I write today to thank AAPOR’s members for giving me the opportunity to plan the 58th Annual Conference for the Association – it was an honor and a pleasure.

I especially thank the membership for giving me the opportunity to take some chances, to move the conference in some new directions, and to allow our discussions to take on some important but difficult issues. My attempts at innovation certainly stirred some controversy, which made the experience all the more challenging. But in the end, it appears that all turned out reasonably well and, I hope, will help the community of survey research professionals to feel an even stronger bond, a more powerful sense of collective mission and importance, and a clearer sense of our potential for constructive impact.

In this essay, I offer some reflections on two of the principal themes addressed by conference events: survey response rates, and criticisms of our work by outside observers.

Response Rates: Too Many Question Marks

For a handful of years, it has seemed to all of us in survey research that response rates pose a substantial challenge to our work. A series of factors have made it more difficult to contact potential respondents, driving up costs. During the same time period, respondents’ willingness to participate in surveys has declined slightly. Taken together, these shifts have led to lower response rates than those of twenty years ago.

Yet our understanding of this phenomenon seemed to me to be relatively superficial in at least two regards. First, very few detailed and systematic studies have reported long term, interpretable tracking of response rates. Without such analyses, we cannot understand why any apparent trends are occurring. At the simplest level, the vast majority of surveys conducted each year are publicized without reporting response rates or their components. So it has been very difficult, even for centrally involved professionals, to know what rates our peers were achieving and why.

Second, we have very little understanding of the factors that affect response rates in naturally occurring surveys. Many studies have experimentally varied study aspects and measured the impact of these changes on response rates. But an important complement to these experiments must be a thorough study of the natural covariation of study characteristics with response rates. This sort of work has been very rarely publicized.

Most importantly, our field has had very little scientific evidence available with which to assess the impact of lowered response rates on survey accuracy. A small handful of recent, and oft-cited, studies have shown that a reduced
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As has been true in each of the 30 years I’ve been attending, I found this year’s annual conference extremely stimulating. I left Nashville with three main take-home points, ideas that will motivate my term as president.

The first: We ought to pay more attention to, and take more responsibility for, the uses and interpretations of the survey and polling data we produce.

In a heavily attended plenary session, Arianna Huffington took us to task for: silly polls; meaningless or superficial polls about weighty questions, such as going to war; and misuses of poll data by the media and politicians.

And in his presidential address, Mark Schulman said that we undervalue the impact of our research, and advised us to place more weight on the relevance of a survey to real decisions.

What might we do differently if we took their comments seriously? We might:

- **promote critical discussion** in AAPOR, and in other public forums, about the uses to which our data are being put—both good uses and bad uses.

- **communicate purposes and uses** to respondents, and—what amounts to the same thing—to the public, to improve public understanding and acceptance of surveys.

- **marry substantive and methodological perspectives** in our own profession, to overcome what may be a too narrow, technical focus by some of us on the methodological side.

- **contextualize results** in public discussions of public opinion—to place them in historical context and interpret them in the light of other beliefs and attitudes, rather than in isolation. Some of the misuses involve narrow focus on single questions, for example horserace questions or questions about presidential popularity.

A second idea I took away from the many sessions on nonresponse was that AAPOR needs to continue to be proactive in promoting survey quality and disclosure.

We’ve made progress in the past few years on the disclosure of response rates, thanks in large part to the able work of the individuals who have developed AAPOR’s standard response rate definitions (and whose contribution was recognized with AAPOR’s Innovator’s Award, given this year to Tom Smith, Rob Daves, and Paul Lavrakas). There is still work to be done to improve our record on disclosure, and we face difficult and troubling questions about the impact of declining response rates on the data and the viability of the survey enterprise. I was struck by Rich Cortin’s graph showing the steady downward march of response rates for the Consumer Sentiment Survey over the decades. It led me to wonder, ‘How much longer will survey research be a viable enterprise?’ and ‘Should AAPOR more actively seek to address response rate issues, perhaps by facilitating or funding research needed to assess the impact of nonresponse on survey validity?’

