This is the USC Listproc archive of AAPORNET messages for this entire month. It is one big message, in chronological order, just the way the USC archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's search function.

Turning this into individual messages that ASU's Listserv software can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits.

New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly, and I have converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to the present.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory
Arizona State University
shap.wolf@asu.edu
AAPORNET volunteer host

I heartily agree with Glenn Roberts's lamentation of diminished collegiality as AAPORNET partisanship heats up. He's of longer tenure than I, but I've been around long enough (since 1968) to have experienced the transition he remarks on. However, there is an even more important issue here, and that is credibility. AAPOR has always had a left-liberal tilt. Given the backgrounds of its members -- mostly social science and journalism -- that should be no surprise. However, in times past this was muted. Our vehicles of communication -- POQ, the Newsletter and the Annual Conference -- were
conducted in non-partisan fashion, serving as models for members in their interactions, not to mention in their work. Irrespective of personal inclination, both journalists and social scientists should strive to conduct their work as objectively as possible, after all. Thanks to AAPOR's non-partisanship, we maintained the image of credibility necessary for our work.

AAPORNET has provided a vehicle on which partisanship can be more conveniently voiced, and members are yielding to that temptation. If it continues, several things predictably will result. (1) we will provide ammunition to critics who already claim that the polls are leftish-biased; (2) we will develop a "spiral of silence" by which aggressively hostile leftish partisans (e.g., who accuse Republicans of being morally despicable -- which, I must say, after seven years of Democrat acquiescence to Clintonian turpitude, is quite a stretch) stifle honest differences of opinion and objective discussion of controversial topics, and (3) relations among AAPORians will become increasingly rancorous, leading to (4) members who tire of being villified and aren't compelled to belong for strictly business reasons simply dropping out, resulting in AAPOR becoming even more leftish-partisan than it is at present.

Jim Beniger will, I hope, continue his policy of open access to AAPORNET. Therefore, colleagues -- each and every one of you -- the choice is yours. Push your partisan leanings, or strive to be objective and courteous. Personally, I'm with Glenn and Harry on this.

Ray Funkhouser

>From mdbenson@compuserve.com Sat Apr  1 07:32:57 2000
Received: from spamgaae.compuserve.com (as-img-5.compuserve.com [149.174.217.148]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us
id HAA05297 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 07:32:57 -0800 (PST)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost) by spamgaae.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.9) id KAA02070 for aapornet@usc.edu; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 10:32:28 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2000 10:31:13 -0500
From: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
Subject: View of AAPOR
Sender: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <200004011031_MC2-9F82-9079@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id HAA05298

I quite agree with the sentiments expressed by Glenn Roberts. The tone of the discussion on AAPORNET -- and by extension AAPOR -- is decidedly partisan.

>From RobertH877@aol.com Sat Apr  1 07:52:48 2000
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.70]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us
id HAA09152 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 07:52:46 -0800
I agree that we should refrain from partisanship whenever possible. However, in light of the consistently partisan attacks on the concepts of sampling, and on the census questions themselves, I don't think that the defenders of the census are being inappropriate. Silence would signify assent.

Dr. Robert Hitlin
Robert Hitlin Research Associates, Inc.
Reston, Va.

Dear All:

I hope that people did not consider my posting partisan. I just wanted to identify my own political "point of view" so I could make my point. Disputed census counts have led to civil war in other venues (e.g. Biafra), a little tussle over the census form is not, in my opinion, that big a deal.

In my opinion some of the discussion on AAPORNET is more self-serving than partisan:

1) Concern with the attack on the census because it will "damage the credibility of Public Opinion research."

If we don't have a reasonably accurate census, which incidentally has a very good response rate for a mail back questionnaire at this point, we are out
of business.

2) The incredible hysteria surrounding the quite amusing Huffington spoof of the Partnership for a Drug Free America. She is a comedian stupid!

3) Vitriolic attacks on some of the efforts to use the internet to collect data. Where is the attack on the Mall intercept or the pre-qualified panel?

4) Even some of the mean spirited attacks on the students at UCONN. How are they going to learn about surveys without doing them?

Survey research is a reasonable method, but given the number of telemarketing calls I get when I work at home, it is not surprising that the response rate is dropping.

Once again, I think Prewitt is doing a very good job, I think we may have a pretty good Census this year. If people don't want to fill in their income or bathrooms on the long form, the bureau will just use the "Hot Deck" procedure and fill it in for them.

Item non-response is actually reported in both types of Census data that are released.

As to questions about counting race and multiple race or adjustment, I suspect those incredibly politically loaded decisions are headed to court. When the court decided to get into the "political thicket" of state level redistricting in the 1950's to assure one man one vote, it seems to me that the current controversies were inevitable. With the advent of voting rights they become all the more serious.

Such conflicts do not make the GOP bad, nor do they make the DEMs (my party) good. Nor are the answers purely political, but they certainly are partially political.

Andy

Mark Benson wrote:

> I quite agree with the sentiments expressed by Glenn Roberts. The tone
> of the discussion on AAPORNET -- and by extension AAPOR -- is
> decidedly partisan.

--

Andrew A. Beveridge         Home Office
209 Kissena Hall             50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology      Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597      Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837          E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax: 718-997-2820            Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps
Science is inextricably bound up in politics; it cannot be separated, except perhaps analytically, from the public sphere and governance. Civility is, however, necessary in order for the polity to be maintained. AAPOR functions best when its members focus on the organization's critical educative function, employing its members' expertise to contribute to sound decision making.

Alice Robbin/FSU

On Sat, 1 Apr 2000 RobertH877@aol.com wrote:

> I agree that we should refrain from partisanship whenever possible.
> However, in light of the consistently partisan attacks on the concepts
> of sampling, and on the census questions themselves, I don't think
> that the defenders of the census are being inappropriate. Silence
> would signify assent.
>
> Dr. Robert Hitlin
> Robert Hitlin Research Associates, Inc.
> Reston, Va.

>**********************************************
>* Alice Robbin
>* School of Information Studies
>* Florida State University
>* 232 Louis Shores Building
>* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100
>* Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253
>* email: arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu
>**********************************************

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Apr  1 08:15:26 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA14320 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 08:15:26 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA24049 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 11:06:36 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2000 11:06:36 -0500 (EST)
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The beginning of partisan attacks
In-Reply-To: <97.3a69e2f.2617752c@aol.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.10004011055011.22672-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Folks,

Leave it to the New York Times, on this Census Day, when the Census Bureau is attempting to take a snapshot of America—including sex, race, and age, education, marital status, and income—to publish a long review of the Human Genome Diversity Project, by far the most intelligent and sustained research ever to demonstrate that all racial distinctions are entirely arbitrary. If you are not at all surprised by this finding, I know that I like you.

The entire review, by Edward Rothstein, follows my message here. For those of you who are too busy answering all 53 questions on the long form to read the entire review, here's a summary of a few highlights (in Rothstein's own words, as much as possible):

* The greatest genetic variation between any racial groups ever identified is far less than the variation within any given population—all racial distinctions are entirely arbitrary.

* Humanity is thought to have begun in Africa and migrated in different periods throughout the world, with the Americas being settled last. Some studies have suggested that the genetic record proves that humanity has a single female ancestor—\(\text{an Eve}\)—and a single male ancestor—\(\text{an Adam}\). The catch: they probably didn't know each other.

* Europeans (myself included) are, in their ancestry, about two-thirds Asian and one-third African.

* Jews who consider themselves descendants of the biblical priest Aaron (a group known as Cohanim) do have a greater concentration of a particular genetic marker than do other Jews, suggesting a common ancestor.

* As shown again and again, genetic hypotheses about migrations and connections between peoples are borne out by geographical and archaeological evidence as well as by studies of linguistic change—an unusually convincing triangulation by diverse methods in three disparate academic fields of research.
The one word that may have been preserved since the Paleolithic era in many languages is "lice."

Now, can't we all just learn to all get along?
-- Jim

* * * * *

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

April 1, 2000

SHELF LIFE

Dismantling Race and Unifying the Human Species

By EDWARD ROTHSTEIN

Taxonomists, the geneticist Luigi Luca Cavalli-Sforza suggests, can be divided into two camps: lumpers and splitters. The lumpers try to synthesize diverse strands of their study; the splitters separate the whole into its parts. This distinction is a taxonomy too, of course, but one of Mr. Cavalli-Sforza's great achievements is that he straddles the divide. There may be no contemporary scholar who has a more detailed understanding of human diversity or a more compelling vision of its unified history.

Mr. Cavalli-Sforza, emeritus professor of genetics at Stanford University, has taken blood samples from African Pygmies in the Central African Republic, examined church records near Parma, Italy, and considered the linguistic connections between the Basques of Spain and the Hunza people of Pakistan. With his colleagues he began a project known as the Human Genome Diversity Project, which is gathering genetic information on every identifiable human population.

This genetic sampling can cause queasiness among contemporary readers. The dark stains left on the 20th century by racism and eugenics are probably why Mr. Cavalli-Sforza begins "Genes, Peoples and Languages,"a compressed yet wide-ranging survey of his ideas, by dismantling the idea of race. He argues that the differences commonly associated with race are purely a matter of surface appearance, adaptations by various populations to the climates in which they evolved. In tropical climates, for example, it is an advantage to be short because that means there is a greater
surface area for the body's sweat to evaporate in relation to the body's volume. In the cold of Siberia, the Mongols developed round heads and bodies, thus increasing body volume while decreasing the evaporative surface area.

Mr. Cavalli-Sforza argues that the greatest genetic variation between any racial groups ever identified is far less than the variation within any given population. Racial distinctions, he concludes, are arbitrary.

Indeed, for him the point of studying genetic differences is not to make distinctions but to reveal profound connections. "The History and Geography of Human Genes" (1994, Princeton), which Mr. Cavalli-Sforza wrote with Paolo Menozzi and Alberto Piazza, is a magisterial survey of the human past. It is based on a century of data about blood types, protein differences and minute changes in DNA of hundreds of the world's peoples.

That book recounts a grand historical narrative that has been constructed by population geneticists over the last 20 years: humanity is thought to have begun in Africa and migrated in different periods throughout the world, with the Americas being settled last. Some studies have suggested that the genetic record proves that humanity has a single female ancestor -- an Eve -- and a single male ancestor -- an Adam. The catch: they probably didn't know each other.

But how can such sweeping hypotheses be made? One set of tools used by population geneticists are forms of genetic material that are rigidly passed down from parents to children and remain relatively immune to the vagaries of natural selection: every mother passes on a nearly exact copy of a form of DNA to her daughter; every father passes on a nearly exact copy of genetic information on his Y chromosome to his son. That means that it is possible to trace patrilineal and matrilineal lines of succession through history; if certain genetic similarities exist between two people, a common ancestor is likely. This is the sort of analysis that recently concluded that Thomas Jefferson might have had children with his slave Sally Heming.

Similar methods have recently been used to show that Jews who consider themselves descendants of the biblical priest Aaron (a group known as Cohanim), have a greater concentration of a genetic marker than other Jews, suggesting a common ancestor.
But another important tool is the differences in such markers. Mutations tend to take place at a fairly constant rate over history. So variations in a gene can serve as a kind of historical clock. If two populations have common ancestors but a large difference in certain key genes, a guess can be made about how long ago their ancestral peoples separated. Mathematical analysis of these kinds of differences can be used to create a historical map of human migrations. Most remarkably, as Mr. Cavalli-Sforza shows again and again, genetic hypotheses about migrations and connections between peoples have been borne out by geographical and archaeological evidence as well as by studies of linguistic change.

This project is an immense intellectual achievement, and "Genes, Peoples and Languages" is a fine way to get a sense of its scope. It is based on a series of lectures, translated by Mark Seielstad from the Italian, but it is not always easy going. Few readers, for example, will have the mathematical background to understand what eigenvalues are, or will be able to follow paragraphs written in the profession's cryptic shorthand. One might have also wanted a more systematic development of the argument, perhaps resembling the opening chapter of "The History and Geography of Human Genes."

But the book also offers bursts of informality and surprising detail. We learn that Europeans are, in their ancestry, about two-thirds Asian and one-third African; that one word that may have been preserved since the Paleolithic era in many languages is lice; and that Mr. Cavalli-Sforza's wife's three uncles all wanted to marry the same woman. This book is the work of a splitter and a lumper. Whatever it pulls apart, it also puts together.
With the Census under assault at this critical juncture, we certainly should be non-partisan in its defense and should be denouncing equally leaders of any political party who are party to this assault be they Republican, Libertarian, or Democrats. It would be helpful if someone could locate a Democrat leader we could attack on this issue.

My quip on this list a few months ago about the Census and non-partisanship was that Democratic presidents had tried to shield the Census from partisan attacks by appointing a Republican as director and Republican presidents had done the same. Oh, where is Vince now that we need him so badly!

The Census figured as a political issue within AAPOR in both 1950 and 1960 because the elder George Gallup argued to Congress and the press that it could and should be done a damn sight cheaper on a sample basis by private contractors.

C'mon guys, the issue isn't how robust our foreign policy should be or how graduated the income tax. It's amazing that cooperation with the decennial Census and other Census surveys is incomparably greater than with private ones even when we have major party presidential candidates who use slogans such as: "Any dollar you give the government is a dollar you could better spend yourself." Think about it.

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

Mark Benson wrote:
>
> I quite agree with the sentiments expressed by Glenn Roberts. The tone of the discussion on AAPORNET -- and by extension AAPOR -- is decidedly partisan. From dscbsg@panther.Gsu.EDU Sat Apr 1 09:11:01 2000

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu
I am also puzzled by the comments of the GOP leadership and various talk show hosts on the right. I can not believe that they do not know the importance of the data that census bureau collects for policy making and research. Dan Miller who chairs the committee on Census taught with us for three years at Georgia State. He is a bright congressman who knows all about sampling and importance of nonresponse. He is also a nice man.

It is hard to escape the conclusion that GOP leadership is coordinating the same campaign that they started against sampling. They want an undercount in the Democratic majority areas. I hope they will not succeed. It is sad that in this process they are tarnishing the very good reputation of the Census Bureau.

Bikramjit Garcha

On Fri, 31 Mar 2000 jaistrup@fhsu.edu wrote:

> I don't know about the rest of you, but I have had enough !@#$ from the GOP leadership on the census. First, they insist that the census should be an enumeration (according to the courts, rightly so). Now, they are making that enumeration more difficult, by feeding the paranoia that the census survey invades a family's privacy and by extension, that the data will be used by the government in a sinister fashion.
>
> Ironically, they are creating an environment where, in order to obtain an accurate count and accurate statistics, it will be absolutely necessary to use a sampling methodology.
>
> This is the essence of stupidity!
>
> Sincerely, Joe Aistrup
>
>
"Albert D. Biderman" wrote:

> With the Census under assault at this critical juncture, we certainly
> should be non-partisan in its defense and should be denouncing equally
> leaders of any political party who are party to this assault be they
> Republican, Libertarian, or Democrats. It would be helpful if someone
> could locate a Democrat leader we could attack on this issue.

I think that the Democratic defense of the "scientific nature" of sampling is certainly, in part, self-serving. There are many other settings where their embrace of science is not so heartfelt.

You should also know that William Kruskal, who was on the panel about adjustment last time around, came out against it, because he thought that it might eventually be politically manipulated.

I don't think something as fundamentally political as the Census can be shielded from politics!!!

Andy

P.S. I am an elected committe member of the Westchester Democratic Party and served as the Second Vice Chair of the Yonkers Democratic Party.
recall the AAPOR business meeting where AAPOR went on record as opposing
Vince's appointment because he was a Nixon Republican. A that meeting I asked
how many in the room knew Vince. Apart from me you could count the responses
on one hand. But that lack or knowledge did not deter the "objective"
professionals from registering their displeasure.

Harry O'Neill

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Apr  1 12:06:50 2000
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA20393 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 12:06:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-3.tuckahoe.bestweb.net
[209.94.107.212])
    by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA04456;
    Sat, 1 Apr 2000 15:06:49 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <38E656AE.BC19FACB@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Sat, 01 Apr 2000 15:06:07 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: View of AAPOR
References: <31.328fa67.2617ac12@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Who is Vince????

HOneill536@aol.com wrote:

> Al - I was amused by your comment as to where is Vince when we need
> him. I recall the AAPOR business meeting where AAPOR went on record as
> opposing Vince's appointment because he was a Nixon Republican. A that
> meeting I asked how many in the room knew Vince. Apart from me you
> could count the responses on one hand. But that lack or knowledge did
> not deter the "objective" professionals from registering their
> displeasure.
> 
> Harry O'Neill

--
Andrew A. Beveridge              Home Office
209 Kissena Hall                 50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology          Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone:  914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597          Fax:    914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837              E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax:   718-997-2820              Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

>From HOneill536@aol.com Sat Apr  1 12:44:44 2000
Received: from imo-d04.mx.aol.com (imo-d04.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.36])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
Vincent Baraba

> From rusciano@rider.edu Sat Apr 1 12:59:29 2000
> Received: from enigma.rider.edu (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id MAA03826 for aapornet@usc.edu; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 15:59:28 -0800
> (PST)
> Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
> id <01JNQ6W2671C001RR4@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 15:59:24 EST
> Received: from rider.edu (fs90.rider.edu [204.142.224.90])
> by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
> with ESMTP id <01JNQ6WYE1MG001PNN@enigma.rider.edu>; Sat, 01 Apr 2000 15:59:23 -0500 (EST)
> Date: Sat, 01 Apr 2000 16:02:30 -0500
> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
> Subject: Re: Washington Post on Census politics
> To: jwerner@jwdp.com
> Cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Message-id: <38E663E6.986DD292@rider.edu>
> MIME-version: 1.0
> X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en]C-NECCK (Win95; I)
> Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
> References: <38E49A07.8E91032A@jwdp.com>

As I wrote to Jan Werner personally, I don't want to get into making partisan comments, but we should note that the Constitution mandates a census every ten years. It seems irresponsible (and perhaps in violation of the constitution) for those who either hold federal office or who aspire to them to advise citizens to avoid participation.

Jan Werner wrote:

> Census day is tomorrow, and politicians are making the most of it.
> 
> Yesterday, Governor Bush said: "We want as accurate a count as
> possible, but I can understand why people don't want to give over that
> information to the government. If I have the long form, I'm not so
> sure I would do it either."
> 
> Today's Washington Post has a front page article describing the latest
I, for one, am not particularly interested in arguing political issues here on AAPORNET, but the Census is something of great importance to us as survey researchers, and if one group of politicians has taken it upon themselves to discourage compliance, for whatever reason, this affects all AAPOR members professionally and is therefore deserving of discussion here.

This really shouldn't be a partisan issue, because even though it is the current Republican leadership in the Congress who seem to be leading the attack on the Census, this does not reflect on all Republicans any more than Mr. Gore's craven pandering on the matter of Elian Gonzalez reflects on all Democrats.

It is somewhat shocking, however, to hear the majority leader of the U.S. Senate and a major party candidate for president, neither of whom is likely to be confused with Martin Luther King or Mahatma Ghandi, advocating selective disregard for the law:

United States Code  
TITLE 13 - CENSUS  
CHAPTER 7 - OFFENSES AND PENALTIES  
SUBCHAPTER II - OTHER PERSONS  

Sec. 221. Refusal or neglect to answer questions; false answers  

(a) Whoever, being over eighteen years of age, refuses or willfully neglects, when requested by the Secretary, or by any other authorized officer or employee of the Department of Commerce or bureau or agency
(b) Whoever, when answering questions described in subsection (a) of this section, and under the conditions or circumstances described in such subsection, willfully gives any answer that is false, shall be fined not more than $500.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no person shall be compelled to disclose information relative to his religious beliefs or to membership in a religious body.

Jan Werner

--
From PAHARDING7@aol.com Sat Apr 1 15:46:19 2000
Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.4]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA13446 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 15:46:18 -0800 (PST)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com by imo14.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v25.3.) id 5.7d.2fca89b (4562) for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Apr 2000 18:45:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <7d.2fca89b.2617e426@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2000 18:45:42 EST
Subject: Re: View of AAPOR
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 100

Andy...

It's my recollection that "Vince" is/was Vince Baraba, who was appointed head of the Census Bureau and, so far as I know, carried out the jobapolitically.
I think the business meeting to which Harry refers took place in 1973; I was then on on the Executive Council, and the matter also came up -- although in very restrained fashion -- at its meeting the following day. The conference

that year coincided with the tele-vised testimony before Sam Ervin's subcommittee of John Dean -- Nixon's White House counsel and the guy who allegedly informed him that "a cancer [was] growing on the presidency" -- and for some of us that was a bigger draw than the sessions.

Phil Harding
paharding7@aol.com

--
From caplanjr@bellsouth.net Sat Apr 1 15:54:47 2000
I may be totally confused here but if those trying to influence Americans not to reply succeed, it will result in OVERREPRESENTATION by those who feel that sort of demagoguery is nonsense. Hence, it will counter productive!

(Or is that another name for a highly efficient Census enumerator?)

Jim Caplan
Miami

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <jaistrup@fhsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2000 8:10 AM
Subject: The Republicans and the Census

> I don't know about the rest of you, but I have had enough !@#$ from the
> leadership on the census. First, they insist that the census should
> be an enumeration (according to the courts, rightly so). Now, they
> are making that enumeration more difficult, by feeding the paranoia
> that the census survey invades a family's privacy and by extension,
> that the data will be used by the government in a sinister fashion.
> 
> Ironically, they are creating an enviroment where, in order to obtain
> an accurate count and accurate statistics, it will be absolutely
> nessary to use a sampling methodology.
> 
> This is the essence of stupidity!
>
> Sincerely, Joe Aistrup

>
A little more detail on this can be found beginning on page 155 of AAPOR's own history, A MEETING PLACE (1992, ed. Paul Sheatsley and Warren Mitofsky). The name is spelled with two b's, Vincent Barabba. This is interesting reading and great that AAPOR published this volume. Hats off to Warren and the late Paul and all the writers who contributed. Bob Shapiro

On Sat, 1 Apr 2000 PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote:

> Andy...
> It's my recollection that "Vince" is/was Vince Baraba, who was appointed head of the Census Bureau and, so far as I know, carried out the job apolitically. I think the business meeting to which Harry refers took place in 1973; I was then on on the Executive Council, and the matter also came up -- although in very restrained fashion -- at its meeting the following day. The conference that year coincided with the tele-vised testimony before Sam Ervin's subcommitte of John Dean -- Nixon's White House counsel and the guy who allegedly informed him that "a cancer [was] growing on the presidency" -- and for some of us that was a bigger draw than the sessions.
>
> Phil Harding
> paharding7@aol.com
Yes, Harry. But you should also mention that AAPOR subsequently applauded Vince's work as Census director, had him as a speaker and commended his recall to a second term as Census director.

warren mitofsky

At 02:46 PM 4/1/00 -0500, you wrote:
> Al - I was amused by your comment as to where is Vince when we need
> him. I recall the AAPOR business meeting where AAPOR went on record as
> opposing Vince's appointment because he was a Nixon Republican. A that
> meeting I asked how many in the room knew Vince. Apart from me you
> could count the responses on one hand. But that lack or knowledge did
> not deter the "objective" professionals from registering their
> displeasure.
> >
> >Harry O'Neill

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 fax

e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com
"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote in part:
>
> "Albert D. Biderman" wrote:
>
> > You should also know that William Kruskal, who was on the panel about
> > adjustment last time around, came out against it, because he thought
> > that it might eventually be politically manipulated.
>
> > <SNIP>

Yes, I knew Bill Kruskal then. Bill Kruskal was a friend of mine. But George W., Trent Lott, Andy Rooney, Rush Limbaugh, et al., ain't none of them a Bill Kruskal.

Al Biderman
abider@american.edu

For those who think the current Census flap is something recent, check out I Chronicles, Ch 21, which begins: "A satan rose up against Israel, and he enticed David into taking a census of Israel." It turned out very badly for King David. Nothing new in 2500 years? When I first ran across this I
looked into it but could find no satisfactory answer for why the ancient Hebrews considered a census to be a bad idea. Anybody know anything about it? Maybe it would even provide some insight into current controversies.

Ray ("Not a Christian Fundamentalist") Funkhouser

>From mkshares@mcs.net Sun Apr 2 09:26:11 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA24160 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Apr 2000 09:26:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P19-Chi-Dial-3.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.147])
   by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA73172
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Apr 2000 11:26:03 -0500 (CDT)
   (envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <38E7203A.48E14E1C@mcs.net>
Date: Sun, 02 Apr 2000 10:26:05 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The Republicans and the Census
References: <OFED26F6FC.DC9DA79-ON86256B3.0046F8C6@fhsu.edu>
           <008c01bf9c35$a4845940$5393fea9@net.JRC>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>From Clarence Page's Tribune column today:

IN DEFENSE OF THE NOZY CENSUS QUESTIONS

"Now that conservative Republicans have embraced rhetoric that panders to
anti-census voices, they actually may be discouraging compliance among their
own most likely supporters. If so, it would be a good example of politics
exerting poetic justice."


Jim Caplan wrote:

> I may be totally confused here but if those trying to influence
> Americans not to reply succeed, it will result in OVERREPRESENTATION
> by those who feel that sort of demagoguery is nonsense. Hence, it
> will counter productive! (Or is that another name for a highly
> efficient Census enumerator?)
>
> Jim Caplan
> Miami
> ------- Original Message -------
> From: <jaistrup@fhsu.edu>
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Friday, March 31, 2000 8:10 AM
> Subject: The Republicans and the Census
I don't know about the rest of you, but I have had enough !@#$ from the GOP leadership on the census. First, they insist that the census should be an enumeration (according to the courts, rightly so). Now, they are making that enumeration more difficult, by feeding the paranoia that the census survey invades a family's privacy and by extension, that the data will be used by the government in a sinister fashion.

Ironically, they are creating an environment where, in order to obtain an accurate count and accurate statistics, it will be absolutely necessary to use a sampling methodology.

This is the essence of stupidity!

Sincerely, Joe Aistrup

Poetic justice indeed!

Can you imagine the outcry if the Bureau announced that, in deference to the legitimate feelings of the honorable members of the legislative branch, they would not follow up on non-response in areas whose elected representatives had advised their constituents not to fill in the forms.

As Brer Rabbit might put it, "Whatever you do, Senator Lott, jes' don't throw me in that there Census briar patch!"

Jan Werner

_______________
Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
> > From Clarence Page's Tribune column today:
> >
> > IN DEFENSE OF THE NOSY CENSUS QUESTIONS
> >
> > "Now that conservative Republicans have embraced rhetoric that panders to anti-census voices, they actually may be discouraging compliance among their own most likely supporters. If so, it would be a good example of politics exerting poetic justice."
> >
> >
> > Jim Caplan wrote:
> >
> > > I may be totally confused here but if those trying to influence Americans not to reply succeed, it will result in OVERREPRESENTATION by those who feel that sort of demagoguery is nonsense. Hence, it will counter productive! (Or is that another name for a highly efficient Census enumerator?)
> >
> > Jim Caplan
> > Miami
> > ----- Original Message -----
> > From: <jaistrup@fhsu.edu>
> > To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Sent: Friday, March 31, 2000 8:10 AM
> > Subject: The Republicans and the Census
> >
> > > I don't know about the rest of you, but I have had enough !@#$
> > > from the GOP
> > > leadership on the census. First, they insist that the census should be an enumeration (according to the courts, rightly so).
> > > Now, they are making that enumeration more difficult, by feeding the paranoia that the census survey invades a family's privacy and by extension, that the data will be used by the government in a sinister fashion.
> > > Ironically, they are creating an enviroment where, in order to obtain an accurate count and accurate statistics, it will be absolutely nessary to use a sampling methodology.
> > > This is the essence of stupidity!
> > >
> > > Sincerely, Joe Aistrup
> >
> >
> >From ande271@attglobal.net Sun Apr  2 17:33:59 2000
> Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [32.97.166.32])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id RAA08431 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Apr 2000 17:33:59 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from attglobal.net ([32.100.253.220]) by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP (PDT)
Frank Rusciano's point is, I believe the best that has been made in this AAPORNET debate. A further point: replying to the Census is mandatory. In this the decennial Census is not similar to public opinion polls. Not to provide data on the Census means risking some sort of sanction. Even though this sanction is rarely applied, it does not seem appropriate for an elected official to appear to condone non-response.

The problem is, what can AAPOR's position be with regard to this? I believe we cannot take a stand on constitutional or legal grounds. We can stress 1) the fact that a decennial Census has been taken since 1790, 2) that individual data are never divulged or used (challenging anyone to contradict this with facts, 3) that the data are extremely useful for a whole host of individual, business and community users, and 4) that the questions are easily and quickly answered, even those on the long form.

Beyond that we cannot go, it seems to me, without compromising our professional standards. There should be a way for individual AAPOR members to "sound off" when research standards are compromised, but AAPORNET should be a forum for professional exchange, leading wherever possible to an AAPOR statement that reflects consensus on research issues.

Frank Rusciano wrote:

> As I wrote to Jan Werner personally, I don't want to get into making partisan comments, but we should note that the Constitution mandates a census every ten years. It seems irresponsible (and perhaps in violation of the constitution) for those who either hold federal office or who aspire to them to advise citizens to avoid participation.
> 
> Jan Werner wrote:
> 
> > Census day is tomorrow, and politicians are making the most of it.
> > >
> > > Yesterday, Governor Bush said: "We want as accurate a count as possible, but I can understand why people don't want to give over that information to the government. If I have the long form, I'm not sure I would do it either."
> > >
> > > Today's Washington Post has a front page article describing the latest round of political blather over the Census, which can be read at:
I always wondered whether it was because there were two reports on results of a single census: both (different) results were reported. Must have shook up the rabbis afterwards. But I don't really know why taking a census is taboo. Orthodox Jews reply to the U.S. decennial Census, don't they?

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> For those who think the current Census flap is something recent, check > out I Chronicles, Ch 21, which begins: "A satan rose up against Israel, and he > enticed David into taking a census of Israel." It turned out very badly for > King David. Nothing new in 2500 years? When I first ran across this I > looked into it but could find no satisfactory answer for why the ancient > Hebrews considered a census to be a bad idea. Anybody know anything about > it? Maybe it would even provide some insight into current controversies.
> 
> Ray ("Not a Christian Fundamentalist") Funkhouser
Two related questions to anyone interested in the study of Internet users:

(1) How are the "internet users" defined in studies?
   --Applications (e-mail only? WWW only? or all services on the Internet including FTP, telnet, IRC?)
   --Frequency (Ever used the Internet? Used the Internet in the past month, past week, yesterday?)
   --Examples of different results based on different definitions

(2) Measurement of the Internet use activity: How are they measured in studies?

I'd appreciate for any comments, recent references, or URLs of related Web sites on these issues. Thank you very much.

Mee-Eun Kang

Keep up the voting! Wednesday Midnight the polls will close.

**********VERY IMPORTANT - VOTING INSTRUCTIONS**********

****Send all votes to TSHIRT2000_1999@yahoo.com

****DO NOT Reply to this email and reveal your vote to everyone on AAPORNET****
The TOP 5 AAPOR T-SHIRT SLOGANS are (not in any particular order):

2. When America Talks, We Listen

4. Is That Your Final Answer?

25. Your Opinion Counts If We Count Your Opinion.

26. "Public Opinion In This Country Is Everything".
   Abraham Lincoln

29. Don't Call Us, We'll Call You.

=====

Katherine "Kat" Lind
Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Talk to your friends online with Yahoo! Messenger. http://im.yahoo.com

I respect Mr. Hitin's opinion, and believe everyone is entitled to their own opinion. My point earlier on was simply that if you have a political opinion, express it someplace where it will do some good, such as to your Congressman. This list is not the place for political venting, though some continually use it for that purpose.
I agree that we should refrain from partisanship whenever possible. However, in light of the consistently partisan attacks on the concepts of sampling, and on the census questions themselves, I don't think that the defenders of the census are being inappropriate. Silence would signify assent.

Dr. Robert Hitlin
Robert Hitlin Research Associates, Inc.
Reston, Va.

Currently we ask two Internet questions on all of our general population surveys (most of which are limited to Virginia).

In the past seven days, have you accessed the Internet either to check email
or visit a website?

AND IF "YES,"

Did you access the Internet from home, from work, from school or a public library, or from someplace else? [Allowing for multiple response]

In general we find between 50%-55% of respondents claim to have accessed the Internet in the past 7 days. Responses follow expected patterns regarding gender, race, age, education, and income.

Most respondents who have accessed the Net report getting on at home (somewhere in the neighborhood of 70%), with a significant minority reporting access from work (approx. 40%).

I'd be interested to hear what others are finding (and how they are asking).

John

--
John C. Fries..................................Voice: (804) 358-8981 Senior Project Director.........................FAX: (804) 358-9701 Southeastern Institute of Research........................Richmond, Virginia Marketing and Opinion Research..........email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

Mee-Eun Kang wrote:
>
> To AAPORneters,
>
> Two related questions to anyone interested in the study of Internet users:
>
> (1) How are the "Internet users" defined in studies?
>     --Applications (e-mail only? WWW only? or all services on the Internet including FTP, telnet, IRC?)
>     --Frequency (Ever used the Internet? Used the Internet in the past month, past week, yesterday?)
>     --Examples of different results based on different definitions
>
> (2) Measurement of the Internet use activity: How are they measured in studies?
>
> I'd appreciate for any comments, recent references, or URLs of related Web sites on these issues. Thank you very much.
>
> Mee-Eun Kang

> From ratledge@UDel.Edu Mon Apr  3 07:03:01 2000
Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA12894 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 07:02:52 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from zeke1.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.23])
  by copland.udel.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA01640 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 10:02:20 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by exchange.chep.udel.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
There seems to be two different issues in this area. The first that surrounds the "digital divide" is the question of access. Here we ask if you have a PC in your household, if you have access to a PC at work, and do you have internet access at home/work. That is decidedly different from measuring utilization. As access increases then utilization takes on a far more important role and the interpretation of the results may be entirely different. We have been concerned primarily with measuring access but I think we will add the utilization dimension to all of our statewide surveys as well.

How to measure utilization is an open question. Checking e-mail is an issue. Many companies have e-mail systems for their companies but block access to the Internet in general. Maybe accessing the WWW once a week is a good proxy for all of it. FTP is a very specific application and probably occurs or is at least perceived to be used less frequently for the average user. Many people may not know they are using the internet with telnet because its usually only an icon setup by some installation software pointing at a single host. Further, its use may be resticted to a particular domain. In the end it all depends on what you want to use the measurements for.

-----Original Message-----
From: Mee-Eun Kang [mailto:mkang@sookmyung.ac.kr]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2000 8:54 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Defining "Internet users"

To AAPORneters,

Two related questions to anyone interested in the study of Internet users:

(1) How are the "internet users" defined in studies?
   --Applications (e-mail only? WWW only? or all services on the Internet including FTP, telnet, IRC?)
   --Frequency (Ever used the Internet? Used the Internet in the past month, past week, yesterday?)
   --Examples of different results based on different definitions

(2) Measurement of the Internet use activity: How are they measured in studies?

I'd appreciate for any comments, recent references, or URLs of related Web sites on these issues. Thank you very much.

Mee-Eun Kang
I think the resistance to filling out the census based on "privacy grounds" is quite humorous considering that marketing lists have considerably more private information about people than any single government agency - just take a look at all of the "targeted samples" that companies like Survey Research can provide.

