

# PROJECT REMEMBRANCE: LOOKING OVER OUR SHOULDER

Debra S. Perkins, Florida Memorial University

## ABSTRACT

This is part 2 of the paper published in 1992 which looked at the formation and development of the Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior streams of research.

## INTRODUCTION

Americans are wonderful people but who, as a people, have short memories and little sense of history. As a European friend once quipped, "The difference between Americans and Europeans is that Europeans think two hundred miles is a long way, and Americans think two hundred years is a long time." So we as Americans seldom accord much thought, much less importance, to the "passing of the torch" or what transpired to create a torch worth passing on.

Most people in the discipline will know that Dr. Ralph Day and Dr. H. Keith Hunt were key figures in the formation of the CS/D stream of research. Due to his declining health, Dr. Day could no longer produce research or participate in editing the conference proceedings or *JCS/D&CB*. In recognition and celebration of his critical contributions, this author suggested attempting to capture Dr. Day's memories of those precipitating events while we still could and Dr. Hunt, who was the managing editor of the *JCS/D&CB* at the time, readily agreed to publish the work. The outcome was "Roots: A Folk History of the Consumer Satisfaction Literature" which was published in the *JCS/D&CB* in Volume five, 1993. This current piece briefly will review the foundation of the discipline previously published; in large part this review is written because few people today seem to be aware of the foundations and in part to make what is uniquely contributed here more understandable to those who have not read the prior piece. This is much like a two part TV show starting with a review of the key scenes that transpired in part one by way of synopsis; but instead of a one week separation, we have 20 years!

During the early formative years of the field I was a welfare worker in Indianapolis and

years away from my MBA and more than a decade away from starting my doctorate; hence did not witness any of the events shared here. While much of the information used to create this piece came from Keith Hunt and, to a lesser degree, Ralph Day, a couple of people who generously responded to the journal's call for inclusions to Project Remembrance, notably Douglas Hausknecht. We thank them for sharing their first-hand accounts and insights.

## CS/D&CB ROOTS

The Better Business Bureau (BBB) of the United States was founded in 1970 with the union of the National Better Business Bureaus (founded in 1912) and the Association of Better Business Bureaus (founded in 1921). The BBB was created to intercede on the part of consumers who felt dissatisfaction with a commercial transaction in hopes of getting some form of resolution for the customer. Funded as they are by businesses, this seems a rather strange goal; yet the BBB serves also to "weed" out those complaints without merit and mediate those with merit to an acceptable conclusion for the merchants and so serves the best interests of both business and consumers. But the focus of the BBB is more on resolution and collecting statistics rather than on developing theories or conducting research.

It would be natural to expect that the first systematic studies on consumer satisfaction would be centered on the U.S. population; but they were actually cross-cultural studies and among the earliest was one conducted by Hans Thorelli from Indiana University using comparative testing reports from the U.S., Norway, and Germany.

In 1972 John Miller produced what is thought to be the first dissertation in the field entitled, "Satisfaction and Modes of Response to Dissatisfaction for Supermarket Customer Segments," which was chaired by Dr. Thorelli. This work was critical in conceptualizing both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Maybe the first finding of dissatisfaction without complaint was uncovered by Jane Willits, a graduate student aiding Robert Herrmann and

Rex Warland in pre-testing a questionnaire for use in a large survey on the consumer movement. A couple of open-ended questions had been inserted as a transition between two sections: "Lately, have you gotten good and mad about the way you were treated as a consumer? And what did you do about it? Ms. Willits noticed that several consumers, although dissatisfied, had not complained or taken any other action despite their feelings.

But the few studies on CS/D that were done were fragmentary rather than a "stream" of research. Dissatisfaction and complaints were not looked upon with favor by the business world. The very existence of complaints implied management was not doing its job and fixes utilized resources leading to diminished profits. Complaints were not opportunities to be learned from, but uses of funds caused largely by a small cadre of "cranks". Andreasen and Best later concluded that the "incurable complainer" was a myth.

### THE FTC CONNECTION

All of the above was highly unsystematic. There were no concerted academic, business or governmental efforts to forward understanding of CS/D. Then came along a most unlikely player: the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). In the wake of the Machiavellian maneuverings of Standard Oil of Indiana to put all its competition out of business so as to create a monopoly on fuel oil (used both for heat and light in the era before electricity) which would create, what at the time would be unimaginably high profits, the Congress passed the Sherman and Clayton Anti-Trust Acts and the Federal Trade Act of 1914, which created the FTC. The FTC was tasked with two broad mandates: to promote competition through its enforcement of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts, and to protect consumers. These became translated into the outlawing of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts and practices including false or misleading advertising.