A third area where I believe AAPOR could usefully play a more active role is pre-election polling. Unlike most surveys, pre-election forecasts may be judged against an external criterion of validity—the actual outcome of an election. Thus, the performance of pre-election polls in forecasting elections may shape public perceptions of the accuracy of surveys more generally. AAPOR has an interest in the quality and credibility of their results and methods. Last year, Council established a committee (chaired by Michael Traugott) to review the methodology used in pre-election polling.
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The 2003 AAPOR Awards for Exceptionally Distinguished Achievement recognized two true survey pioneers, Don Dillman and retired CBS President Frank Stanton. The awards were conferred at the AAPOR Conference Awards Banquet in Nashville on May 17.

Dillman’s work has transformed the practice of mail and self-administered surveys. Stanton’s achievements include not only his pioneering work in media research, but his championing of research at CBS as well.

**Don Dillman and TDM**

Dillman’s “Total Design Method,” first formulated in his 1978 book, *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method,* is widely regarded as the “Bible” of mail and self-administered surveys. The Washington State University professor has authored nine books and hundreds of articles and papers.

Dillman’s award also recognized his contributions to our profession beyond his publications. In 1970, he was founding coordinator of the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) at Washington State, one of the first university-based telephone survey laboratories in the United States.

From 1991 – 1995, Dillman served as Senior Survey Methodologist in the Office of the Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, where he provided leadership for the development of new questionnaire designs and procedures for the 2000 Decennial Census and other government surveys. This and related work on other federal agency surveys led to his receiving the Roger Herriot Award for innovation in federal statistics in September 2000.

His award plaque noted that “Don’s ‘Total Design Method’ has now evolved into the ‘Tailored Design Method.’” Whatever follows in the ‘TDM’ tradition, we can be assured that the “Total Dillman Method” will always stand for rigor, dedication and integrity.

**Frank Stanton’s “Radio Project”**

Stanton’s achievements began in the pioneering days of survey research in the 1930s. His groundbreaking doctoral research, completed in 1935, was one of the first investigations into why people react positively to certain radio shows but negatively to others. He launched his career that year in the fledgling CBS audience research department. He established research as an integral component of news reporting and corporate strategy.

In 1937, Stanton and Hadley Cantril secured Rockefeller Foundation funding to conduct seminal media research for what came to be called the “Radio Project.” Stanton and Cantril recruited the Viennese social psychologist Paul Lazarsfeld to direct the project. Stanton was largely responsible for one of the project’s crowning achievements, the Stanton-Lazarsfeld Program Analyzer. “Little Annie” — a media audience research tool still in use today — transformed radio, film, and ultimately television programming.

During his long tenure as President of CBS, 1946-1971, Stanton nurtured research and established a highly prolific department, headed by Joseph Klapper, to study the effects of mass media on the public. He established written survey reporting standards at CBS News to ensure that all reported surveys met high quality standards.

The CBS presence at AAPOR goes back to AAPOR’s early years, beginning with our second president, Elmo Wilson. Inspired by the Stanton tradition, five AAPOR presidents and many AAPOR officers have come from CBS.

Stanton’s AAPOR award plaque read, “Were it not for his even greater and overshadowing achievements as President of CBS, Inc., he would have been recognized by AAPOR long before today.” A video tribute to Stanton, as well as an audio recording of his long-distance acceptance of the award, are available at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

This year’s AAPOR Award Committee members were: Mark Schulman, Eleanor Singer, Norman Bradburn, Diane Colasanto, Clyde Tucker and Kathy Frankovic.
response rate causes little or no decline in survey accuracy, but we need much more such work to bolster our understanding of this phenomenon.

The volume of work reported on this topic at the conference was truly impressive, and included papers by some of the field’s top scholars. I was able to hear only a small subset of these presentations personally, but they were powerfully consistent in making the case that while response rates are generally lower now than they have been, some studies continue to achieve remarkably high response rates. And, a range of effective techniques are available for us to use to increase response rates considerably if we wish to expend resources to do so. But much evidence suggested that lower response rates are not in fact associated with notably decreased survey accuracy, certainly a reassuring finding, but one that demands more study and a better understanding of why this finding obtains and whether it may not under some realistic conditions. I hope the field will take steps to be sure the wisdom gained will see its way into print and become a permanent part of our professional archive.