Lynda Voigt
The Southeastern Legal Foundation is at it again with this press release saying in so many words that the Census as currently conducted violates the Constitution. These are the same folks that brought -- and won-- the suit regarding sampling as a part of the enumeration process.

http://www.southeasternlegal.org/p0004031.html

--------------B4C2B31C740A86FCC0553EAD
Content-Type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1; name="p0004031.html"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline;
  filename="p0004031.html"
Content-Base: "http://www.southeasternlegal.org/p0004031.html"
Content-Location: "http://www.southeasternlegal.org/p0004031.html"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//IETF//DTD HTML//EN">
<html>
<head>
<meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
<meta name="GENERATOR" content="Microsoft FrontPage 4.0">
<script language="JavaScript">
<!--
function MM_swapImgRestore() { //v2.0
  if (document.MM_swapImgData !=null)
    for (var i=0; i<(document.MM_swapImgData.length-1); i+=2)
      document.MM_swapImgData[i].src = document.MM_swapImgData[i+1]; }
function MM_preloadImages() { //v2.0
  if (document.images) {
    var imgFiles = MM_preloadImages.arguments;
    if (document.preloadArray=3D=3Dnull) document.preloadArray = new Array();
    var i = document.preloadArray.length;
    with (document) for (var j=0; j<imgFiles.length; j++) if (imgFiles[j].charAt(0)!=#) {
      preloadArray[i] = new Image;
      preloadArray[i++].src = imgFiles[j];
    }
  }
}
function MM_swapImage() { //v2.0
  var i,j=3D0, objStr, obj, swapArray=3Dnew Array, oldArray=3Ddocument.MM_swapImageData;
  for (i=3D0; i < (MM_swapImage.arguments.length-2); i+=3D3) {
    objStr = MM_swapImage.arguments[(navigator.appName =3D=3D 'Netscape')?i:i+1];
    if ((objStr.indexOf('document.layers[')=3D=3D0 & document.layers=3D=3Dnull) ||
     (objStr.indexOf('document.all[') =3D=3D0 & document.all =3D=3Dnull))
      objStr = 'document'+objStr.substring(objStr.lastIndexOf('.')+'.');
  }<script language="JavaScript">
</html>
tr.length);
  obj = eval(objStr);
  if (obj != null) {
    swapArray[j++] = obj;
2Esrc: oldArray[j];
    obj.src = MM_swapImage.arguments[i+2];
  }
}
document.MM_swapImgData = swapArray; //used for restore

//-->
</script>

<title>U.S. SUPREME COURT CENSUS VICTORS CALL FOR DISMANTLING OF CENSUS BUREAU</title> </head>

<body>
<table border=3D"0" width=3D"600" bgcolor=3D"#FFFFFF" align=3D"center">
  <tr>
    <td align=3D"center" width=3D"180"><p align=3D"center"><img src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/sflbanner.gif" width=3D"550" height=3D"88"></p></td>
  </tr>
  <tr>
    <td align=3D"center" width=3D"600"><img src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/red_spacer.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"20"><a href=3D"index.htm" onMouseOut=3D"MM_swapImgRestore()" onMouseOver=3D"MM_swapImage('document.home','document.home','images/m_home_r.gif','#92152511790')"><img name=3D"home" border=3D"0" src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/m_home_b.gif" width=3D"49" height=3D"20"></a><img src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/red_spacer.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"20"><a href=3D"about_us.htm" onMouseOut=3D"MM_swapImgRestore()" onMouseOver=3D"MM_swapImage('document.about_us','document.about_us','images/m_about_us_r.gif','#921289672720')"><img name=3D"about_us" border=3D"0" src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/m_about_us_b.gif" width=3D"95" height=3D"95"></a><img src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/red_spacer.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"20"><a href=3D"cases.htm" onMouseOut=3D"MM_swapImgRestore()" onMouseOver=3D"MM_swapImage('document.cases','document.cases','images/m_cases_r.gif','#921290808580')"><img name=3D"cases" border=3D"0" src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/m_cases_b.gif" width=3D"63" height=3D"63"></a><img src=3D"http://southeasternlegal.org/images/red_spacer.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"20"></td>
  </tr>
</table>
WASHINGTON, DC/ATLANTA: The Southeastern Legal Foundation today called for the dismantling of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, to be replaced by two independent agencies designed to ensure a "fair, constitutional decennial census count," according to SLF President Matthew Glavin.
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Foundation won a 1999 U.S. Supreme Court decision banning the Clinton administration’s plan to use the controversial method known as "statistical sampling" rather than the constitutionally prescribed "actual Enumeration" head count for determining congressional apportionment.

With the release of our special report, Census 2000 Crisis: The Response Gap & Blueprint for Reform, the Southeastern Legal Foundation seeks to highlight the structural and philosophical problems at the Census Bureau which make it impossible to conduct a constitutional, fair and accurate census count, making the failures this year look less like reasonable mistakes and more like deliberate sabotage, said Glavin. What we are saying is simple — remove the political aspects of the census, separate out the constitutional ten-year head count for legislative apportionment, and allow the statisticians to gather information in separate activities.

The American people have overwhelmingly rejected participation in this year’s Census because, frankly, they do not trust the federal government, said Glavin. No other government agency, or law enforcement body, has the power to ask the invasive questions required on the census forms except by power of a court-ordered warrant or legal proceeding.

As such, the entire process raises serious constitutional questions about why we conduct a census in the first place. That’s why less than 40 percent of Americans have bothered to participate this year.
released the special report and took questions on Monday at 1 pm at the National Press Club, Edward R. Murrow Room.
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CENSUS IN CRISIS

Dear Aapo,

I am writing to urge your support of the Census in Crisis Coalition.

As you know, the Census is critical to ensuring the fair distribution of
federal funds and resources for programs that serve the community.

The Census is conducted every ten years and is a snapshot of the nation's
population and housing. The data collected is used to determine how
federal funds are allocated and how many congressional representatives
are needed for each state.

Unfortunately, the Census is facing significant challenges. The federal
government has reduced funding for the Census and has made it more
difficult for communities to participate. This could lead to an undercount
of the population and result in losses of federal funds and resources.

I urge you to support the Census in Crisis Coalition and help ensure
accurate and complete Census data.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Dick Halpern

P.S. Please join the Census in Crisis Coalition by signing up at
http://censusinthecrisis.org/

If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact
me.

Best regards,

Dick Halpern
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Hi folks,

Here, in greater detail is the proposal by the Southeastern Legal Foundation regarding Census problems and how they ought to be fixed. It's a bit long but it paints a pretty good picture of exciting things to come. To find out more about this foundation, which is admittedly politically very conservative, go to their web site

Dick Halpern

CENSUS IN CRISIS

The Response Gap
and
A Blueprint for Reform

Southeastern Legal Foundation
3340 Peachtree Road
Suite 2515
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(404) 365-8500, Fax (404) 365-0017
www.southeasternlegal.org

INTRODUCTION

The Atlanta-based Southeastern Legal Foundation opened the national dialogue on Census 2000 with a successful U.S. Supreme Court challenge against the Clinton administration's plan to use the controversial method known as "statistical sampling" rather than the "actual Enumeration" head count required by the U.S. Constitution for purposes of congressional apportionment. Now, constitutional questions have arisen regarding questions asked on census forms, as well as logistical and philosophical questions which have arisen in light of manifest problems with the conduct of Census 2000. What follows is a discussion of the so-called "Response Gap" (widespread failure and discontent with conduct and content of Census 2000), and a Blueprint for Reform of the decennial census process.

PART ONE

THE 2000 CENSUS IN CRISIS

CREATING THE RESPONSE GAP

The 2000 Census is ripe for failure, for both long-term structural and strategic reasons, and short-term tactical decisions made by Bureau personnel. This observation is validated by the fact that the 2000 Census=\ldots
GAO has appeared every year on the GAO’s high-risk series of government programs most prone to failure, waste, fraud, and abuse since the inception of the reports five years ago.

Problems with understanding the purpose of the census

The most fundamental problem with the 2000 census has been the failure by Congress and the Bureau to address the simple question of whether we actually count every American or simply rely on statistical estimates. The Bureau has lost track of the constitutional purpose of the census through the addition of a myriad of non-constitutional responsibilities, many of which are constitutionally suspect, that the Bureau has either assumed or created for itself since 1790.

Problems with Census Bureau philosophy

Today’s Census Bureau can be divided into two philosophical factions, the enumerators and the statisticians. For 200 years, the philosophy of the enumerators governed the census, namely, that the Bureau is to go out and actually count each resident, one by one, as prescribed by the Constitution and federal law. During the last 10 years, the philosophy of the statisticians has become ascendant, namely, that it is impossible to count everyone, and the best way to conduct the census is to take a statistical survey. Their belief in the Holy Grail of the use of statistics is unshakable, and all who disagree are thought of as unsophisticated Luddites. Even after the U.S. Supreme Court issued its ruling against the use of sampling in Glavin v. Clinton, this attitude has persisted among many within the Census Bureau, potentially poisoning the entire 2000 census as a result.

Problems with Census Bureau mission

The development of the harmful philosophy of the statisticians can be directly traced to the Bureau’s split from its past traditions and constitutional mission in favor of becoming the self-described “World’s Premier Statistical Agency.” The primary culprit in this split was the development of, and emphasis on, the census long form, and the dozens of other similarly intrusive statistical surveys conducted by the Bureau each year. Instead of focusing its resources on the constitutional element of the decennial census, the Bureau has instead over the years placed increasing emphasis on conducting these sample surveys and developing new ones. Inevitably, as these surveys became a larger and more important part of Bureau operations, the power and influence of the statisticians in charge of them grew. And, as that influence grew, statisticians began to offer their sampling methodology first as an enhancement to, and then as a replacement for, the primary enumeration mission of the decennial census.

Problems with Census Bureau organization

As Abraham Lincoln said, “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” Yet, the modern Census Bureau is as divided by mission and methodology. On one hand are the enumerators, responsible for activities such as address list development, promotion and outreach, recruitment and retention of field interviewers, and compiling and publishing census data.
The common denominator of the enumerators' work is that it is difficult, exacting, and time-consuming. On the other hand are the statisticians, ever ready to develop elaborate new statistical procedures, thus offering a tempting shortcut for the work of the enumerator, but at the staggering price of compromising the constitutionality and legality of the census. Having these two factions in close contact within the same agency exacerbates tensions and distracts each from their legitimate mission and purpose.

While in theory these groups should be complementary, in reality, they are competitors for limited resources and subject to conflicts between different approaches.

Problems with agency infrastructure

As currently designed, the Census Bureau is an unwieldy agency that serves many masters, often with conflicting goals and agendas. While the primary constitutional responsibility of the Bureau is to provide Congress with the apportionment and redistricting counts, the census authority was unwisely delegated to the Executive Branch by Congress. As a result, the vast majority of activities the Bureau is now involved with have little or nothing to do with the decennial census, but rather are justifications for an expanded workforce of statisticians throughout the decade. This exacerbates the Bureau's lack of focus on its primary constitutional mission.

Problems with politicization of the census

Because so much political power and federal funding is distributed on the basis of census data, the Bureau has become the whipping boy of politicians in both parties. The inclusion of data on racial and ethnic origin has made this problem even worse, as exemplified by the debate over the multiracial classification and the Bureau's decision, under pressure from minority interest groups, to categorize multiracial respondents in one of the old racial minority categories instead of classifying them as identified. Another example of a politicized census was the decision by the Bureau in 1996 to alter their original non-response sampling plan from a target of reaching 90% in each county before SNRFU began to a target of 90% in each census tract before SNRFU begins. This decision was a result of direct political pressure from the Congressional Black Caucus, who felt the county based plan might erode their power. The Bureau can also be political in deciding which programs not to include, such as their refusal to include post-census local review in the 2000 plan because it was supported by Congressional Republicans. The level of Bureau and Administration involvement in the politics of opposing legislation to mandate PCLR was appalling, including putting political pressure on mayors who had endorse PCLR to reverse their stand. Finally, the entire question of adjusting census counts through sampling brings the ultimate politicization of the process. While the science behind sampling may be valid, the selection of blocks for sampling and many other assumptions in formulas open the process to many different outcomes determined solely by these choices. This places in the hands of a select few individuals the opportunity to manipulate the census data to achieve a desired outcome, a terrifying tool that threatens the foundation of representative democracy. In short, he who creates the statistical model controls the outcome.
Problems with Census Bureau credibility

The mantra of the Census Bureau for several years has been that Congress and the American public should trust them completely, as they are models of professionalism, ethics, and honesty. However, many incidents have shown this to be untrue. In 1998, the Washington Times discovered that the chairman of an important NAS panel evaluating the Bureau’s statistical plans for 2000 was in fact a key executive at a firm receiving millions of dollars in contracts from the Bureau, a clear conflict of interest and violation of professional ethics. The Bureau has repeatedly refused to respond to legitimate oversight inquiries by the Congress and CMB, and is incredibly tardy and incomplete in providing documents and information to its overseers. During the politically charged 1998 Census Dress Rehearsal, the Bureau claimed that the non-response follow-up period went so well that it was concluded over a week early. Subsequent investigation by the GAO determined that the Bureau misled the public and Congress about the Dress Rehearsals, and that in fact, nearly 20% of the data collected during NRFU was guesswork proxy data, not actual interviews with respondents.

Most appallingly, three successive Census Bureau directors lied under oath to Congress about the Bureau’s role in identifying Japanese-Americans during World War II. While all three directors’ testimony highlighted the supposed refusal of the Bureau to cooperate with military authorities who wanted information on the Nisei as an example of how confidential census material is at all times, recent investigative reports have uncovered evidence that the Bureau actually cooperated in providing to the military block level data on where the Nisei lived. While technically not a violation of Title 13, this Bureau cooperation makes them complicit in the imprisonment of thousands of innocent Japanese-Americans in internment camps, and raises serious questions about what might be done in future crises by the Bureau. In sum, the Bureau’s credibility problems inspire little confidence in the American people for the agency.

Increasing societal concerns about privacy

The revelation of the Bureau’s role in the shameful Nisei episode could not come at a worse time. In recent surveys conducted by private polling organizations, a majority of Americans stated that one of their primary worries in the 21st century is a loss of privacy. With the advent of the Internet and instant worldwide data transmission, Americans are concerned about their privacy more than ever before. Into this environment of jealously guarded privacy comes the Census Bureau, with the invasive long form sent to 1 in 6 households nationwide, and 1 in 2 households in rural areas. Internal Census Bureau studies show that the inclusion of the long form in the decennial census drives down the response rate and drives up enumeration costs. Yet, the Bureau and Congress both share guilt in continuing what amounts to the largest corporate welfare giveaway of the U.S. government. More importantly, the census long form represents the only attempt sanctioned by American law to demand, under threat of criminal and civil penalty, information which could not be obtained by law enforcement or revenue officers without a court order (due process and equal protection concerns are apparent).
EXACERBATING THE RESPONSE GAP

THE PLANNING PROBLEMS AND OPERATIONAL FAILURES OF THE 2000 CENSUS

In addition to the long-term structural and philosophical problems outlined above, the Bureau has made numerous missteps, bad decisions, and flawed execution of programs over the past several years.

The primary culprit in all of these poor decisions and mistakes has been the Bureau placing a priority emphasis on statistical techniques at the expense of counting techniques. In 1990, the Bureau put counting first and estimating second. While this was the correct approach, it frustrated statisticians and some politicians who wanted statistically adjusted numbers to be used for legislative redistricting. The deadline for the release of redistricting data is April 1 of the year following the census, and in 1990, the Bureau simply could not get the results of its 150,000 household sample survey completed, processed, and statistically integrated into the actual census counts in time. As a result of this, and of political decisions by the Bush Administration, sampled numbers were not released. Bureau planners and their political allies have vowed not to allow this to happen again, and as a result, have designed a census where sampling comes first and counting a distant second. This highly questionable decision, motivated by partisan politics and a desire for vindication by Bureau statisticians, has compromised the Census 2000 design in many areas.

Address list development

This critical census function has been executed poorly by the Bureau. Despite hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars spent on the address list during the last decade, it remains inaccurate and incomplete in many areas. The most glaring problem is failure to add many newly constructed residential areas to the list, exemplified by the exclusion of at least on street in the subdivision where census plaintiff Matthew Glavin resides in suburban Atlanta. Local maps have shown and the Post Office has been delivering mail to this street for more than three years. Indeed, most private sector maps and geography tools are more up-to-date and accurate than Bureau materials. Without this basic building block done correctly as a foundation, the entire census will be inaccurate, and statistical remedies will exacerbate rather than solve the problem.

Lack of a Post-Census Local Review (PCLR) Program

The best way to correct a flawed address list is to allow local governments to review the list both before and after the census is taken. While the Bureau, at the insistence of Congress, added the pre-census review period known as LUCA, it has adamantly refused to accept any type of meaningful PCLR. This will leave communities with no chance to see if entire blocks of addresses were missed, a particularly troubling issue in areas of rapid growth and many new addresses. The lack of PCLR is a direct result of the Bureau's desire to finish its field work rapidly in order to release adjusted numbers by the April 1, 2001 deadline.
Ill-considered timetable for Census 2000 field operations

The most time-consuming job in the census is field follow-up on non-responding households. It was one of the most critical and costly problems encountered by the 1990 census. Despite this, the Bureau’s official timetable for 2000 incredibly calls for follow up on 12 million more non-responding households than in 1990, but in 4 weeks less time. Equally unrealistic is the Bureau’s plan to survey twice as many households in its statistical adjustment sample, 300,000 instead of 150,000, but to do it in 13 weeks instead of the 26 weeks it took for half as many people in 1990. These two items taken together strongly suggest that the Bureau will be relying on an inordinate amount of proxy data for actual enumeration, as was found in the dress rehearsal, and extremely questionable practice that verges on outright fraud of the taxpayer and the spirit of the census. Once again, these timetable decisions are a result of the rush to released sampled data by April 1, 2001.

Elimination of the second mailing

With a declining mail response rate over the past several decades, Census 2000 originally planned to use two mailings to achieve a response rate goal of 67 percent. 60 percent was to come from the first mailing, and 7 percent from the second. Despite it being tested with successful results in the 1998 Dress Rehearsal, the second mailing was dropped from the final plan. Why? Because once again, the Bureau determined a second mailing would take too much time to complete and would delay the release of statistically adjusted data in April 2001. So, the Bureau consciously decided to forgo collecting the completely accurate, legitimate data on millions of Americans that would be derived from a second mailing in favor of saving time to develop statistically manufactured data later. Interestingly enough, even though the Bureau dropped the second mailing and had to reconcile itself to a lower overall mail response rate, and a larger non-response follow-up field work load, it did not allow itself any more time to do field work in the master plan.

Greatly restricted de-duplication activities

According to a report of the Commerce Department Inspector General, in 1990, the Census Bureau looked for duplicate forms in a radius of 9 census blocks from the respondents address. This was a time-consuming, but thorough process. In 2000, to save time, this search for duplicates has been restricted to just one block. The Bureau then plans to use controversial statistical methods to identify duplicates in the aggregate rather than physical duplicates. This will result in the unjustified deletion of many legitimate households from the census counts. Once again, thoroughness and accuracy is sacrificed to save time and enhance the use of statistics.

Inclusion and massive overuse of the census long form

The census long form is the best example of the Bureau’s deviation from the original purpose of the census found in the Constitution. Weighing in at 57 questions, the long form is a time-consuming invasion of privacy that drives down response rates, especially in hard-to-count areas. The
Bureau and its special interest group and corporate welfare allies have resisted all efforts to reduce the size of the long form or separate it from the decennial census entirely. Furthermore, the long form, which is a statistical sample, is incredibly overused. The statistical experts at the Bureau tried to convince Americans that seats in the U.S. House could be apportioned and redistricted on the basis of a sample of less than 1% of all American homes. Yet these same experts insist that surveying any less than 1 in 6 homes, and 1 in 2 in rural areas, with the long form will lead to inaccurate and misleading results. This disingenuous argument betrays once again the bias towards survey-taking rather than counting, and the devotion of Bureau statisticians to fulfilling the needs of their corporate and special interest allies who use long form data to market to the American people or modify their behavior with government programs.

Using a misleading advertising campaign

The Bureau has used a misleading campaign of greed motivation to promote participation in the 2000 Census. Conveniently ignoring the fact that federal funding is a zero-sum game, the Bureau has led every community and resident in the United States to believe that somehow they were cheated out of funds in the last census, and if they only fill out their forms, new roads, schools, and other government goodies will magically appear, funded courtesy of Uncle Sam. The problem is that for every funding winner, there are several losers. After making these promises that can't be delivered, and peddling the fiction that the census will be the basis of many decisions that it actually isn't, the cynicism of the American people towards the Bureau will continue to rise.

Detail/technical errors undermine confidence

The Bureau has encountered any number of smaller technical errors as a result of the massive size of the operation and a lack of attention to any non-statistically oriented detail. Most famously, an initial mailing went out to 120 million households, each of which was incorrectly addressed by a Bureau subcontractor. In addition to exposing the Bureau to ridicule, it was also notorious for the fact that the English language portion of the mailer did not even explain what it was for, unlike the foreign language version on the back. This incident gave rise to the perception that the Bureau is unduly focusing resources on a few select minority groups at the expense of the general nationwide population. That perception is reinforced by a census advertising and outreach campaign, which is heavily concentrated in a few urban areas and virtually ignores suburban and rural residents. While all of the Bureau's technical glitches are annoying, embarrassing, and sometimes amusing, they give rise to a very serious question. If the Bureau cannot do these relatively simple things without making major mistakes, how can anyone have faith that they will pull off the immensely complex and challenging undertaking of statistical adjustment without making hundreds of undetectable and uncorrectable errors?

PART TWO

CLOSING THE RESPONSE GAP
A BLUEPRINT FOR REFORM
Census Reform is Needed

While the 2000 Census continues to look as though it will be a disaster, there is hope that out of the ashes, a new and improved census and data collection system can be born. With its current structural and operational design, the US Census Bureau simply cannot be expected to accomplish all of its diverse and conflicting missions. The Bureau needs radical reform and a reassessment of priorities to be successful in the twenty-first century. The key to success is to design a new system with a thorough understanding of the problems and failures of the old structure. Here are some suggested steps.

Dismantle the Bureau of the Census

In its present form, it is simply too big, has too large a mandate, and too many tasks trying to be accomplished in decennial census. Additionally, the current structure makes the Bureau too subject to political pressure and the ongoing tension between enumerators and statisticians.

Create the United States Decennial Census Agency

This agency would have the sole mission of fulfilling the constitutional mandate of a decennial enumeration of the population for the purposes of reapportionment and redistricting. It should also:

Be constructed as an independent, legislative branch agency such as the GAO. This would do much to reduce the partisan pressures on the census, especially if the agency head is selected and empowered in a similar manner as the Comptroller General of the GAO.

Be mission-oriented in its structure. This means having a design that focuses solely on the decennial census task. The key elements are address list development, community outreach and partnership, recruitment and retention of human resources, execution of field operations, and timely compilation and release of accurate results.

Have a command structure that is based on the mission. For example, there should be no director of the agency per se, but rather a director of the 2010 decennial census, a director of the 2020 decennial census, and so forth. This is because each census is a separate and distinct 15-year task. Planning for the 2000 Census began in 1987, and the census will not be over until all data is released and challenges resolved in 2002. Having a director with a 15-year term for the entire decennial project ensures a continuity never before seen at the Bureau.

Select the proper leader. The census is the largest peacetime mobilization of American national resources. It is not an academic task, but rather a task where organizational skills and leadership are most important. As such, an academic, statistician, or theoretician is not the preferred leader for the USDCA, as they lack relevant and appropriate experience to do the job. Instead, the USDCA would ideally be led by a high-ranking former military officer or corporate executive with vast experience in recruitment, motivation, logistics, and operations.
Restrict the mission to the constitutional task. The long form must be jettisoned from the decennial census. Its negative effects on response rate, public confidence, and concerns about privacy increasingly jeopardize the success of the census. Additionally, as America moves towards the diverse and color-blind society envisioned by Dr. Martin Luther King, questions about race, ethnicity, and ancestry are irrelevant or outdated at best and damaging to societal progress at worst. Not surprisingly, the best solution is to return to the wise original intent of the Founders laid out nearly 225 years ago to simply get a count of the number of residents nothing more, nothing less.

Reinforce successful contracting operations. While there may be concerns about some of the messages the Bureau designed to promote the 2000 Census, no one can question the success of the advertising agencies in delivering that message. The USDCA should build on this success by continuing to contract out advertising and promotion functions, and should look to expand the contracting to include address lists, maps, data processing, and other non-Title 13 privacy sensitive operations.

Prepare to take advantage of developing technology trends. The growth of the Internet from 1990 to 2000 has been nothing short of astounding. This growth in Internet use should grow exponentially between 2000 and 2010, meaning that the entire paradigm of how a census is taken can be rethought. The digital divide, already shrinking, may be just a memory by 2010, with nearly all Americans connected to the Internet. The 2010 census should be designed around this central fact, and must take advantage of the massive time and cost savings opportunities provided by an Internet-based census. For those who still lack access, such as the homeless, recent immigrants, and economically isolated individuals, the USDCA can concentrate an even higher amount of resources than ever before to count them.

Create the United States Statistical Agency

Think tanks and political scientists from both the left and right have supported the concept of statistical consolidation for many years. They recognize the inefficiency of the current structure, which divides statistical program responsibility over many different agencies, creating overlaps and redundancy, as well as rivalries and political turf-fighting. The creation of the USSA can resolve these problems in a much more efficient manner, and explore new and innovative ways to gather relevant information from American people. Some key concepts:

Reassessment of all statistical functions of the US government. The federal government conducts countless surveys each year, all usually based on legislation passed at some point by the Congress. Some of these surveys are vitally important, others are nuisances that often raise serious questions of invasion of privacy. As the USSA is organized, a separate congressional blue-ribbon panel should review all surveys conducted by the government, and recommending their continuation, modification, or elimination.

Making compliance with government surveys voluntary. While statisticians will howl in anger, survey compliance should be voluntary and not under the threat of civil fines and government retaliation. The privacy guarantees of our Constitution to all Americans should be the primary
concern of the government, not the desire of statisticians and social scientists to gather data which is then used to justify federal government-run social engineering programs or provided to giant corporations for marketing data to be used to solicit the American people for their products.

Providing independent control and oversight. In today’s privacy-conscious society, concerns over government misuse of data are commonplace and not without foundation. Just ask any Nisei or their descendants. To safeguard the privacy of those responding to federal surveys, and to protect the USSA from politicization, an independent, bipartisan commission must be established to oversee their activities.

Selecting the proper leader. Unlike the USDCA, the USSA is a statistical agency, and thus should be headed by a statistician or academic. By placing all the statisticians at the USSA, the poisonous conflict between enumerators and estimators currently found at the US Census Bureau is eliminated.

CONCLUSION

Failure of current census paradigm is inevitable. The U.S. Bureau of the Census, currently constituted, has too many tasks to perform, for too many reasons, with too little success in its primary function to count the American population every ten years for purposes of congressional and legislative districting. As such, the non-constitutional purposes, and the efforts designed to gather information for federal funding and Reform is required to 1) fulfill the constitutional mandate to count the whole number of persons in each State; 2) refocus census-gathering efforts on the constitutionally required information; 3) enable statisticians to gather information in a less intrusive, more relevant manner for other purposes. The modest proposal outlined herein, which includes the dismantling of the current U.S. Bureau of the Census, may serve as a guidepost for policy makers in the coming decades.
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Hi folks,

Here, in greater detail is the proposal by the Southeastern Legal Foundation regarding Census problems and how they ought to be fixed. It's a bit long but it paints a pretty good picture of exciting things to come. To find out more about this foundation, which is admittedly politically very conservative, go to their web site

Dick Halpern

CENSUS IN CRISIS
The Response Gap
Southeastern Legal Foundation
3340 Peachtree Road<br>Suite 2515<br>Atlanta, Georgia 30326<br>(404) 365-8500, Fax (404) 365-0017
<a href="http://www.southeasternlegal.org/" eudora="autourl">www.southeasternlegal.org</a>

INTRODUCTION

The Atlanta-based Southeastern Legal Foundation opened the national dialogue on Census 2000 with a successful U.S. Supreme Court challenge against the Clinton administration's plan to use the controversial method known as "statistical sampling" rather than the "actual Enumeration" head count required by the U.S. Constitution for purposes of congressional apportionment. Now, constitutional questions have arisen regarding questions asked on census forms, as well as logistical and philosophical questions which have arisen in light of manifest problems with the conduct of Census 2000. What follows is a discussion of the so-called "Response Gap" (widespread failure and discontent with conduct and content of Census 2000), and a Blueprint for Reform of the decennial census process.

PART ONE

CREATING THE RESPONSE GAP

The 2000 Census is ripe for failure, for both long-term structural and strategic reasons, and short-term tactical decisions made by Bureau personnel. This observation is validated by the fact that the 2000 Census has appeared every year on the GAO's high-risk series of government programs most prone to failure, waste, fraud, and abuse since the inception of the reports five years ago.

PROBLEMS WITH UNDERSTANDING THE PURPOSE OF THE CENSUS

The most fundamental problem with the 2000 census has been the failure by Congress and the Bureau to address the simple question of whether we actually count every American or simply rely on statistical estimates. The Bureau has lost track of the constitutional purpose of the census through the addition of a myriad of non-constitutional responsibilities, many of which are constitutionally suspect, that the Bureau has either assumed or created for itself since 1790.

Today's Census Bureau can be divided into two philosophical factions, the enumerators and the statisticians. For 200 years, the philosophy of the enumerators governed the census, namely, that the Bureau is to go out and actually count
each resident, one by one, as prescribed by the Constitution and federal law. During the last 10 years, the philosophy of the statisticians has become ascendant, namely, that it is impossible to count everyone, and the best way to conduct the census is to take a statistical survey. Their belief in the Holy Grail of the use of statistics is unshakable, and all who disagree are thought of as unsophisticated Luddites. Even after the U.S. Supreme Court issued its ruling against the use of sampling in \textit{Glavin v. Clinton}, this attitude has persisted among many within the Census Bureau, potentially poisoning the entire 2000 census as a result.

Problems with Census Bureau mission

The development of the harmful philosophy of the statisticians can be directly traced to the Bureau’s split from its past traditions and constitutional mission in favor of becoming the self-described \textit{World’s Premier Statistical Agency}. The primary culprit in this split was development of, and emphasis on, the census long form, and the dozens of other similarly intrusive statistical surveys conducted by the Bureau each year. Instead of focusing its resources on the constitutional element of the decennial census, the Bureau has instead over the years placed increasing emphasis on conducting these sample surveys and developing new ones. Inevitably, as these surveys became a larger and more important part of Bureau operations, the power and influence of the statisticians in charge of them grew. And, as that influence grew, statisticians began to offer their sampling methodology first as an enhancement to, and then a replacement for, the primary enumeration mission of the decennial census. As Abraham Lincoln said, “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” Yet, the modern Census Bureau is as divided by mission and methodology as ever. On one hand are the enumerators, responsible for activities such as address list development, promotion and outreach, recruitment and retention of field interviewers, and compiling and publishing census data. The common denominator of the enumerators’ work is that it is difficult, exacting, and time-consuming. On the other hand are the statisticians, ever ready to develop elaborate new statistical procedures, thus offering a tempting shortcut for the work of the enumerator, but at the staggering price of compromising the constitutionality and legality of the census. Having these two factions in close contact within the same agency exacerbates tensions and distracts each from their legitimate mission and purpose. While in theory these groups should be complementary, in reality, they are competitors for limited resources and subject to conflicts between different approaches.

Problems with agency infrastructure

As currently designed, the Census Bureau is an unwieldy agency that serves many masters, often with conflicting goals and agendas. While the primary constitutional responsibility of the Bureau is to provide Congress with the apportionment and redistricting counts, the census authority was unwisely delegated to the Executive Branch by Congress. As a result, the vast majority of activities the Bureau is now involved with have little or nothing to do with the decennial census, but rather are justifications for an expanded workforce of statisticians throughout the decade. This exacerbates the Bureau’s lack of focus on its primary constitutional mission.

Problems with politicization of the census

Because so much political power and federal funding is distributed on the basis of census data, the Bureau has become the whipping boy of politicians in both parties. The inclusion of data on racial and ethnic origin has made this problem even worse, as exemplified by the debate over the multiracial classification and the Bureau’s decision, under pressure from minority interest groups, to categorize multiracial
respondents in one of the old racial minority categories instead of classifying them as identified. Another example of a politicized census was the decision by the Bureau in 1996 to alter their original non-response sampling plan from a target of reaching 90% in each county before SNRFU began to a target of 90% in each census tract before SNRFU begins. This decision was a result of direct political pressure from the Congressional Black Caucus, who felt the county based plan might erode their power. The Bureau can also be political in deciding which programs not to include, such as their refusal to include post-census local review in the 2000 plan because it was supported by Congressional Republicans. The level of Bureau and Administration involvement in the politics of opposing legislation to mandate PCLR was appalling, including putting political pressure on mayors who had endorse PCLR to reverse their stand. Finally, the entire question of adjusting 94 census counts through sampling brings the ultimate politicization of the process. While the science behind sampling may be valid, the selection of blocks for sampling and many other assumptions in formulas open the process to many different outcomes determined solely by these choices. This places in the hands of a select few individuals the opportunity to manipulate the census data to achieve a desired outcome, a terrifying tool that threatens the foundation of representative democracy.

In short, he who creates the statistical model controls the outcome.

Problems with Census Bureau credibility

The mantra of the Census Bureau for several years has been that Congress and the American public should trust them completely, as they are models of professionalism, ethics, and honesty. However, many incidents have shown this to be untrue. In 1998, the chairman of an important NAS panel evaluating the Bureau's statistical plans for 2000 was in fact a key executive at a firm receiving millions of dollars in contracts from the Bureau, a clear conflict of interest and violation of professional ethics. The Bureau has repeatedly refused to respond to legitimate oversight inquiries by the Congress and CMB, and is incredibly tardy and incomplete in providing documents and information to its overseers. During the politically charged 1998 Census Dress Rehearsal, the Bureau claimed that the non-response follow-up period went so well that it was concluded over a week early. Subsequent investigation by the GAO determined that the Bureau misled the public and Congress about the Dress Rehearsals, and that in fact, nearly 20% of the data collected during NRFU was guesswork proxy data, not actual interviews with respondents. Most appallingly, three successive Census Bureau directors lied under oath to Congress about the Bureau's role in identifying Japanese-Americans during World War II. While all three directors' testimony highlighted the supposed refusal of the Bureau to cooperate with military authorities who wanted information on the Nisei as an example of how confidential census material is at all times, recent investigative reports have uncovered evidence that the Bureau actually cooperated in providing to the military block level data on where the Nisei lived. While technically not a violation of Title 13, this Bureau cooperation makes them complicit in the imprisonment of thousands of innocent Japanese-Americans in internment camps, and raises serious questions about what might be done in future crises by the Bureau. In sum, the Bureau's credibility problems inspire little confidence in the American people for the agency.

Increasing societal concerns about privacy

The revelation of the Bureau's role in the shameful Nisei episode could not come at a worse time. In recent surveys conducted by private polling organizations, a majority of Americans...
stated that one of their primary worries in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is a loss of privacy. With the advent of the Internet and instant worldwide data transmission, Americans are concerned about their privacy more than ever before. Into this environment of jealously guarded privacy comes the Census Bureau, with the invasive long form =96 sent to 1 in 6 households nationwide, and 1 in 2 households in rural areas. Internal Census Bureau studies show that the inclusion of the long form in the decennial census drives down the response rate and drives up enumeration costs. Yet, the Bureau and Congress both share guilt in continuing what amounts to the largest corporate welfare giveaway of the U.S. government.

More importantly, the census long form represents the only attempt sanctioned by American law to demand, under threat of criminal and civil penalty, information which could not be obtained by law enforcement or revenue officers without a court order (due process and equal protection concerns are apparent).

EXACERBATING THE RESPONSE GAP

THE PLANNING PROBLEMS AND OPERATIONAL FAILURES OF THE 2000 CENSUS

In addition to the long-term structural and philosophical problems outlined above, the Bureau has made numerous missteps, bad decisions, and flawed execution of programs over the past several years. The primary culprit in all of these poor decisions and mistakes has been the Bureau placing a priority emphasis on statistical techniques at the expense of counting techniques. In 1990, the Bureau put counting first and estimating second. While this was the correct approach, it frustrated statisticians and some politicians who wanted statistically adjusted numbers to be used for legislative redistricting. The deadline for the release of redistricting data is April 1 of the year following the census, and in 1990, the Bureau simply could not get the results of its 150,000 household sample survey completed, processed, and statistically integrated into the actual census counts in time. As a result of this, and of political decisions by the Bush Administration, sampled numbers were not released. Bureau planners and their political allies have vowed not to allow this to happen again, and as a result, have designed a census where sampling comes first and counting a distant second. This highly questionable decision, motivated by partisan politics and a desire for vindication by Bureau statisticians, has compromised the Census 2000 design in many areas.