Dr. Hunt's dissertation focused on his first research interest: whether corrective advertising had the intended impact on consumers of correcting the unfair competitive advantages gleaned by advertisers' utilization of deceptive ads and whether counter advertising was effective. The reason a company would undertake deceptive advertising was to create profits at the expense of

competition. Corrective advertising was a remedy imposed by the FTC which was intended to inform the consumer of the falseness of the claims thereby restoring balance to the competitive arena. Counter advertising is advertising undertaken by the offending firm to lessen the impact of the corrective advertising required by the FTC in an attempt to thwart the intended effect of corrective advertising and keep the ill-gotten gains from deceptive advertising. As Dr. Hunt utilized published deceptive, corrective, and counter advertisements, this research was as close to "real world" as it could be made to be. Note this effort is squarely in the public policy and advertising domains. But one outcome was an invitation to present the research to the FTC which liked it enough to invite Dr. Hunt to join the FTC as a Visiting Professor for 1973-4.

During the 14 months of residence, Dr. Hunt had "Fun, Fun, Fun!!!" Dr. Hunt was the Marketing/communication telephone contact for those months and came to know lots of professors interested in the same things that interested him. That mutual interest and the resulting friendships continued for a lifetime.

A highlight was when Dr. Ralph Day showed up as a Summer Visiting Professor. Although Ralph and Keith knew each other before their visit together at the FTC, they were not well acquainted. As Keith told it, he had been a "nobody" for 6 years during the time he finished his dissertation and taught at the University of Iowa, and Ralph was one of the leading scholars in the marketing field, so their paths did not cross much. They became close friends at the FTC. They shared a smallish office on the Pennsylvania Avenue side of the building on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor. They put the backs of their desks together in the middle of the room, giving chair room to sit at their desks. "Though we were looking at each other all the time we spoke only when needed. Ralph was by nature a quiet guy, and I respected his quietness and I was in awe of him. The ice melted slowly, but surely, and we became best of friends, eventually running the CS/D&CB conferences as partners for several years."

Edward Heiden, then director of the Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation (OPPE) had a mandate to develop a rational budgeting system which could verify that the FTC's money was being spent in those areas of greatest need. The FTC had 2 primary sources of information: letters and calls that came into the FTC offices

and data from the BBBs. The problem was that there was no way to judge the representativeness of the BBB and FTC data. As Hunt tells it, to overcome this weakness, Heiden suggested to Hunt that a national survey be undertaken for about \$20,000. A serious research effort could not be undertaken for so little so Hunt turned his attention elsewhere. But when Dr. Day came to the FTC and was approached to do the same study, he also said the funding was impractically low; however he thought it an interesting idea and he agreed to spend some time on it. As Hunt phrased it, he wrote the study off because the money wasn't there to do the study, and Dr. Day took it on because it was an intrinsically interesting and important research question.

So Day, Hunt, Edward Heiden, and Laird Landon set off to create the study expected to need \$200,000 with only the \$20,000 available. It was thought that the remaining funding could be scraped together with contributions from several governmental agencies, but that was not to be.

The study was finally done in Canada through the office of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada for about \$270,000 through an Indiana University connection with Steve Ash, then a graduate student working on his dissertation. It is interesting to note the differences in the attitudes about consumer issues in Canada and the U.S. at the time. One plausible route to the Prime Minister's office in Canada was through the office of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. No such route existed in the U.S. government at that time through any consumer related office—and does not to this day. Nevertheless, the U.S. did eventually follow the Canadian study based on Day's framework with one a little differently constructed and conducted through Technical Assistance for Research Programs (TARP). While the American study had little impact on launching CS/D because it was so late in publication compared to the Canadian study, it did have an immense impact on subsequent research and thought over time.