Inviting Huffington

A second major theme of the conference was the credibility of our profession in the eyes of the principal consumers of our work. There has been no shortage of criticism of surveys over the years, and yet our sponsors continue to commission work from us. Under such circumstances, it is easy to see why many of us would be tempted to ignore our critics, believing their complaints fall on deaf ears or are universally viewed as lacking veracity.

But I believe such a passive approach is dangerous for survey research when there is at least one kernel of truth to the critics’ complaints.

Our profession can do more to take on our critics, to help them understand the intricacies of our methodologies, and to explain why what might appear to be very damaging critiques of surveys are not in fact so. I therefore wanted to program events to inspire thoughtful analysis of the subject.

Certainly the most controversial such event was the invitation I extended to Arianna Huffington to speak at one of the plenary sessions. Huffington is a widely-known pundit and author who, along with co-leader Harry Shearer, is heading a “Crusade” to end polling. A rough summary of her arguments:

1) Politicians are slaves to polls – they won’t do anything unless a poll shows that the public supports that course of action.
2) But polls are unreliable, because (a) response rates are low, (b) question wording can affect answers, (c) question order can affect answers, (d) some respondents make up answers superficially to get off the phone quickly, (e) respondents are reluctant to acknowledge socially undesirable opinions, (f) a single closed-ended question cannot reveal the richness and texture of public preferences, and (g) a cagey researcher can manipulate sample selection or weighting to alter results.
3) More concern is justified by the fact that survey researchers hide their response rates. If they had nothing to hide, why hide them?
4) Therefore, politicians should ignore polls, use solid values to envision sensible courses of action for government, and be strong leaders.
5) But politicians are too afraid to do that. So they kowtow to polls.
6) The only way to inspire politicians to be real leaders is to cut off polls at their source: Stop them from being conducted at all.

Many of us would disagree with the bottom line of this argument, but I could understand why a person outside of our field would offer the criticisms contained in point two above. Yet it is very difficult to find powerful, data-based responses to such criticisms in print.

Upcoming WAPOR Events

Some key dates for the World Association for Public Opinion Research, including future seminars and the next annual meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 17-19, 2003</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Annual Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23-24, 2004</td>
<td>Manila, Philippines</td>
<td>Regional Conference in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11-13, 2004</td>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona (USA)</td>
<td>Annual Conference (jointly with AAPOR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24-26, 2004</td>
<td>Cadenabbia, Italy</td>
<td>“Quality Criteria in Survey Research” Thematic Seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAPOR’s “meeting place” will return to the Sonoran desert May 13-16, 2004, for the 59th Annual Conference at the Pointe Hilton Tapatio Cliffs Resort. As AAPOR has grown, so has its need for larger facilities. The Arizona resort’s hotel will be better able to meet our members’ needs than hotels in recent years.

The conference committee will be examining your responses to the post-conference survey to build on the successes of this year’s conference. If you have suggestions or comments for the 2004 conference, you can send them to conference program chair Rob Daves at daves@startribune.com.

Meanwhile, save the date!

I believe it is our responsibility to formulate those answers and to educate the public about the value and validity of our work, rather than essentially asking the public to give us the benefit of the doubt.

I invited Huffington to speak at our plenary so that (1) our members could hear her articulate her views first hand, (2) some of our industry’s leaders would be inspired to formulate and express their most compelling and reassuring responses to her criticisms, and (3) our membership could then judge for themselves whether the responses were sufficiently compelling or whether they made clear the need for more research to understand the phenomena in question.

By many accounts, the event was the most well-attended plenary in AAPOR’s history (filling the huge ballroom to near capacity), and the full audience remained in the room until the very end of the evening. Casual conversations and AAPORnet postings afterward suggested that the audience was stimulated in many constructive ways by the interchange between Huffington and the panel of expert respondents (in addition to being entertained by Huffington’s wit and charm). I am not in a position to characterize whether the event was a success, but I hope Rob Daves’s post-conference survey will be able to do so in an objective and detailed way.

More importantly, I hope that the evening will lead all AAPOR members to listen a little more carefully to our critics and to think carefully in assembling compelling, data-based responses to them. I also hope it highlighted the potential benefits of having an open flow of communication between our profession and the consumers of our work, so that we can continue giving voices to members of democratic societies and monitoring the quality of life now and in the future.