Address list development

The best way to correct a flawed address list is to allow local governments to review the list both before and after the census is taken. While the Bureau, at the insistence of Congress, added the pre-census review period known as
LUCA, it has adamantly refused to accept any type of meaningful PCLR. This will leave communities with no chance to see if entire blocks of addresses were missed, a particularly troubling issue in areas of rapid growth and many new addresses. The lack of PCLR is a direct result of the Bureau's desire to finish its field work rapidly in order to release adjusted numbers by the April 1, 2001 deadline.

**Ill-considered timetable for Census 2000 field operations**

The most time-consuming job in the census is field follow-up on non-responding households. It was one of the most critical and costly problems encountered by the 1990 census. Despite this, the Bureau's official timetable for 2000 incredibly calls for follow up on 12 million more non-responding households than in 1990, but in 4 weeks less time.

Equally unrealistic is the Bureau's plan to survey twice as many households in its statistical adjustment sample, 300,000 instead of 150,000, but to do it in 13 weeks instead of the 26 weeks it took for half as many people in 1990. These two items taken together strongly suggest that the Bureau will be relying on an inordinate amount of proxy data for actual enumeration, as was found in the dress rehearsal, and extremely questionable practice that verges on outright fraud of the taxpayer and the spirit of the census.

Once again, these timetable decisions are a result of the rush to released sampled data by April 1, 2001.

**Elimination of the second mailing**

With a declining mail response rate over the past several decades, Census 2000 originally planned to use two mailings to achieve a response rate goal of 67 percent. 60 percent was to come from the first mailing, and 7 percent from the second. Despite it being tested with successful results in the 1998 Dress Rehearsal, the second mailing was dropped from the final 2000 plan.

Because once again, the Bureau determined a second mailing would take too much time to complete and would delay the release of statistically adjusted data in April 2001. So, the Bureau consciously decided to forgo collecting the completely accurate, legitimate data on millions of Americans that would be derived from a second mailing in favor of saving time to develop statistically manufactured data later. Interestingly enough, even though the Bureau dropped the second mailing and had to reconcile itself to a lower overall mail response rate, and a larger non-response follow-up field work load, it did not allow itself any more time to do field work in the master plan.

**Greatly restricted de-duplication activities**

According to a report of the Commerce Department Inspector General, in 1990, the Census Bureau looked for duplicate forms in a radius of 9 census blocks from the respondents address. This was a time-consuming, but thorough process. In 2000, to save time, this search for duplicates has been restricted to just one block.

The Bureau then plans to use controversial statistical methods to identify duplicates in the aggregate rather than physical duplicates.

This will result in the unjustified deletion of many legitimate households from the census counts. Once again, thoroughness and accuracy is sacrificed to save time and enhance the use of statistics.

**Inclusion and massive overuse of the census long form**

The census long form is the best example of the Bureau's deviation from the original purpose of the census found in the Constitution. Weighing in at 57 questions, the long form is a time-consuming invasion of privacy that drives down response rates, especially in hard-to-count areas. The Bureau and its special interest group and corporate welfare allies have resisted all efforts to reduce the size of the long form or separate it from the decennial census entirely. Furthermore, the long form, which is a statistical sample, is incredibly overused. The statistical experts at the Bureau tried to convince Americans that seats in the
U.S. House could be apportioned and redistricted on the basis of a sample of less than 1% of all American homes. Yet these same experts insist that surveying any less than 1 in 6 homes, and 1 in 2 in rural areas, with the long form will lead to inaccurate and misleading results. This disingenuous argument betrays once again the bias towards survey-taking rather than counting, and the devotion of Bureau statisticians to fulfilling the needs of their corporate and special interest allies who use long form data to market to the American people or modify their behavior with government programs. Using a misleading advertising campaign, the Bureau has used a misleading campaign of greed motivation to promote participation in the 2000 Census. Conveniently ignoring the fact that federal funding is a zero-sum game, the Bureau has led every community and resident in the United States to believe that somehow they were cheated out of funds in the last census, and if they only fill out their forms, new roads, schools, and other government goodies will magically appear, funded courtesy of Uncle Sam. The problem is that for every funding winner, there are several losers. After making these promises that can’t be delivered, and peddling the fiction that the census will be the basis of many decisions that it actually isn’t, the cynicism of the American people towards the Bureau will continue to rise.

Detail/technical errors undermine confidence. The Bureau has encountered any number of smaller technical errors as a result of the massive size of the operation and a lack of attention to any non-statistically oriented detail. Most famously, an initial mailing went out to 120 million households, each of which was incorrectly addressed by a Bureau subcontractor. In addition to exposing the Bureau to ridicule, it was also notorious for the fact that the English language portion of the mailer did not even explain what it was for, unlike the foreign language version on the back. This incident gave rise to the perception that the Bureau is unduly focusing resources on a few select minority groups at the expense of the general nationwide population. That perception is reinforced by a census advertising and outreach campaign, which is heavily concentrated in a few urban areas and virtually ignores suburban and rural residents. While all of the Bureau’s technical glitches are annoying, embarrassing, and sometimes amusing, they give rise to a very serious question. If the Bureau cannot do these relatively simple things without making major mistakes, how can anyone have faith that they will pull off the immensely complex and challenging undertaking of statistical adjustment without making hundreds of undetectable and uncorrectable errors?

PART TWO

Closing the Response Gap

Census Reform is Needed. While the 2000 Census continues to look as though it will be a disaster, there is hope that out of the ashes, a new and improved census and data collection system can be born. With its current structural and operational design, the US Census Bureau simply cannot be expected to accomplish all of its diverse and conflicting missions. The Bureau needs radical reform and a reassessment of priorities to be successful in the twenty-first century. The key to success is to design a new system with a thorough understanding of the problems and failures of the old structure. Here are some suggested steps.

Dismantle the Bureau of the Census. In its present form, it is simply too big, has too large a mandate, and too many tasks trying to be accomplished in decennial census. Additionally, the current structure makes the Bureau too subject to political pressure and the ongoing tension between enumerators and statisticians. Create the United States Decennial Census Agency. This agency would have the sole mission of fulfilling the constitutional mandate of a...
decennial enumeration of the population for the purposes of reapportionment and redistricting. It should also: <br> <b>Be constructed as an independent, legislative branch agency such as the GAO</b>. This would do much to reduce the partisan pressures on the census, especially if the agency head is selected and empowered in a similar manner as the Comptroller General of the GAO. <br> <b>Be mission-oriented in its structure</b>. This means having a design that focuses solely on the decennial census task. The key elements are address list development, community outreach and partnership, recruitment and retention of human resources, execution of field operations, and timely compilation and release of accurate results. <br> <b>Have a command structure that is based on the mission</b>. For example, there should be no director of the agency per se, but rather a director of the 2010 decennial census, a director of the 2020 decennial census, and so forth. This is because each census is a separate and distinct 15-year task. Planning for the 2000 Census began in 1987, and the census will not be over until all data is released and challenges resolved in 2002. Having a director with a 15-year term for the entire decennial project ensures a continuity never before seen at the Bureau. <br> <b>Select the proper leader</b>. The census is the largest peacetime mobilization of American national resources. It is not an academic task, but rather a task where organizational skills and leadership are most important. As such, an academic, statistician, or theoretician is not the preferred leader for the USDCA, as they lack relevant and appropriate experience to do the job. Instead, the USDCA would ideally be led by a high-ranking former military officer or corporate executive with vast experience in recruitment, motivation, logistics, and operations. <br> <b.Restrict the mission to the constitutional task</b>. The long form must be jettisoned from the decennial census. Its negative effects on response rate, public confidence, and concerns about privacy increasingly jeopardize the success of the census. Additionally, as America moves towards the diverse and color-blind society envisioned by Dr. Martin Luther King, questions about race, ethnicity, and ancestry are irrelevant or outdated at best and damaging to societal progress at worst. Not surprisingly, the best solution is to return to the wise original intent of the Founders laid out nearly 225 years ago =96 to simply get a count of the number of residents =96 nothing more, nothing less. <br> <b>Reinforce successful contracting operations</b>. While there may be concerns about some of the messages the Bureau designed to promote the 2000 Census, no one can question the success of the advertising agencies in delivering that message. The USDCA should build on this success by continuing to contract out advertising and promotion functions, and should look to expand the contracting to include address lists, maps, data processing, and other non-Title 13 privacy sensitive operations. <br> <b>Prepare to take advantage of developing technology trends</b>. The growth of the Internet from 1990 to 2000 has been nothing short of astounding. This growth in Internet use should grow exponentially between 2000 and 2010, meaning that the entire paradigm of how a census is taken can be rethought. The digital divide, already shrinking, may be just a memory by 2010, with nearly all Americans connected to the Internet. The 2010 census should be designed around this central fact, and must take advantage of the massive time and cost savings opportunities provided by an Internet-based census. For those who still lack access, such as the homeless, recent immigrants, and economically isolated individuals, the USDCA can concentrate an even higher amount of resources than ever before to count them. <br> <b>Create the United States Statistical Agency</b>
of statistical consolidation for many years. They recognize the inefficiency of the current structure, which divides statistical program responsibility over many different agencies, creating overlaps and redundancy, as well as rivalries and political turf-fighting. The creation of the USSA can resolve these problems in a much more efficient manner, and explore new and innovative ways to gather relevant information from American people. Some key concepts:<br>

- **Reassessment of all statistical functions of the US government.** The federal government conducts countless surveys each year, all usually based on legislation passed at some point by the Congress. Some of these surveys are vitally important, others are nuisances that often raise serious questions of invasion of privacy. As the USSA is organized, a separate congressional blue-ribbon panel should review all surveys conducted by the government, and recommending their continuation, modification, or elimination.<br>

- **Making compliance with government surveys voluntary.** While statisticians will howl in anger, survey compliance should be voluntary and not under the threat of civil fines and government retaliation. The privacy guarantees of our Constitution to all Americans should be the primary concern of the government, not the desire of statisticians and social scientists to gather data which is then used to justify federal government-run social engineering programs or provided to giant corporations for marketing data to be used to solicit the American people for their products.<br>

- **Providing independent control and oversight.** In today’s privacy-conscious society, concerns over government misuse of data are commonplace and not without foundation — just ask any Nisei or their descendants. To safeguard the privacy of those responding to federal surveys, and to protect the USSA from politicization, an independent, bipartisan commission must be established to oversee their activities.<br>

- **Selecting the proper leader.** Unlike the USDCA, the USSA is a statistical agency, and thus should be headed by a statistician or academic. By placing all the statisticians at the USSA, the poisonous conflict between enumerators and estimators currently found at the US Census Bureau is eliminated.<br>

**CONCLUSION**<br>

Failure of current census paradigm is inevitable. The U.S. Bureau of the Census, currently constituted, has too many tasks to perform, for too many reasons, with too little success in its primary function — to count the American population every ten years for purposes of congressional and legislative districting. As such, the non-constitutional purposes, and the efforts designed to gather information for federal funding and Reform is therefore required to 1) fulfill the constitutional mandate to count the whole number of persons in each State; 2) refocus census-gathering efforts on the constitutionally required information; 3) enable statisticians to gather information in a less intrusive, more relevant manner for other purposes. The modest proposal outlined herein, which includes the dismantling of the current U.S. Bureau of the Census, may serve as a guidepost for policy makers in the coming decades.
Could it be that the resistance to the Census is a direct result of the gathering and distribution of "private" information in the private sector. It is hard to prevent that, but one can rebel against the Census. If I didn't provide my drivers license, SSN, and credit card to the local cable company they wouldn't supply a digital converter! That's scary not the Census.

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2000 10:26 AM
To: aaapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Resistance to census

I think the resistance to filling out the census based on "privacy grounds" is quite humorous considering that marketing lists have considerably more private information about people than any single government agency - just take a look at all of the "targeted samples" that companies like Survey Research can provide.

Lynda Voigt
Ray, Look in The Book of Numbers. Moses is commanded by God several times to take a Census of one or more of the Tribes. You may also notice that the numbers conveniently end in 00's. So, apparently, estimation was ok. Moses probably had not heard of sampling nonrespondents. I wonder what God's position would have been on that. Reading the two sections leads me to believe that the census was alright when commanded by God but not alright when commanded by Satan. David did Satan's census because he lost faith in God's promise to protect Israel. This theme occurs over and over in the Old Testament.

Ken (neither a Fundamentalist nor a Bible scholar) Rasinski.

>>>Ray Funkhouser wrote.

For those who think the current Census flap is something recent, check out I Chronicles, Ch 21, which begins: "A satan rose up against Israel, and he enticed David into taking a census of Israel." It turned out very badly for King David. Nothing new in 2500 years? When I first ran across this I looked into it but could find no satisfactory answer for why the ancient Hebrews considered a census to be a bad idea. Anybody know anything about it? Maybe it would even provide some insight into current controversies.
AAPORNET Digest 1369

Topics covered in this issue include:

1) It's in the Bible
   by RFunk787@aol.com
2) Re: The Republicans and the Census
   by Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
3) Re: The Republicans and the Census
   by Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
4) Re: Washington Post on Census politics
   by Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>
5) Re: It's in the Bible
   by Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Mon Apr 3 09:35:24 2000
Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id JAA10355 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 09:35:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
   with Novell GroupWise; Mon, 03 Apr 2000 12:40:29 -0400
Message-Id: <s8e8913d.026@srbi.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Mon, 03 Apr 2000 12:39:05 -0400
From: "Mark Schulman" <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>
To: rys4@columbia.edu
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: View of AAPOR
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id JAA10365

Bob, are you planning to be at the AAPOR Conference in May? Any interest in
being a discussant or chairing a session? I'd sure like to put you to work
if you are! Let me know....Thanx. Mark

>From rusciano@rider.edu Mon Apr 3 10:50:26 2000
Received: from enigma.rider.edu (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA16071 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 10:50:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
   id <01JNSV1FD9N4001Q65@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 3 Apr
   2000 13:51:46 EDT
Received: from rider.edu (fs90.rider.edu [204.142.224.90])
   by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
   with ESMTP id <01JNSV1F55OE01L3V@enigma.rider.edu>; Mon,
   03 Apr 2000 13:51:46 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Mon, 03 Apr 2000 13:53:33 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: The Republicans and the Census
To: mkshares@mcs.net
However poetic the justice may be, I think we at AAPOR should hold to the position of encouraging ALL individuals to fill out the census. Partisan feelings aside, it does not comfort me that any group, conservative, liberal, or whatever, should be undercounted due to irresponsibility of our elected officials.

Frank Rusciano

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> >From Clarence Page's Tribune column today:
> >
> >IN DEFENSE OF THE NOSY CENSUS QUESTIONS
> >
> >"Now that conservative Republicans have embraced rhetoric that panders to anti-census voices, they actually may be discouraging compliance among their own most likely supporters. If so, it would be a good example of politics exerting poetic justice."
> >
> >
> >Jim Caplan wrote:
> >
> >> I may be totally confused here but if those trying to influence Americans not to reply succeed, it will result in OVERREPRESENTATION by those who feel that sort of demagoguery is nonsense. Hence, it will counter productive! (Or is that another name for a highly efficient Census enumerator?)
> >
> >Jim Caplan
> >Miami
> >----- Original Message ----- 
> >From: <jaistrup@fhsu.edu>
> >To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> >Sent: Friday, March 31, 2000 8:10 AM
> >Subject: The Republicans and the Census
> >
> >I don't know about the rest of you, but I have had enough !@#$
> >from the GOP leadership on the census. First, they insist that the census should be an enumeration (according to the courts, rightly so). Now, they are making that enumeration more difficult, by feeding the paranoia that the census survey invades a family's privacy and by extension, that the data will be used by the government in a sinister fashion.
Ironically, they are creating an environment where, in order to obtain an accurate count and accurate statistics, it will be absolutely necessary to use a sampling methodology. This is the essence of stupidity!

Sincerely, Joe Aistrup

Phil Tichenor

rshalpern wrote:

> Hi folks,
>
> The Southeastern Legal Foundation is at it again with this press
release saying in so many words that the Census as currently conducted violates the Constitution. These are the same folks that brought -- and won-- the suit regarding sampling as a part of the enumeration process.

http://www.southeasternlegal.org/p0004031.html

Unconstitutional questions, poor execution threaten Census 2000 disaster

U.S. SUPREME COURT CENSUS VICTORS CALL FOR DISMANTLING OF CENSUS BUREAU Monday April 3, 2000

WASHINGTON, DC/ATLANTA: The Southeastern Legal Foundation today called for the dismantling of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, to be replaced by two independent agencies designed to ensure a "fair, constitutional decennial census count," according to SLF President Matthew Glavin.

The Foundation won a 1999 U.S. Supreme Court decision banning the Clinton administration's plan to use the controversial method known as "statistical sampling" rather than the constitutionally prescribed "actual Enumeration" head count for determining congressional apportionment.

"With the release of our special report, Census 2000 Crisis: The Response Gap & A Blueprint for Reform, the Southeastern Legal Foundation seeks to highlight the structural and philosophical problems at the Census Bureau which make it impossible to conduct a constitutional, fair and accurate census count, making the failures this year look less like reasonable mistakes and more like deliberate sabotage," said Glavin."What we are saying is simple - remove the political aspects of the census, separate out the constitutional ten-year head count for legislative apportionment, and allow the statisticians to gather information in separate activities."

"The American people have overwhelmingly rejected participation in this year's Census because, frankly, they do not trust the federal government," said Glavin."No other government agency, or law enforcement body, has the power to ask the invasive questions required on the census forms except by power of a court-ordered warrant or legal proceeding. As such, the entire process raises serious constitutional questions about why we conduct a census in the first place. That's why less than 40 percent of Americans have bothered to participate this year."

Glavin released the special report and took questions on Monday at 1 pm at the National Press Club, Edward R. Murrow Room.
A non-profit conservative law firm, we need your financial help to ensure success in the courts of law and public opinion. Contributions are tax-deductible for Federal income tax purposes. Southeastern Legal Foundation is organized under IRS Code 501(c)(3). Latest Financial Report and Registration information.

Southeastern Legal Foundation
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The Southeastern Legal Foundation is at it again with this press release saying in so many words that the Census as currently conducted violates the Constitution. These are the same folks that brought -- and won-- the suit regarding sampling as a part of the enumeration process.
Unconstitutional questions, poor execution threaten Census 2000 disaster

U.S. SUPREME COURT CENSUS VICTORS CALL FOR DISMANTLING OF CENSUS BUREAU

Monday April 3, 2000

Unconstitutional questions, poor execution threaten Census 2000 disaster

U.S. SUPREME COURT CENSUS VICTORS CALL FOR DISMANTLING OF CENSUS BUREAU
WASHINGTON, DC/ATLANTA: The Southeastern Legal Foundation today called for the dismantling of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, to be replaced by two independent agencies designed to ensure a "fair, constitutional decennial census count," according to SLF President Matthew Glavin. The Foundation won a 1999 U.S. Supreme Court decision banning the Clinton administration's plan to use the controversial method known as "statistical sampling" rather than the constitutionally prescribed "actual Enumeration" head count for determining congressional apportionment.

"With the release of our special report, Census 2000 Crisis: The Response Gap & A Blueprint for Reform, the Southeastern Legal Foundation seeks to highlight the structural and philosophical problems at the Census Bureau which make it impossible to conduct a constitutional, fair and accurate census count, making the failures this year look less like reasonable mistakes and more like deliberate sabotage," said Glavin. "What we are saying is simple - remove the political aspects of the census, separate out the constitutional ten-year head count for legislative apportionment, and allow the statisticians to gather information in separate activities." Glavin released the special report and took questions on Monday at 1 pm at the National Press Club, Edward R. Murrow Room.

"The American people have overwhelmingly rejected participation in this year's Census because, frankly, they do not trust the federal government," said Glavin. "No other government agency, or law enforcement body, has the power to ask the invasive questions required on the census forms except by power of a court-ordered warrant or legal proceeding." As such, the entire process raises serious constitutional questions about why we conduct a census in the first place. That's why less than 40 percent of Americans have bothered to participate this year."
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I'm pretty busy, giving one paper and chairing the panel with Singer, Dillman, and Smith, but if you need me, I can do things that don't conflict with my other obligations. I will not be there Sunday.

>>> "Mark Schulman" <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com> 04/03/00 12:39PM >>>
Bob, are you planning to be at the AAPOR Conference in May? Any interest in being a discussant or chairing a session? I'd sure like to put you to work if you are! Let me know....Thanx. Mark
To all conference session presenters:

The Audiovisual request deadline is here!

All session rooms will be equipped with standard overhead projectors
and microphones appropriate to the room. Poster session materials will be
provided. If you need other AV equipment, please make a request
online, by fax, or email by COB Tuesday April 4th.

You can find the AV request instructions and forms on the conference
website:
  http://www.aapor.org/conference/avrequest.html
or call/email me ASAP. Thanks,

Carl

********************************************************************************

Carl Ramirez
Senior Social Science Analyst
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G St, NW, Room 2921
Washington, DC 20548
phone: (202) 512-3721
fax: (202) 512-3774
e-mail: ramirezc.ggd@gao.gov
********************************************************************************

The opinions expressed here are my own and
do not represent official policy of GAO.
********************************************************************************

>From maj1@is2.nyu.edu Mon Apr 3 14:13:41 2000
Received: from is2.nyu.edu (root@IS2.NYU.EDU [128.122.253.135])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id OAA22763 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 14:13:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from e070h (SSWEN88.SSW.NYU.EDU [128.122.225.49])
  by is2.nyu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id RAA17439
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 17:13:38 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20000403171321.007ad300@is2.nyu.edu>
X-Sender: maj1@is2.nyu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Mon, 03 Apr 2000 17:13:21 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Mary Ann Jones <maj1@is2.nyu.edu>
Subject: Partisan, schmartisan--but what is Al Gore Thinking?
In-Reply-To: <3c.24618e6.26175b58@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
I for one have found the discussion of the Census informative and interesting, and the occasional partisan touches have just added a bit of spice.

But, turning to opinion polls, are there any numbers to make Al Gore's support of the Elian Gonzales legislation an intelligent move on his part? It looks like a total loss to me: he can't out-Bush, Bush; but he will alienate his own natural constituency.

Mary Ann Jones
Mary Ann Jones, DSW
Associate Professor
Ehrenkranz School of Social Work
New York University
1 Washington Square North, Room G02
New York, N.Y. 10003
212-998-5972

>From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Mon Apr 3 14:26:26 2000
Received: from proxy.directionsrsch.com (IDENT:root@dri74.directionsrsch.com [206.112.196.74])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA02407 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 14:26:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com
    by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id QAA06217
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 16:37:26 -0400
Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2
5-20-1999)) id 852568B6.00754085 ; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 17:20:42 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <852568B6.00753EED.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2000 17:20:37 -0400
Subject: Re: U.S. SUPREME COURT CENSUS VICTORS CALL FOR DISMANTLING OF
    CENSUS BUREAU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

I find it interesting that these folks claim that less than 40% have responded to the census. I believe a few days ago a press report cited the Census as saying they already had 42% compliance which was, to them, a positive sign of more to come.

Can someone from Census tell us what the latest return rates are??

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Mon Apr 3 14:31:18 2000

I find it interesting that these folks claim that less than 40% have responded to the census. I believe a few days ago a press report cited the Census as saying they already had 42% compliance which was, to them, a positive sign of more to come.

Can someone from Census tell us what the latest return rates are??
I find it interesting that these folks claim that less than 40% have responded to the census. I believe a few days ago a press report cited the Census as saying they already had 42% compliance which was, to them, a positive sign of more to come.

Can someone from Census tell us what the latest return rates are??

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Spring-Summer 2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776
I checked census.gov today. As of April 2nd, the response rate was 53%.

Mickey Blum
Dear AAPOR:

I'm surprised no one is discussing whether or not the strategy promulgated by many Republicans is going to mobilize public opinion in their favor. I can't imagine the Jack Kemp wing of the GOP seeking to gain minority votes by discouraging minorities from filling out the census.

Questions about undercounting and enumeration aside, I still think my GOP friends are on the wrong track by criticizing the census. In two years, 'Democratic states' may gain a seat or two in Congress, but if one is thinking long term, one wants embrace those potential constituents, not alienate them.

-Robert Eisinger
Lewis & Clark College
Portland, OR (72 degrees, sunny)

-----Original Message-----
From: BLUMWEP@aol.com [mailto:BLUMWEP@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2000 5:35 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. SUPREME COURT CENSUS VICTORS CALL FOR DISMANTLING OF CENSUS BUREAU

I checked census.gov today. As of April 2nd, the response rate was 53%.

Mickey Blum

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

try: rss@soltec.net

try: rss@soltec.net
Trying to get a reservation continues to be a third-world experience. I tried the 800 number this afternoon (4:15 p.m. Pacific time). The woman who answered the phone desperately tried to please, though she had trouble understanding where I wanted the reservation. She then spent 20 minutes trying to get through to Portland; at least that's what she said she was trying to do as she came back on the line every 2 minutes. Then she took my name and number and promised someone would call back.

Assuming nothing would come of that effort, I dialed the 503 number. I got lots of courtesy, but not much comprehension. I was told no rooms were available in Portland, but would Vancouver do? I asked to be moved up the chain of command. A woman named Emeline came on the line and explained that every room had been booked. I explained that rooms were supposed to be available until the 20th. In her best cooling-out mode, she suggested that somebody would call me back to explain the situation. I said I didn't want an explanation; I wanted a reservation. She then said she would try to reach "Chris" on his cell phone. I gathered that Chris is in charge of this charade.

Time passed; Emeline came back on the line to say Chris was "off property" but would get back to me if I would give her my name and number. She asked me if I wanted a river view or a (?) view, bringing pseudo-service to a level of pretense not often encountered. I said I would be delighted to give her my name, number, and Credit card number and perhaps she could get me a reservation. No, she couldn't do that and she didn't want to be responsible for my credit card number. I said wasn't there a reservation clerk available?

The best I could get out of her was a promise that Chris would call. I got his name -- Chris Taylor -- and what she alleged was his "direct line" -- 503 - 978 - 4584. I asked what time he came in -- 8 a.m. Pacific time.

I told her that nightmare stories about her firm's performance have been going around the country and abroad for weeks and said I would do my best to contribute to the collection. That blew her cover. She asked if I was threatening her. The call ended in mutual umbrage.

I guess we're trapped as an organization. We can add Portland to our select list of conference experiences we'd rather not repeat. Like the cottage cheese in Asheville. But, I have a personal alternative.
Paul, Shap: Sorry to bug you when you must be on the edge of the ledge. What do I do to register for the conference and get meal tickets? I can stay with friends in Portland.

Unthreateningly yours, and with profound sympathy for suffering through a thankless task,

Bernie Roshco

Bernie,

Unfortunately, yours is the second report we've heard today of 'totally sold out.' By our figures, there should still be rooms available, and we have been trying to follow up with the hotel; we haven't reached Chris either.

We will escalate this in the morning and post a note back here on the results.

This is certainly not the kind of service you should expect, nor does it reflect our visit to the property last month; we're all puzzled.

Thanks for letting us know about this breakdown,
Shap Wolf, Conference Operations Associate Chair

-----Original Message-----
From: Bernard Roshco [mailto:broshco@wizard.net]
Sent: Monday, 03 April, 2000 09:16 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: My Third-World Experience in Search of a Reservation
Trying to get a reservation continues to be a third-world experience. I tried the 800 number this afternoon (4:15 p.m. Pacific time). The woman who answered the phone desperately tried to please, though she had trouble understanding where I wanted the reservation. She then spent 20 minutes trying to get through to Portland; at least that’s what she said she was trying to do as she came back on the line every 2 minutes. Then she took my name and number and promised someone would call back.

Assuming nothing would come of that effort, I dialed the 503 number. I got lots of courtesy, but not much comprehension. I was told no rooms were available in Portland, but would Vancouver do? I asked to be moved up the chain of command. A woman named Emeline came on the line and explained that every room had been booked. I explained that rooms were supposed to be available until the 20th. In her best cooling-out mode, she suggested that somebody would call me back to explain the situation. I said I didn't want an explanation; I wanted a reservation. She then said she would try to reach "Chris" on his cell phone. I gathered that Chris is in charge of this charade.

Time passed; Emeline came back on the line to say Chris was "off property" but would get back to me if I would give her my name and number. She asked me if I wanted a river view or a (?) view, bringing pseudo-service to a level of pretense not often encountered. I said I would be delighted to give her my name, number, and Credit card number and perhaps she could get me a reservation. No, she couldn't do that and she didn't want to be responsible for my credit card number. I said wasn't there a reservation clerk available?

The best I could get out of her was a promise that Chris would call. I got his name -- Chris Taylor -- and what she alleged was his "direct line" -- 503 - 978 - 4584. I asked what time he came in -- 8 a.m. Pacific time.

I told her that nightmare stories about her firm's performance have been going around the country and abroad for weeks and said I would do my best to contribute to the collection. That blew her cover. She asked if I was threatening her. The call ended in mutual umbrage.

I guess we're trapped as an organization. We can add Portland to our select list of conference experiences we'd rather not repeat. Like the cottage cheese in Asheville. But, I have a personal alternative.

Paul, Shap: Sorry to bug you when you must be on the edge of the ledge. What do I do to register for the conference and get meal tickets? I can stay with friends in Portland.

Unthreateningly yours, and with profound sympathy for suffering through a thankless task,

Bernie Roshco

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Mon Apr  3 19:34:48 2000
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id TAA29273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 19:34:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (garnet2-fi.acns.fsu.edu
Census response overall is 55% and climbing.
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Spring-Summer 2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270
850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208
The El Paso Times, a daily newspaper in El Paso, Texas, is seeking the assistance of AAPOR members to analyze survey research currently being conducted in our readership area. The mail survey concerns a number of financial services issues, such as access to capital, and is to be used to build the agenda for a community "summit" on financial issues in mid-May.

Because this study is intended to help the community set long-term policies on financial services matters, the newspaper is attempting to assess the quality of the research to ensure that the underpinnings of that policy are being arrived at in a scientific and responsible manner.

A key point to this effort is to help educate our readers about the differences between sound and flawed survey research. That's why we've turned to AAPOR for assistance.

We propose to do the analysis in two phases. The first phase would involve reviewing the seven-page survey instrument itself, and commenting on issues such as possible bias, quality of design, etc. We can commence this phase immediately.

The second phase would involve analyzing the methodology of the survey, including response rates and other key issues. The survey's principal researcher has agreed to cooperate with our effort but cannot make the methodology available until April 15, after preliminary data analysis is complete.

Our publication goal is early May, before the beginning of the financial services summit. We realize this is a tight deadline, but we would appreciate any assistance AAPOR members could provide.

We are interested in two kinds of responses. The preferred method would be "on the record," meaning that we could publish results of the analysis and attribute it to a named source. However, we also will accept "off the record" comments, meaning we would not use the comments or the name of the reviewer in our paper. Such comments would be used entirely for background purposes and not for publication, because of a newspaper policy that
discourages the use of unnamed sources.

We would prefer a written critique of the survey instrument and methodology, and we would post the entire text of "on the record" critiques on our website, so readers could assess the work themselves. We've also committed to sharing the critiques with the principal researcher to allow for response.

We understand this can be a fairly extensive undertaking, but we will not be able to provide compensation because we view participants as news sources. Part of our ethics policy prohibits paying news sources. But we hope several AAPOR members will participate as a means of furthering public understanding of survey research. If you're interested in participating in this effort, contact Bob Moore, assistant managing editor, at Bmoore@elpaso.gannett.com or call him at (800) 351-6007, ext. 6145.

*****

>From drivers@intersurvey.com Mon Apr  3 20:41:31 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id UAA04289 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Apr 2000 20:41:30 -0700
(PDT)
Message-ID: <746196386bfad87fdf31a9162293228d38e96531@inter-survey.com>
From: "Douglas Rivers" <drivers@intersurvey.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10004032008490.22843-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Seek AAPOR members help evaluating a survey in the news (fwd)
Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2000 20:47:23 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Do they pay their reporters?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2000 8:17 PM
Subject: Seek AAPOR members help evaluating a survey in the news (fwd)

> 
> > 
> > -------- Forwarded message --------
> > Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2000 13:49:49 -0400
> > From: "Moore, Bob (El Paso)" <bmoore@elpaso.gannett.com>
> > To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
> > Subject: Seek AAPOR members help evaluating a survey in the news
> > 
> > The El Paso Times, a daily newspaper in El Paso, Texas, is seeking the
> > assistance of AAPOR members to analyze survey research currently being
> > conducted in our readership area. The mail survey concerns a number of
> > financial services issues, such as access to capital, and is to be
> > used to build the agenda for a community "summit" on financial issues


> in mid-May.
> Because this study is intended to help the community set long-term policies
> on financial services matters, the newspaper is attempting to assess
> the quality of the research to ensure that the underpinnings of that policy
> are
> being arrived at in a scientific and responsible manner.
> A key point to this effort is to help educate our readers about the differences between sound and flawed survey research. That's why we've turned to AAPOR for assistance.
> We propose to do the analysis in two phases. The first phase would involve reviewing the seven-page survey instrument itself, and commenting on issues such as possible bias, quality of design, etc. We can commence this phase immediately.
> The second phase would involve analyzing the methodology of the survey, including response rates and other key issues. The survey's principal researcher has agreed to cooperate with our effort but cannot make the methodology available until April 15, after preliminary data analysis is complete.
> Our publication goal is early May, before the beginning of the financial services summit. We realize this is a tight deadline, but we would appreciate any assistance AAPOR members could provide.
> We are interested in two kinds of responses. The preferred method would be "on the record," meaning that we could publish results of the analysis and attribute it to a named source. However, we also will accept "off the record" comments, meaning we would not use the comments or the name of the reviewer in our paper. Such comments would be used entirely for background purposes and not for publication, because of a newspaper policy that discourages the use of unnamed sources.
> We would prefer a written critique of the survey instrument and methodology, and we would post the entire text of "on the record" critiques on our web site, so readers could assess the work themselves. We've also committed to sharing the critiques with the principal researcher to allow for response.
> We understand this can be a fairly extensive undertaking, but we will not be able to provide compensation because we view participants as news sources. Part of our ethics policy prohibits paying news sources. But we hope several AAPOR members will participate as a means of furthering public understanding of survey research. If you're interested in participating in this
> effort, contact Bob Moore, assistant managing editor, at
> Bmoore@elpaso.gannett.com <mailto:Bmoore@elpaso.gannett.com>, or call
> him at (800) 351-6007, ext. 6145.
> 
> * * * * * * * * *
> 
> From pbraun@braunresearch.com Tue Apr  4 05:33:21 2000
> Received: from futuna.netreach.net (qmailr@futuna.netreach.net
> [207.106.22.5])
>    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
>    id FAA21819 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 05:33:20 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: (qmail 15386 invoked from network); 4 Apr 2000 12:33:06 -0000
> Received: from ppp-207205-010.netreach.net (HELO pbraun) (207.29.205.10)
>    by futuna.netreach.net with SMTP; 4 Apr 2000 12:33:06 -0000
> Reply-To: <pbraun@braunresearch.com>
> From: "Paul Braun" <pbraun@braunresearch.com>
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: RE: Republicans and the Census
> Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2000 08:32:27 -0400
> Message-ID: <003001bf9e32$1a9837c0$9ac2fea9@pbraun>
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain;
>       charset="iso-8859-1"
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
> In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.4.10.10004031432120.8457-100000@haystack.lclark.edu>
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
> 
> Has anyone done a national survey and compared census returns to the
> Presidential horse race? Just curious.
> 
> Regards to all
> 
> Paul Braun

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
Robert Eisinger
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2000 5:44 PM
To:   aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:    Republicans and the Census

Dear AAPOR:

I'm surprised no one is discussing whether or not the strategy promulgated
by many Republicans is going to mobilize public opinion in their favor. I
can't imagine the Jack Kemp wing of the GOP seeking to gain minority votes
by discouraging minorities from filling out the census.

Questions about undercounting and enumeration aside, I still think my GOP
friends are on the wrong track by criticizing the census. In two years, 'Democratic states' may gain a seat or two in Congress, but if one is thinking long term, one wants embrace those potential constituents, not alienate them.