### LAUNCHING THE RESEARCH STREAM

Although many academics and others were talking about CS/D, little actual research was being conducted or published. With Keith's enthusiasm, savvy networking skills and an existing relationship with George Brasseur, a National Science Foundation (NFS) administrator

who had an on-going interest in CS/D, he sought and received a grant to bring together active researchers in CS/D. He and Day organized a workshop held April 11-13, 1976 at the O'Hare Inn, Chicago, IL. About 20 people attended. The purpose of the event was to create critical mass for CS/D and bring about a blossoming of research. In the end, it was determined that the workshop had not achieved its goal. To be even-handed in this evaluation, it must be said that so few attendees and the overall unformed state of CS/D acted to limit the outcomes; additionally it simply takes time to design, run, and write up research for publication. While the workshop format was not that successful, it was decided to try again using a conference format. The NSF was again asked, but decided not to fund a second effort. Dr. Day then approached the dean of the School of Business and Indiana University to underwrite the conference which was held and about 30 papers resulted. It cannot be known for certain, but it could be that the workshop acted to "prime the pump" such that when the conference was subsequently held, researchers were ready to participate. In any event, the field took off and has been very successful.

### CONTINUITY OF LEADERSHIP

There were many people who researched and published in CS/D actively and they enriched the research stream substantially by their efforts. In addition to the obvious examples of Ralph and Keith there were John Swan, Richard Oliver, Marsha Richens, Robert Westbrook, Judy Zaichkowsky, Hans Thorelli, Rex Warland, William Darden and so many others: a virtual "Who is Who" for the marketing field.

But it was the continuity of leadership provided by Ralph Day and H. Keith Hunt through the years in publishing the conference proceedings and the *Journal of CS/D&CB* that provided the underpinning and security to the field. And the field prospered. To quote from the preface of the *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior Combined Proceedings of 1984 & 1985*, written by H.Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day:

“It is with substantial satisfaction that many of us look at the continuing development of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction and complaining behavior as a research topic. It is now a general topic for publication in the leading journals. The research tradition is well grounded. While these CS/D&CB conference proceedings volumes still provide the dominant literature base for the topic, the last few years have seen the base expand to include so many publications that is now hard to keep track of all the articles on the topic. The 1984 bibliographical update attempts to “keep score” but the breadth is becoming too great for the task to be done with any hope of completeness. And this is just what some of us several years ago hoped would happen. It is hard to accept that perhaps the reasons for existence of the CS/D conference have been achieved. One of these days the series will end.”

To provide proper perspective, it is worth noting that Hunt edited or co-edited 11 proceedings on subjects from advertising to government relations, to interdisciplinary research to CS/D during the period from 1977-1985. He was also publisher, coeditor (with Ralph Day until about 1993) and then editor of the *JCS/D&CB* from 1988-2004. Hunt also co-authored nearly 50 papers during this period from 1977-2005. So the leadership provided by Hunt and Day was not just in editing but in researching and writing in the field as well.

### **CAMARADERIE AND SHARING: FORMATIVE KEYS**

In responding to Project Remembrance, Douglas Hausknecht submitted this unique contribution. It is so well stated that reprinting it seems the most straight-forward avenue.

“One factor that should be included in the history of any emerging academic field is a description of how knowledge was shared.

CS/D evolved as the information age was exploding. One factor that Ralph and Keith brought to the field early on was a sense of camaraderie and reinforcement that persists to the present. The researchers enjoyed what we did and enjoyed sharing with one another. The conferences were by design intimate and engaging. All sessions were plenary, never were concurrent sessions held. Conference programs included time to socialize (the current buzzword is networking) and exchange ideas, but also get to know one another and learn a bit about each other’s world view. Knowing the background of the authors of research often helps to put designs and interpretations into a perspective that mere data and meta-analyses cannot hope to accomplish.

The conference-on-a-bus provided the opportunity to exchange ideas more than one would have expected. Having a “progressive conference” that year sort of enabled a “reset” at each location.

My summer travel schedules have caused me to miss the last several conferences. I miss the level of interaction and the richness that was added to the discipline by virtue of the exchanges.”

While I never experienced the “conference on a bus” concept, I too can speak to the sharing and camaraderie. My first conference was June, 1991 at Snow Bird in Utah as a not-quite newly minted doctorate (i.e., ABD and my final defense scheduled for the late July/early August timeframe). Keith was always unfailingly kind, but we were doing business together (CS/D bibliographic updates and capturing Day’s remembrances for an article) and, at the time, I thought that work was related my good treatment. (Doctoral students are SO paranoid!) I was delighted almost beyond words to interact with John Swann and Robert Woodruff at the conference, well-recognized scholars whose articles were featured in the doctoral courses just completed, but also Robert East, who became a

collaborator and friend, as well as many others. What most impressed me then and left me amazed for years was the fact that these luminaries spoke with me as though my thoughts mattered! They listened with care, shared their insights, critiqued with the lightest touch and encouraged always.