A final note: Huffington’s appearance was only one small part of a larger and richer conference program. It included 194 oral paper presentations, 6 roundtables, 101 poster presentations, and 57 interactive paper presentations. Total attendance at the conference was 763 people, and there were 341 registrations for short courses. Clearly, this was a big event for AAPOR, and again, I am grateful for having had the opportunity to serve the Association as program chair. Thank you!
AAPOR Membership Growing

The numbers are in! AAPOR’s post-conference figures indicate that the number of members in all sectors – academia, industry, government, and nonprofit – is at an all-time high. The proportion of members in each sector has shifted slightly to include more academic members, reflecting a marked (nearly 50 percent) increase in the number of student members.

AAPOR regional chapters are flourishing as well. The New York and Washington DC/Baltimore chapters continue to attract members. After a strong membership drive this past year, the New Jersey chapter has grown considerably and now stands at over 90 members. The New England, Midwest, Southern, and Pacific chapters, all of which hold annual conferences, remain strong. That membership remains, at the very least, stable is no small feat given the recent economic downturn.

AAPOR’s Membership and Chapter Relations Committee will be working this year on sustaining and increasing membership, both at the national and chapter levels. In addition, we will be working with chapter liaisons to update bylaws, discuss chapter incorporation, and work toward an integration of chapter websites.

If you have any ideas or would like to become more involved, please feel free to contact me at pmoy@u.washington.edu, or contact an officer in your local AAPOR chapter.

– Patricia Moy, Membership and Chapter Relations Chair

New York Chapter (NYAAPOR)

New York’s AAPOR Chapter had an active, fun, and successful year. After a tough post-9/11 year, the chapter’s membership rebounded, thanks to the efforts of Membership Chair Graham Hueber and Associate Membership Chair Diana Pollich. Mickey Blum, our indefatigable Councilor-at-Large, spearheaded a campaign to enlist corporate and individual sponsors. That successful effort considerably helped defray expenses, to the relief of Treasurer Annie Weber. Marjorie Connolly, Communications Chair, continued to develop our fledgling website (www.nyaapor.org), which now boasts a number of great features: information about our programs, with snapshots; information about our sponsors; and even the speech given by Warren Mitofsky when he received NYAAPOR’s Distinguished Achievement Award last July.

We hosted a number of fascinating and well-attended programs on a wide range of topics, all put together by Program Chair Sarah Dutton and Associate Program Chair Ariela Keysar. Programs since the last newsletter include: a brown-bag lunch session and a workshop on public speaking by Dan Broden (Ketchum Public Relations); an evening session about the 2000 Census with Doug Muzzio (Baruch College), Andy Beveridge (Queens College), and Joe Salvo (NYC Department of Planning); and an evening session entitled “Is Big Brother Watching? Americans’ Attitudes Toward Privacy,” with Gary Langer (ABC News), Eleanor Singer (University of Michigan), Sandra Bauman (Bauman Research and Consulting), and David Krane (Harris Interactive). Michael Kagay, Director of Polling at the New York Times, received the NYAAPOR Distinguished Award at this year’s final meeting (watch for his speech on our website).

In short, it was a dynamic and stimulating year, all ably recorded by Secretary Michael Butterworth, and presided over by the Council’s President, Corinne Kirchner, whose wise and kind leadership helped make 2002-2003 a great success. Jo Holz, Past President, shepherded the election process, with the new Council to be announced in our next report.

– Geoff Feinberg

10 years of AAPOR membership...a long way from 194 members in 1947!
Midwest Chapter
(MAPOR)

“Public Opinion in Crisis” is the theme for MAPOR’s annual conference to be held November 21-22, 2003, in Chicago at the Radisson Hotel & Suites (120 E. Huron). The theme refers to the ways public opinion functions during times of war and other crises, and it also reflects the current climate for polling. Students should take advantage of the MAPOR Fellows Student Paper Competition. A $200 prize is awarded to the top student paper. The winner, and any students awarded “honorable mention,” receives free conference registration and a free ticket to the MAPOR luncheon on Friday.