-Robert Eisinger
Lewis & Clark College
Portland, OR (72 degrees, sunny)

http://rates.census.gov/

From: rstuefen@usd.edu Tue Apr  4 06:04:47 2000
Received: from exchange.usd.edu (exchange.usd.edu [192.236.35.95])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA02077 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 06:04:46 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by exchange.usd.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <2A02J5TH>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 08:01:22 -0500
Message-ID: <C3AC1B98FED7D21190E700C00D003E8C02957CB0@exchange.usd.edu>
From: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@usd.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: What is the Census Response Rate in your state?
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2000 08:01:18 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

http://rates.census.gov/

From: mkshares@mcs.net Tue Apr  4 06:18:20 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA06194 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 06:18:19 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P19-Chi-Dial-3.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.147])
    by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA14789;
    Tue, 4 Apr 2000 08:18:11 -0500 (CDT)
    (envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <38E99734.77CD9A94@mcs.net>
Date: Tue, 04 Apr 2000 07:18:20 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
CC: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The Republicans and the Census
References: <OFED26F6FC.DC9DBA79-ON862568B3.0046F8C6@fhsu.edu>
    <008c01b9c358a48459405393f9a9@net.JRC> <38E7203A.48E14E1C@mcs.net>
    <38E8DA9D.81832328@rider.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
    x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
I don't think Page was encouraging non-response. The point he was making was the irony in Census critics possibly encouraging an undercount of their own constituents.

Frank Rusciano wrote:

> However poetic the justice may be, I think we at AAPOR should hold to the position of encouraging ALL individuals to fill out the census. Partisan feelings aside, it does not comfort me that any group, conservative, liberal, or whatever, should be undercounted due to irresponsibility of our elected officials.

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> From Clarence Page's Tribune column today:
> "Now that conservative Republicans have embraced rhetoric that panders to anti-census voices, they actually may be discouraging compliance among their own most likely supporters. If so, it would be a good example of politics exerting poetic justice."


Jim Caplan wrote:

> I may be totally confused here but if those trying to influence Americans not to reply succeed, it will result in OVERREPRESENTATION by those who feel that sort of demagoguery is nonsense. Hence, it will counter productive! (Or is that another name for a highly efficient Census enumerator?)

Jim Caplan
Miami

----- Original Message ----- From: <jaistrup@fhsu.edu> To: <aapornet@usc.edu> Sent: Friday, March 31, 2000 8:10 AM Subject: The Republicans and the Census

I don't know about the rest of you, but I have had enough !@#$ from the GOP leadership on the census. First, they insist that the census should be an enumeration (according to the courts, rightly so). Now, they are making that enumeration more difficult, by feeding the paranoia that the census survey invades a family's privacy and by extension, that the data will be used by the government in a sinister fashion. Ironically, they are creating an enviroment where, in order to
obtain an accurate count and accurate statistics, it will be absolutely necessary to use a sampling methodology.

This is the essence of stupidity!

Sincerely, Joe Aistrup

Roman Czujko
American Institute of Physics

Hello all,

The National Science Foundation recently published an interesting 4 page summary of home computer usage. It can be found at:

http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf00314

Roman Czujko
I am interested in learning about any surveys done in which the general population's views toward technology were investigated. Hopefully, members of this mail group can help. Specifically, I am interested in survey questions, survey data, and/or survey analyses, regardless of the mode of data collection, that deal with, but are not exclusive to:

- people's definitions of what technology is
- people's views toward technology
- people's views of technology in their communities
- people's views on the role of government, both local and national, in the development of technology
- people's views on the roles of primary, secondary, and higher level education in the development of technology
- people's views on the role of the business sector in the development of technology.

I would appreciate any help that is offered. Please feel free to e-mail responses directly to me or via aapornet. Thank you in advance.

Jeffery A. Stec  
Research Associate  
Center for Survey Research  
The Ohio State University  
3045 Derby Hall  
154 N. Oval Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210

>From rstuefen@usd.edu Tue Apr 4 06:59:28 2000  
Received: from exchange.usd.edu (exchange.usd.edu [192.236.35.95])  
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
    id GAA21181 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 06:59:20 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: by exchange.usd.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
    id <2A02J61P>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 08:55:55 -0500  
Message-ID: <C3AC1B98FED7D21190E700C00D003E8C02957CFC@exchange.usd.edu>  
From: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@usd.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject:  
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2000 08:55:51 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Does anyone know why South Dakota Indian Reservations are not listed by the Census on their tally page?

http://rates.census.gov/cgi-bin/ResponseRates

Randall M. Stuefen  
Director of Research & Associate Director
You might want to check out the surveys done by the Pew Research Center - www.people-press.org.

stec.4@pop.service.ohio-state.edu on 04/04/2000 09:52:23 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Anna Greenberg/FS/KSG)
Subject: technology

I am interested in learning about any surveys done in which the general population's views toward technology were investigated. Hopefully, members of this mail group can help. Specifically, I am interested in survey questions, survey data, and/or survey analyses, regardless of the mode of data collection, that deal with, but are not exclusive to:

- people's definitions of what technology is
- people's views toward technology
- people's views of technology in their communities
- people's views on the role of government, both local and national, in the development of technology
- people's views on the roles of primary, secondary, and higher level education in the development of technology
people's views on the role of the business sector in the development of technology.

I would appreciate any help that is offered. Please feel free to e-mail responses directly to me or via aapornet. Thank you in advance.

Jeffery A. Stec
Research Associate
Center for Survey Research
The Ohio State University
3045 Derby Hall
154 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210

A lot of the work on knowledge about and attitudes toward technology and science are conducted by Jon Miller of the International Center for the Advancement of Scientific Literacy (affiliated with the Univ of Chicago). Some of these data are cited in the appendix tables of the "Science and Engineering Indicators" which is published by the National Science Foundation in even numbered years.

Roman Czujko
American Institute of Physics
Considerable work on this subject has been done under the titles of risk perception, judgment and decision making, and risk communication. This body of work includes experimental, survey, case study, and historical studies. One place to start a search is at www.decisionresearch.org which lists a bibliography of work done by researchers at Decision Research over the past 30 years or so.

----Original Message-----
From: Jeffery Stec <stec.4@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Tuesday, April 04, 2000 6:49 AM
Subject: technology

> I am interested in learning about any surveys done in which the
general population's views toward technology were investigated.
> Hopefully, members of this mail group can help. Specifically, I am
> interested in survey questions, survey data, and/or survey analyses,
> regardless of the mode of data collection, that deal with, but are not
> exclusive to:
> > - people's definitions of what technology is
> > - people's views toward technology
> > - people's views of technology in their communities
> > - people's views on the role of government, both local and national,
> > in the development of technology
> > - people's views on the roles of primary, secondary, and higher level
> education in the development of technology
> > - people's views on the role of the business sector in the development
> > of technology.
> > I would appreciate any help that is offered. Please feel free to
e-mail responses directly to me or via aapornet. Thank you in advance.
> >Jeffery A. Stec
>Research Associate
>Center for Survey Research
>The Ohio State University
>3045 Derby Hall
>154 N. Oval Mall
>Columbus, OH 43210
>
>From jdfranz@earthlink.net Tue Apr  4 08:59:39 2000
Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.123])
I personally know of someone who did not send her Census form in until April 1 because a) it wouldn't necessarily be an accurate reflection of the state of affairs on "Census Day" otherwise; and b) it appeared that the form wasn't supposed to be mailed in before April 1. (This is a highly intelligent individual, by the way.) As for myself, I sent the form in earlier but wrote in beside the number of people space, "Unless someone dies before then."

I actually have found it passing strange that the Census would ask for the number of people residing at an address on April 1 yet advertise for the form to be returned earlier. Certainly many things change in households between mid-March and April 1?

Jennifer D. Franz

>From daves@startribune.com Tue Apr  4 09:01:43 2000
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com [132.148.80.211])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA28039 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 09:01:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id LAA03496; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 11:00:40 -0500
Received: from mailserv1.startribune.com(132.148.25.25) by
firewall2.startribune.com via smtp (V4.2)
    id xma003330; Tue, 4 Apr 00 11:00:29 -0500
Received: from SMTP (stnave.startribune.com [132.148.90.39])
    by mailserv1.startribune.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id KAA11779
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Apr 2000 10:56:43 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from mail.startribune.com ([132.148.90.226]) by 132.148.90.39
    (Norton AntiVirus for Internet Email Gateways 1.0) ;
    Tue, 04 Apr 2000 15:55:59 0000 (GMT)
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
    with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 04 Apr 2000 10:58:33 -0600
Message-Id: <s8e9cad9.051@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Tue, 04 Apr 2000 10:57:48 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: stec.4@pop.service.ohio-state.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: technology
Mime-Version: 1.0
Mr. Stec:

We occasionally explore people's attitudes about technology. We try to look at a number of dimensions, including early adopters and fear of technology.

We've done several polls on the subject, including the most recent one late in 1999, the findings of which may still be on our web site at www.startribune.com.

Hope this helps.

Robert P. Daves, Director
Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN 55419 USA

Jon Miller is now at Northwestern, mostly at the school of journalism:

j-miller8@nwu.edu

Susan

At 10:11 AM 4/4/2000 -0400, you wrote:
>A lot of the work on knowledge about and attitudes toward technology
>and science are conducted by Jon Miller of the International Center for
>the Advancement of Scientific Literacy (affiliated with the Univ of
>Chicago). Some of these data are cited in the appendix tables of
>the "Science and Engineering Indicators" which is published by the
>National Science Foundation in even numbered years.
>
>Roman Czujko
>American Institute of Physics
>
>Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
>Spring-Summer 2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
>slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208
33'rd ESSEX SUMMER SCHOOL
IN
SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA ANALYSIS
AND
COLLECTION
9th July - 18th August 2000

The Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis and Collection offers over 50 one and two-week courses on social survey design and analysis, sampling, regression, multilevel analysis, time series analysis, correspondence analysis, log linear analysis, latent class analysis, discourse analysis, game theory, rational choice, social theory, data visualisation and data mining, social network analysis, maximum likelihood estimation and limited dependent variables, categorisation and sorting, scaling, structural equation models, qualitative data analysis, focus groups, deliberative polls, interviewing, participant observation, content analysis (including the General Inquirer), SPSS, Amos, Lisrel, British Household Panel Survey, time budgets diary collection and analysis, facet theory, frame analysis and international conflict management.

A small number of ESRC bursaries are available to participants from British academic institutions.

For further details see URL <http://www.essex.ac.uk/methods>
or
e-mail sumsch@essex.ac.uk
or
write to The Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis & Collection
University of Essex
Colchester, Essex CO4 3SQ,
United Kingdom
or
Fax [international] 44-1206-873598 [UK/Eire] 01206-873598
or
Before considering this plea, AAPOR members should know that it is not considered unethical for newspaper companies to pay for professional advice on research methodology. (If it were, some of us would be a lot poorer.) You should also know that the parent company of the El Paso Times reported operating income of $1.6 billion last year.
Hello all:

As I previously posted on this list some time ago, I am preparing the third edition of "The Sociology of Sexuality and Sexual Orientation: Syllabi and Teaching Materials" for the Teaching Resource Center of the American Sociological Association. I would like to receive relevant course outlines and syllabi, pedagogical essays, bibliographies and filmographies, games and simulation exercises, assignments, and other materials that may be of value to instructors of courses in this area. Send your contributions to:

    Tracy E. Ore
    Assistant Professor
    Department of Human Relations
    & Multicultural Education
    Saint Cloud State University
    B118 Education Building
    720 Fourth Avenue South
    Saint Cloud, Minnesota  56301-4498

Deadline for submission of materials has been extended to April 30, 2000. Please submit materials in hard copy and disk form (note application and version on disk). Please direct any questions to me privately at tore@stcloudstate.edu.

Tracy

**************************************************************************
Tracy E. Ore, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Human Relations
& Multicultural Education
The Netherlands Science Foundation is now implementing a survey in which knowledge of, attitudes towards, interest in science and technology is surveyed. Both general public and special groups (e.g. science journalists, politicians) are investigated. They use a questionnaire based on specially designed questions for this survey, with added questions from earlier studies in the Netherlands, and international studies.

Good luck,

Edith de Leeuw
At 09:52 AM 4/4/00 -0400, you wrote:
> I am interested in learning about any surveys done in which
> the
> general population's views toward technology were
> investigated. Hopefully, members of this mail group can
> help. Specifically, I am interested in survey questions, survey data,
> and/or survey analyses, regardless of the mode of data collection, that
> deal with, but are not exclusive to:
- people's definitions of what technology is
- people's views toward technology
- people's views of technology in their communities
- people's views on the role of government, both local and national, in the development of technology
- people's views on the roles of primary, secondary, and higher level education in the development of technology
- people's views on the role of the business sector in the development of technology.

I would appreciate any help that is offered. Please feel free to e-mail responses directly to me or via aapornet. Thank you in advance.

Jeffery A. Stec
Research Associate
Center for Survey Research
The Ohio State University
3045 Derby Hall
154 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210

--- Original Message ---
From: Everett.G.Whiteley@ccmail.census.gov
[mailto:Everett.G.Whiteley@ccmail.census.gov]
Sent: April 04, 2000 3:00 PM
To: Stuefen, Randy
Subject: RE: Response rates for South Dakota Reservations

Everett,

Thanks. The reservations are a significant geographic area in our state. It is interesting that all of our reservations would be chosen for enumeration while that is not true in other states. I hope someone lets us know some of the reasoning on this sometime.

Thanks again,
Randy
Dear Mr. Stuefen,

I tried to find response rates for these areas on our internet site and failed to do so. The only thing that tells me is that these reservations are probably in areas that will be enumerated directly. That is, these are probably not areas to which forms are mailed and thus would not be included in the response rates.

Everett Whiteley

"Stuefen, Randy" <rstufen@usd.edu> on 04/04/2000 11:35:05 AM

To: Everett G Whiteley/DIR/HQ/BOC@BOC
cc:

Subject: RE: Response rates for South Dakota Reservations

South Dakota Reservations include:

Pine Ridge
Cheyenne River
Standing Rock
Rosebud
Lower Brule
These rates are not listed by state. However, if you know the names of the reservations you are interested in, you can pull the rates for each individually. Go to http://rates.census.gov/aia.html and the reservation you're interested in should be there.

Hope this helps,

Everett Whiteley
Public Information Office
US Census Bureau

>From Sunday's New York Times Magazine--Ethics for the Census Respondent

THE ETHICIST BY RANDY COHEN

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
When I fill out my census form, I am considering declaring myself poor and African-American. This would be a lie because I am middle class and white, but it strikes me as responsive to a higher ethic. Adding one more tally to a group known to be undercounted would help right the inaccurate figures. Should I suppress my socially conscious concerns? -- J. Sommer, New York

You should express your concerns, but not in the way you propose. While the census is seriously -- and, many say, deliberately -- flawed, it is not so utterly discredited as to justify the small civil disobedience you describe. Instead, write to your representatives and demand the use of sampling techniques that would yield a more accurate count, and urge your local officials to make every effort to see that all are tallied. But when the census form arrives, fill it out honestly.

Aside from the legal objection to falsifying the form, it is in everyone's interest to make the count as accurate as possible. If your policy were universally adopted, the census would be discredited as little more than fiction, particularly the part about the 35 Guamanians living in my apartment.

Do you have ethical queries that you need answered? Send them to ethicist@nytimes.com or The Ethicist, The New York Times Magazine, 229 West 43rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.

---

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

---

>From ASafir@ui.urban.org Wed Apr 5 06:11:57 2000
Received: from uint3.urban.org (webmail.urban.org [192.188.252.70]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA18016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 06:11:56 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by webmail.urban.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21) id <22W0G1VA>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 09:09:25 -0400
Message-ID: <419A83918993D311B61A00508B6F39B024779C8UINT4>
From: "Safir, Adam" <ASafir@ui.urban.org>
Out of curiosity, I forwarded Ray's question about the bible and the census to a friend pursuing his rabbinical studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. This was his response.

Adam Safir
Urban Institute

***

Great question.

It is true that there was a biblical tradition not to count people. There still exists this counting taboo in modern Judaism. Today the reason is that it is not right to reduce humans to mere numbers. However, there are definite necessities to account for the number of people in a community, i.e., taxes or even if there are ten people present in a minyan. So how do we get around the problem of counting to arrive at a sum total? My professor Eliezer Slomovic told me that in his community in Sighet, Hungary, when referring to the number of people in the town they would say, "there are five hundred and twenty three talleisim (prayer shawls) in Sighet." This meant that there were that many men (recognize the non-egalitarian element of that culture). And when we count the number of people in a room to verify if there are ten people for a minyan, it is traditional to use a verse in the Bible that has ten words and assign each person a word (Hebrew of Psalms 28:9).

The same fear of reducing people to numbers was the same fear that existed in biblical times. It is clear that when there were God-ordained census (Exodus 30:11-12) there was also an alternative way to count people. In the cited case each person, rich and poor alike, donated a half shekel to the sanctuary. The half shekels were then counted to arrive at the number of Israelites. This was not the only God-ordained census (see Numbers 3:40-43). In each case there were specific reasons why God commanded there to be a census.

David was castigated, for counting the people, and a plague broke out because it was not ordained by God, according to the author of 1 Chronicles chapter twenty one.

In order to decide if the American census is a good thing today will depend if you think it was "God ordained." What that means for us today is we must decide what is good for our county throughout democracy. I am sure the Republicans and Democrats will adequately represent their constituents' voices.

One thing that we can learn from the Bible, as Republicans and Democrats, that we must never reduce people to mere numbers. Counting should be for the purpose of enhancing our humanity.
I hope this modest attempt begins to answer the complicated question.

L'Shalom,

Russell Barkan

>-----Original Message-----
>RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
>
>> For those who think the current Census flap is something
>> recent, check out I
>> Chronicles, Ch 21, which begins: "A satan rose up against
>> Israel, and he
>> enticed David into taking a census of Israel." It turned
>> out very badly for
>> King David. Nothing new in 2500 years? When I first
>> ran across this I
>> looked into it but could find no satisfactory answer for why
>> the ancient
>> Hebrews considered a census to be a bad idea. Anybody know
>> anything about
>> it? Maybe it would even provide some insight into current
>> controversies.
>>
>> Ray ("Not a Christian Fundamentalist") Funkhouser
>
>From jcf3c@erols.com Wed Apr  5 09:28:26 2000
Received: from web1.planet2000.com ([159.169.245.10])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA02851 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 09:28:26 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from WINGATE (WINGATE [209.3.2.162]) by web1.planet2000.com
    (NTMail 3.02.13) with ESMTPr id na047047 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr
    2000 12:35:12 -0400
Message-ID: <38EB6A07.5476CA45@erols.com>
Date: Wed, 05 Apr 2000 12:29:59 -0400
From: "John C. Fries" <jcf3c@erols.com>
Reply-To: jcf3c@erols.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (WinNT; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Panels: The Good, the Bad, and the Defensible?
References: <419A83918993D311B61A00508B6F39B024779C8UINT4>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

All,

I've recently been embroiled in a discussion of the use of mega-panels from
which to draw samples for particular studies. Certainly with web/email
surveys the use of million-plus member panels has emerged as the first
significant answer proposed for questions of how to get a representative
sample from the internet. I've also heard many a story about comparisons
between random samples and panel-derived samples that showed no significant
differences. However, knowing that not everyone in a particular population
had an equal and known probability of being selected for inclusion in the mega-panel sends flags waving. How could a randomly drawn sample from this mega-panel then be representative?

I know that many AAPORNETters are or have been involved with these large panel based research groups and was hoping both they and others could share their thoughts (both positive and negative) about this emerging option for dealing with both the Internet and declining response rates.

Basically, can samples drawn from pre-recruited panels be used to gather scientifically defensible, representative data?

John

--
John C. Fries.................................Voice: (804) 358-8981 Senior Project Director..................FAX: (804) 358-9701 Southeastern Institute of Research..............Richmond, Virginia Marketing and Opinion Research.............email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

Adam and others:


Barry M. Feinberg
Audits & Surveys Worldwide

"Safir, Adam" wrote:

> Out of curiosity, I forwarded Ray's question about the bible and the
The same fear of reducing people to numbers was the same
fear that existed in biblical times. It is clear that
when there were God-ordained census (Exodus 30:11-12) there was also
an alternative way to count people. In the cited case each person,
rich and poor alike, donated a half shekel to the sanctuary. The half
shekels were then counted to arrive at the number of Israelites. This
was not the only God-ordained census (see Numbers 3:40-43). In each
case there were specific reasons why God commanded there to be a
census.

David was castigated, for counting the people, and a plague broke out
because it was not ordained by God, according to the author of 1
Chronicles chapter twenty one.

In order to decide if the American census is a good thing today will
depend if you think it was "God ordained." What that means for us
today is we must decide what is good for our county throughout
democracy. I am sure the Republicans and Democrats will adequately
represent their constituents' voices.

One thing that we can learn from the Bible, as Republicans and
Democrats, that we must never reduce people to mere numbers. Counting
should be for the purpose of enhancing our humanity.

I hope this modest attempt begins to answer the complicated question.

L'Shalom,

Russell Barkan

>-----Original Message-----
> RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
> >
> >> For those who think the current Census flap is something
> >> recent, check out I
> >> Chronicles, Ch 21, which begins: "A satan rose up against
> >> Israel, and he
> >> enticed David into taking a census of Israel." It turned
> >> out very badly for
> >> King David. Nothing new in 2500 years? When I first
> >> ran across this I
> >> looked into it but could find no satisfactory answer for why
> >> the ancient
> >> Hebrews considered a census to be a bad idea. Anybody know
> >> anything about
> >> it? Maybe it would even provide some insight into current
> >> controversies.
> >>
> >> Ray ("Not a Christian Fundamentalist") Funkhouser
> >
>
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Apr  5 10:59:49 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA25550 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 10:59:48 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA05449 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 10:59:50 -0700
   (PDT)
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2000 10:59:50 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Not the census, nor the size of cities
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10004051028510.28983-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The American poet Ralph Waldo Emerson, writing in his "Society and Solitude"
(1870), in the section titled "Civilization," and following his immortal
exhortation to "Hitch your wagon to a star," went on to say:

    The true test of civilization is, not the census,
    nor the size of cities, nor the crops--no, but the
    kind of man the country turns out.

Emerson was born (1803) during Thomas Jefferson's first term of office, and
he wrote the words above during or shortly after Abraham Lincoln's second
term, which of course ended with his assassination.

We can only wonder what Emerson might have thought of our likely choice
between George W. and Al G. for the next "man" to hold the same office, and
whether Emerson would have worried very much, comparatively speaking, about
the current problems of Census 2000.

-- Jim
********

From pbeatty@umich.edu Wed Apr  5 11:37:58 2000
Received: from donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
       (smtp@donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.163])
       by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
       id LAA01891 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 11:37:26 -0700
       (PDT)
Received: from stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
       [141.211.2.154])
       by donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
       OAA06173
       for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 14:36:41 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (pbeatty@localhost)
       by stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id
       OAA26151
       for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Apr 2000 14:37:21 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2000 14:37:21 -0400 (EDT)
From: Paul Beatty <pbeatty@umich.edu>
X-Sender: pbeatty@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Portland Conference Reservations
Message-ID:
       <Pine.SOL.4.10.10004051411030.14893-100000@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

******** From the Conference Operations Committee **************

This message is for those of you who are planning to attend the AAPOR Conference in Portland this year, but have NOT yet made hotel reservations.

At the moment, both conference hotels are completely full. AAPOR has filled (and slightly exceeded) our room block, which is roughly the same size for every AAPOR conference. Still, we realize that some more members want to stay in the conference hotels if at all possible.

There is a possibility that we will be able to secure an additional 20-30 rooms from the Doubletrees for AAPOR members who want to attend but have not yet made reservations. We expect to know for sure by tomorrow, and will update everyone via AAPORNET if and when rooms are available.

If you have not yet made reservations, please be patient until our next update today or tomorrow. At that time we'll know for sure about Doubletree availability and will also pass on information about alternative hotels with best access to the conference. For the moment, we ask that you briefly stand by, and give us the chance to accommodate as many of you as possible in the conference hotels.

Many thanks,

Paul Beatty
Conference Operations Chair
An interesting historical tidbit about the first US Census:

April 3, 2000

1790 Census: 'Perfect Enumeration'

Filed at 1:24 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- In late 1790, an inquisitive government agent knocked on the door of Boston silversmith and patriot Paul Revere and dutifully noted his name and the number of people living under his roof.

Two hundred and ten years later, the ledgerbook recording that raw data about Revere and his Boston neighbors is on view at the National Archives, pen-and-ink evidence of the first U.S. census and the 20 national head counts that followed.

The Archives pulled the 1790 ledger from its miles of shelves just as the 21st census got under way with the dispatching of questionnaires to about 120 million households.

As the American Revolution began in 1775, Revere galloped out from Boston to Lexington, Mass., rousing the countryside and warning that the British...
>were marching. His midnight mission would be immortalized in Henry
>Wadsworth Longfellow's ``Paul Revere's Ride.''
>
>None of that is obvious from the 1790 census. Revere's name appears as
>head of a household that included three boys under age 16 and three white
>females. All except Revere are listed as numbers.
>
>``Other than that we know nothing else about them, not even their
>names,''
said Connie Potter, an Archives official. ``But it is clear, from the
>questions that were asked, that there were no slaves in Paul Revere's
>household.''
>
>In the first census, just 650 people did the counting in the 13 states,
>the districts of Maine, Vermont and Kentucky and the Southwest Territory,
>which later became the state of Tennessee.
>
>Responsibility for the count was lodged with the U.S. marshal in each
>state and district. Those doing the actual counting were hired as
>assistant marshals.
>
>In populous towns and cities the pay was $1 for every 300 people
>counted;
in the countryside it was $1 for every 150, but that was increased in
>sparsely settled areas to $1 for every 50.
>
>Each census worker took an oath to make ``a just and perfect
>enumeration
>and description of persons within the division assigned to him.''
>
The count was essential. It not only established the total population
>but
>also served as the basis of apportioning state delegations to the new
>House of Representatives.
>
>``Most people realized the important nature of what was being set in
>motion,'' said David Hendricks, a Census Bureau historian, standing near
>the case with the sheet of ruled paper listing the names of Paul Revere
>and other Bostonians.
>
>``It was important because they were building a democratic government
>for
>the first time and the government needed to distribute political power to
>the people based on their numbers.''
>
>Unlike the secrecy rules prevailing today, the 1790 census rules
>required
>that two copies of the final tallies be publicly displayed. Records show
>that copies went on view in such places as ``in front of the Court
>House,'' the Orange Tree Inn, a local gristmill, or, in one case, ``Mr.
>Henry Eckhart's Tavern.''
>
The third tally sheet was sent to President Washington.
>
>As in every census, some people were missed, either because they were
>hard
>to find or because they wished to remain uncounted.
But I think there was a general acceptance in 1790 that while not everyone got counted, it was good enough for what they had to do,'" Hendricks said.

According to the formula established by the Constitution, slaves were counted as three-fifths of a whole person for the purposes of apportionment. Free blacks were counted as whole people. So were indentured servants.

There were just six questions asked in 1790, of which two were basic: the name of the head of each family and the number of people in each household.

The census takers recorded the number of free, white males 16 years or older to determine how many men might be potentially available for military service. They also counted the number of free, white males younger than 16; the number of free, white females; all other free people by sex and race and the number of slaves in the household.

When all the adding of names and numbers was over, the result did not meet everyone's expectations.

Washington and other unhappy government officials had hoped the count would show a population of significantly more than 4 million. It didn't.

When the census was over, the population of the United States at the end of 1790 was certified at exactly 3,929,214.

That included Paul Revere.
WASHINGTON (AP) -- In late 1790, an inquisitive government agent knocked on the door of Boston silversmith and patriot Paul Revere and dutifully noted his name and the number of people living under his roof.

Two hundred and ten years later, the ledgerbook recording that raw data about Revere and his Boston neighbors is on view at the National Archives, pen-and-ink evidence of the first U.S. census and the 20 national head counts that followed.

The Archives pulled the 1790 ledger from its miles of shelves just as the 21st census got under way with the dispatching of questionnaires to about 120 million households.

As the American Revolution began in 1775, Revere galloped out from Boston to Lexington, Mass., rousing the countryside and warning that the British were marching. His midnight mission would be immortalized in Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's `"Paul Revere's Ride.''

None of that is obvious from the 1790 census. Revere's name appears as head of a household that included three boys under age 16 and three white females. All except Revere are listed as numbers.

``Other than that we know nothing else about them, not even their names,'' said Connie Potter, an Archives official. `"But it is clear, from the questions that were asked, that there were no slaves in Paul Revere's household.''

In the first census, just 650 people did the counting in the 13 states, the districts of Maine, Vermont and Kentucky and the Southwest Territory, which later became the state of Tennessee.

Responsibility for the count was lodged with the U.S. marshal in each state and district. Those doing the actual counting were hired as assistant marshals.

In populous towns and cities the pay was $1 for every 300 people counted; in the countryside it was $1 for every 150, but that was increased in sparsely settled areas to $1 for every 50.

Each census worker took an oath to make `"a just and perfect enumeration and description of persons within the division assigned to him.''

The count was essential. It not only established the total population but also served as the basis of apportioning state delegations to the new House of Representatives.
Most people realized the important nature of what was being set in motion, said David Hendricks, a Census Bureau historian, standing near the case with the sheet of ruled paper listing the names of Paul Revere and other Bostonians.

It was important because they were building a democratic government for the first time and the government needed to distribute political power to the people based on their numbers.

Unlike the secrecy rules prevailing today, the 1790 census rules required that two copies of the final tallies be publicly displayed. Records show that copies went on view in such places as in front of the Court House, the Orange Tree Inn, a local gristmill, or, in one case, Mr. Henry Eckhart's Tavern.

The third tally sheet was sent to President Washington.

As in every census, some people were missed, either because they were hard to find or because they wished to remain uncounted.

But I think there was a general acceptance in 1790 that while not everyone got counted, it was good enough for what they had to do, Hendricks said.

According to the formula established by the Constitution, slaves were counted as three-fifths of a whole person for the purposes of apportionment. Free blacks were counted as whole people. So were indentured servants.

There were just six questions asked in 1790, of which two were basic: the name of the head of each family and the number of people in each household.

The census takers recorded the number of free, white males 16 years or older to determine how many men might be potentially available for military service. They also counted the number of free, white males younger than 16; the number of free, white females; all other free people by sex and race and the number of slaves in the household.

When all the adding of names and numbers was over, the result did not meet everyone's expectations.

Washington and other unhappy government officials had hoped the count would show a population of significantly more than 4 million. It didn't.
When the census was over, the population of the United States at the end of 1790 was certified at exactly 3,929,214.

That included Paul Revere.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Lawrence L. Knutson has reported on the White House, Congress and the history of Washington for more than 30 years.

Scott,

When you come tomorrow, bring your paper on response rate effects on accuracy of polls. Looking forward to seeing you.

Ron

At 11:57 AM 3/1/2000 -0500, you wrote:

I agree with Nick's point that Democrats are not "raiding" the Republican primaries for the purpose of making mischief. But in fact only about half of McCain voters yesterday in Virginia (48%) said they would vote for Bush against Gore in the fall. Forty-one percent would vote for Gore. Not surprisingly, most of the likely defectors were Democrats or independents. But it's not clear that these are troublemakers. Among Democrats who voted for McCain, 53% would vote for McCain if he got the nomination against Gore (33% would vote
>for Gore). But even though some would defect, virtually
>all of the "McCain Democrats" (95%) had a favorable
>impression of him. They really like the guy.
>
>---------------------------
>Scott Keeter
>Dept. of Public and International Affairs
>George Mason University MSN 3F4
>Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
>Voice 703 993 1412
>Department fax 703 993 1399
>Personal fax 703 832 0209
>E-mail skeeter@gmu.edu
>Web site http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter
>
>On Wed, 1 Mar 2000, Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
> > After the Michigan GOP primary, Republicans cried "foul" and said
> > Democrats and Independents had invaded their party. (You would cry too
> > if it happened to you.)
> >
> > They claimed these voters showed up not in support of McCain but to cast
> > a vote for the "weaker" opponent against Gore in November.
> >
> > In Virginia, VNS asked GOP primary voters how they would vote in
> > November. (These exact numbers don't appear in the exit polls but can be
> > derived form the data.)
> >
> > Among McCain voters, 11% would vote for Gore in November in a match-up
> > against Gore. (Among Bush voters, 3% would vote for Gore in November.)
> >
> > 11% doesn't sound much like an invasion, more like a skirmish.
> > Moreover, we can't necessarily impute an improper motive to all of these
> > voters. It is perfectly reasonable to assume that some McCain backers,
> > if deprived of the chance to vote for him in November, would shift their
> > support to Gore.
> >
>
>Ronald Rapoport
Department of Government
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

e-mail: rbrapo@wm.edu
phone: (757) 221-3042
fax: (757) 221-2390

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Apr  6 10:04:29 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id KAA14677 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 10:04:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
Opinion polling and market research alive on the Web, but advertising experiencing considerable difficulties....

-- Jim

THE INDUSTRY STANDARD'S
NET PERSUASION
A Report on the Meeting of Marketing and the Internet

GOT MILK? Several TV stations in U.S. cities recently pulled an Epinions.com ad that featured a mother using and reviewing a breast pump to store her breast milk. This "censorship" drew an angry response from breast-feeding activist group La Leche League. After polling visitors to its site, Epinions also chose not to run on television another ad in the campaign, which depicted a reviewer shooting his iMac full of holes.

MARKETING METRICS
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"I can usually trust and believe the advertising appearing in or on ..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Network TV</th>
<th>Cable TV</th>
<th>The Internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 percent</td>
<td>32 percent</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Media Choices 2000 survey from The Magazine Publishers of America. The survey polled 8,000 "random consumers."

Copyright 2000 The Industry Standard

******

>From kat_lind99@yahoo.com Thu Apr  6 12:06:21 2000
Received: from web701.mail.yahoo.com (web701.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.21])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
  id MAA07651 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 12:06:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (qmail 12858 invoked by uid 60001); 6 Apr 2000 19:06:17 -0000
The winning entry for the AAPOR 2000 T-Shirt Slogan Contest is...

"Your opinion counts if we count your opinion."

Submitted by Tom Smith at NORC.

Congratulations Tom, and thank you to everyone who submitted entries and to all of you who voted.

Katherine "Kat" Lind
AAPOR Social Coordinator
LIND@IOPA.SC.EDU

I am puzzled by the ignorance of the content of U.S. Censuses of the 19th and early 20th Centuries that is currently manifest in political discussion of the Census. One would think that the fascination of so
many Americans with genealogy and the ubiquity of URL's and library resources devoted to it would make for widespread knowledge of the fact that U.S. Censuses with questions every bit as "intrusive" (and more) as those in the 2000 Census go way back in American history. Some of the states and territories found the U.S. Decennial Census was insufficient for their needs and supplemented it with intercensal censuses of their own.

As an example plucked from a host of genealogically oriented websites that offer detailed descriptions of the content of all censuses since 1790, I have plucked that of the Genealogical Society of Washtenaw County, Michigan, Inc. ("Facts Contained in Population Schedules U.S. Federal Census, 1790-1860" which also has links to its corresponding table for those from 1870-1920 and to all Michigan state and territorial censuses, some of which outdid the federal one in what passes today as "intrusiveness.")

<http://www.hvcn.org/info/gswc/censusfactsus1.htm>

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

>From mtrau@umich.edu Thu Apr  6 16:31:50 2000
Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.ited.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.ited.umich.edu [141.211.83.35])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA16748 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 16:31:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from s-isr-ml.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
    by vivalasvegas.rs.ited.umich.edu (8.9.1/3.1r) with ESMTP id TAA23796
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 19:31:35 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <FQY4MYJM>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 19:35:14 -0400
Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700C9B4268E03BC6CA8@isr.umich.edu>
From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: AAPOR Election
Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2000 19:35:04 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Just a reminder that balloting for AAPOR officers for next year is still underway. We will be tabulating ballots through April 24. Just like the decennial census, we are striving for the highest participation rate possible.