I later spoke with Keith about my amazement over the friendliness and welcoming ways of the participants. He told me that all the folks who attended the conferences were genuinely nice people. Although I agreed that this was a true statement despite the fact that my assessment was based on a convenience sample of attendees of one conference, I nevertheless asked him how that could be so. That is, how is it that only nice people attend? His answer was, "People who are not nice don't get their papers accepted a second time." The idea of screening out undesirables never occurred to me as a possibility at the time, but it is an idea in accord with the later published advice of Dr. Robert Sutton in *The No Asshole Rule: Building a Civilized Society and Surviving One that Isn't* (2007) which suggests that the best way to keep a healthy work environment is the rule: HIRE NO ASSHOLES. Our iteration of that rule would be, given Keith's gentle nature and ever-present good manners: ACCEPT ONLY NICE PEOPLE.

Dr. Hausknecht's observation on the affective impact of missing the conferences also rings true to me. When I failed to achieve tenure in the mid 1990's I joined my husband's business and together we were far more successful than we ever imagined. For a while we were almost rich! But that took years to develop.

In the meantime I was depressed when I would allow myself to stop and think about it. I had promised Keith another update of the bibliography and I had worked on it for many hours before leaving academia; but I just could not make myself finish it. I also could not overcome my embarrassment enough to attend the conference or even to respond appropriately to Keith when he would write. Finally he wrote asking if he should remove my name from the emailing list as it was clear that his missives only seemed to be adding to my pain; but that any time I was ready to return, he and the conference would be there for me. That is exactly what happened. After more than a decade of business success, I returned to the academy and within a year re-established my involvement. People still remembered me, welcomed me, commiserated

over my far from unique tenure battles and wounds, congratulated me on our business success, and encouraged me to write again.

I missed the people and the support over the years I was absent; but I needed success elsewhere to get back my confidence and equilibrium. Now I tell my colleagues at my current institution (none of whom have ever attended our conferences despite my urging) that people here are genuinely nice, helpful and fun. I use the positive affect generated at the conferences to push myself through the travails of an academy that has fallen on hard financial times. But always I find the money to follow the CS/D&CB conference where ever it goes.

### SOME OF THE BYWAYS OF CS/D

Although much early effort went into conceptualization and measurement, CS/D has been "unruly" from the outset moving in sometimes unpredictable directions. A look through the tables of contents of some of the earlier conference proceedings illustrates this point very well. As expected we see sections on theory and models and measurement and design issues. We also had several papers looking at consumer characteristics (for example personality and demographics) in relation to CS/D (largely in complaining behavior) and papers on the strategic implications of CS/D. Studies looked at car repairs, purchases of major home appliances, food products, repairs under warranty, and super markets. Research settings have continued to expand over time into patient, elderly, students, gaming, clothing purchase, technology licensees, financial services, emergency services (like 911 calls), volunteerism, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. In fact there may be no segment of society or setting left untouched by CS/D research.

In order to get some kind of "handle" on all this research, early on Hunt undertook to produce regular bibliographies of the CS/D literature. These were manually produced on typewriters after being manually gathered from visual index searches. At a later time Perkins took over this effort at Hunt's urging and produced bibliographic updates during the transition from manual to computer searches which finally made the bibliographies obsolete due to technological advance. But the flourishing of the field was very evident just from the number of entries and search

terms utilized to produce the bibliographies. In the 1991 version, 1000 entries were added to the 700 that were in the prior edition. The 1993 edition contained another 1700 entries. So while not exponential, the rate of increase was substantial. The search terms had also expanded to include life, marital, service, product, students, educational, medical, dental, and citizen satisfaction/dissatisfaction and complaining among others.

One area of CS/D that did not develop as expected was the area of Complimenting Behavior. As Keith and Ralph both commented on several occasions, the focus in CS/D was so often on the negative. As they postulated, this focus may have arisen in large part due to the roots of the discipline in the FTC with its use of BBB and in-house complaint data forthcoming from failed customer interactions with business. As a counter to this negativistic focus, Hunt and Day decided to take a look at the positive. They even went so far as trying unsuccessfully to change the lettering to CS/D&CCB for complaining and complimenting behavior. The new acronym did not catch on.