To participate, students whose abstracts are accepted must complete their papers and submit them by postal mail by October 1 to Mark Miller (mark@mmmiller.com), Fellows Coordinator. For more information, see the MAPOR website: www.MAPOR.org.

— Julie Andsager

Washington DC/ Baltimore Chapter (DC AAPOR)

The record cold, rain, and snow notwithstanding, the DC/Baltimore Chapter of AAPOR had a wonderfully productive spring, successfully holding elections, hosting Executive Council meetings, scheduling seminars and social events, and thinking about new and better ways to bring the AAPOR experience to local area students.

Congratulations to the newly elected 2004 Council — Paul Beatty (Vice President and President Elect), Eileen O’Brien (Associate Program Chair), Diane Willimack (Associate Secretary/ Membership Chair), and Michael Cohen (Associate Treasurer). We were very fortunate to have an outstanding slate of candidates this year, and are thrilled to be working with this great new group of Council members!

The DC/Baltimore Chapter was happy to host the 2003 AAPOR Executive Council meeting in March, preceded the evening before by a well-attended happy hour for local members and friends. Photos are on the DC-AAPOR website: www.dcaapor.org.

This spring, local members had a chance to see a superb series of lunchtime seminars. In February, Carolyn L. Funk discussed the impact of the survey introduction on respondents, followed by a talk by Bob Groves in April on interviewer falsification and scientific misconduct. In May, Brian Harris-Kojentin and Karen Lee presented insights into the OMB clearance process for survey information collections, and in June, DC-AAPOR co-sponsored the Second Seminar on the Funding Opportunity in Survey Research at the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The DC/Baltimore Chapter is excited to join other chapters in holding an annual paper competition for local area students. We are currently in the planning stages, but very hopeful to have the program up and running this coming fall. We are looking for a few volunteers to join our “planning committee” — if interested, please contact Dawn Nelson at dawn.v.nelson@census.gov.

— Adam Safir

New England Chapter
(NEAAPOR)

The New England Chapter held its eighth annual conference on April 4, 2003, at the historic Longfellow’s Wayside Inn, in Sudbury, Massachusetts. With lit fireplaces, and a traditional New England luncheon of chicken-pot pie and Yankee pot roast, a captive crowd enjoyed a full program featuring several dynamic presentations, including the National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES) Project, by Ken Winneg, Kate Kenski, and Dannagal Goldthwait; Thomas E. Patterson of Harvard University’s The Vanishing Voter project; Al Leighton of the Muskie School discussed research on refusal conversion; and NEAAPOR member David Moore presented the very latest Gallup findings on American public opinion of the Iraq War—which had literally just begun. In addition, Marc Maynard of the Roper Center paid a special tribute to NEAAPOR’s first honorary Lifetime Member, the late Bud Roper.

Every year after AAPOR’s annual May conference, we usher in a new slate of NEAAPOR officers: Doug Schwartz of Quinnipiac University is our new President, Andrew Smith of University of New Hampshire is Vice-President, Gallup’s Lydia Saad is on board as chapter Secretary, and April Radocchio continues (thank you!) as Treasurer for another year. Cynthia Talkov Boyd will serve as Past-President, and Ellen Boisvert—NEAAPOR’s first President back in 1995—remains our trusted chapter Advisor.

— Cynthia Talkov Boyd

New Jersey Chapter
(NJAAPOR)

This spring the newly energized New Jersey Chapter held its elections. The newly elected officers are Janice Ballou of Mathematica Policy Research, President (jballou@mathematica-mpr.com); Ed Freeland of Princeton University, Vice President (efreeland@princeton.edu); Paul Braun of Braun Research, Treasurer (pbraun@braunresearch.com); Jim Sears of James M. Sears Associates, Secretary (jsears1234@comcast.net); and Frank Rusciano of Rider University, Program Chair (rusciano@rider.edu). Currently, the chapter has 92 dues paying members and 62 participated in the election for a turnout of 67 percent. Over the summer the officers will be making plans for the 2003-2004 programs, will continue to recruit members, and will review the bylaws. Please contact any of the officers with ideas for chapter programs or for membership information.