>From browning@sfsu.edu Thu Apr  6 23:45:48 2000
Received: from diana.sfsu.edu (root@diana.sfsu.edu [130.212.10.239])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id XAA03519 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 23:45:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from computer (max1-8.sfsu.edu [130.212.200.8])
    by diana.sfsu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id XAA06270
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Apr 2000 23:45:47 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20000406234532.0092ac80@sfsu.edu>
X-Sender: browning@sfsu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Thu, 06 Apr 2000 23:45:32 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Rufus Browning <browning@sfsu.edu>  
Subject: Institute Associate Director  

Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id XAA03529

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR  
Public Research Institute - San Francisco State University

The Public Research Institute at San Francisco State University (PRI) seeks a fulltime Associate Director to lead its research operations.

Established in 1984, PRI provides applied social science research to the community—primarily government agencies, non-profit organizations, and community groups in the Bay Area and California—and to San Francisco State University. PRI conducts 20-40 projects per year in various fields including environmental attitudes and behavior, housing and other public-policy issues, human relations, academic assessments, needs assessments, program evaluations, and demand studies. PRI enables faculty, staff, and students to do research by providing research opportunities, capabilities, and support, and research employment, internships, and training. PRI aims at continuous improvement of its service to clients and of learning opportunities for participating faculty, staff, and students.

Position Description and Qualifications

The Associate Director is an experienced and highly qualified social research professional who can lead PRI's research operations at a high level of knowledge, skill, and responsibility. Ph.D. in one of the social sciences and experience in applied social research are preferred; candidates with excellent experience who have not completed a Ph.D. will also be considered. The Associate Director reports to and works closely with the Director. PRI has a CATI facility; the Associate Director must bring survey experience, innovative approaches, and the highest standards to improved training of survey staff, establishment of more effective practices, and oversight of survey execution.

PRI's work is set by grants and contracts, mainly with agencies of local and state government but also with SFSU and with nonprofit organizations, foundations, community groups, and other universities. The Associate Director will meet with potential clients, explore possibilities, develop proposals, and negotiate contracts, and will oversee other staff in these roles. PRI encourages participating faculty and staff to develop grant and contract proposals in areas of interest to them and to publish the results of their work. The Associate Director plays a leadership role in developing proposals.

PRI works in project teams. The Associate Director helps form teams, allocates work to teams or individual staff, and oversees the work. The Associate Director must be able to gain trust, guide individuals and teams, set standards, plan and implement effective training and development, and inspire high levels of performance. The Associate Director is responsible for the quality of the work s/he oversees including proposals, surveys and reports.
PRI is led by the Director and a management team that includes the Director, Associate Director, senior faculty and staff researchers, and project coordinators, currently seven in all. The Associate Director will be responsible for coordinating PRI's human, technical, and physical resources and scheduling work so as to meet deadlines and avoid or resolve resource conflicts. In this role, the Associate Director will assess PRI's staff resources and hiring needs, propose hiring, and oversee hiring of new staff. The Associate Director will help conduct or oversee performance evaluations of staff and make recommendations for personnel actions.

Terms: $55-60,000/year DOE with full benefits. Equal Opportunity Employer.

Position posted April 5, 2000, and will be open until filled. Send letter and résumé including references by email, fax, or post to Rufus Browning, Director. Email: browning@sfsu.edu. Fax: (415) 338-6099. Post: PRI, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132-4025.

>From ROBINSON@socy.umd.edu Fri Apr  7 08:33:43 2000
Received: from gvpt.umd.edu (bsos.umd.edu [129.2.168.61])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
  id IAA24868 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Apr 2000 08:33:42 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from Tydings-Message_Server by gvpt.umd.edu
  with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 07 Apr 2000 11:32:11 -0400
Message-Id: <s8edc73b.099@gvpt.umd.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.2.1
Date: Fri, 07 Apr 2000 11:31:53 -0400
From: "John Robinson" <ROBINSON@socy.umd.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Election
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id IAA24885

I dont have the ballots. Is it possible to have another set sent?

>From shap.wolf@asu.edu Fri Apr  7 11:44:41 2000
Received: from post1.inre.asu.edu (post1.inre.asu.edu [129.219.13.100])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id LAA01559 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Apr 2000 11:44:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mainex1.asu.edu (mainex1.asu.edu [129.219.10.200])
  by asu.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #33824) with ESMTP id <0FSN004C3TEFUF@asu.edu> for
  aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 7 Apr 2000 11:44:40 -0700 (MST)
Received: by mainex1.asu.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
  id <2LH522PH>; Fri, 07 Apr 2000 11:44:39 -0700
Content-return: allowed
Date: Fri, 07 Apr 2000 11:44:34 -0700
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Subject: Portland Reservations: Update on Alternative Hotel
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Paul Beatty (E-mail)" <pbeatty@umich.edu>,
    Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Reply-to: "Paul Beatty (E-mail)" <pbeatty@umich.edu>
******** From the Conference Operations Committee**********

This message is for anyone who does not yet have a hotel reservation in Portland, but plans to attend the AAPOR conference there next month.

We have made arrangements for additional rooms at the Oxford Suites, which is located directly across the street from our conference hotels. The Oxford Suites is offering a rate of $89.00 per night for AAPOR conference attendees. Reservations can be made by calling 800-548-SUITE (800-548-7848) or by calling the hotel directly at 503-283-3030.

This rate doesn't include the meal package, but anyone staying at the Oxford Suites who would like to purchase the meal plan will be able to do so when they pick up their conference registration materials. The Doubletree will set up a booth near the AAPOR registration area for meal ticket sales. The meal package rate will be approximately $71 per day, the same rate that is included in the Doubletree room rates. It will not be necessary to make advance reservations for the meal package.

Additional information on the Oxford Suites is available on their web site: http://www.oxfordsuites.com, then navigate to the hotel, or directly at: http://www.oxfordsuites.com/cfdocs/suites.cfm?hotel=5

We're pleased that we could find a additional hotel only a short walk away, and are thrilled that so many of you are planning to come to the conference.

Please contact one of us directly if you have questions.

Paul Beatty, Conference Operations Chair  
pbeatty@umich.edu

Shap Wolf, Associate Chair  
shap.wolf@asu.edu

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>  
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
******** From the Conference Operations Committee**********

This message is for anyone who does not yet have a hotel reservation in Portland, but plans to attend the AAPOR conference there next month.

We have made arrangements for additional rooms at the Oxford Suites, which is located directly across the street from our conference hotels. The Oxford Suites is offering a rate of $89.00 per night for AAPOR conference attendees. Reservations can be made by calling 800-548-SUITE (800-548-7848) or by calling the hotel directly at 503-283-3030.

This rate doesn't include the meal package, but anyone staying at the Oxford Suites who would like to purchase the meal plan will be able to do so when they pick up their conference registration materials. The Doubletree will set up a booth near the AAPOR registration area for meal ticket sales. The meal package rate will be approximately $71 per day, the same rate that is included in the Doubletree room rates. It will not be necessary to make advance reservations for the meal package.

Additional information on the Oxford Suites is available on their web site:


We're pleased that we could find a additional hotel only a short walk away, and are thrilled that so many of you are planning to come to the conference.

Please contact one of us directly if you have questions.

Paul Beatty, Conference Operations Chair
pbeatty@umich.edu

Shap Wolf, Associate Chair
shap.wolf@asu.edu
Hi Folks,

Here is an interesting commentary by David Broder, columnist for the Washington Post about some potential effects that attacks on the census might have on low income, minority, immigrant groups, etc. Article was reprinted in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, April 7th.

Most vulnerable Americans hurt by attacks on census
David Broder - Special

Friday, April 7, 2000

Something about the census makes Republicans crazy. For the better part of two years, they battled the scientific community and the Clinton administration to prevent the use of statistical sampling techniques to correct for the undercount of people --- mainly low-income, minority, immigrant, transient and homeless --- that marred the 1990 census.

After reaching an impasse in Congress, the Republicans took the issue to court and had to be satisfied with a Supreme Court ruling that barred the use of sampling for apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives but approved it for everything else.

Then last week, just as the publicity effort to persuade people to return their census forms was reaching its peak, several prominent Republicans said that Uncle Sam was getting too personal in some of the census questions and suggested that it would be OK for people to skip over those items they found offensive.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott told reporters that if he had received one of the long forms (delivered to one of every six households) he might
have demurred at answering some of the questions. George W. Bush, the GOP's presidential choice, said he hadn't opened his census form yet but wasn't sure if he would fill out the whole thing.

Later, both men retreated part-way from their positions and said people should return the forms with as much information as they could in good conscience provide. But Rep. J.C. Watts of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Republican Conference, blamed the bureaucracy for including questions that have raised an unprecedented level of concern, and other Republicans said they would introduce legislation to make responding to the census voluntary, rather than requiring it by law.

All of this is basically nonsense --- the kind of politicians' talk that gives hypocrisy a bad name even as it has serious policy consequences. Every single question on the Census 2000 form was vetted with Congress two years ago, and every one has its origin and justification in a requirement included in a law passed by Congress.

In my files on census topics, I have a March 1998 report entitled "Questions Planned for Census 2000."

In the back of that report is a table showing the first census in which each category of questions was asked. One of the questions on Census 2000 to which some Republicans have objected asks for the family income. That has been asked in every census since 1940.

Another, the subject of much ridicule, asks, "Do you have complete plumbing facilities in this house, apartment or mobile home; that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet and a bathtub or shower?" That question, too, has been on the long form since 1940.

The plumbing question is asked, along with other measures of housing adequacy, as a way of targeting federal grants to the communities where the need for decent housing is greatest.

The income question is used for a much wider variety of federal programs. In all, more than $185 billion of federal grants to state and local governments are distributed on the basis of census information. One of the major concerns about the 1990 undercount is that it deprived areas with large numbers of low-income people of the assistance they deserved.

There's not a bit of evidence to justify the expressed concerns that the Census Bureau professionals will violate the privacy of individual families' responses. There is all too much proof that a flawed census hurts the most vulnerable Americans.

It is time the politicians stop messing around with the census.

David Broder's column appears Fridays.

Political reporter for The Washington Post

Copyright 2000 The Atlanta Journal and Constitution
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Something about the census makes Republicans crazy. For the better part of two years, they battled the scientific community and the Clinton administration to prevent the use of statistical sampling techniques to correct for the undercount of people --- mainly low-income, minority, immigrant, transient and homeless --- that marred the 1990 census. <br>

After reaching an impasse in Congress, the Republicans took the issue to court and had to be satisfied with a Supreme Court ruling that barred the use of sampling for apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives but approved it for everything else. <br>

Then last week, just as the publicity effort to persuade people to return their census forms was reaching its peak, several prominent Republicans said that Uncle Sam was getting too personal in some of the census questions and suggested that it would be OK for people to skip over those items they found offensive. <br>

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott told reporters that if he had received one of the long forms (delivered to one of every six households) he might have demurred at answering some of the questions. George W. Bush, the GOP's presidential choice, said he hadn't opened his census form yet but wasn't sure if he would fill out the whole thing. <br>

Later, both men retreated part-way from their positions and said people should return the forms with as much information as they could in good conscience provide. But Rep. J.C. Watts of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Republican Conference, blamed the bureaucracy for including questions that have raised an unprecedented level of concern, and other Republicans said they would introduce legislation to make responding to the census voluntary, rather than requiring it by law. <br>

All of this is basically nonsense --- the kind of politicians' talk that
gives hypocrisy a bad name even as it has serious policy consequences. Every single question on the Census 2000 form was vetted with Congress two years ago, and every one has its origin and justification in a requirement included in a law passed by Congress.

In my files on census topics, I have a March 1998 report entitled "Questions Planned for Census 2000." In the back of that report is a table showing the first census in which each category of questions was asked. One of the questions on Census 2000 to which some Republicans have objected asks for the family income. That has been asked in every census since 1940.

Another, the subject of much ridicule, asks, "Do you have complete plumbing facilities in this house, apartment or mobile home; that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet and a bathtub or shower?" That question, too, has been on the long form since 1940.

The plumbing question is asked, along with other measures of housing adequacy, as a way of targeting federal grants to the communities where the need for decent housing is greatest.

The income question is used for a much wider variety of federal programs. In all, more than $185 billion of federal grants to state and local governments are distributed on the basis of census information. One of the major concerns about the 1990 undercount is that it deprived areas with large numbers of low-income people of the assistance they deserved.

There's not a bit of evidence to justify the expressed concerns that the Census Bureau professionals will violate the privacy of individual families' responses. There is all too much proof that a flawed census hurts the most vulnerable Americans.

It is time the politicians stop messing around with the census.

David Broder's column appears Fridays.

Political reporter for The Washington Post
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Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
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******************************************************************
One news story heavy with irony--anyone know if this is indeed true?

-- Jim
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April 06, 2000, 03:43 PM PST

Census 2000 Not Connecting Netizens

Security and demographic concerns spur the Feds not to publicize citizens' ability to fill out forms online.

By Ben Hammer

The U.S. Census Bureau says it's doing all it can to get residents to complete and return this year's forms. But despite a participation rate hovering around 50 percent, the agency has deliberately played down a new program that allows most households to complete the questionnaire online. Officials say they are wary of hackers and want to ensure privacy. They say they view this year's online filings as a test for the next decennial census, when they expect the Internet to be the medium for more than half the returns.

The 10-year census effort is one of the largest logistical operations that the U.S. government manages. The government delivers and collects forms from 98 million households, and complaints of undercounting are common. The census bureau estimates that its latest effort undercounted minorities, the poor and immigrants by as much as 4 percent.
An online census could magnify that gap by making it easier for wealthier communities to take part in the census. On the other hand, it might increase overall participation. Regardless, online collection efforts should make it easier for the census bureau to complete its mission.

With little fanfare but a lot of internal debate, the Census Bureau built a Web site with enough juice to process in only a few days all 80 million forms eligible to be filed online. The agency has not tested the site on a large scale to see if it can withstand this level of response or the kind of hacking that took some prominent Web sites offline in early February.

Given its lack of experience, the census bureau didn't feel ready to rely on the Internet as a primary means of collection this year. As a result, the agency did little to publicize the fact that people could file online. Instead, it told short-form recipients that they could seek help from a census Web page connected to the site that would let them file online.

"[The Internet] is very inequitably distributed as an opportunity across American society, and because we're trying to focus on the communities that are not as well represented, we made an effort to spend our money and time where they would increase participation," says Director Kenneth Prewitt. "We are also a relatively cautious organization, and so we wanted to use this year's census as an effort to test the system." Having tested the site's security and operability since March 1998, Prewitt decided in January 1999 to move ahead with the online project, albeit slowly.

To be eligible to answer the census online, a household has to be a short-form recipient (five in six are) and have a Web browser with 40 bits of encryption—a relatively low level of security. Given these requirements, 25 million U.S. households would be able to file online. As of March 3, the agency was on pace to receive fewer than 100,000 census returns online, according to Ed Gore, an operations official responsible for online efforts.

Former Director Martha Farnsworth decided against using the Internet to collect census responses because she thought the public was too concerned with privacy and security issues to participate online, Gore said. For this census, he says, the site's main mission is to divert calls from the bureau's toll-free help telephone number. Since March 3, he said, the call center has been receiving about half as many calls as projected.

As for the security issues, Gore says, "We have noted activities from time to time that might raise some suspicion. But to characterize those as hacker attacks at this point is not really for certain."

For the next census, Gore says, the agency will unleash a full-fledged online collection effort. In 2010, the census might use push technology to send an interactive version of the questionnaire to people's homes via their PCs or televisions, Gore says. But no matter how advanced the technology becomes, he believes that snail mail will continue to play a role.

"I don't think we'll ever get away from paper totally," Gore says. "There will always be some element of the digital divide, and we'll always have
to make a way to get to those people."

---
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>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Fri Apr  7 20:18:50 2000
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id UAA22839 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Apr 2000 20:18:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1-fi.acns.fsu.edu
    [192.168.197.1])
    by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id XAA93994
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Apr 2000 23:18:47 -0400
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial179.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.179])
    by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id XAA127940
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Apr 2000 23:18:46 -0400
Date: Fri, 7 Apr 2000 23:18:46 -0400
Message-Id: <200004080318.XAA127940@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: the latest

On April 7, the response was estimated to be 59%. Yesterday it was 57%.

I wish these newsguys would check the Census.gov site before they wrote
their articles.
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Spring-Summer 2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270
Except for the digs at the Republicans, this column could have been written on AAPOR letterhead. WHY WASN'T IT?

We could have added that the Census Bureau takes great pains to protect confidentiality of information. DO WE NOT BELIEVE THAT?

I hope that someone on AAPORNET acknowledges to the entire net that he/she has read it. I am tired of sending messages that no one reads. I am grateful for the comments I do receive privately, but it is obvious that I am not considered a contributor to the discussion by most fellow members of the net.

dick halpern wrote:

> Hi Folks,
>
> Here is an interesting commentary by David Broder, columnist for the Washington Post about some potential effects that attacks on the census might have on low income, minority, immigrant groups, etc.
> Article was reprinted in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, April 7th.
Most vulnerable Americans hurt by attacks on census

Saturday, April 7, 2000

Something about the census makes Republicans crazy. For the better part of two years, they battled the scientific community and the Clinton administration to prevent the use of statistical sampling techniques to correct for the undercount of people — mainly low-income, minority, immigrant, transient and homeless — that marred the 1990 census.

After reaching an impasse in Congress, the Republicans took the issue to court and had to be satisfied with a Supreme Court ruling that barred the use of sampling for apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives but approved it for everything else.

Then last week, just as the publicity effort to persuade people to return their census forms was reaching its peak, several prominent Republicans said that Uncle Sam was getting too personal in some of the census questions and suggested that it would be OK for people to skip over those items they found offensive.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott told reporters that if he had received one of the long forms (delivered to one of every six households) he might have demurred at answering some of the questions. George W. Bush, the GOP's presidential choice, said he hadn't opened his census form yet but wasn't sure if he would fill out the whole thing.

Later, both men retreated part-way from their positions and said people should return the forms with as much information as they could in good conscience provide. But Rep. J.C. Watts of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Republican Conference, blamed the bureaucracy for including questions that have raised an unprecedented level of concern, and other Republicans said they would introduce legislation to make responding to the census voluntary, rather than requiring it by law.

All of this is basically nonsense — the kind of politicians' talk that gives hypocrisy a bad name even as it has serious policy consequences. Every single question on the Census 2000 form was vetted with Congress two years ago, and every one has its origin and justification in a requirement included in a law passed by Congress.

In my files on census topics, I have a March 1998 report entitled "Questions Planned for Census 2000."

In the back of that report is a table showing the first census in which each category of questions was asked. One of the questions on Census 2000 to which some Republicans have objected asks for the family income. That has been asked in every census since 1940.

Another, the subject of much ridicule, asks, "Do you have complete plumbing facilities in this house, apartment or mobile home; that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet and a bathtub or shower?"
That question, too, has been on the long form since 1940.

The plumbing question is asked, along with other measures of housing adequacy, as a way of targeting federal grants to the communities where the need for decent housing is greatest.

The income question is used for a much wider variety of federal programs. In all, more than $185 billion of federal grants to state and local governments are distributed on the basis of census information. One of the major concerns about the 1990 undercount is that it deprived areas with large numbers of low-income people of the assistance they deserved.

There's not a bit of evidence to justify the expressed concerns that the Census Bureau professionals will violate the privacy of individual families' responses. There is all too much proof that a flawed census hurts the most vulnerable Americans.

It is time the politicians stop messing around with the census.

David Broder's column appears Fridays.

Political reporter for The Washington Post
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From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Apr  8 18:28:25 2000
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA01986 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Apr 2000 18:28:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-5.tuckahoe.bestweb.net
[209.94.107.214])
    by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.3) with ESMTP id VAA28840;
    Sat, 8 Apr 2000 21:28:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <38EFCE79.8A29B412@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Sat, 08 Apr 2000 20:27:38 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The "Real" Census Results
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Dear AAPORNET'ers:

Take a look at this:


Andy

--
Andrew A. Beveridge              Home Office
209 Kissena Hall                 50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology          Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597          Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837              E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax: 718-997-2820                Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

>From JHall@mathematica-mpr.com Mon Apr 10 07:25:10 2000
Received: from mpr1.mathematica-mpr.com ([38.233.146.11])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
     id HAA07217 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Apr 2000 07:25:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by MPR1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
     id <HQ822PLN>; Mon, 10 Apr 2000 10:24:57 -0400
Message-ID: <897E2323A97AD311AEBB00508B116D546A62150MPR1>
From: John Hall <JHall@mathematica-mpr.com>
To: "Jeanne Anderson" <ande271@attglobal.net>, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Most vulnerable Americans hurt by attacks on census --commentary
Date: Mon, 10 Apr 2000 10:24:55 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

May your wish come true.
John Hall
Mathematica Policy Research
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Anderson [mailto:ande271@attglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 08, 2000 8:23 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Most vulnerable Americans hurt by attacks on census
   --commentary

Except for the digs at the Republicans, this column could have been
written on AAPOR Leterhead. WHY WASN'T IT?

We could have added that the Census Bureau takes great pains to protect
confidentiality of information. DO WE NOT BELIEVE THAT?

I hope that someone on AAPORNET acknowledges to the entire net that
he/she has read it. I am tired of sending messages that no one reads.
I am grateful for the comments I do receive privately, but it is obvious
that I am not considered a contributor to the discussion by most fellow members of the net.

dick halpern wrote:

> Hi Folks,
> 
> Here is an interesting commentary by David Broder, columnist for the Washington Post about some potential effects that attacks on the census might have on low income, minority, immigrant groups, etc. Article was reprinted in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, April 7th.
> 
> Most vulnerable Americans hurt by attacks on census
> David Broder - Special
> 
> Friday, April 7, 2000
> 
> Something about the census makes Republicans crazy. For the better part of two years, they battled the scientific community and the Clinton administration to prevent the use of statistical sampling techniques to correct for the undercount of people --- mainly low-income, minority, immigrant, transient and homeless --- that marred the 1990 census.
> 
> After reaching an impasse in Congress, the Republicans took the issue to court and had to be satisfied with a Supreme Court ruling that barred the use of sampling for apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives but approved it for everything else.
> 
> Then last week, just as the publicity effort to persuade people to return their census forms was reaching its peak, several prominent Republicans said that Uncle Sam was getting too personal in some of the census questions and suggested that it would be OK for people to skip over those items they found offensive.
> 
> Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott told reporters that if he had received one of the long forms (delivered to one of every six households) he might have demurred at answering some of the questions. George W. Bush, the GOP's presidential choice, said he hadn't opened his census form yet but wasn't sure if he would fill out the whole thing.
> 
> Later, both men retreated part-way from their positions and said people should return the forms with as much information as they could in good conscience provide. But Rep. J.C. Watts of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Republican Conference, blamed the bureaucracy for including questions that have raised an unprecedented level of concern, and other Republicans said they would introduce legislation to make responding to the census voluntary, rather than requiring it by law.
> 
> All of this is basically nonsense --- the kind of politicians' talk that gives hypocrisy a bad name even as it has serious policy consequences. Every single question on the Census 2000 form was vetted with Congress two years ago, and every one has its origin and justification in a requirement included in a law passed by Congress.
In my files on census topics, I have a March 1998 report entitled "Questions Planned for Census 2000."

In the back of that report is a table showing the first census in which each category of questions was asked. One of the questions on Census 2000 to which some Republicans have objected asks for the family income. That has been asked in every census since 1940.

Another, the subject of much ridicule, asks, "Do you have complete plumbing facilities in this house, apartment or mobile home; that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet and a bathtub or shower?"

That question, too, has been on the long form since 1940.

The plumbing question is asked, along with other measures of housing adequacy, as a way of targeting federal grants to the communities where the need for decent housing is greatest.

The income question is used for a much wider variety of federal programs. In all, more than $185 billion of federal grants to state and local governments are distributed on the basis of census information. One of the major concerns about the 1990 undercount is that it deprived areas with large numbers of low-income people of the assistance they deserved.

There's not a bit of evidence to justify the expressed concerns that the Census Bureau professionals will violate the privacy of individual families' responses. There is all too much proof that a flawed census hurts the most vulnerable Americans.

It is time the politicians stop messing around with the census.

David Broder's column appears Fridays.

Political reporter for The Washington Post
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Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
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From M.SCHULMAN@srb.com Mon Apr 10 12:30:14 2000
Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id MAA24269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Apr 2000 12:30:12 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
Just a reminder, the AAPOR Conference Operations Committee has arranged for additional rooms in Portland at the Oxford Suites, which is located directly across the street from our conference hotels. The Oxford Suites is offering a rate of $89.00 per night for AAPOR conference attendees. Reservations can be made by calling 800-548-SUITE (800-548-7848) or by calling the hotel directly at 503-283-3030. Be sure to mention that you are attending the AAPOR Conference, American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Don't call the Doubletree to request these rooms. Contact Oxford Suites directly.

This rate doesn't include the meal package, but anyone staying at the Oxford Suites who would like to purchase the meal plan will be able to do so when they pick up their conference registration materials. The Doubletree will set up a booth near the AAPOR registration area for meal ticket sales. The meal package rate will be approximately $71 per day, the same rate that is included in the Doubletree room rates. It will not be necessary to make advance reservations for the meal package.

Additional information on the Oxford Suites is available on their web site: http://www.oxfordsuites.com, then navigate to the hotel, or directly at: http://www.oxfordsuites.com/cfdocs/suites.cfm?hotel=5

We're pleased that we could find a additional hotel only a short walk away, and are thrilled that so many of you are planning to come to the conference.

Please contact one of us directly if you have questions.

Paul Beatty, Conference Operations Chair
pbeatty@umich.edu

Shap Wolf, Associate Chair
shap.wolf@asu.edu
On Sunday, the New York Times published the first in a four-part series on rampage killers, based on an exhaustive survey and innovative use of databases and data analysis, which clearly establishes that most were long known to be mentally ill before committing their crimes.

Unfortunately, what might otherwise be a landmark in investigative reporting on a major social issue is flawed by an appalling analytical blunder that, to me at least, casts doubt on the ability of the authors to interpret their own data.

The article states that "[t]he racial profile of the rampage killers is close to that of the entire population", whereas "[h]alf of all murderers in this country are black. Eighty percent went to high school, and no further."

But these figures represent only persons actually apprehended and convicted of murder. It ignores the fact (pointed out earlier in the article itself) that fewer than a third of homicides are resolved. Nor does it take into account the well-documented evidence that persons of lower socio-economic status, especially blacks and the less educated, are far more likely to be indicted and convicted of serious crimes than their more advantaged peers under our system of justice.

Although I doubt that the authors of the article ascribe to this belief themselves, an obvious implication of their analysis is that while rampage killers are mentally ill persons randomly distributed in the population, regular murderers tend to be uneducated blacks.

This is not much different from the kind of prejudice against Irish and Italians that was so common in the early part of this century. One would have thought that the editors would be a little more careful about propagating this kind of stereotype under the banner of the New York Times.

Jan Werner
On one of the late night comedy shows on Sat. somebody played a TV news anchor... In the "news report" he announced that "According to the U.S. census, 51% of Americans have responded so far." He followed that by "What I want to know is how do they know that?" cheers, mark

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Apr 10 17:10:16 2000
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id RAA03318 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Apr 2000 17:10:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-2.tuckahoe.bestweb.net
[209.94.107.211])
   by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id UAA17033;
   Mon, 10 Apr 2000 20:09:53 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <38F26D1B.4BF0868A@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Mon, 10 Apr 2000 20:08:59 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-MAILER: Mozilla 4.72 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The Actual Census
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Actual Census

...
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
MONDAY, APRIL 10, 2000

Contact: Morrie Goodman
202-482-4883

Maury Cagle
301-457-3030

Commerce Secretary Daley Reports Nation Hits Key Census Milestone

U.S. Secretary of Commerce William M. Daley and Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt announced today that 61 percent of American households have returned their census forms. The 61 percent mail response rate meets the Census Bureau's projection used for budget and management purposes in planning census field operations and requesting funding from the U.S. Congress.

"The first census of the new millennium has reached an important milestone," said Secretary Daley. "However, we can and must do better. Every resident in America should be cooperating fully in this process. If you still have a census form, fill it out completely and send it back now. If you don't mail back your form, please cooperate with census workers when they knock at your door."

Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt said, "The 61 percent response rate is encouraging news, but we still have a long way to go to reach a complete count. Census 2000 will succeed only if people cooperate fully. In this context, recent congressional actions and statements that might support some people's inclinations to leave some questions blank are unhelpful and potentially harmful to this effort."

Secretary Daley added, "The Sense of the Senate amendment approved by voice vote last week tells the Census Bureau to do nothing at all to ensure that people answer all census questions. While the amendment has no real legal effect, it sends the wrong message that people can refuse to answer questions they don't like. This is extremely unfortunate. All Census 2000 questions were reviewed by Congress in advance, and the data gathered are vital to communities across America carrying out laws and properly distributing federal funds. At this moment, it is imperative that we do everything humanly possible to encourage, not discourage, full participation in Census 2000."
Through April 11, the Census Bureau will post the Census 2000 initial response rates on its Internet site at <http://www.census.gov> for state, local and tribal entities. This site provides valuable feedback to local areas about the mailback rate so they can monitor their household participation rate within their communities.

On April 27, the Census Bureau will begin sending enumerators to visit all those households that have not returned their census forms.

The Census Bureau's '90 Plus Five campaign challenged state and local jurisdictions to raise their response rates by at least 5 percentage points over 1990. In 1990, the national response rate was 65 percent; thus the '90 Plus Five goal is 70 percent.

Currently, 7 percent of the nation's jurisdictions have met or exceeded their target response rate. Among them are Boston, Mass.; Santa Ana, Calif.; Anaheim, Calif.; Compton, Calif.; Modesto, Calif.; Plymouth, Mass.; Panama City, Fla.; and St. Cloud, Minn.

-X-

>From kat_lind99@yahoo.com Tue Apr 11 07:53:43 2000
Received: from web702.mail.yahoo.com (web702.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.22]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id HAA11441 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 07:53:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (qmail 10182 invoked by uid 60001); 11 Apr 2000 14:53:27 -0000
Message-ID: <20000411145327.10181.qmail@web702.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [129.252.103.23] by web702.mail.yahoo.com; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 07:53:27 PDT
Date: Tue, 11 Apr 2000 07:53:27 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kat Lind <kat_lind99@yahoo.com>
Subject: "field trips" in Portland
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

As mentioned in the preliminary program, we are planning for some "organized" transportation to and from the downtown area.

Currently, we are planning to offer transportation to several local bars and Powell's books on Friday night after dinner and Saturday afternoon with stops at various family oriented places (the zoo, the Children's museum, the art fair and the general downtown area).

The cost would be approximately $5 to $7 per person round trip. Sign-up and tickets will be sold at registration.

If you think you would be interested in this type of organized transportation. Please email me at
TSHIRT2000_1999@yahoo.com

and let me know the day and number of people so I can
get a better idea of the type of van/bus to rent.

Thank you,

Katherine "Kat" Lind
AAPOR Social Activities Coordinator
LIND@IOPA.SC.EDU

Do You Yahoo!?
Talk to your friends online with Yahoo! Messenger.
http://im.yahoo.com

Hi Gang...

Those of you with access to the April 10 New Yorker check out Pp. 50-51.
It's a riot.

Cheers.

Phil Harding
paharding7@aol.com

P.S. to Mark Richards: It's up to 61% this morning, Mark, well short of the
70% the CB's was shooting for by now. Basis for the percent calculation
still not indicated. t Caught Colin O'Brien's "In the News" sketch on SNL,
and, so far as I know, God alone knoweth the answer to the question that he
(on NBC) and then you (on aapornet) echoed.

PAH
My younger brother worked for a couple years in Mexico City as a VP for Continental Bank. He shared with me this funny experience while being interviewed for the 1980 census.

<<<<In the midst of all the fuss about the 2000 Census, I remember being censed in Mexico City in the 1980 Mexican Census. I was interviewed in our home in a very nice part of Mexico City and giggled through some of the many, many questions asked.

I remember specifically: "How many pigs sleep in your yard each night?" The census taker tried to keep a straight face as I hooted and laughed. She didn't have a chance with the next question. "How many alligators sleep in your yard each night?"

Richard Rands

>From ulisesb@mail.internet.com.mx Tue Apr 11 16:33:43 2000
Received: from rtn.net.mx (zeus.rtn.net.mx [204.153.24.7])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP id QAA19370 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 16:33:42 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mail.internet.com.mx (ppp104.rtn.net.mx [204.34.68.104])
  by rtn.net.mx (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id SAA06162 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 18:29:55 -0500 (CDT)
Message-ID: <38F3B6E9.824A7E3@mail.internet.com.mx>
Date: Tue, 11 Apr 2000 18:36:09 -0500
From: "Dr. Ulises Beltran" <ulisesb@mail.internet.com.mx>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win95; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Census Humor - 1980 Mexican Census
References: <4.1.20000411133738.00bd9a50@pop.cfmc.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

With all due respect, your brother was coming back from a wild party, was living
in a rural area or the maid in his house (of peasant background) talked him about
the Agrarian Census taken in 1981. As a compulsive user of Census data (and five
times censed person in Mexico), I can assure you all that none of those questions
has ever been part of a Mexican General Population Census.

Richard Rands wrote:

> My younger brother worked for a couple years in Mexico City as a VP for
> Continental Bank. He shared with me this funny experience while being
> interviewed for the 1980 census.
>
> <<In the midst of all the fuss about the 2000 Census, I remember being
censed
> in Mexico City in the 1980 Mexican Census.
> I was interviewed in our home in a very nice part of Mexico City and
giggled
> through some of the many, many questions asked.
>
> I remember specifically: "How many pigs sleep in your yard each night?"
The census taker tried to keep a straight face as I hooted and laughed. She

> didn't have a chance with the next question. "How many alligators sleep in
> your yard each night?"
>
> Richard Rands

I am glad that you confirmed this. It seemed awfully suspect, kind of a "oh
those silly Mexicans" joke...

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Dr. Ulises Beltran
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2000 7:36 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Census Humor - 1980 Mexican Census
With all due respect, your brother was coming back from a wild party, was living
in a rural area or the maid in his house (of peasant background) talked him about
the Agrarian Census taken in 1981. As a compulsive user of Census data (and five
times censed person in Mexico), I can assure you all that none of those questions
has ever been part of a Mexican General Population Census.

Richard Rands wrote:

> My younger brother worked for a couple years in Mexico City as a VP for
> Continental Bank. He shared with me this funny experience while being
> interviewed for the 1980 census.
> <<In the midst of all the fuss about the 2000 Census, I remember being censed
> in Mexico City in the 1980 Mexican Census.
> I was interviewed in our home in a very nice part of Mexico City and giggled
> through some of the many, many questions asked.
> I remember specifically: "How many pigs sleep in your yard each night?"
> The census taker tried to keep a straight face as I hooted and laughed. She
> didn't have a chance with the next question. "How many alligators sleep in
> your yard each night?"
>
> Richard Rands
> From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Apr 11 17:33:18 2000
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id RAA09688 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 17:33:17 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-3.tuckahoe.bestweb.net [209.94.107.212])
   by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.3) with ESMTP id UAA06068;
   Tue, 11 Apr 2000 20:32:11 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <38F3C40B.5DE6BE07@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Tue, 11 Apr 2000 20:32:11 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Census at 62% and Counting!!!!
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Decennial Media Relations
301-457-3691/301-457-3620 (fax)
301-457-1037 (TDD)
e-mail: 2000usa@census.gov
Census Director and Commerce Secretary Say Nation "In Reach" of Major Civic Accomplishment

Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt announced today that 62 percent of American households had already returned their census forms by mail, with just one week to go before census takers will complete the process of identifying those households that have not responded and will require follow-up visits by enumerators.

This is the last day the Census Bureau will report daily mail response rates for more than 38,000 local jurisdictions. Prewitt said, "...America is within reach of doing as well or better than 1990, which would be a major civic accomplishment and reverse a decades-long trend of civic disengagement."