Despite the fact that complimenting did not really “catch on” they nevertheless had lots of fun with the complimenting research. But complimenting did not carry the positive emotional loading similar to the negative emotional loading for complaining, grudgeholding, and retaliation. They even tried to assess the lost profit/sales due to dissatisfaction in one of the last articles in an attempt to demonstrate the costs of dissatisfaction which could be countered by the avoidance of it in the first place (see for example Otto, Parry, Payne, Huefner, Hunt, JCS/D&CB, 2004).

Hunt and co-authors also looked at the subtopics of grudgeholding and retaliation. As Hunt phrased it, if you are dissatisfied you may complain, or you may do some other action. Grudgeholding asked if persons had even been so dissatisfied that they stayed dissatisfied over many years. Retaliation asked if persons had been so dissatisfied that to bring personal equilibrium something had to be done in return to hurt the person or business that made you dissatisfied. Both topics were fun to study. Hunt and coauthors tried various approaches and forms of analysis.

Life satisfaction has taken on a new twist in the current century with its emphasis on

Work/Life Balance. The popular press is all but absorbed with Work/Life Balance tips, articles, etc. and the academic journals take the topic very seriously. Given the deep roots of life satisfaction in the CS/D literature and the timeliness of this topic, plus startling volume of work produced by Keith and sterling quality of his service in the academic world, it was natural to ask his take on the topic. Again to give some perspective, one need only review a partial list of Hunt’s accomplishments during the CS/D years given at the end of the prior heading.

Hunt says he was very fortunate to be teaching two courses during the two regular semesters and two courses during summer. Eventually he stopped teaching summer and was teaching just four courses a year. Two preps: consumer behavior and entrepreneurship twice a year, for 20+ years. And no graduate student theses or seminars. While others put man-months of effort into graduate theses, he was free from that and could spend his time rendering service to ACR and AAA and CS/D. So one key to a highly successful academic career is strictly limited teaching requirements including the smallest number of preps possible over the greatest time possible.

But to getting back to the Work/Life Balance issue, Keith says that for many years he was an advocate of the balanced life. Now he is totally against it.

“There isn’t time in life to keep everything in balance. A life in balance is a mediocre life. One has to decide what is worth doing and put great effort into that. And decide what is not as worth doing and do as little of that as possible, maybe even eliminating it from one’s life. I have been very fortunate to have a wife who is at least as bright as I am and who was capable not only of raising the family but of pitching in to help with ACR when needed. I pitched in to help with the family and she pitched in to help with [academic] work. Together it seemed to work out okay. In my closing years of teaching I made it a point to present to each class the fallacy of a balanced life. It is a crock. It is the excuse people make who are

mediocre at everything; taking solace in their balanced mediocrity. How's that for a statement! Decide what is most important and put almost all your effort into that facet of life."

So here is the second part; choose as a team to "divide and conquer" rather than to have both work at everything and achieving little and poorly.

### THE CAP

When asked whether Keith left anything undone in CS/D that he wished he had addressed, he said that he had no regrets and that everything that had specific interest for him he had done. It was a fun topic with lots of people involved, but for him, it had run its course. One weakness of the CS/D streams of research is that it leaves too much unexplained. As Keith explicated it:

"In class I would give the example of my eating at the Student Union cafe, getting a hamburger, knowing it was going to be less than desirable, but I was there and it was not all that expensive, so I got it AND I WAS SATISFIED BECAUSE I GOT EXACTLY WHAT I EXPECTED TO GET. On the other hand, I went to a high end seafood restaurant with Carolyn. It was outstanding in every way but one. The main course was magnificent. The dessert was splendid. The service was outstanding. The atmosphere was excellent. All was superior, EXCEPT that the clam chowder didn't have as much clams and potatoes as usual. I did not get what I expected and thus was NOT satisfied. SO I was satisfied with a cheap hamburger and dissatisfied with one of the finest seafood meals I had ever eaten. That is not a robust research track. So Expectation, regardless of what some top scholars still maintain, is not an interesting track. Rich Olshavsky was saying that for a long time. So was John Miller. I eventually went off in other directions. I think Rich

Oliver's book pretty well put the expectations approach to bed, telling all that was worth telling on the topic and urging others on to better work.