— Janice Ballou

Pacific Coast Chapter
(PAPOR)

The Pacific Coast Chapter is having a busy and highly successful year. On the business front, we became a registered non-profit organization in California and also moved our website to www.field.com/papor/ where it is being hosted by Field Research Corporation.
Hitting the Links

This year’s AAPOR golf outing, arranged by Norm Trussell, was held Thursday morning at the spectacular Hermitage Golf Course. The weather could not have been better as the 27 golfers made their way around the beautifully laid out course. When it was all over, Bob Baumgartner was the winner of both low net and low gross, as well as the ‘closest to the pin’ honors. Nancy Whelchel had second overall low net, and low net and low gross for the women. Congratulations to all the golfers!

AAPOR’s Athletes: 2003 Fun Run/Walk Results

Several of our more active members got up early Saturday morning to participate in AAPOR’s Annual Fun Run/Walk. Thirty-five AAPORites took off at the 7:00 a.m. start for a scenic 1.5 mile run/walk through empty parking lots, honeysuckle-lined deserted streets, and a lovely little lake (complete with signs to ‘beware of snakes!’). Dashing through the heat and humidity to finish first among the male runners, with a time of 10:27, was Rob Suls, while Adria Gallup-Black finished first among the female runners with a time of 10:46. First among the walkers were Rob Simmons and Trish Gallagher. Congratulations to all who participated in this annual AAPOR event! We hope to see even more folks for a run/walk through the desert at the Tapatio Cliffs Resort in Phoenix!
Award Renamed in Honor of Sudman

AAPOR is extremely pleased to announce the endowment of the annual student paper award in the name of Seymour Sudman, world-renowned survey methodologist and former AAPOR President. The prize will now be called the AAPOR Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award.

This endowment is made possible, in large part, by a very generous contribution from Ed Blair, Professor and Chair of the Department of Marketing and Entrepreneurship at the University of Houston’s C.T. Bauer College of Business. Blair is a former graduate student of Sudman’s and collaborated with the noted author on several books.

This contribution, in addition to ongoing support from Sudman’s many friends, makes it possible to fund the award in perpetuity, using the interest for the annual prize while conserving the principle. Additional contributions will always, of course, be welcomed, and can be made by check (payable to AAPOR Endowment Fund, with a notation to the Seymour Sudman fund), or credit card, with information sent to Mike Flanagan at the AAPOR office.

This year’s winners of the Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award were:

Devon Johnson, Harvard University & Markus Prior, Princeton University

Honorable mention went to:

Clarissa David, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania

“A Meeting Place”

By Tom W. Smith

ACROSS
1. AAPOR’s start
7. 11 down located in
8. Era
10. Old college _____
11. AAPOR’s and Dorothy’s home
15. Median point
16. Not right
19. Bay site
23. Regional Transportation Authority (abr.)
24. Iron
25. You
27. Opposite of under votes (abr.)
28. Professor’s helper (abr.)
30. White plague
32. Sun god
34. Current
36. Random draws
39. St. Petersburg _____
41. Maine cataloger (abr.)
42. Hispanic candidate threw _____ hat into the ring
45. Black gold
48. Zip
49. Deep sleep
51. Wisconsin site

DOWN
1. Anti
2. Expression in 4 down
3. Light unit
4. Canada site
5. Charged particle
6. _____ saying
9. Windows is one (abr.)
11. Amusing site
12. Much _____
13. Quakers (abr.)
14. Either/ _____
15. Open-ended question
16. Surgery location (abr.)
18. Passed from Schulman to Martin
20. Run crosstab again
21. IJPOR preposition
22. Rent
26. Feminist grail
29. AAPOR’s country home
31. _____ humbug
33. I think therefore I _____
35. Buck Hill Falls, _____ (abr.)
37. Mightier than the sword
38. Tree or e-mail program
40. Copper
42. Baker’s Square geometry
43. Everyone
44. Copacetic
46. Law (Danish)
47. Links pc’s
50. Danvers, _____ (abr.)
Federal Do-Not-Call Registry Exempts Surveys

By Mark Schulman, Past President

Millions of Americans jammed the Internet and government toll-free numbers, starting June 25, to register their phone numbers on the federal government’s national telemarketing “do-not-call” registry. This single, comprehensive registry is being administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

Survey research calls remain exempt from the federal registry. However, the survey industry is affected by the federal and state do-not-call registries in several ways. First, because telemarketers have often used “surveys” as a guise for telemarketing (“sugging”) and fundraising (“frugging”), survey respondent confusion is already resulting in some hostile feedback from registrants. Many registrants are unaware that survey research is exempt.