Mail response rates to the census questionnaire have dropped from a high of 78 percent in 1970, to 75 percent in 1980 and 65 percent in 1990. The Bureau made substantial operational changes and modified the census form during the last decade to help reverse this decline. It predicted to Congress that even with these changes, only 61 percent of households would respond by mail in Census 2000. With just a few more days to process mail returns, Prewitt noted that reaching 65 percent again "might demonstrate that a positive shift in attitudes toward civic responsibility may be underway in the country, as well as a major improvement in the basic census design."

Prewitt also noted that the response rate for Census 2000 long forms continues to trail the short form response by a much larger margin than in 1990. "The long form response rate is lagging behind the short form by more than double the rate experienced in 1990," Prewitt said.

Commerce Secretary William H. Daley said, "It's not too late. It is in the hands of the American people to demonstrate we can be better. To anyone who has not yet mailed in their form, do it today and make a difference for you, your community and your nation."

Next Tuesday, April 18th, is the last day a mailed-in form can prevent a follow-up visit next month by census enumerators. Prewitt said he hoped to be able to report at that time that the nation has at least matched its 1990 performance.

Prewitt stressed that mailed-in forms arriving as late as April 18th
Dr. Beltran,
No need to take offense, but here is my brother's reply:

" I did live in Mexico City until September 1981, so I may have been mistaken regarding the census date. With all due respect for Dr. Beltran, I personally sat through the census taker's long list of questions. We sat at my large dining room table. I distinctly remember the pig and alligator (caiman) questions. You remember my house in Lomas de Chapultepec and I'm sure you can appreciate how ludicrous the questions seemed to me."

I can also vouch for my brother's fluency in Spanish. Sounds to me like the census taker missed some training sessions.

Richard Rands

>With all due respect, your brother was coming back from a wild party, was living in a rural area or the maid in his house (of peasant background) talled him
about the Agrarian Census taken in 1981. As a compulsive user of Census data (and
five times censed person in Mexico), I can assure you all that none of those
questions has ever been part of a Mexican General Population Census.

Richard Rands wrote:

>> My younger brother worked for a couple years in Mexico City as a VP for
>> Continental Bank. He shared with me this funny experience while being
>> interviewed for the 1980 census.
>> <<In the midst of all the fuss about the 2000 Census, I remember being
censed in Mexico City in the 1980 Mexican Census.
>> I was interviewed in our home in a very nice part of Mexico City and
giggled through some of the many, many questions asked.
>> I remember specifically: "How many pigs sleep in your yard each night?"
The census taker tried to keep a straight face as I hooted and laughed. She
didn't have a chance with the next question. "How many alligators sleep in
your yard each night?"

>> Richard Rands

No offense at all. I am sure there is some census where the number of
alligators in the back yards is relevant.

I am sure something weird happened, but the point is that whatever interview your
brother had it was not the Census. I have the 1980 General Population Census in front of me and I can not find how many alligators there were in Mexico City in 1980 or 1981. Does your brother remember?

Ulises Beltrán

Richard Rands wrote:

> Dr. Beltran,
> No need to take offense, but here is my brother's reply:
> 
> " I did live in Mexico City until September 1981, so I may have been mistaken regarding the census date.
> With all due respect for Dr. Beltran, I personally sat through the census taker's long list of questions. We sat at my large dining room table. I distinctly remember the pig and alligator (caiman) questions.
> You remember my house in Lomas de Chapultepec and I'm sure you can appreciate how ludicrous the questions seemed to me."
> 
> I can also vouch for my brother's fluency in Spanish. Sounds to me like the census taker missed some training sessions.
> 
> Richard Rands
> 
> > >With all due respect, your brother was coming back from a wild party, was living in a rural area or the maid in his house (of peasant background) talked him about the Agrarian Census taken in 1981. As a compulsive user of Census data (and five times censed person in Mexico), I can assure you all that none of those questions has ever been part of a Mexican General Population Census.
> > 
> > Richard Rands wrote:
> > 
> >> My younger brother worked for a couple years in Mexico City as a VP for Continental Bank. He shared with me this funny experience while being interviewed for the 1980 census.
> >> 
> >> <<In the midst of all the fuss about the 2000 Census, I remember being censed in Mexico City in the 1980 Mexican Census.
> >> I was interviewed in our home in a very nice part of Mexico City and giggled through some of the many, many questions asked.
> >> 
> >> I remember specifically: "How many pigs sleep in your yard each night?"
> >> The census taker tried to keep a straight face as I hooted and laughed.
She
> >> didn't have a chance with the next question. "How many alligators sleep
in
> >> your yard each night?"
> >>
> >> Richard Rands

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Tue Apr 11 19:46:49 2000
Received: from granger.mail.mindspring.net (granger.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.148])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id TAA29300 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 19:46:48 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from w5y0s9 (user-381cfaa.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.61.74])
   by granger.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id WAA13232
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Apr 2000 22:46:46 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.20000411223420.00a6eac0@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Tue, 11 Apr 2000 22:35:51 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Census Humor - 1980 Mexican Census
In-Reply-To: <38F3DCF4.50805BF6@mail.internet.com.mx>
References: <4.1.20000411133738.00bd9a50@pop.cfmc.com>
   <4.1.20000411174150.00b8c330@pop.cfmc.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id TAA29302

This is great! Reading AAPORNET messages has become almost as good as
Comedy Central!

At 10:18 PM 4/11/00 , you wrote:
> No offense at all. I am sure there is some census where the number of
> alligators in
> the back yards is relevant.
> >
> I am sure something weird happened, but the point is that whatever
> interview your
> brother had it was not the Census. I have the 1980 General Population
> Census in
> front of me and I can not find how many alligators there were in Mexico
> City in 1980
> or 1981. Does your brother remember?
> >
> Ulises Beltrán
>
> Richard Rands wrote:
> >
> > Dr. Beltran,
> > No need to take offense, but here is my brother's reply:
> >
> > " I did live in Mexico City until September 1981, so I may have been
mistaken
regarding the census date.
> With all due respect for Dr. Beltran, I personally sat through the census
taker's long list of questions. We sat at my large dining room table. I
distinctly remember the pig and alligator (caiman) questions.
You remember my house in Lomas de Chapultepec and I'm sure you can
appreciate how ludicrous the questions seemed to me."

I can also vouch for my brother's fluency in Spanish. Sounds to me
like the census taker missed some training sessions.

Richard Rands

With all due respect, your brother was coming back from a wild party, was
living in a rural area or the maid in his house (of peasant background)
talled him about the Agrarian Census taken in 1981. As a compulsive user of Census data
(and five times censed person in Mexico), I can assure you all that none of those
questions has ever been part of a Mexican General Population Census.

Richard Rands wrote:

My younger brother worked for a couple years in Mexico City as a VP for
Continental Bank. He shared with me this funny experience while being
interviewed for the 1980 census.

<<In the midst of all the fuss about the 2000 Census, I remember being
censed in Mexico City in the 1980 Mexican Census.
I was interviewed in our home in a very nice part of Mexico City and
giggled through some of the many, many questions asked.

I remember specifically: "How many pigs sleep in your yard each
night?"
The census taker tried to keep a straight face as I hooted and
laughed. She
didn't have a chance with the next question. "How many alligators
sleep in
your yard each night?"

Richard Rands

From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Apr 12 06:10:10 2000
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
Dear All:

>From 1978 to 1981, I administered something at Columbia University called the Annual Housing Survey Project. Our job was to put the AHS data into common form and distribute it. Also we linked it from year to year.

During that period, I got to know Arthur Young pretty well. Arthur was the head of the housing division of the Census Bureau and was responsible for the AHS. They had done a lot of work to try to figure out the best measure of "bad housing." It turned out that the best measure of "bad housing" was the reported presence or absence of rats. (Not mice and not cockroaches!)

They proposed that that question be added to the long form. The proposal was accepted.

A Congressman got up in Congress and proclaimed: "This is a Census of people, this is not of Census of rats."

End of the rat question.

Andy
Dear All:

This was prompted by the alligators in Mexico. (I am sending it again, since it seems to have vanished into the ethernet.)

>From 1978 to 1981, I administered something at Columbia University called the Annual Housing Survey Project. Our job was to put the AHS data into common form and distribute it. Also we linked it from year to year.

During that period, I got to know Arthur Young pretty well. Arthur was the head of the housing division of the Census Bureau and was responsible for the AHS. They had done a lot of work to try to figure out the best measure of "bad housing." It turned out that the best measure of "bad housing" was the reported presence or absence of rats. (Not mice and not cockroaches!)

They proposed that that question be added to the long form. The proposal was accepted.

A Congressman got up in Congress and proclaimed: "This is a Census of people, this is not of Census of rats."

End of the rat question.

Andy

--

Andrew A. Beveridge              Home Office
209 Kissena Hall                 50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology          Bronxville, NY 10708
 Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
 Flushing, NY 11367-1597          Fax:  914-337-8210
 Phone: 718-997-2837             E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
 Fax:   718-997-2820              Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps
Thanks to all those who responded to my query about King David's problems
with his census. I found it fascinating how different approaches to this
emerged -- scriptual, spiritual, psycho-social (King David's ego trip), etc.

Two people referred me to Albert Madansky (U. of Chi.), who sent me a copy
of his very interesting paper, "On Biblical Censuses" (Journal of Official
Statistics, Vol 2, No. 4, 1986, pp 561-569). In it he comments on not only
King David's census (ca. 1000 B.C.), but also on censuses taken by Moses
during the Exodus some 250 years earlier. Among other things, he notes that
the counts (or at least reports) of the Mosiac censuses were wildly
inconsistent, some of them out of whack by possibly as much as 1000X. He
also noted that Rabbis and Biblical scholars have been delving into these
matters ever since, using not only religious but also legal, political,
mathematical, semantic and even encryptive (i.e., looking for encoded hidden
meanings) approaches.

To tell the truth, I had been looking for more straightforwardly practical
explanations. This is not as cynical as it may sound, since the point of
religions has always been to provide structure, interpretation and guidance
for living in the practical world of human affairs. Indeed, had not
Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, etc, been pretty successful at
this, they wouldn't still be going strong after thousands of years (also cf.,
"Cannibals and Kings -- The Origins of Cultures" by Marvin Harris). One
such explanation I ran across when I first got into this about 15 years ago
was that King David ruled over a confederation of tribes or lesser kingdoms,
and that his taking a census ruffled local bigwigs by encroaching on their
prerogatives -- a sort of "states' rights vs. Beltway" flap. As a protest,
complaint, warning or whatever, his census was subsequently spun by
 chroniclers in terms of satans, sin, plagues, etc. The ancient Hebrews were
a highly political lot, and the Old Testament is full of "spin", e.g., the
various "twice-told tales" (of which David's census is one -- I Chronicles
21 and 2 Samuel 24) may have been spun to enhance the interests of the
factions.
who produced them.

It seems that despite the efforts of a lot of smarter people than I, this early census remains controversial, unexplained and puzzling. But apparently, we at least can surmise that 3000 or more years ago:

1. censuses were very political, with implications for various factions
2. not only counts, but interpretations of these counts, were wildly variable and subject to spin
3. some people, for various reasons (I wouldn't be surprised if avoiding military conscription were one), objected to being counted in censuses
4. therefore, censuses were undertakings fraught with trouble, strife and controversy

>From which I can only conclude: "Le plus la change . . . " Perhaps Ken Prewitt and Barbara Bailar can find some consolation in this, anyway.

Thanks again for your help. I hope you found this as interesting as I did.

Ray Funkhouser

This Biblical excursion reminded me of Jimmy Durante's quip about King Solomon's 1000 wives: "Ya know what dat means? Every mornin' ya find two thousand nylon stockin's hangin' in the bathroom!"

>From hse@elwaypoll.com Wed Apr 12 14:14:58 2000
Received: from dfw-smtpout4.email.verio.net (dfw-smtpout4.email.verio.net [129.250.36.44])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usoc) with ESMTP
   id OAA06588 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Apr 2000 14:14:57 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [129.250.38.63] (helo=dfw-mmp3.email.verio.net)
   by dfw-smtpout4.email.verio.net with esmtp (Exim 3.12 #7)
   id 12fUTR-0004wl-00
   for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Apr 2000 21:14:57 +0000
Received: from [209.43.128.34] (helo=uranus)
   by dfw-mmp3.email.verio.net with smtp (Exim 3.12 #7)
   id 12fUTQ-0002xL-00
   for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Apr 2000 21:14:56 +0000
Message-ID: <003901bfa4c3$f39a0ac0$cc13fea9@uranus>
From: "H. Stuart Elway" <hse@elwaypoll.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Newspaper Pollsters Guild
Date: Wed, 12 Apr 2000 14:11:15 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="---=_NextPart_000_0024_01BFA488.F72703E0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
APPORitioners,

The bicoastal conveners of the Amalgamated Newspaper Pollsters Guild =
invite any and all media pollsters to join us in Portland for an =
informal meet and greet. We can share insights, tell each other lies =
and complain about editors. Let's gather in the bar (where else?!) of =
the Janzen Beach DoubleTree at 5:00 on Thursday the 18th.
Stuart Elway (Seattle Times)
Pama Mitchell (Atlanta Constitution),
Elway Research, Inc.
206/ 264-1500
Survey and market researchers who promise confidentiality to respondents in Web surveys will now have to answer to the FTC, or at least it would seem, from Commissioner Thompson's remarks...

-- Jim

---

FTC OFFICIAL: NET PRIVACY VIOLATORS NOT IMMUNE

Europe has a privacy directive in place, but that does not mean that Europeans have more privacy than Americans, said FTC Commissioner Mozelle Thompson, speaking at the Computers, Freedom, and Privacy conference last week. The U.S. privacy model depends on industry self-regulation, and if companies deviate from their stated privacy policies, the FTC will actively pursue them, Thompson said. The FTC has brought fraud and deception charges against some 120 people during the past two-and-a-half years, said Thompson, adding that last month alone the agency and other groups uncovered more than 1,600 Web sites offering Internet scams. Thompson said he has voted in the past--along with other FTC commissioners--against recommending online privacy legislation to lawmakers. Thompson said the U.S. government would be better served by educating the public about privacy than playing a role in enforcing it.

CNN Interactive, 10 April 2000.

---

News abstracts Copyright 2000, Information Inc., Bethesda, MD
Edupage Copyright 2000, EDUCAUSE, an international nonprofit association dedicated to transforming education through information technologies
---

*****

>From pbeatty@umich.edu Thu Apr 13 11:39:09 2000
This message only applies to those of you who plan to attend AAPOR in Portland and have not yet made hotel reservations.

Portland is turning out to be immensely popular, with hotels filling very quickly. Our primary hotels, the Doubletrees, remain full. Our first alternate hotel, the Oxford Suites, still has a few rooms but is also filling quickly. They can be reached at 800-548-SUITE, or 503-283-3030. Their location is extremely convenient to the conference hotels.

In the event that the Oxford Suites is completely full, we have arranged for another alternative hotel, the Holiday Inn Express at Portland-Jantzen Beach. They are a few blocks from the conference hotel, and are offering AAPOR members a rate of $79. You can call them at 503-283-8000, or access their website at http://www.basshotels.com/hiexpress?_franchisee=PDXNH

This information will also be listed on the AAPOR website within the next day or so.

If you call to make a reservation, be sure to mention that you are with AAPOR. Please make reservations promptly! Hotel rooms seem to be filling as quickly as we can find them.

As always, feel free to contact myself or Shap Wolf if you experience problems.

Paul Beatty
Conference Operations Chair
pbeatty@umich.edu

Shap Wolf
I will be away from the office until April 17, 2000, and will answer my email when I return.

>>> "aapornet@usc.edu" 04/13/00 14:39 >>>

***** From the Conference Operations Committee **************

This message only applies to those of you who plan to attend AAPOR in Portland and have not yet made hotel reservations.

Portland is turning out to be immensely popular, with hotels filling very quickly. Our primary hotels, the Doubletrees, remain full. Our first alternate hotel, the Oxford Suites, still has a few rooms but is also filling quickly. They can be reached at 800-548-SUITE, or 503-283-3030. Their location is extremely convenient to the conference hotels.

In the event that the Oxford Suites is completely full, we have arranged for another alternative hotel, the Holiday Inn Express at Portland-Jantzen Beach. They are a few blocks from the conference hotel, and are offering AAPOR members a rate of $79. You can call them at 503-283-8000, or access their website at http://www.basshotels.com/hiexpress?_franchisee=PDXNH

This information will also be listed on the AAPOR website within the next day or so.

If you call to make a reservation, be sure to mention that you are with AAPOR. Please make reservations promptly! Hotel rooms seem to be filling as quickly as we can find them.

As always, feel free to contact myself or Shap Wolf if you experience
problems.

Paul Beatty
Conference Operations Chair
pbeatty@umich.edu

Shap Wolf
Conference Operations Associate Chair
shap.wolf@asu.edu

>From kat_lind99@yahoo.com Thu Apr 13 11:46:28 2000
Received: from web702.mail.yahoo.com (web702.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.22])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with SMTP
    id LAA18732 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Apr 2000 11:46:27 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: (qmail 16739 invoked by uid 60001); 13 Apr 2000 18:46:26 -0000
Message-ID: <20000413184626.16738.qmail@web702.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [129.252.103.23] by web702.mail.yahoo.com; Thu, 13 Apr 2000
11:46:26 PDT
Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2000 11:46:26 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kat Lind <kat_lind99@yahoo.com>
Subject: Clarification on "Field trips" transportation
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Just to clarify,

The organized transportation is meant to provide an inexpensive way to get to and from downtown and surrounding area. The van/bus will make a couple of stops.

Friday night - Powells book store, a bar area which myself and several other AAPOR folks checked out in October (also very close ot Powells), and downtown central where there are other clubs and restaurants of interest.

Saturday afternoon - the zoo, the weekend art fair, the children's museum, and downtown central.

You will be free to go where you please, just be back in time for the return trip. Maps will be made available of the area.

So, if you are interested, please send an email to TSHIRT2000_1999@yahoo.com and let me know the number of people and day you are interested in.

Please pass this along to other AAPOR members in your office who are not on AAPORNET.

Thanks,
I will be away from the office until April 17, 2000, and will answer my email when I return.

>>> "aapornet@usc.edu" 04/13/00 14:46 >>>

Just to clarify,

The organized transportation is meant to provide an inexpensive way to get to and from downtown and surrounding area. The van/bus will make a couple of stops.

Friday night - Powell's book store, a bar area which myself and several other AAPOR folks checked out in October (also very close to Powell's), and downtown central where there are other clubs and restaurants of interest.

Saturday afternoon - the zoo, the weekend art fair, the children's museum, and downtown central.

You will be free to go where you please, just be back in time for the return trip. Maps will be made available of the area.
So, if you are interested, please send an email to TSHIRT2000_1999@yahoo.com and let me know the number of people and day you are interested in.

Please pass this along to other AAPOR members in your office who are not on AAPORNET.

Thanks,

Katherine "Kat" Lind
AAPOR Social Activities Coordinator
LIND@IOPA.SC.EDU

Do You Yahoo!?
Send online invitations with Yahoo! Invites.
http://invites.yahoo.com

>From Karin_Clissold@marketstrategies.com Thu Apr 13 12:31:50 2000
Received: from sharpie.marketstrategies.com ([199.3.218.10])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id MAA26674 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Apr 2000 12:31:48 -0700
(PDT)
From: Karin_Clissold@marketstrategies.com
Received: from killdeer.marketstrategies.com ([10.10.30.125])
  by sharpie.marketstrategies.com (Pro-8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id
  PAA19856
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Apr 2000 15:29:18 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Information on Opinions of Genetics
To: Chris_Montaglione@marketstrategies.com, aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: 
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.2a November 23, 1999
Message-ID: <OFF3D662D3.D1F2A750-ON852568C0.0067FF99@marketstrategies.com>
Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2000 15:32:38 -0400
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on Killdeer/MSI(Release 5.0.1a|August 17, 1999) at 04/13/2000 03:32:38 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

For a client, we are about to begin work on a structured interview and need to find some measures that have been used to gauge public opinion on beliefs about genetics, inequality, the origins of inequality, the biological basis for individual and group race, class, gender) differences, and people's stereotypes and prejudices with regard to gender, race, and class. We are wondering if you know of or have access to any databases which contain measures of these issues in the context of public opinion pools or survey data.

Thanks for your help.
I decided to post this question on the AAPORnet because others might be asking themselves the same question. I received the packet for the AAPOR/WAPOR conference registration, and it had the usual two prices for registration for members and non-members. However, there was no space that I could see (did I miss it) for those of us who wish to pay the fee to renew our membership and register for the conference at the same time (and at the lower rate). Did I miss something? If not, how do we go about doing this?

Thanks (and I think perhaps it would be good to answer to the whole Net),

Frank Rusciano
I tried looking up presenters at the 1996 American Sociological Association on the topics of science & tech, mass comm & public opinion, and race/ethnicity. There were only a few who seemed like they might know something helpful, and I couldn't much contact info for them. They are long shots, but they were:

Samuel Cohn, 409 845 5133, ran a discussion on Marxist ideas about racial issues.
Robin Stryker, 319 335 2489, presented on Politics of science and public issue in equal employment opportunity.
Karen O'neill, 460 South Madison Ave. #13 Pasadena, CA 91101, presented Legitimization and official statistics of professional punishment.

I am very interested in your project. Let me know what you find. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
On Behalf Of Karin_Clissold@marketstrategies.com
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2000 3:33 PM
To: Chris_Montaglione@marketstrategies.com; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Information on Opinions of Genetics

For a client, we are about to begin work on a structured interview and need to find some measures that have been used to gauge public opinion on beliefs about genetics, inequality, the origins of inequality, the biological basis for individual and group race, class, gender) differences, and people's stereotypes and prejudices with regard to gender, race, and class. We are wondering if you know of or have access to any databases which contain measures of these issues in the context of public opinion pools or survey data.

Thanks for your help.
Hi folks,

Philip E. Agre, Associate Professor of Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles offers some interesting and pertinent commentary concerning privacy issues currently facing the census - and about which AAPORNET has witnessed no end of discussion over the last year. Phil is editor of the Red Rock Eater News Service (RRE) with which some of you may be familiar. Some years ago he was one of perhaps two dozen privacy experts who were invited to the Census Bureau offices in Maryland to help the Census people prepare for the 2000 census.

Dick Halpern

Phil's web site: http://dlis.gseis.ucla.edu/people/pagre/rre.html; Home page: http://dlis.gseis.ucla.edu/pagre/  
E mail: Phil Agre <pagre@alpha.oac.ucla.edu>

With his permission I'd like to share his remarks with you:

"The US Census Bureau claims to be surprised at the degree of privacy concern that has arisen lately over its "long form". This really makes me wonder about the Census Bureau. I was one of perhaps two dozen privacy experts who were invited to the Census Bureau offices in Maryland a few years ago to help the Census people prepare for the 2000 census, and I found the Census people clueless. Of course they knew about the federal Privacy Act, and they said good (and probably true) things about their security precautions. Anyone who had never set foot outside of Washington would say that their butts were covered. But I found their problems astounding, and I ended the meeting by chewing them out at great length.

"First of all, the Census Bureau was suffering from a dangerous case of mission creep. The most obvious problem is the huge variety of questions on the Census form that are unrelated to the Constitutional purpose of the Census. Every one of those questions has an interest group behind it, and the Census has little power to resist the piling-on of questions from every agency in the government. Much worse, the Census was under great pressure to conduct an infinitely expanding range of studies that would require Census data to be mixed with data from other sources. I believe them when they say that they are resisting these pressures, but their ability to resist sounds finite.
I strenuously warned them that this trend risked discrediting their core function of counting heads for apportionment.

"Second, the Census people informed us in an off-handed way that they had already been engaging in a practice that I found astounding: in follow-up interviews with people who had filled in census forms, they were drawing on data from other government agencies (the buzzword is "administrative records") in double-checking the accuracy of the census data. That is, they would say to people: "on the census form you said X, but on this other form you said Y". I am not making this up, and I warned them that it is a very bad idea. For one thing, it's guaranteed to create paranoia. For another thing, the Census people don't know whether they are disclosing this other information to the same member of the household who provided it. I encouraged them to think about a scenario wherein a remarried person hasn't told their new spouse about children from a past marriage, and the new spouse learns of these children from a Census worker. Of course, we would all prefer that remarried spouses share that kind of information with each other. But it's not the government's job to be revealing it.

"Finally, I expressed distress at the Census Bureau's seeming lack of preparation for its meeting with the privacy experts. In fact, they seemed systematically unclear about why they had even called the meeting. It had never occurred to them, for example, that we might want to look at the current drafts of the census forms. They could not agree whether we were there to discuss their current practices or future practices that they were contemplating. Despite all of the expense and the full day taken out of our lives, the discussion never proceeded beyond abstract generalities because the Census staff was not prepared to discuss any of the specifics of their practices.

"The current flap over the census, however, is not just the Census Bureau's fault. The ultimate responsibility lies with the Republican Congress, which is once again pretending that it is not the government. The Census is absolutely right that they are collecting all of that information because Congress told them to, and the Congress saw the list of questions in plenty of time to do something about it if they wanted to. Congress' new concern with privacy is a welcome thing, but this particular version of it is hypocritical. Working for the government is no fun because you're always trapped in this sort of double bind."
As I am abroad and using a different email server, AAPORNET's listserv doesn't recognize me as a member. Could you post this to the list?

-- Eric

**

With tax day tomorrow, AAPORNET members may be interested in seeing the most recent public opinion "Pulse" by the Economic Policy Institute. The "Pulse" was initiated by Ruy Tuxiera and is currently continued by Nancy Wiefek. It is a periodic review of public opinion on current policy topics.

Go to:

http://www.epinet.org/pulse/taxanalysis.html

for the pulse on taxes. From there you can get to previous reports on economy, globalization, education, social security and health care.

-------- Forwarded message --------

Jim,

As I am abroad and using a different email server, AAPORNET's listserv doesn't recognize me as a member. Could you post this to the list?

-- Eric

**

With tax day tomorrow, AAPORNET members may be interested in seeing the most recent public opinion "Pulse" by the Economic Policy Institute. The "Pulse" was initiated by Ruy Tuxiera and is currently continued by Nancy Wiefek. It is a periodic review of public opinion on current policy topics.

Go to:

http://www.epinet.org/pulse/taxanalysis.html

for the pulse on taxes. From there you can get to previous reports on economy, globalization, education, social security and health care.

Eric Plutzer

January - June 2000: (Eric.Plutzer@rz.hu-berlin.de)
Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Permanent: Associate Professor of Political Science and Sociology
Penn State University (plutzer@psu.edu)
A note about respondent burden in this year's Census:

I finally got around to filling out my own census form this week. Our household (three persons) was one of the lucky winners who was sent the long form. I was astounded at the amount of effort it required to fill out this form. I had no issues with question clarity, but I had to go on a search of household records to answer questions like: total spent last year on electricity, gas, water, real estate tax, home insurance. Since we just moved to a new house, I ended up estimating some of these amounts. I also had difficulty deciding how to list the ethnic ancestry of my child; my wife and I ended up discussing this at some length. I left it to my wife to fill out her section, including wages, consulting income, etc. Together we invested at least 45 minutes and more like 1 hour in this form. And it FELT like doing your taxes or filling out a FAFSA form for your college-bound kid. I guesstimate that 20 million households are being directed to do this task.

You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to wonder if all of this burden is fully justified. I'm really having trouble knowing why Census needs me to report my RE tax amount if (1) they know where I live (2) I told them the value of my house, and (3) I told them my mortgage payment includes RE tax and (4) amount of the mortgage payment. If it's part of info they need at an individual level, that is easily modeled or estimated. If they want it at an aggregate level, a report from the County Assessor would be much more accurate and less expensive.

Don't mean to vent on AAPORnet but I wonder if I am alone in the perception that the 2000 long form is more burdensome than some of us might have thought based on past censuses?

Thomas M. Guterbock .................... Voice:(804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia .................. University of Virginia
539 Cabell Hall .......................... 539 Cabell Hall
We drew the long form too. My husband spent a half hour then said "you're the survey person. you do it if you think its so important." I haven't read all the releases closely--is anyone stratifying response rates by long/short form?

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

"Thomas M. Guterbock" wrote:

> A note about respondent burden in this year's Census:
> I finally got around to filling out my own census form this week. Our household (three persons) was one of the lucky winners who was sent the long form. I was astounded at the amount of effort it required to fill out this form. I had no issues with question clarity, but I had to go on a search of household records to answer questions like: total spent last year on electricity, gas, water, real estate tax, home insurance. Since we just moved to a new house, I ended up estimating some of these amounts. I also had difficulty deciding how to list the ethnic ancestry of my child; my wife and I ended up discussing this at some length. I left it to my wife to fill out her section, including wages, consulting income, etc. Together we invested at least 45 minutes and more like 1 hour in this form. And it FELT like doing your taxes or filling out a FAFSA form for your college-bound kid. I guesstimate that 20 million households are being directed to do this task.
> You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to wonder if all of this burden is fully justified. I'm really having trouble knowing why Census needs me to report my RE tax amount if (1) they know where I live (2) I
told them the value of my house, and (3) I told them my mortgage payment
includes RE tax and (4) amount of the mortgage payment. If it’s part of
info they need at an individual level, that is easily modeled or
estimated.
If they want it at an aggregate level, a report from the County Assessor
would be much more accurate and less expensive.
Don’t mean to vent on AAPORnet but I wonder if I am alone in the
perception that the 2000 long form is more burdensome than some of us
might
have thought based on past censuses?

Thomas M. Guterbock .................... Voice:(804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... PAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia ............................
539 Cabell Hall ............................................
Charlottesville, VA 22903 ........... e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

A note about respondent burden in this year's Census:
I finally got around to filling out my own census form this week. Our
household (three persons) was one of the lucky winners who was sent the
long form. I was astounded at the amount of effort it required to fill
out
this form. I had no issues with question clarity, but I had to go on a
search of household records to answer questions like: total spent last
year
on electricity, gas, water, real estate tax, home insurance. Since we
just
moved to a new house, I ended up estimating some of these amounts. I
also
had difficulty deciding how to list the ethnic ancestry of my child; my
wife and I ended up discussing this at some length. I left it to my wife
to fill out her section, including wages, consulting income, etc.
Together
we invested at least 45 minutes and more like 1 hour in this form. And it
FEEL like doing your taxes or filling out a FAFSA form for your
college-bound kid. I guesstimate that 20 million households are being
> directed to do this task.
> You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to wonder if all of this
> burden is fully justified. I'm really having trouble knowing why Census
> needs me to report my RE tax amount if (1) they know where I live (2) I
> told them the value of my house, and (3) I told them my mortgage payment
> includes RE tax and (4) amount of the mortgage payment. If it's part of
> info they need at an individual level, that is easily modeled or
> estimated.
> If they want it at an aggregate level, a report from the County Assessor
> would be much more accurate and less expensive.

Dear Tom:

Some researcher might want to use the components of housing cost to figure
out housing affordability in various areas. The components you are
complaining about are used exactly for this purpose.

It seems to me that the same thing could be said about many of the
surveys that are done by AAPOR members.

If we know where someone lives, and the voting district they are
in, why should we ask them about who they favor for voting.

If we know where someone lives, why do we care about their
use of financial services.

If we know where someone lives . . . .

But we really don't need surveys at all, we can just access the
data files collected by magazines, credit card companies,
the state DMV, etc.

Andy

>From pbeatty@umich.edu Fri Apr 14 11:02:57 2000
Received: from donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
   (smtp@donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.163])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id
   LAA16628 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 11:02:38 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
   [141.211.2.154])
   by donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
   OAA24080
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 14:00:29 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (pbeatty@localhost)
   by stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id
   OAA03321
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 14:01:19 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2000 14:01:19 -0400 (EDT)
From: Paul Beatty <pbeatty@umich.edu>
X-Sender: pbeatty@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Doubletree Hotel Registration verification
Message-ID:
******** From the Conference Operations Committee **************

To all AAPOR attendees staying at the Doubletrees (either Jantzen Beach or Columbia River) for the 2000 Conference:

Please visit the following website to confirm that your registration information is correct (specifically, your arrival and departure dates, spelling of your name, and room sharing information, if applicable):

http://www.aapor.org/conference/aaporrooms.html

If you find information in error, please call the Doubletrees Reservations Center-- the contact information appears on the web page.

Thanks,

Paul Beatty

Now AAPORNET has had in rapid succession one post (Halpern's fwd yesterday of Agre's comments) in which the Census Bureau is damned for using case matching with other agencies' data bases and another (Guterbock's today) for its not doing so.

In 1951, a USAF institute (Norm Green was PI) began research on making population estimates by aerial reconnaissance (it worked unexpectedly well). That's the best way of doing it for a hostile population for which a Census count is unavailable. So, with the U.S. population as hostile to their government as to have sociology professors, no less,
disturbed by a one-hour Census response burden, I guess the job will have to get turned over to our space agency next time; that is, assuming we (I mean those I leave behind) will still have federal agencies 10 years from now.

Meanwhile, we who have depended on the bases of the Census of Population and Housing for sample design and a myriad other purposes are indebted to Prof Guterbock and spouse for their diligent completion of a long-form despite their reservations about it. For other social and opinion researchers, journalists and politicians who are more vehement than he is in their objections to the Census or its long form, I suggest they organize a boycott of primary and secondary uses of "unnecessary" Census data by those so minded until the data are collected unobtrusively.

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

"Thomas M. Guterbock" wrote:

> A note about respondent burden in this year's Census:
> I finally got around to filling out my own census form this week. Our household (three persons) was one of the lucky winners who was sent the long form. I was astounded at the amount of effort it required to fill out this form. I had no issues with question clarity, but I had to go on a search of household records to answer questions like: total spent last year on electricity, gas, water, real estate tax, home insurance. Since we just moved to a new house, I ended up estimating some of these amounts. I also had difficulty deciding how to list the ethnic ancestry of my child; my wife and I ended up discussing this at some length. I left it to my wife to fill out her section, including wages, consulting income, etc. Together we invested at least 45 minutes and more like 1 hour in this form. And it FELT like doing your taxes or filling out a FAFSA form for your college-bound kid. I guesstimate that 20 million households are being directed to do this task.
> You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to wonder if all of this burden is fully justified. I'm really having trouble knowing why Census needs me to report my RE tax amount if (1) they know where I live (2) I told them the value of my house, and (3) I told them my mortgage payment includes RE tax and (4) amount of the mortgage payment. If it's part of info they need at an individual level, that is easily modeled or estimated.
> If they want it at an aggregate level, a report from the County Assessor would be much more accurate and less expensive.
> Don't mean to vent on AAPORnet but I wonder if I am alone in the perception that the 2000 long form is more burdensome than some of us might have thought based on past censuses?
>
> Thomas M. Guterbock .................... Voice:(804) 924-6516
> Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028
> University of Virginia ..................
There are many reasons to gripe about the long form, some of which are reasonable (as in Tom's case) and some of which are not reasonable (as in George W. Bush's case). I hope this is the last time it is used. My understanding was that the Census Bureau was going to expand the American Community Survey so that the long form would no longer be needed. The decennial census form could then be pared back to a simple and more constitutionally appropriate function of counting people for purposes of legislative apportionment. The result will be an end to partisan bickering about the purpose of the census, higher response rates, lower costs, and (most importantly!) higher quality population data for the survey research community.

Andrew Beveridge wrote:

> A note about respondent burden in this year's Census:
> I finally got around to filling out my own census form this week.
A household (three persons) was one of the lucky winners who was sent the long form. I was astounded at the amount of effort it required to fill out this form. I had no issues with question clarity, but I had to go on a search of household records to answer questions like: total spent last year on electricity, gas, water, real estate tax, home insurance. Since we just moved to a new house, I ended up estimating some of these amounts. I also had difficulty deciding how to list the ethnic ancestry of my child; my wife and I ended up discussing this at some length. I left it to my wife to fill out her section, including wages, consulting income, etc. Together we invested at least 45 minutes and more like 1 hour in this form. And it FELT like doing your taxes or filling out a FAFSA form for your college-bound kid. I guesstimate that 20 million households are being directed to do this task.

You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to wonder if all of this burden is fully justified. I'm really having trouble knowing why Census needs me to report my RE tax amount if (1) they know where I live, (2) I told them the value of my house, and (3) I told them my mortgage payment includes RE tax and (4) amount of the mortgage payment. If it's part of info they need at an individual level, that is easily modeled or estimated. If they want it at an aggregate level, a report from the County Assessor would be much more accurate and less expensive.

