee should be responsible for whatever public relations program seemed called for to carry out the mandates of the conference body.

The program to improve research standards might well place special emphasis upon scientific study as a means of perfecting polling techniques and all other phases of public opinion research, Dr. Clyde W. Hart stated. Upon the suggestion of Dr. Dodd, Dr. Julian L. Woodward, who presided at the closing session, instructed the Continuing Committee to emphasize, in preparing its statement of purposes, the importance not only of scientific research in polling processes but of the uses made of the scientific results of polling.

In this connection, Dr. Floyd Ruch added that it might be advantageous to include in the public statement some special comment on the contribution that universities have made and are able to make as a means of stimulating academic interest in the field of public opinion research. In obtaining university assistance for scientific research, Dr. Ruch contended, the physical sciences are faring much better than the social sciences.

Further clarifying the duties of the two committees as related to the work of the body which already had taken certain steps toward association (Gallup, Roper, and Crossley), Dr. Woodward submitted and the delegates approved a suggestion that it be the responsibility of the Continuing Committee to communicate to the other body the sentiments of the Central City Conference

as they applied to the activities of the proposed association of polling agencies. Both committees were further instructed to cooperate with the other group in every way possible to achieve the end of creating an active organization to carry out concretely the aims in which the Central City Conference and the three planners are alike keenly interested.

Robert N. Ford expressed the opinion that wider publicity should be given to the accomplishments of the Central City Conference and to similar conferences in the future. He suggested that perhaps The Public Opinion Quarterly might wish to devote a special issue to the work of the conference. Dr. Woodward added that the proceedings of the conference should be made available, in usable form, and with comments, to other interested journals. Dr. Lucien H. Warner made a more general proposal that all those attending the conference might themselves take the responsibility for informing others in the field as to the conference and its implications. Harry H. Field invited members of the group to assist in compiling a list of names to be used as a basis for a program to distribute panel reports among opinion research experts not present at the conference.

Dr. Henry David nominated the following conference delegates to serve as the Continuing Committee proposed in the first resolution: Harry H. Field, Chairman, Dr. George Gallup, Dr. Julian L. Woodward, Dr. Clyde W. Hart, and Lloyd L. Borg. The nomination was seconded by Dr. Stuart C. Dodd, and the nominations were closed, automatically electing the proposed members to the committee.\*

The selection of a second committee to represent a wider viewpoint of a more inclusive range of public opinion experts than the Continuing Committee was suggested by Dr. Woodward. The second committee, to be known as the Committee on Standards, is expected to have a particular interest in research standards of organizations reporting research results to the public. Nominated by Dr. Hart for the Committee on Standards, and unanimously favored by delegates to the Central City Conference, were Morris H. Hansen, Chairman, Dr. Henry David, and Elmo C. Wilson. The primary responsibility of this three-man committee is to confer with Gallup, Roper, and Crossley and to offer any possible aid in setting up the new association of polling agencies.

Harry H. Field, representing NORC as the host-agency of the conference, expressed a final word of appreciation for the cooperation evidenced by all delegates:

"In my opening remarks I said I was awfully happy to see you. Little did I know how happy I was. Having you here has been a tremendous pleasure for me and all NORC. You have seen for yourselves a team that works. This whole conference and the running of it would have

---

\*The Continuing Committee subsequently appointed Dr. Dodd and Dr. Gallup as co-chairmen of a subcommittee to be concerned with international polling problems, particularly the development of a "Barometer of International Security" and the possibility of being of service to the United Nations. This appointment was to carry out instructions received in Resolution #4.

been impossible without the tremendous cooperation that we had first from members of NORC and then from you. I said at first that this was your conference, and I think it was you who made it a success, and it was we who gave the time and place."

Dr. Julian L. Woodward adjourned the meeting after a concluding comment:

"We all feel Harry has started something here, not for our field of activity alone, but for democracy itself. In passing the resolution of appreciation for his efforts we did so with our hearts. It is far from the usually perfunctory gesture of thanks for making the conference arrangements and doing its housekeeping. We owe a real debt of gratitude to Harry and NORC for what they have done."

P R I C E   S C H E D U L E S

COMPLETE:

<u>The Proceedings of the Central City Conference on Public Opinion Research</u>	Quantity	Price Per Copy
	1 - 4	\$5.00
	5 - 24	4.50
	25 - 39	4.00
	40 - 99	3.50
	100 or more	2.50

SINGLE PANELS:

1. Public Opinion and International Affairs	<u>Each includes the Program, Who's Who, and General Closing Session in addition to the report of the topical panel.</u>	
2. Technical and Ethical Standards in Public Opinion Research		
3. Interviewing Problems		
4. Local (City or State) Survey Problems		
5. Validity in Public Opinion Surveys	Quantity	Price Per Copy
6. Sampling Problems	1 - 9	\$.50
7. Public Relations Research	10 - 49	.35
8. Wording and Order of Questions	50 - 99	.30
9. Use of Special Groups	100 - 249	.25
10. Radio Research	250 - 499	.20
11. Newspaper Research	500 - 999	.15
Special Radio Broadcast	1000 or more	.10

Send orders and inquiries regarding other NORC publications to:

THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER

University of Denver

Denver 10, Colorado