Second, the survey industry needs to remain vigilant in monitoring both state and federal legislation. Some state lawmakers, for example, have inadvertently included surveys in state do-not-call legislation.

Third, survey organizations using listed samples supplied by telemarketing list compilers should determine whether “do not call” registrants were removed from the lists. If so, organizations may request that registrants be included in their samples.

Many survey organizations have been arming their interviewers with scripts to inform complaining respondents about differences between survey research and telemarketing. The impact of the registry on survey response rates will need to be monitored.

Several survey industry organizations have been tracking do-not-call legislation. These include CMOR, which was founded as The Council for Marketing & Opinion Research in 1992 by four major marketing and market & opinion research trade associations, and the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO). AAPOR has contributed to CMOR.

Exemptions from the list also include calls from charities and calls on behalf of politicians. Enforcement begins October 1, 2003. Both the FTC and the FCC have Internet sites devoted to the do-not-call registry. See http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/conline/edcams/donotcall/index.html and http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/donotcall/

For further details or any questions regarding the FTC or FCC actions, please contact CMOR’s Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

Answers to puzzle on page 8.

Don’t forget to check out the still-fledgling AAPOR website for a look back at Nashville 2003 and the dates of Phoenix 2004. A transcript of the epic ‘Huffington vs. the Pollsters’ panel will also be on the site shortly.

Feedback, suggestions, and offers of help are always welcome. Contact Publications Chair, Claudia Deane at deanec@washpost.com, or Web Coordinator, Steve Everett at steve@everettgroup.com.

Remember that the current issue of POQ is now posted in the “Members Only” area. If you’ve forgotten your membership ID number, don’t be bashful, e-mail AAPOR-info@goAMP.com and ask them to send it to you again.
Watch out Annie Liebowitz, turns out we have a portrait artist in our midst. Below a selection of the work of AAPOR member (and official Website Coordinator) Steve Everett, who went snap happy in Nashville. (More of Everett’s photos are posted at www.aapor.org.)

Shap Wolf

Tom W. Smith

Cecilie Gaziano

Robert Groves

Terry Richardson and Kathy O’Connor

Michael O’Neil

Harry O’Neill

Kathleen Frankovic and Susan Pinkus

Kurt Lang

Steven Kull

Dawn V. Nelson

Mollyann Brodie
election polling, to document methods and provide guidance to the public and to journalists in using and interpreting such data. The work of this committee is intended to complement and build on other efforts to review poll performance, such as the National Council on Public Polls’ review of 2002 election polls.

Reflecting on the conference reminded me of discussions of similar issues almost 20 years ago by the National Academy of Science’s Panel on Survey Measurement of Subjective Phenomena. The first recommendation of the panel’s report, to “Take surveys and polls seriously,” foreshadows Huffington’s critique and still seems relevant today, as does the panel’s answer to its rhetorical question:

“How would life be different if this recommendation were generally accepted? There would be fewer polls and surveys that are manifestly inadequate to their stated purpose…. One would not read extravagant or frivolous interpretations of poll results, presented so that a critical reader has no opportunity to make a contrary interpretation. Polls and surveys would be applied to serious social purposes and not used solely for the sake of public relations or the legitimization of decisions already taken. Moreover, the public would be supportive of competent and careful exercise of the art of surveying or poll-taking and capable of discriminating between standard and substandard performance. And, finally, resources would be husbanded so that fewer surveys and polls could provide more and better information. When polls are taken seriously, the public will no longer believe on the authority of a cynical pollster that you can come up with any result you want.”

As was true then, AAPOR continues to have an important role to play in getting survey practitioners, survey critics, survey users, and the public at large to “take surveys and polls seriously.”

Rob Daves, Tom W. Smith and Paul Lavrakas won the 2003 AAPOR Innovators Award for their leadership in producing “Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys.” The three received their award at the annual conference in Nashville.