Dear Tom:

Some researcher might want to use the components of housing cost to figure out housing affordability in various areas. The components you are complaining about are used exactly for this purpose.

It seems to me that the same thing could be said about many of the surveys that are done by AAPOR members.

If we know where someone lives, and the voting district they are in, why should we ask them about who they favor for voting.

If we know where someone lives, why do we care about their use of financial services.

If we know where someone lives . . . .

But we really don't need surveys at all, we can just access the data files collected by magazines, credit card companies, the state DMV, etc.

Andy
Dear All:

I have been using the ACS data for Rockland. It may take some of the pressure off the short form. But there have been very similar complaints ala Gutterbock to the ACS form.

Put simply, there is a respondent burden.

Perhaps the Census should convince people that the Census and ACS is the only survey they need participate in every 10 years?

Andy
There are many reasons to gripe about the long form, some of which are reasonable (as in Tom's case) and some of which are not reasonable (as in George W. Bush's case). I hope this is the last time it is used. My understanding was that the Census Bureau was going to expand the American Community Survey so that the long form would no longer be needed. The decennial census form could then be pared back to a simple and more constitutionally appropriate function of counting people for purposes of legislative apportionment. The result will be an end to partisan bickering about the purpose of the census, higher response rates, lower costs, and (most importantly!) higher quality population data for the survey research community.

Andrew Beveridge wrote:
>
> A note about respondent burden in this year's Census:
> I finally got around to filling out my own census form this week. Our household (three persons) was one of the lucky winners who was sent the long form. I was astounded at the amount of effort it required to fill out this form. I had no issues with question clarity, but I had to go on a search of household records to answer questions like: total spent last year on electricity, gas, water, real estate tax, home insurance. Since we just moved to a new house, I ended up estimating some of these amounts. I also had difficulty deciding how to list the ethnic ancestry of my child; my wife and I ended up discussing this at some length. I left it to my wife to fill out her section, including wages, consulting income, etc. Together we invested at least 45 minutes and more like 1 hour in this form. And it felt like doing your taxes or filling out a FAFSA form for your college-bound kid. I guesstimate that 20 million households are being directed to do this task. You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to wonder if all of this burden is fully justified. I'm really having trouble knowing why Census needs me to report my RE tax amount if (1) they know where I live (2) I told them the value of my house, and (3) I told them my mortgage payment includes RE tax and (4) amount of the mortgage payment. If it's part of
Dear Tom:

Some researcher might want to use the components of housing cost to figure out housing affordability in various areas. The components you are complaining about are used exactly for this purpose.

It seems to me that the same thing could be said about many of the surveys that are done by AAPOR members.

If we know where someone lives, and the voting district they are in, why should we ask them about who they favor for voting?

If we know where someone lives, why do we care about their use of financial services.

If we know where someone lives . . . .

But we really don't need surveys at all, we can just access the data files collected by magazines, credit card companies, the state DMV, etc.

Andy

From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Fri Apr 14 14:01:13 2000
Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (eeyore.cc.uic.edu [128.248.171.51])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA00067 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 14:01:12 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (smtp.srl.uic.edu [131.193.93.96])
    by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA12051
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 15:58:14 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
    with Novell GroupWise; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 15:00:29 -0500
Message-Id: <s8f7328d.027@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2000 15:57:41 -0500
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Seymour Sudman

TO: Friends of Seymour Sudman (and those who might have left him a voicemail or email message in the past few days)
FROM: Diane O'Rourke, Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois

Seymour had a stroke yesterday morning (4/13) while on his way to an ASA committee meeting in Washington DC. He had fallen a couple of weeks ago and injured his back and neck -- and unknowingly injured his aorta, which subsequently caused the stroke. Fortunately the stroke
happened on the sidewalks of DC (rather than alone in the middle of the night), so he received immediate medical care. He is alert and talking. It is hoped that in a few days he will be stabilized and able to fly back to Champaign to begin rehabilitation.

He is currently at George Washington University Hospital, 901 23rd St. NW, Washington DC 20037. Get well wishes can be sent there or to our office (Survey Research Laboratory, 909 W. Oregon, Suite 300, Urbana, IL 61801).

>From ratledge@UDel.Edu Fri Apr 14 14:33:32 2000
Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA25215 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 14:33:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from zekel.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.23])
   by copland.udel.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA12543
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 17:33:31 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by exchange.chep.udel.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
   id <2LBL9FG0>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 17:33:39 -0400
Message-ID: <95926F60629FD3119EF800C9E589950BFB46@exchange.chep.udel.edu>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDel.Edu>
To: ""aapornet@usc.edu"" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Tom Gutterbock's Census Form
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2000 17:33:38 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

The ACS is essentially the long form and it is being tested against the Census 1999-2001 in 31 comparison sites. It is scheduled to go nationwide in 2003. Then data will be collected every year giving essentially long form sample sizes over 5 years for the smaller jurisdictions. State and county data should be available annually with substantial sample sizes. Response rates to the ACS have been similar to the long form mailing but they are doing two mailings, CATI interviews and I believe CAPI on one third of the remaining non-respondents. I think we have seen the last of the long form in the decennial and the smaller annual samples for the ACS will cause less of an uproar.

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Apr 14 15:41:25 2000
Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.31])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA23392 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 15:41:24 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from lavrakaslaptop (ts5-7.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.112.94])
   by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA19193
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Apr 2000 18:41:22 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2000 18:41:22 -0400 (EDT)
Dear Diane,

Thanks for this update. he is so dear a person to so many others. Do you expect that he will be at GW hospital through the weekend?

At 03:57 PM 4/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
> TO: Friends of Seymour Sudman (and those who might have left him a
> voicemail or email message in the past few days)
> FROM: Diane O'Rourke, Survey Research Laboratory, University of
> Illinois
>
> Seymour had a stroke yesterday morning (4/13) while on his way to an
> ASA committee meeting in Washington DC. He had fallen a couple of
> weeks ago and injured his back and neck -- and unknowingly injured his
> aorta, which subsequently caused the stroke. Fortunately the stroke
> happened on the sidewalks of DC (rather than alone in the middle of the
> night), so he received immediate medical care. He is alert and talking.
> It is
> hoped that in a few days he will be stabilized and able to fly back to
> Champaign to begin rehabilitation.
>
> He is currently at George Washington University Hospital, 901 23rd St.
> NW, Washington DC 20037. Get well wishes can be sent there or to our
> office (Survey Research Laboratory, 909 W. Oregon, Suite 300, Urbana,
> IL 61801).
>
> From ballrok@usc.edu Sat Apr 15 14:51:43 2000
Received: from mizar.usc.edu (root@mizar.usc.edu [128.125.7.135])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA29303 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 15 Apr 2000 14:51:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from usc.edu (ppp-225-095.usc.edu [128.125.225.95])
    by mizar.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA17984 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 15 Apr 2000 14:51:40 -0700
(PDT)
Message-ID: <38F8E425.8FE1EC5D@usc.edu>
Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2000 13:50:32 -0800
From: Sandra Ball-Rokeach <ballrok@usc.edu>
X-Sender: "Sandra Ball-Rokeach" <ballrok@mizar.usc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61C-CCK-MCD {University of Southern California}
    (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: recent urban RDD rates
Can anyone point me to a recent article on response rates employing RDD methods in large urban areas? I am particularly interested in any study that employs bilingual data collection. There is much discussion on this listserv about how these rates have gone down, but I cannot find an article that pulls together the outcomes post 1985 or thereabouts.

I would much appreciate any suggestion you can give me.

Sandra Ball-Rokeach
ballrok@usc.edu

---

I am engaged in a longitudinal study of families in upstate New York and having trouble locating some of my families on wave 2. I have used knowx on the web with mixed success. Can you recommend any search services I might hire to help me?

Thanks.

gary
If anyone knows of any organization that can track individuals, I'd greatly appreciate knowing. Responses can be posted to me yd17@cornell.edu.

Thanks.

---

I am engaged in a longitudinal study of families in upstate New York and having trouble locating some of my families on wave 2. I have used knowx on the web with mixed success. Can you recommend any search services I might hire to help me?

Thanks.

gary
Seymour is still in an intensive care unit and thus cannot receive flowers, fruit, etc. Please send cards only (George Washington University Hospital, 901 23rd St. NW, Washington DC 20037). There is no direct phone line and he is unable to speak on the phone anyway, so please do not call. I speak with Blanche Sudman daily and the calls are routed through the nurses' station, so we don't want to over burden them. They are restricting his visitors to family members.

Right now he is still being stabilized, on blood thinner and restricted to bed. While he is weak, this morning he was quite able to give Blanche the passwords for his voicemail and email so that I could check messages.
(Gosh, I forget those things sometimes!) When he is stronger, he will probably be moved to the hospital's rehab unit. This will probably not be for several weeks. Eventually, when he can travel, he will be moved back to Illinois. When there is something new to report I will certainly update everyone.

Diane O'Rourke

>From lhawkins@csd.uwm.edu Mon Apr 17 10:38:28 2000
Received: from batch3.csd.uwm.edu (root@batch3.csd.uwm.edu [129.89.7.226]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA09920 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Apr 2000 10:38:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from alpha3.csd.uwm.edu (lhawkins@alpha3.csd.uwm.edu [129.89.7.203]) by batch3.csd.uwm.edu (8.8.4/8.6.8) with SMTP id MAA21213 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Apr 2000 12:38:24 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from localhost (lhawkins=localhost) by alpha3.csd.uwm.edu (8.8.4/8.6.8) with SMTP id MAA27478 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Apr 2000 12:38:24 -0500 (CDT)
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 12:38:24 -0500 (CDT)
From: Linda L Hawkins <lhawkins@csd.uwm.edu>
Reply-To: Linda L Hawkins <lhawkins@csd.uwm.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Position Announcement
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.1000417123824.25847A@alpha3.csd.uwm.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: MULTIPART/MIXED; BOUNDARY="0-829850849-955993104=:25847"

This message is in MIME format. The first part should be readable text, while the remaining parts are likely unreadable without MIME-aware tools. Send mail to mime@docserver.cac.washington.edu for more info.

--0-829850849-955993104=:25847
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The Institute for Survey and Policy Research, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has an opening for a Survey Specialist.

If you are interested or would like additional information, please see the attached Word document.

Thank you.

--0-829850849-955993104=:25847
Content-Type: APPLICATION/msword; name="ANNOUNCEMENT.doc"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: BASE64
Content-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.1000417123824.25847A@alpha3.csd.uwm.edu>
Content-Description:
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Dear Colleagues

I am attempting to do a study on patient satisfaction in the Florida medicaid program. If any of you could help by providing information on surveys you have conducted concerning patient satisfaction, it would be greatly appreciated. Also, if anyone could point me in the direction of surveys that they know about, it would also be very helpful. I am especially interested in survey instrument itself.

Thank you for your help,
Suzanne Parker

Dr. Suzanne Parker
Associate Professor
Dept. of Political Science
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

SUPPORT SUNSHINE IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS!
On the chance that you haven't looked here, there is a standard instrument for this called the "Consumer Assessment of Health Plans" (CAHPS), available from the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, part of HHS. Details at:

http://www.ahcpr.gov/qual/cahpfact.htm

and you can download the instruments from there.

They also have links to other health care quality assessment studies at:

http://www.ahcpr.gov/qual/index.html#faact

Shap Wolf

--- Original Message ---
From: Suzanne Parker [mailto:sparker@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
Sent: 17 April 2000 11:40 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Patient Satisfaction

Dear Colleagues

I am attempting to do a study on patient satisfaction in the Florida medicaid program. If any of you could help by providing information on surveys you have conducted concerning patient satisfaction, it would be greatly appreciated. Also, if anyone could point me in the direction of surveys that they know about, it would also be very helpful. I am especially interested in survey instrument itself.

Thank you for your help,
Suzanne Parker

Dr. Suzanne Parker
Associate Professor
Dept. of Political Science
Florida State University
There are many states currently doing the CAHPS (Consumer Assessment of Health Plans) surveys. Some are done only with Medicaid, others are done with participants in particular health plans. We currently do a continuous survey over the year of size 1800 statewide on the adult population. It is in its 3rd year and is done for the Delaware Health Care Commission.

-----Original Message-----
From: Suzanne Parker [mailto:sparker@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2000 2:40 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Patient Satisfaction

Dear Colleagues

I am attempting to do a study on patient satisfaction in the Florida medicaid program. If any of you could help by providing information on surveys you have conducted concerning patient satisfaction, it would be greatly appreciated. Also, if anyone could point me in the direction of surveys that they know about, it would also be very helpful. I am especially interested in survey instrument itself.

Thank you for your help,
Suzanne Parker

Dr. Suzanne Parker
Associate Professor
Dept. of Political Science
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Position Announcement

Joint Appointment as a Research Associate in the Docking Institute of Public Affairs and Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Social Work at Fort Hays State University

Description

One half of the appointment is a renewable position with the Department of Sociology at the rank of assistant professor. The position carries a six hour course load during the spring and fall semesters. The successful candidate will be prepared to teach a broad range of courses in the department, including introduction to sociology, research methods, rural and urban sociology, community theory and development and demography. These areas of teaching closely parallel the research and activities of the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. For more information about the Department of Sociology and Social Work visit our website at: http://www.fhsu.edu/sociology/index.html

The other half of the appointment is with the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. Primary responsibilities include management of the day to day operations in the Institute's University Center for Survey Research. This entails programming survey instruments to be used in the Center's CATI system, survey data management and analysis, report writing, presentation of survey findings to clients, and supervising graduate and undergraduate students. Proficiency in social science research methods is essential. Prior knowledge of SPSS is preferred. The successful applicant will also have the opportunity assist in project design and grant/project proposal development. The Docking Institute of Public Affairs is a university based consulting, research, and policy analysis organization. Its clients are exclusively non-profit and governmental entities. The Institute's University Center for Survey Research is active in telephone surveying, with 15 CATI stations. Mail surveys and focus groups are also commonly conducted by the Institute. For more information about activities of the Docking Institute visit our website at: http://www.fhsu.edu/docking
This is a 12-month appointment teaching two courses each fall and spring semester. The salary range is in the mid $30,000s, commensurate with experience and education. The appointment can begin as early as June 11, 1999, and must be filled by August 16, 1999. Review of applications will begin May 10 and will continue until the position is filled. A Masters degree in sociology by the time of appointment is required. A Ph.D. is preferred. Please submit application materials including a letter of interest, vita, and three letters of reference to Docking Institute/Sociology Search Committee, Docking Institute of Public Affairs, Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS, 67601. You may direct inquiries to Dr. Joe Aistrup, Docking Institute Director at (785) 628-4189 [jaistrup@fhsu.edu] and Ms. Rose Arnhold, Department of Sociology Chair (785) 628-5397 [rarnhold@fhsu.edu].

Notice of Non-discrimination: Fort Hays State University does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, national origin, age, disability, Vietnam era veteran status or special disabled veteran status in its programs and activities. Fort Hays State University is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. The director of affirmative action, coordinator of Title IX, Title VI, Section 504 and ADA regulations, may be contacted at 600 Park Street, Hays, KS 67601-4099, (785) 628-4033.

From bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com Mon Apr 17 14:56:38 2000
Received: from arlmsg002.haglerbailly.com (mail.haglerbailly.com [208.138.215.14]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id OAA03850 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Apr 2000 14:56:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by ARLMSG002 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
  id <294ZC3V3>; Mon, 17 Apr 2000 17:55:36 -0400
Message-ID: <713ED6F94609D211B5F200805F9F8E33E9E9F@madfps001.haglerbailly.com>
From: "Baumgartner, Bob" <bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Arabic-speaking focus group moderator
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 17:54:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"

AAPORNETters:

I am looking for an experienced (or even a semi-experienced) focus group moderator of Arabic descent who can conduct 2-4 focus groups in the Detroit area -- 1-2 with Arabic-speaking participants and 1-2 with English-speaking participants of Arabic descent. Travel can be arranged, if necessary. Timing would be early summer (sometime in June).

Please reply with suggestions or recommendations to me directly:

bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com

Bob Baumgartner
Hagler Bailly Services
VA does a lot of patient satisfaction work. I'm not sure who does it but you might want to check with Lynne Heltman, who does customer satisfaction in another area at VA, at <ormlhelt@vba.va.gov>. She will be able to point you in the right direction. Feel free to mention my name.

Steve Dienstfrey
Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.
Dear Folks: As you can see from the job announcement below, we are recruiting a researcher/project director for the L.A. FANS survey. It is a great job and a unique opportunity for the right person, and we really need someone who is topnotch. I am writing to ask for your help in identifying potential candidates. Please pass this along to anyone you think might be interested. Also please feel free to send me ideas for potential candidates. Thanks for your help!

Anne

RAND invites applications for the position of researcher and project manager with the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (L.A.FANS), a major on-going longitudinal research project focused on the effects of neighborhoods, families and schools on children's welfare and development, on residential mobility and residential segregation, and on local level consequences of welfare reform. The L.A.FANS is a multiwave longitudinal survey in which data are collected from adults, children, and neighborhood key informants in a stratified random sample of 65 neighborhoods throughout Los Angeles County. The first wave of L.A.FANS is currently in the field. Los Angeles County is a very diverse region covering more than 4000 square miles with a population of more than 9 million people. More information on the survey is available at www.lasurvey.rand.org. The person who fills this position will work with the L.A.FANS project team which includes researchers at RAND, UCLA, and several universities throughout the U.S. Responsibilities include collaboration with project team members on: (1) sample and questionnaire design for subsequent waves of the L.A.FANS and (2) analysis and publication of results from Wave 1 and from subsequent waves. Applicants must have graduate-level training in sociology, demography, economics, survey research methods, child development, or a relevant social science discipline. PhD plus at least two years research experience preferred, but ABD or masters degree with significant research experience and new PhDs will be considered. The applicant must have strong interpersonal skills and know how to work well in a congenial and collaborative environment. Excellent writing and communication skills and strong quantitative skills are required. Experience in questionnaire and survey design, project management, and analysis of large survey data sets (such as PSID, NSFH, NLSY, SIPP, etc.) using SAS and/or STATA are highly desirable. Bilingual or multilingual candidates with Spanish language skills are especially urged to apply. Position begins in Fall 2000, though flexibility in the start date is possible for the right candidate. Interested applicants should send a letter, CV and the names of three references to: Anne R. Pebley, RAND Labor and Population Program, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407. E-mail: pebley@rand.org. Please mention reference codeBHS003-510 in your letter.

******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Apr 19 09:22:34 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA03310 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Apr 2000 09:22:33 -0700
(PDT)
VT. SENATE OKS GAY UNIONS BILL

Filed at 10:53 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

MONTPELIER, Vt. (AP) -- A bill that would create the closest thing in America to gay marriage won final approval in the state Senate today. The bill now returns to the House for consideration of changes to the House-approved version.

The 19-11 vote mirrored preliminary approval that was given to the bill on Tuesday.

Stopping short of recognizing gay marriages, the measure would enable gay couples to form "civil unions" that would entitle them to all 300 or so rights and benefits available under state law to married couples. There was no guarantee other states would recognize the unions.

Democratic Gov. Howard Dean has said he will sign the bill.

The biggest difference between the House and Senate bills is the effective date. Under the Senate proposal, the first civil unions could take place beginning July 1. The House set the date two months later.

Before today's vote, senators turned aside one amendment that would have stated in state law
that one of the central purposes of marriage is procreation.

Only about two dozen people lined the Senate galleries today, in contrast to crowds that filled corridors on Tuesday. Most of them wore pink stickers signaling their support for the bill.

There was little reaction in the chamber when the vote total was announced by Lt. Gov. Douglas Racine, but once the Senate adjourned, there were hugs and tears.

``It's great that it passed,'' said Beth Robinson, one of the lawyers who successfully argued before the Supreme Court that gay and lesbian couples were being unconstitutionally denied the benefits of marriage.

``What's greater to me is the margin by which it passed,'' Robinson said. ``That shows me the Senate understands that gays and lesbians need and deserve the same protections as heterosexuals in our society and that's a great breakthrough.''

House Speaker Michael Obuchowski said today he would hold the House vote next Tuesday and was confident it would win final approval in that chamber.

The state Supreme Court set the stage for the legislation with its unanimous December ruling that same-sex couples were being unconstitutionally denied the benefits of marriage.

Under the new legislation, gay and lesbian couples could obtain a license from their town clerks and then have their unions certified by a judge or member of the clergy.

They then would qualify for the wide array of benefits available to married couples, from being able to make medical decisions on behalf of their partners to qualifying for certain tax breaks.

The couples would have to accept the burdens, as well. To break up a civil union, couples would have to go through Family Court to obtain dissolutions, just as when married couples divorce. Couples would have to accept the joint debts of their partners, as well.

Gay couples would still not be entitled to the federal benefits available to married couples in such areas as taxes and Social Security.
And unlike marriage, civil unions might not be recognized in other states.

At least 30 states have banned gay marriages, and Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act, which denied federal recognition of homosexual marriage and allowed states to ignore same-sex unions licensed elsewhere.

``If people want to fly in for the weekend and get a civil union license and fly home, it's unlikely they're going to have their home state give it any legal recognition,'' House Judiciary Committee chairman Thomas Little has said.

On Tuesday, senators had debated whether civil unions would eventually lead to gay marriage or whether they would threaten traditional marriage.

``If this bill passed, would it have the tendency to encourage homosexuality?'' wondered Republican Sen. John Crowley.

Sen. James Leddy said civil unions would not undermine his 28-year marriage -- or anyone else's.

``There's nothing in this court decision, nothing in this bill, nothing in the committed relationships of two people that presents a threat to my marriage,'' the Democrat said.

Tuesday's Senate debate lacked much of the passion displayed during 17 hours of debate last month in the House, where the Legislature's only openly gay member spoke several times, drawing tears to the eyes of many observers.

National groups quickly weighed in after Tuesday's preliminary Senate vote.

``It's a tragic day for the state of Vermont, for the Senate has ignored the will of the people,'' Janet Parshall of the Family Research Council said in a statement. ``But it's an even sadder day for the state of marriage, for the Senate action today was a direct assault on this sacred institution.''

The nation's largest gay rights organization cheered Tuesday's vote.

``Vermont is taking care of its gay and lesbian citizens in a way that other states are not,'' said David Smith of the Human Rights Campaign.
``Vermont is restating its commitment to fairness
by today's action.''

-----

On the Net: Vermont Legislature:
http://www.leg.state.vt.us

Family Research Council: http://www.frc.org

Human Rights Campaign: http://www.hrc.org
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Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2000 09:44:32 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The Census' Race Problem?
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.20.0004190932520.15266-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The following piece, which appears on the Op-Ed page of this morning's New
York Times, continues some of the arguments implied by the findings of the
Human Genome Diversity Project, as reported by the Times--and posted by
me to AAPORNET--on April 1.

-- Jim

******

April 19, 2000
THE CENSUS' RACE PROBLEM
By DAWN STOVER

WHITE SALMON, Wash. -- The 2000 census, bedeviled by poor compliance and charges of intrusiveness, has at least pleased some Americans by giving them far more choices than ever before on the question about race. While this change may have satisfied some of the critics of the rigid racial classifying the census used to demand, it has not made the process more scientifically accurate. No matter which racial box you checked, no one will be able to prove you wrong by any scientific measure, for the simple reason that there is none.

At the genetic level, race does not exist. Studies of human DNA have found that there is far more genetic variability between individuals within any given "racial" group than between two such groups.

Human coloration tends to vary with latitude, but skin color is not a reliable indicator of biological kinship. For example, sub-Saharan Africans are more genetically similar to Europeans than to Melanesians, despite the fact that Melanesians and sub-Saharan Africans share dark skin and curly hair.

Nevertheless, the Census Bureau continues to divide Americans into distinct racial groups, as it has done since the first census in 1790. The information is now used to help enforce the Voting Rights Act and other civil rights legislation. It also helps researchers with problems like identifying patterns of discrimination and uncovering disparities in health and environmental risks. Collecting racial data is a recognition that although race is not a valid biological concept, it remains a potent cultural and political one.

It is the pragmatic need to recognize racial divisions despite their deeper irrelevance that bedevils both the Census Bureau and the many Americans, now filling out their forms or talking to census takers, who resist rigid racial categorization. To an American woman who has, for example, a father who defines himself as half African-American and half Asian and a mother who is Hispanic, the census question exposes the whole business of race for what it is not only on the genetic level but in the daily reality of her family life: forced, arbitrary and ultimately meaningless.
This year the census recognizes more than a dozen races, selected by a political process, not a scientific one. Samoans and Guamanians are included, for example, but not Arabs. In the end, it is up to the person filling out the census to make the racial call. Yet research has shown that when race or ethnicity is determined by self-identification, the results are often different than when the identification is done by an interviewer.

The American Anthropological association argues that eventually, American society must replace racial classifications with some more accurate way of characterizing the diversity of the American people -- perhaps "ethnic group." Many Americans already consider race and ethnicity interchangeable. In a 1996 Census Bureau test, many respondents viewed "Hispanic" as their racial classification and did not see themselves as belonging under "white" or any of the other census racial categories.

Whatever the eventual answer, as immigration continues and "interracial" marriage becomes increasingly common, the Census Bureau's problems with racial categorization are likely to increase. Meanwhile, borrowing the census phrase for those who can find no classification they like, I invite others to join me in considering themselves members of "some other race" -- the human race.

-----
Dawn Stover is the science editor of Popular Science magazine.

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
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I would value AAPOR members' suggestions on what they would name a market research/public opinion company if they could start a new company today. Kindly reply to me directly. I will post the suggestions on AAPORnet if I receive any.

I've been asked to assist in establishing a new polling venture. Thanks.

- Marc Zwelling

Signature:

Marc Zwelling
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991
http://www.vectorresearch.com/

---

Marc Zwelling
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991
http://www.vectorresearch.com/

---
Response Rate for Census 2000 Matches 1990 Rate

The Census Bureau announced today that "the initial response rate" for Census 2000 the percentage of questionnaires returned before enumerators begin knocking on the doors of nonrespondents later this month was 65 percent, matching the 1990 rate.
"We are gratified with the nation's response," Secretary of Commerce William M. Daley said in a statement. "This initial response shows that the hard work of Census Bureau professionals, who planned and executed Census 2000, kept the bureau on track for a very successful census, the first of the new century."

Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt said, "I believe this American achievement represents a significant reversal in the trend toward civic disengagement. We did better than we planned (61 percent) and we matched what we did in 1990."

"Now our job is cut out for us: we will make every effort, beginning on April 27, to contact all of those who did not return their forms so that we can achieve a 100-percent count of our nation's population. And we ask for the public's cooperation in this endeavor."

About 120 million census questionnaires were mailed or hand-delivered to homes across the country in March. As questionnaires were returned, the Census Bureau posted daily, from March 27 to April 11, on its Internet site <http://www.census.gov> the rates of return for the country, the states and about 38,000 local and tribal governments.

Under a promotional campaign called '90 Plus Five, the Census Bureau challenged the nation, the states and local communities to do as well as they did in 1990, plus 5 percent. By April 18, about 15 percent of the entities had met their goals.

By April 11, the Census Bureau reported that the response rate the number of those who either mailed back, transmitted via the Internet or had a telephone assistance operator take their answers over the phone stood at 62 percent, a percentage point better than what it had projected for planning and budgetary purposes.

In the next phase of the census, called "non-response follow-up," as many as half a million temporary workers, with address lists and maps, will visit housing units the Census Bureau did not hear from. They will make up to six attempts to contact nonresponding households three personal visits and three phone calls.

This operation will extend through July 7.

-X-

>From jcf3c@erols.com Wed Apr 19 12:22:11 2000
Received: from web1.planet2000.com ([159.169.245.10])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id MAA18113 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Apr 2000 12:22:05 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from WINGATE (WINGATE [209.3.2.162]) by web1.planet2000.com
   (NTMail 3.02.13) with ESMTP id ea050340 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Apr
Message-ID: <38FE076A.B15959B5@erols.com>
All,

I am currently in the process of reevaluating available CATI software. I have begun to search the AAPORNet archives for previously posted information, but am already finding the task somewhat daunting.

So, without wanting to clutter AAPORNet further with this age old request, has anyone done an evaluation of CATI packages with the past 6 months or so that they would be willing to share? My plan is to create some sort of comparison table of the better systems available, including some form of evaluation of each. I will be happy to share this once it is finished.

In the meantime, I would appreciate hearing from anyone who is willing to share their experiences with their current system or previous systems they have used. Please email me directly. Also, if you want a summary of the information I receive just let me know and I'll be happy to get it to you.

Thanks in advance for any and all sharing.

John

--
John C. Fries..................................Voice: (804) 358-8981
Senior Project Director.........................FAX: (804) 358-9701
Southeastern Institute of Research..............Richmond, Virginia
Marketing and Opinion Research..............email: JCF@SIRresearch.com
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Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (eeyore.cc.uic.edu [128.248.171.51])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id NAA25453 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Apr 2000 13:34:22 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (smtp.srl.uic.edu [131.193.93.96])
  by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA02536
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Apr 2000 15:31:23 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
  with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 19 Apr 2000 15:31:31 -0500
Message-Id: <s8fdd153.085@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2000 15:30:36 -0500
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Seymour Sudman update
Seymour is now stable and is out of ICU and in a private room (Room 511). Get well wishes can be sent there (George Washington Univ. Hosp., 901 23rd St. NW, Washington DC 20037). He cannot yet speak well enough to talk on the phone. Depending on his condition, he may be able to return to Illinois for continuing rehab treatment sometime next week.

Diane O'Rourke

Dear Di,

How are you? Thanks for the info about Seymour. All the best... love from Hot Arizona.

-----Original Message-----
From: Diane O'Rourke [mailto:DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2000 1:31 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Seymour Sudman update

Seymour is now stable and is out of ICU and in a private room (Room 511). Get well wishes can be sent there (George Washington Univ. Hosp., 901 23rd St. NW, Washington DC 20037). He cannot yet speak well enough to talk on the phone. Depending on his condition, he may be able to return to Illinois for continuing rehab treatment sometime next week.

Diane O'Rourke

---
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2000 1:31 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Seymour Sudman update

Seymour is now stable and is out of ICU and in a private room (Room 511). Get well wishes can be sent there (George Washington Univ. Hosp., 901 23rd St. NW, Washington DC 20037). He cannot yet speak well enough to talk on the phone. Depending on his condition, he may be able to return to Illinois for continuing rehab treatment sometime next week.

Diane O'Rourke
Diane,

I'm sure I speak for many who would say Thank You for keeping us updated on Seymour's progress.

Carolyn White

When I do consulting I am "The Numbercruncher." I am trade-marked so don't take that one!

Susan

At 02:53 PM 4/19/2000 -0400, you wrote:
> I would value AAPOR members' suggestions on what they would name a market research/public opinion company if they could start a new company today. Kindly reply to me directly. I will post the suggestions on AAPORnet if I receive any.
> I've been asked to assist in establishing a new polling venture. Thanks. - Marc Zwelling/President/Vector Research + Development Inc./The Vector Poll

> -------------------------------------------------------
>             - Marc Zwelling -
> Vector Research + Development Inc.
>     Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
>     Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991
>     http://www.vectorresearch.com/
> -------------------------------------------------------
I would value AAPOR members' suggestions on what they would name a market research/public opinion company if they could start a new company today. Kindly reply to me directly. I will post the suggestions on AAPORnet if I receive any.

I've been asked to assist in establishing a new polling venture. Thanks. - Marc Zwelling/President/Vector Research + Development Inc./The Vector Poll

-------------------------------------------------------
- Marc Zwelling - <BR>Vector Research + Development <BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320 <BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991 <BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; <A href="http://www.vectorresearch.com/">http://www.vectorresearch.com/</A><BR>-------------------------------------------------------

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.<br>Spring-Summer 2000 PHONE 850-385-4266<br>slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research<br>Florida State University<br>Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office<br>FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology<br>Florida State University<br>Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

850-644-6416 Sociology Office<br>FAX 850-644-6208
Hi everyone,

I am program chair for the MRA annual conference in June in Seattle. We have a panel discussion planned on the topic of "Research in a Multi-Cultural Society." One of the panel members, who was going to cover the ethnic issues resulting from the new census form, has had to cancel out.

I am now looking for someone who has worked closely with the census this year who can speak to the impact that the new ethnic breakdowns will have on future research. The program will consist of a 10-12 minute presentation along with several other presenters, followed by Q&A. The session will be presented at 10:45am on Thursday, June 8th and repeated again at 3:30pm the same day. It will also be web-cast.

If anyone is interested, or if you know someone who might be interested, please call me at 415-777-0470 ex 111, or reply to my email address: rrands@cfmc.com

Thanks,

Richard Rands
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Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
University of Cambridge
Cambridge, UK

University Lectureship or Assistant University Lectureship

Applications are invited for a Lectureship or Assistant Lectureship specialising in the Sociology of Marriage, the Family and Sexualities. The successful candidate will be expected to offer teaching for the Social and Political Sciences Tripos and to base his or her research in the Centre for Family Research. The appointment can be taken up on or before 1 September 2000, or as soon as possible thereafter.

The Faculty of the Social and Political Sciences is an interdisciplinary Faculty with teaching and research in politics, psychology and sociology. The Centre for Family Research is a multi-disciplinary research group founded some 30 years ago. Its Director is Professor Martin Richards. The Centre has an international reputation for its research. It is part of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences which includes social and developmental psychology, sociology and politics as well as interdisciplinary work. The research work of the Centre is organised in four clusters: socio-legal studies of the family, childhood and youth, psycho-social aspects of the new human genetics and maternity services. The work of the Centre is more fully described in the accompanying leaflet or can be found on the Centre's website http://www.sps.cam.ac.uk/Research.html

The essential qualifications for the post are:
1. Degree and postgraduate qualification in sociology or a related social science discipline with a strong interest in research and teaching on the family, marriage and gender roles.
2. A track record for published family research of international standing.

3. Good teaching, research and communication (including written, verbal and IT) skills.

4. Good interpersonal and team working skills.

Applications, including a curriculum vitae and a list of publications, together with names of three referees (ten copies) should be sent to

Ms Kate Stacey
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
University of Cambridge
Free School Lane
Cambridge CB2 3RQ, UK

to reach her not later than 5 May 2000.
Applicants should ask three referees to write directly on their behalf by the same date. Applicants should state whether they are candidates for the University Lectureship, the University Assistant Lectureship or both. There is no application form.

Informal enquiries may be addressed to Professor Bryan Turner at the above address, or to bst22@cam.ac.uk, tel: 44-1223 334 527.
Information relating to the Centre for Family Research can be obtained from Professor Martin Richards at the above address or at mpmr@cam.ac.uk, tel: 44-1223 334 510.

----------------------------------
*                                 *
*                                *
*                              BMS  *
* (Bulletin de Methologie Sociologique) *
* (Bulletin of Sociological Methodology) *
* bmsl@ext.jussieu.fr *
* http://www.ccr.jussieu.fr/bms *
*                                *
*                              RC33 *
* (Research Committee "Logic & Methodology"
* of the International Sociological Association) *
* rc33@ext.jussieu.fr *
* http://local.uaa.alaska.edu/~aaso353/isa/index.htm *
*                                *
*                     Karl M. van Meter *
* email bms@ext.jussieu.fr       LASMAS, IRESCO-CNRS *
* tel/fax 33 (0)1 40 51 85 19   59 rue Pouchet *
*                              75017 Paris, France *
* http://www.iresco.fr/labos/lasmas/accueil_f.htm *
----------------------------------
Here's one educated glimpse of the future of market research on the World Wide Web. I'd very much like to hear the reactions of AAPORNET's many experts in this field, either on list or off.

-- Jim

******

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

April 20, 2000

FUTURE HOLLYWOOD: PERSONAL NETWORKS AND LITTLE PRIVACY

By BONNIE ROTHMAN MORRIS

Some entertainment and computer executives have seen the future, and it is one in which consumers surrender more of their privacy than they do today.

At a panel discussion in Las Vegas last week on what the entertainment industry will be like in 2010, participants were giddy with the prospect of the world's population tuning in via the Internet, contributing to content and giving up privacy to marketers.