So this is likely the "cap." To move on from here means to move away from expectations and on to a new idea. This becomes the challenge going forward. Where do we go from here?

In volume 6, 1993 Hunt posited some ideas for research in the 1990's. These ideas included, among others, the following thoughts:

1. **IT IS EMOTION, NOT COGNITION THAT DRIVES CS/D&CB.** We academics have become comfortable with our cognition driven disconfirmation paradigm, but it is worth little until we couple it with emotion. The evidence is now overwhelming that emotion is the critical element in CS/D&CB.

2. **ACTION TENDENCY.** We need to study all parts of the tripartite attitude theory and preferably at the same time. Look only at retaliation, grudgeholding, word-or-mouth, and repatronage and it is obvious that these are action terms rather than emotional or cognition terms.

3. **POSITIVE DISCONFIRMATION.** What would be wrong with looking at the positive? A shift to the positive would be good for both theory and practice.

4. **STORYTIME.** Some social science disciplines such as sociology and anthropology collect stories routinely; but not CS/D. We need to collect these and write them down.

5. **WHAT ABOUT THE "C" IN CS/D&CB?** At the very least we need to open up the CS/D&CB literature to business to business transactions.

While there has been some movement on these suggestions, there would seem to be much more needed. A long time contributor and reviewer for JCS/D&CB, Dr. Magnus Söderlund (Professor and Centre Director, Centre for

Consumer Marketing (CCM), Stockholm School of Economics, P.O. Box 6501, SE-113 83 Stockholm, Sweden), recently provided some additional food for thought in an email to this author. He states:

*“Here are two themes I feel would need more research (and both, I believe, may broaden the nomological network of the effects of satisfaction and possibly make CS research more relevant for other sub-fields within the marketing realm):*

*First, existing CS research is very heavily focused on the effects of CS stemming from one particular object X on the customer's reaction to X (e.g., loyalty to X, word-of-mouth related to X). Yet it seems likely that the satisfaction created by X would have implications also for the customer's reaction to other objects. For example, given that CS is a positive state of mind, and given that a positive state of mind creates broader consideration sets and encourages variety seeking behavior and exploration behavior, and a more generous categorization of objects, it seems likely that CS may lead the customer to turn to competitors - quite counter-intuitive given the idea that CS leads to loyalty. This is indeed an under-researched issue, quite similar to the fact that one particular ad for X, which creates positive affect, could lead the customer to Y and Z (yet this is never examined in advertising effectiveness studies). For instance, the immediate implication of one customer's satisfaction with one store may be that the customer continues shopping in other stores - or the satisfaction stemming from one part of the store may lead the customer to other parts of the same store. In other words, perhaps it is time to expand the effect side of what satisfaction does to customers.*

*Second, much research has identified that emotions are contagious. Given*

*that some emotion theorists think that CS is an emotion, it seems likely that CS can be contagious, too. This, I think, implies several underexplored social effects of satisfaction. Maybe, for example, the reason why many studies suggest that the receiver of word-of-mouth is likely to act on the advice is that the sender's satisfaction has somehow been transferred to the receiver and affects the receiver's decisions? And in settings in which several customers are present and can see what each receives from a provider (e.g. in a restaurant and in an aircraft), maybe the satisfaction of one customer can affect the satisfaction of others.*

*Thus, the possibility of CS transferring to other customers is another aspect that may broaden the view of the effects of Consumer Satisfaction.”*

Life cycles are common. It may be time now to revitalize and re-launch the CS/D&CB. Hopefully, some of the above ideas may help to show the way.

## CONCLUSION

A folk history is not a comprehensive anything. Rather it is a look at the people and events that shaped the focal topic. It is a capturing of the stories for future readers.

Most the ideas above came from emails between Keith and this author over the course of a few weeks in May and June 2010. Much of what we discussed did not make it into this article. A work such as this commonly goes by “fits and starts”. Ideas dead end and topics serendipitously emerge.

Certainly H. Keith Hunt is to be thanked for his gracious open-handed giving of his time and efforts to this endeavor and to current Editor of JCS/D&CB Stephen Goodwin for accepting it on faith. It is to be hoped that both they and the reader will find value in the final product.