"Suddenly, we are the Jetsons," said Mayra Langon Reisman, one of the participants in the discussion, which was part of the National Association of Broadcasters convention. Ms. Reisman, the founder of Film Scouts, a Web entertainment site, noted that entertainment in the future will be about "on-demand immersion and interactivity" using the kinds of wireless technology already in existence.

"People will be able to immerse themselves in
whatever content they desire at whatever time they choose," she said.

The price consumers pay, participants said, will be in their privacy. "You're giving up information for Little Brother," said Errol Gerson, senior agent in the new media division at Creative Artists Agency.

Gordon Paddison, vice president for worldwide interactive marketing at New Line Cinema, said a college student in 2010 who wanted the new Mariah Carey CD, for example, would be able to get it free by giving lots of information about himself. The entertainment companies, he added, will use the information to create products and advertisements specifically designed to add value to that person's life.

The concept, called "permission marketing," is in use today. As technology advances, it is expected to become ubiquitous.

Another participant, Sun Microsystems' chief researcher, John Gage, predicted that 5 billion people will be online by 2010, feeding everything they see into at least 2 billion handheld devices through minicameras installed somewhere on their bodies. Broadcasting will be extinct; "bodycasting" will be the wave of the future, Mr. Gage said. Privacy, he added, will be traded for "convenience and security."

With the proliferation of technology and the prediction that bandwidth -- which is most valuable to broadcasters today -- will cost nothing, every citizen can become a content creator. Instead of everyone having a Web site, picture everyone in charge of his own little television network.

That notion caused the panelists to re-affirm the value of "talent" and "big events" like the Oscars or the Olympics, complete with all the great drama and ceremony that the human, now wired, race will still desire.

With so much choice in entertainment, what might be needed most are more effective program guides, said Stuart Gross, chief executive of Random Order, an advertising agency. And, even though predictions are that, with fully immersible technology, movie-viewing may occur on a wristwatch in an airport, it may not. People will still want non-interactive entertainment experiences in a comfortable environment. To that end, Mr. Gross predicted that "couch potatoes
will not die in the year 2010."

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
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From: "H. Stuart Elway" <hse@elwaypoll.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Newspaper Pollsters Guild
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 14:11:20 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   --=_NextPart_000_0028_01BFAAD2.4D453AE0
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_0028_01BFAAD2.4D453AE0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Media Pollsters,

We have had some interest in an informal gathering of media =
pollsters at the AAPOR conference, but since we didn't ask for an RSVP =
we have no idea of whether to hold a table in the corner or reserve the =
West Wing of the Hotel. We are planning to meet at the bar of the =
Janzen Beach Doubletree at 5:00 pm on Thursday the 18th. If you think =
you might drop by, let me know so we secure an appropriate venue.

See you in Portland.
Stuart Elway
The Seattle Times
Elway Research, Inc.
Media Pollsters,

We have had some interest in an informal gathering of media pollsters at the AAPOR conference, but since we didn't ask for an RSVP we have no idea of whether to hold a table in the corner or reserve the West Wing of the Hotel. We are planning to meet at the bar of the Janzen Beach Doubletree at 5:00 pm on Thursday the 18th. If you think you might drop by, let me know so we secure an appropriate venue.

Stuart Elway
The Seattle Times
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500
AAPOR is still accepting advertisements for this year's conference program in Portland, Oregon, a joint meeting with the World Association for Public Opinion Research.

If you are interested in placing an Ad, please let us know immediately. The program will be delivered to the printer next week.

Advertising space is available in full, half, and quarter-sizes. The program is prepared in an 8.5" x 11" format. Advertising is accepted from corporations, agencies, organizations, groups of individuals, or individual AAPOR members. Ad content is fairly open.

You can us an electronic submission either on disk (to AAPOR) or directly to goetzcraft@aol.com. The printer accepts Quark 4.1, pagemaker styles, Microsoft Publisher. A hardcopy must accompany the electronic version (w/ fonts). Allow a 1/2" border. 133 line screen. Preferably no bleeds. B & W. Work should be to size.

Also acceptable is film negative, w/ a proof. Clean black & white camera ready artwork, w/ a proof.

Marlene at AAPOR
734.764.1555
mbednarz@umich.edu
Just what is "educated" about this self-proclaimed glimpse of the future?

Why should we pay any more attention to this than to such predictions as a helicopter in every garage (1950's), robot houses that clean themselves (1960's), the end of the fossil fuel based economy (1970's) or the paperless office (1980's), all of which were supposed to have come to pass by now.

The people pushing this view of the future are the same folk who were selling "push" technology (a somewhat less sophisticated version of the permission marketing concept) as the way everyone would be using the web by now. They also need to be very careful about exercising self-restraint, because politicians love to make hay with issues that don't cost the taxpayers money.

Actually, some of these issues, including sharing of credit and personal data, are already coming under regulatory scrutiny by the FCC in this country, and by government agencies in most European countries. The FCC recently has announced that it considers posted privacy positions binding and will take action against web sites that violate their stated rules.

People are also developing chaff mechanisms to deal with many aspects of online data mining, similar to what the military uses to fool enemy intelligence, including selective use of multiple email and ISP accounts.

As for the dangers to the market researchers themselves, I have a copy of an old "Calvin & Hobbes" comic strip on the bulletin board next to my desk.

In it, Calvin, the obnoxious little kid, tells his imaginary tiger friend Hobbes: "I'm filling out a reader survey for Chewing Magazine. See, they asked how much money I spend on gum each week, so I wrote $500. For my age, I put '43', and when the asked what my favorite flavor is, I wrote 'garlic/curry'."

Hobbes comments: "This magazine should have some amusing ads soon." Calvin replies: "I love messing with data."

Jan Werner

James Beniger wrote:
>
> Here's one educated glimpse of the future of market research on the World Wide Web. I'd very much like to hear the reactions of AAPORNET's many experts in this field, either on list or off.
>
> ******
>
> *******
>
> Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
April 20, 2000

FUTURE HOLLYWOOD: PERSONAL NETWORKS
AND LITTLE PRIVACY

By BONNIE ROTHMAN MORRIS

Some entertainment and computer executives have seen the future, and it is one in which consumers surrender more of their privacy than they do today.

At a panel discussion in Las Vegas last week on what the entertainment industry will be like in 2010, participants were giddy with the prospect of the world's population tuning in via the Internet, contributing to content and giving up privacy to marketers.

"Suddenly, we are the Jetsons," said Mayra Langon Reisman, one of the participants in the discussion, which was part of the National Association of Broadcasters convention. Ms. Reisman, the founder of Film Scouts, a Web entertainment site, noted that entertainment in the future will be about "on-demand immersion and interactivity" using the kinds of wireless technology already in existence.

"People will be able to immerse themselves in whatever content they desire at whatever time they choose," she said.

The price consumers pay, participants said, will be in their privacy. "You're giving up information for Little Brother," said Errol Gerson, senior agent in the new media division at Creative Artists Agency.

Gordon Paddison, vice president for worldwide interactive marketing at New Line Cinema, said a college student in 2010 who wanted the new Mariah Carey CD, for example, would be able to get it free by giving lots of information about himself. The entertainment companies, he added, will use the information to create products and advertisements specifically designed to add value to that person's life.

The concept, called "permission marketing," is in use today. As technology advances, it is expected to become ubiquitous.

Another participant, Sun Microsystems' chief researcher, John Gage, predicted that 5 billion people will be online by 2010, feeding everything they see into at least 2 billion handheld devices.
through minicameras installed somewhere on their bodies. Broadcasting will be extinct; "bodycasting" will be the wave of the future, Mr. Gage said. Privacy, he added, will be traded for "convenience and security."

With the proliferation of technology and the prediction that bandwidth -- which is most valuable to broadcasters today -- will cost nothing, every citizen can become a content creator. Instead of everyone having a Web site, picture everyone in charge of his own little television network.

That notion caused the panelists to re-affirm the value of "talent" and "big events" like the Oscars or the Olympics, complete with all the great drama and ceremony that the human, now wired, race will still desire.

With so much choice in entertainment, what might be needed most are more effective program guides, said Stuart Gross, chief executive of Random Order, an advertising agency. And, even though predictions are that, with fully immersible technology, movie-viewing may occur on a wristwatch in an airport, it may not. People will still want non-interactive entertainment experiences in a comfortable environment. To that end, Mr. Gross predicted that "couch potatoes will not die in the year 2010."

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
Q Are there any Supreme Court decisions relating to the scope of the census? The Constitution mentions "enumeration" for the purpose of determining representation in the House of Representatives. Has anyone challenged the much broader demographic questioning that citizens are legally obligated to answer?

CHRIS JONES
March 14, 2000

A The court ruled last term that statistical sampling could not replace the actual enumeration for the purposes of apportioning the House of Representatives. As you note, the census is used for other purposes -- state legislative redistricting, the disbursement of federal aid, etc. I'm not aware of any legal challenges to these further uses of the census or to the various questions the census asks beyond the actual headcount, and I'm not sure what the basis of such a challenge would be. As a policy matter, some of these questions have been controversial, however.
Hi..I hope to join you..depending on other possible responsibilities..so put me down as a maybe..Janice Ballou..Eagleton Poll

> "H. Stuart Elway" wrote:
> 
> Media Pollsters,
> 
>      We have had some interest in an informal gathering of media
> pollsters at the AAPOR conference, but since we didn't ask for an RSVP
> we have no idea of whether to hold a table in the corner or reserve
> the West Wing of the Hotel. We are planning to meet at the bar of
> the Janzen Beach Doubletree at 5:00 pm on Thursday the 18th. If you
> think you might drop by, let me know so we secure an appropriate
> venue.
> 
> See you in Portland.
> 
> Stuart Elway
> 
> The Seattle Times
> 
> Elway Research, Inc.
> 
> 206/ 264-1500

---

From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Apr 21 06:02:04 2000
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA01154 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Apr 2000 06:02:03 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp9.vgernet.net [205.219.186.109])
   by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id JAA22746
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Apr 2000 09:28:43 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39005106.28CF0E9F@jwdp.com>
Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2000 09:00:54 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Obligation to answer Census questions?
References: <Pine.GSO.4.20.0004202128450.2194-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
This brings up a different, but equally interesting question, namely, how can one actually trust the information one receives from a "trusted source".

In her response, Linda Greenhouse states: "The court ruled last term that statistical sampling could not replace the actual enumeration for the purposes of apportioning the House of Representatives."

This is not strictly speaking false, but it is extremely misleading, because it implies that the Supreme Court has ruled on the matter of using statistical sampling, whereas the court simply said that the matter "does not arise" at this time, because the Census Act, as currently amended, explicitly enjoins the Census Bureau from using statistical estimation techniques for apportionment of the House of Representatives.

In other words, when Congress, as it will almost certainly have to do before the next decennial census, changes the rules on statistical sampling, the issue will probably be back before the Supreme Court for resolution, and the language of the current opinion strongly indicates that this particular court would not rule statistical sampling unconstitutional.

But it seems to be a common belief among journalists that the Supreme Court has ruled on statistical sampling itself. I have counted no less than 3 front page articles on the 2000 Census in my local newspaper in the last few months that said that the Supreme Court had ruled the use of statistical sampling was unconstitutional for purposes of apportionment.

Linda Greenhouse may well be one of the few who do understand the difference, but the language she uses here reinforces the common misunderstanding.

Jan Werner
__________

James Beniger wrote:
> > So who, then, does know?  -- Jim
> > ********
> > ________________________________
> > Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
> > ________________________________
> > April 21, 2000
> > SUPREME COURT Q & A / By LINDA GREENHOUSE
> > THE CENSUS
Linda Greenhouse, 1998 winner of the Pulitzer Prize for beat reporting, answers readers' questions on Supreme Court rules and procedure in this column, available only on The New York Times on the Web.

Q Are there any Supreme Court decisions relating to the scope of the census? The Constitution mentions "enumeration" for the purpose of determining representation in the House of Representatives. Has anyone challenged the much broader demographic questioning that citizens are legally obligated to answer?

CHRIS JONES
March 14, 2000

A The court ruled last term that statistical sampling could not replace the actual enumeration for the purposes of apportioning the House of Representatives. As you note, the census is used for other purposes -- state legislative redistricting, the disbursement of federal aid, etc. I'm not aware of any legal challenges to these further uses of the census or to the various questions the census asks beyond the actual headcount, and I'm not sure what the basis of such a challenge would be. As a policy matter, some of these questions have been controversial, however.

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
I believe it is useful to reflect upon the reason the census was originally called for in the Constitution to clarify some of the debates now taking place. The founders demanded a census every ten years because they feared that without a regularly scheduled count, the party in power might attempt to delay or cancel the census for fear it would lose power in the allocation of representatives to areas that were growing in population.

If this sounds familiar, it should. Those who oppose methods of statistical sampling, or who counsel others not to submit the forms, often have as their motives the continued underrepresentation of certain groups we know were undercounted in the 1990 census. That violates the true spirit and justification of the decennial census in the most direct fashion.

The irony here is that these individuals who make these arguments often do so because they state that the census bureau cannot be trusted with the duties of enumeration, since they obviously have a political agenda in pursuing such things as sampling. This reasoning turns the founders' logic on its head. The founders originally mandated that the census bureau conduct the decennial census to keep the count out of the hands of those with partisan intentions. Now we are being told that it is better to accept an undercount than to put the job in the hands of the census bureau.

All of this seems to prove that first, the founders had great wisdom in fearing partisan interference in an accurate count due to political reasons, and second, that certain individuals, even some on the federal court, are willing to ignore the logic of the Constitution in favor of a literal reading of its articles.

Frank L. Rusciano, Professor and Chair
Political Science Department
Rider University
e-mail at rusciano@rider.edu
Hi Stuart,

Unfortunately, a last minute change in plans will prevent me from attending the AAPOR conference this year. As a media pollster, (we poll for the Philadelphia Daily News, Fox News Philadelphia, the Harrisburg Patriot, the Lancaster New Era, and public television stations) I have grown increasingly concerned about the proliferation of cheap, nonscientific polls that masquerade in the media as serious scientific polls, and the battles we face with political consultants who routinely challenge the results of our polls while hiding behind a pledge of confidentiality to their clients. I have had more than one battle with political pollsters over sample size, polling methodology, etc., etc., etc. If you spend your time in academe working hard on developing good methodology and conforming to the best practices in our field, it is both disquieting and disdainful to deal with the political types who routinely angle for advantages in the campaigns. At any rate, maybe the time has come to think of a formal organization for those of us who do media polls?

Dr. G. Terry Madonna
Director, Keystone Poll and the Center for Politics & Public Affairs
Chair, Political Science Department
Millersville University

-----Original Message-----
From: H. Stuart Elway [mailto:hse@elwaypoll.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2000 5:11 PM
To: AAPORNENET
Subject: Newspaper Pollsters Guild

Media Pollsters,

We have had some interest in an informal gathering of media pollsters at the AAPOR conference, but since we didn't ask for an RSVP we have no idea of whether to hold a table in the corner or reserve the West Wing of the Hotel. We are planning to meet at the bar of the Janzen Beach Doubletree at 5:00 pm on Thursday the 18th. If you think you might drop by, let me know so we secure an appropriate venue.

See you in Portland.

Stuart Elway
The Seattle Times
Elway Research, Inc.
206/ 264-1500
Hi Stuart,

Unfortunately, a last minute change in plans will prevent me from attending the AAPOR conference this year. As a media pollster, (we poll for the Philadelphia Daily News, Fox News Philadelphia, the Harrisburg Patriot, the Lancaster New Era, and public television stations) I have grown increasingly concerned about the proliferation of cheap, nonscientific polls that masquerade in the media as serious scientific polls, and the battles we face with political consultants who routinely challenge the results of our polls while hiding behind a pledge of confidentiality to their clients. I have had more than one battle with political pollsters over sample size, polling methodology, etc., etc., etc. If you spend your time in academe working hard on developing good methodology and conforming to the best practices in our field, it is both disquieting and disdainful to deal with the political types who routinely angle for advantages in the campaigns. At any rate, maybe the time has come to think of a formal organization for those of us who do media polls?

Dr. G. Terry Madonna
Director, Keystone Poll and the Center for Politics & Public Affairs
Chair, Political Science Department

Harrisburg University

-----Original Message-----
From: H. Stuart Elway [mailto:hse@elwaypoll.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2000 5:11 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Newspaper Pollsters Guild
interest in an informal gathering of media pollsters at the AAPOR conference,
but since we didn't ask for an RSVP we have no idea of whether to hold a table
in the corner or reserve the West Wing of the Hotel. We are planning to meet at the bar of the Janzen Beach Doubletree at 5:00 pm on Thursday the 18th. If you think you might drop by, let me know so we secure an appropriate venue.

See you in Portland.

Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500

Putting aside for the moment professional loyalties, affection for our Census colleagues, hatred of Republicans, etc, etc, has anyone done a cost-benefit analysis of a census scheme I've seen recently floated -- conducting the congressional districting enumeration separately from the "long form"?

I can see a number of advantages in this. It would defuse the issue of intrusiveness (nobody's objecting to the head count itself). It could spread the task of gathering the more comprehensive data over a longer time period, lessening the decennial spike in data-gathering activity. It also would make it possible to gather a larger amount of data, since it would be a separate survey (or surveys).

Also, it might result in better return rates, particularly if households included in the general survey were offered an incentive (say, $10) rather
than being threatened with fines and jail sentences. For that matter, would
an incentive be cost-effective in getting a better return rate on the short
form? (incentives to paid upon completion, of course). There must be some
break-even completion rate at which the cost of such incentives saves money
over the cost of on-foot follow ups.

I realize that every citizen should do his duty and be counted, but under
the present system a lot of them aren't doing that. Citizens also are
taxpayers, and giving some of their own money back to them might be a better
use of it than hiring people to badger them (and, many of the people not
responding could use the money). I've noticed some discussion on AAPORN
ET about how marketers ought to pay people for their data. Why not the
government too? As long as it's cost-effective, of course.

I'd be surprised if no one had investigated these possibilities already,
because they are all pretty obvious. But I've never seen anything about it.

Anybody know?

Ray Funkhouser

>From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Fri Apr 21 08:03:04 2000
Received: from proxy.directionsrsch.com (IDENT:root@dri74.directionsrsch.com
[206.112.196.74])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA14087 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Apr 2000 08:02:57 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com
   by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id LAA29099
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Apr 2000 11:07:03 -0400
   Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2
5-20-1999)) id 852568C8.00521F53 ; Fri, 21 Apr 2000 10:56:59 -0400
   X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI
   From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
   To: aapornet@usc.edu
   Message-ID: <852568C8.00521D87.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
   Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2000 10:56:54 -0400
   Subject: Re: the census: what if . . . ?
   Mime-Version: 1.0
   Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
   Content-Disposition: inline

There's a lot of people who would do anything for $10 bucks. They could
even tie it to their tax form. ($10 added to your refund, or deducted from what
you pay)...

>From ratledge@UDel.Edu Fri Apr 21 08:06:20 2000
Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
I think that is precisely what the end result of the American Community Survey will be i.e. the long form spread over 5 years with the same resulting sample size. The return rates in the ACS seem to be similar to the census even without the $10. The addition of a second mailing, CATI, and CAPI for a sample of remaining non-respondents I would bet gives a better final result.

-----Original Message-----
From: RFunk787@aol.com [mailto:RFunk787@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2000 10:59 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: the census: what if . . . ?

Putting aside for the moment professional loyalties, affection for our Census colleagues, hatred of Republicans, etc, etc, has anyone done a cost-benefit analysis of a census scheme I've seen recently floated -- conducting the congressional districting enumeration separately from the "long form"?

I can see a number of advantages in this. It would defuse the issue of intrusiveness (nobody's objecting to the head count itself). It could spread the task of gathering the more comprehensive data over a longer time period, lessening the decennial spike in data-gathering activity. It also would make it possible to gather a larger amount of data, since it would be a separate survey (or surveys).

Also, it might result in better return rates, particularly if households included in the general survey were offered an incentive (say, $10) rather than being threatened with fines and jail sentences. For that matter, would an incentive be cost-effective in getting a better return rate on the short form? (incentives to paid upon completion, of course). There must be some
break-even completion rate at which the cost of such incentives saves money over the cost of on-foot follow ups.

I realize that every citizen should do his duty and be counted, but under the present system a lot of them aren't doing that. Citizens also are taxpayers, and giving some of their own money back to them might be a better use of it than hiring people to badger them (and, many of the people not responding could use the money). I've noticed some discussion on AAPORNET about how marketers ought to pay people for their data. Why not the government too? As long as it's cost-effective, of course.

I'd be surprised if no one had investigated these possibilities already, because they are all pretty obvious. But I've never seen anything about it.

Anybody know?

Ray Funkhouser

Dear All:

I agree with Ed about the ACS. I am using the test version for Rockland County (1996 to 1998) and it is actually longer than the long form. Also, at this point it has been vigorously embraced by the GOP County Executive and the business community there. Many of the "intrusive" questions to which Tom Guterbock objected are very useful for planning purposes (housing questions, including bathrooms, bedrooms and costs; travel to work, migration, etc.). I just answered my Consumer Reports annual questionnaire and it probably takes longer to do than the long form!!!!
You should realize, however, that the ACS is not authorized nor appropriated past the present set of tests. Nor have they worked out data access issues very well, at least with respect to tabulated data. The PUMS data are fine.

It shows great promise, but it is not yet an official replacement to the long form.

As to whether or not people will object to it, I think that remains to be seen.

As everyone reading this list must know, during the Reagan administration there was a concerted attack on the Federal Statistical System and on social science more generally.

(This was planned for in the famous Heritage Foundation memo "Defunding the Left.")

Often data depicting social conditions are controversial.

Andy

"Ratledge, Edward" wrote:

> I think that is precisely what the end result of the American Community Survey will be i.e. the long form spread over 5 years with the same resulting sample size. The return rates in the ACS seem to be similar to the census even without the $10. The addition of a second mailing, CATI, and CAPI for a sample of remaining non-respondents I would bet gives a better final result.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: RFunk787@aol.com [mailto:RFunk787@aol.com]
> Sent: Friday, April 21, 2000 10:59 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: the census: what if . . . ?
>
> Putting aside for the moment professional loyalties, affection for our Census colleagues, hatred of Republicans, etc, etc, has anyone done a cost-benefit analysis of a census scheme I've seen recently floated -- conducting the congressional districting enumeration separately from the "long form"?
>
> I can see a number of advantages in this. It would defuse the issue of intrusiveness (nobody's objecting to the head count itself). It could spread the task of gathering the more comprehensive data over a longer time period,
lessening the decennial spike in data-gathering activity. It also would make it possible to gather a larger amount of data, since it would be a separate survey (or surveys).

Also, it might result in better return rates, particularly if households included in the general survey were offered an incentive (say, $10) rather than being threatened with fines and jail sentences. For that matter, would an incentive be cost-effective in getting a better return rate on the short form? (incentives to paid upon completion, of course). There must be some break-even completion rate at which the cost of such incentives saves money over the cost of on-foot follow ups.

I realize that every citizen should do his duty and be counted, but under the present system a lot of them aren't doing that. Citizens also are taxpayers, and giving some of their own money back to them might be a better use of it than hiring people to badger them (and, many of the people not responding could use the money). I've noticed some discussion on AAPORNET about how marketers ought to pay people for their data. Why not the government too? As long as it's cost-effective, of course.

I'd be surprised if no one had investigated these possibilities already, because they are all pretty obvious. But I've never seen anything about it.

Anybody know?

Ray Funkhouser

--

Andrew A. Beveridge              Home Office
209 Kissena Hall                 50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology          Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone:  914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597          Fax:    914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837              E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax:   718-997-2820              Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps
Excellent summation of the key points!

Hank Zucker

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2000 7:33 AM 
Subject: Reflecting on the census 

> I believe it is useful to reflect upon the reason the census was originally 
> called for in the Constitution to clarify some of the debates now taking 
> place. The founders demanded a census every ten years because they feared 
> that without a regularly scheduled count, the party in power might attempt 
> to delay or cancel the census for fear it would lose power in the 
> allocation of representatives to areas that were growing in population. 
> 
> If this sounds familiar, it should. Those who oppose methods of 
> statistical sampling, or who counsel others not to submit the forms, often 
> have as their motives the continued underrepresentation of certain groups 
> we know were undercounted in the 1990 census. That violates the true 
> spirit and justification of the decennial census in the most direct 
> fashion. 
> 
> The irony here is that these individuals who make these arguments often do 
> so because they state that the census bureau cannot be trusted with the 
> duties of enumeration, since they obviously have a political agenda in 
> pursuing such things as sampling. This reasoning turns the founders' logic 
> on its head. The founders originally mandated that the census bureau 
> conduct the decennial census to keep the count out of the hands of those 
> with partisan intentions. Now we are being told that it is better to 
> accept an undercount than to put the job in the hands of the census bureau. 
> 
> All of this seems to prove that first, the founders had great wisdom in 
> fearing partisan interference in an accurate count due to political
reasons, and second, that certain individuals, even some on the federal
court, are willing to ignore the logic of the Constitution in favor of a
literal reading of its articles.

Frank L. Rusciano, Professor and Chair
Political Science Department
Rider University
email at rusciano@rider.edu

To Terry Madonna and others on aapornet who are not aware of it..There
is such an organization--it is the National Council on Public Polls.. It
has been around for a good while..NCPP has published both books and the
pamphlet--20 Questions a Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results. In
addition we currently have a process in place to monitor and release
information about polls tht are not up to standards. NCPP welcomes any
new members..you can get in with Ed Efchak our current
Secretary/Treasurer at efchak@bergan.com or me if you want any
additional information about membership or NCPP activities. Janice
Ballou

To aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Newspaper Pollsters Guild
References: <A58A19632EEDD211A67D0090273AE939983D2F@mail1.millersv.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Folks, there is a formal organization for those who do media polls, such as Terry Madonna calls for below. It is the National Council on Public Polls. Why not visit our web site at <http://www.ncpp.org> NCPP welcomes the participation of organizations, not individuals. Andy Kohut is currently the president.

warren mitofsky

At 10:42 AM 4/21/00 -0400, you wrote:
> Hi Stuart,
> 
> Unfortunately, a last minute change in plans will prevent me from attending the AAPOR conference this year. As a media pollster, (we poll for the Philadelphia Daily News, Fox News Philadelphia, the Harrisburg Patriot, the Lancaster New Era, and public television stations) I have grown increasingly concerned about the proliferation of cheap, nonscientific polls that masquerade in the media as serious scientific polls, and the battles we face with political consultants who routinely challenge the results of our polls while hiding behind a pledge of confidentiality to their clients. I have had more than one battle with political pollsters over sample size, polling methodology, etc., etc., etc. If you spend your time in academe working hard on developing good methodology and conforming to the best practices in our field, it is both disquieting and disdainful to deal with the political types who routinely angle for advantages in the campaigns. At any rate, maybe the time has come to think of a formal organization for those of us who do media polls?
>
> Dr. G. Terry Madonna
> Director, Keystone Poll and the Center for Politics & Public Affairs
> Chair, Political Science Department
> Millersville University

>-----Original Message-----
>>From: H. Stuart Elway [mailto:hse@elwaypoll.com]
>>Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2000 5:11 PM
>>To: AAPORNET
>>Subject: Newspaper Pollsters Guild
>>
>> Media Pollsters,
> We have had some interest in an informal gathering of media pollsters at the AAPOR conference, but since we didn't ask for an RSVP we have no idea whether to hold a table in the corner or reserve the West Wing of the Hotel. We are planning to meet at the bar of the Janzen Beach Doubletree at 5:00 pm on Thursday the 18th. If you think you might drop by, let me know so we secure an appropriate venue.
>> See you in Portland.
>>Stuart Elway
>>The Seattle Times
>>Elway Research, Inc.
>>206/ 264-1500
Hi. I just wanted to let you know that we've been in the process of updating the group profiles for the Minorities at Risk project for about a year. This means that most of the 277 groups in all regions of the world, except Latin America which will be completed this summer, are current up to 1999 or 2000. The chronologies have been supplemented with important events that took place between 1995 and the time of the update, and that the overviews and risk assessments have been revised in many cases to reflect these events. I've also added a new column on all the regional tables from which the groups are accessible that shows the date of the last update. This way, researchers will know how current the group profiles and assessments are just by looking at the list of groups.

Please pass this information on to interested parties on your listserv, and thanks for your support. Anne Pitsch

Anne Pitsch
Minorities at Risk Project Coordinator
Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM)
0145 Tydings Hall
University of Maryland, College Park, MD. 20742-7231
(301)314-7706 (off) (301)314-9256 (fax)
http://www.bsos.umd.edu/cidcm/mar
Dr. Madonna—Please keep in mind that all academic polls are not necessarily good nor are all commercial polls necessarily bad. I hope you agree, but your comments seem to suggest this.

There is a formal organization for those who conduct polls that are released in the media. The organization is the National Council on Public Polls, established in 1969 with the primary purpose of working with the media to promote a better understanding of polls and polling methodology and the accurate reporting thereof. We would welcome your membership.

Harry O'Neill
Ray - I think your census idea is worthy of serious discussion. Probably no one responded to it because it's more fun to bash politicians (especially those of a particular persuasion).

Harry O'Neill

I'm new to AAPORNET, and it is great -- plenty of interesting things to think about. I have a couple of logistical questions relating to the upcoming conference:

1) Has anyone got a lead on good air fares from NYC to Portland? I'm hoping I can do better than the price I got, even though it was through Conventions in America.

2) Is anyone interested in getting together at the conference to chat about progressive thinking in community surveying? I'm curious what's being done in that area.

Thanks.

Dr. Josh Klein
One of those weird coincidences -- WorldNetDaily carried the story below this a.m. Good luck to the folks at Census. Perhaps during the next few years they will be able to work out procedures so that the 2010 effort will have an outcome more satisfactory to all concerned. It ought to be a unifying, not divisive, undertaking, after all. (I don't think the headline writer here is helping: one congressional aide = "GOP"? I wonder how many interviews it took to find this particular quotation? And how many said, "Sure, try it and see what happens"?) (why not "Census Director Criticizes Census Incentive", which is equally accurate?).

Phone cards isn't a bad idea -- full value to the recipients, but far less marginal cost than actual cash.

Ray Funkhouser

***************************************************************************
**
Friday April 21 3:44 AM ET
GOP Criticizes Census Incentive
By GENARO C. ARMAS, Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - A Census Bureau distribution of 30-minute telephone calling cards to a select group of people to get them to return their census reports sends a mixed message to the public as to why they should participate in the
A randomly selected group of 15,000 households took part in the program, in which they received a card good for $20 worth of long-distance telephone calls if they answered the census questions.

The incentive was part of a number of test programs the bureau routinely does during census years in preparation for future counts, Census Bureau spokesman Steve Jost. "This doesn't mean this is a final decision on whether we will use these incentives or not" in the next census to be taken in 2010.

This is the first time an incentive program has been tested by the bureau as a way to get forms back.

But Chip Walker, an aide to Rep. Dan Miller, R-Fla., chairman of the House Government Reform Committee's census panel, said "education, not compensation, should be what motivates people to participate in the census."

"The census should be a civic ceremony similar to voting," Walker said. "I think if we start going down that road, we may find ourselves in one, two or three censuses from now trying outbid a previous census."

Jost said Census director Kenneth Prewitt personally opposes incentives, but is willing to test it if it means more people will respond. If the incentive sticks, it could also cost far less than paying to send an enumerator to homes that did not mail back their census forms.

About 35 percent of the forms mailed out have yet to be returned. Census Bureau workers will be sent to these homes, beginning April 27, to gather the missing information.

One city, Valdosta, Ga., drew criticism after offering a $5 incentive to people who returned their forms. The Southeastern Legal Foundation, a conservative public interest law group, said that incentive may violate Georgia law.
I am directing a series of surveys of Medicaid beneficiaries for the state of Michigan, most of them using the standardized CAHPS instrument and protocols. If you have specific issues you'd like addressed, I'll try to help.

Sid Groeneman
Market Facts
McLean, Virginia
703 790-9099 Ext.105

Suzanne Parker wrote:

> Dear Colleagues
> > I am attempting to do a study on patient satisfaction in the Florida medicaid program. If any of you could help by providing information on surveys you have conducted concerning patient satisfaction, it would be greatly appreciated. Also, if anyone could point me in the direction of surveys that they know about, it would also be very helpful. I am especially interested in survey instrument itself.
>
> Thank you for your help,
> Suzanne Parker
>
> Dr. Suzanne Parker
> Associate Professor
> Dept. of Political Science
> Florida State University
> Tallahassee, FL 32306
>
> SUPPORT SUNSHINE IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS!
If anyone has national data broken out by party affiliation (Reps-Dems-Independents) and by any other factors that helps explain public opinion towards the Elian Gonzales matter, I for one would appreciate having it posted as I find the simplistic marginals that are being reported unsatisfying. Thanks.

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Mon Apr 24 06:05:32 2000
Received: from imo24.mx.aol.com (imo24.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.68])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA23985 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Apr 2000 06:05:31 -0700
(PDT)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
    by imo24.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v25.3.) id 5.9d.47f4f8b (9761)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Apr 2000 09:05:02 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <9d.47f4f8b.2635a07d@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2000 09:05:01 EDT
Subject: Managing International Survey Research Projects -- 5/3 NYAAPOR Mtg
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 106

If responding, email RoniRosner@aol.com ONLY, not the list.

---------------------------------------------
--
------
NEW YORK AAPOR and the MEDIA STUDIES CENTER
    present an Afternoon Workshop

Date ............................... Wednesday, 3 May 2000
Presentation ................... 2:30 p.m. -- 5:00 p.m.
Place .............................. Newseum/NY (The Media Studies Center)
    580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Auditorium

MANAGING INTERNATIONAL SURVEY RESEARCH PROJECTS

Allen Khorami...Sr. VP/Director, Int'l Div., Audits & Surveys Worldwide
Terry Coen......VP, Sales and Marketing, Survey Sampling, Inc.

In today's global economy, international survey research is becoming increasingly important to many organizations. This workshop will explain the requirements for conducting successful multi-country studies that are comparable and consistent across countries. Topics include:

* Developing the appropriate international sampling strategy
* Dealing with cultural and translation issues in questionnaire design and data analysis
* Options for fielding surveys in different countries
* How to evaluate international research firms for fieldwork
* Costs associated with international research

Speakers Allen Khorami and Terry Coen bring to the workshop a combined total of more than 40 years of international research experience in dozens of countries, with two of the leading firms involved in global marketing and opinion research.

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE RESERVATION ONLY. E-MAIL ronirosner@aol.com, or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Mon., 1 May. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $50 (members), $65 (nonmembers), $30 (student members), $40 (student nonmembers, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

I will attend the NYAAPOR afternoon workshop on Wednesday, 3 May 2000 with ______ additional guests.

NAME: ____________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ______________________________
HOME PHONE: ________________________________
E-MAIL: ____________________________________
AFFILIATION: ________________________________
GUEST'S NAME: ______________________________

PREPAID FEES: MEMBERS: $40 ___ NONMEMBERS: $55 ___ STUDENT MEMBERS: $25 ___ STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: $35 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 1 May to:
Roni Rosner 1235 Park Avenue/Suite #7C New York, NY 10128-1759

>From BLACKJS@aol.com Mon Apr 24 06:54:20 2000
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.2]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA07466 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Apr 2000 06:54:19 -0700 (PDT)
From: BLACKJS@aol.com
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v25.3.) id d9.336b0f8 (4239) for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Apr 2000 09:53:41 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <d9.336b0f8.2635abe4@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2000 09:53:40 EDT
Subject: Re: Partisanship and Elian-related opinion
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 100

Check with NBC. They didn't show the numbers broken down, but this morning they said morning that men strongly approved the use of force while women strongly opposed it. That just a paraphrasing on my part--I don't remember
Dear AAPORites,

We extremely pleased that so many of you will be joining us in Portland, Oregon for the upcoming AAPOR/WAPOR Conference. The AAPOR Conference is May 18-21. The WAPOR Conference is May 17-19. The excitement is building for this truly global conference!

Here are a few reminders and updates:

1. Preregistration: Please preregister for the Conferences by the end of this month to receive the preregistration discount. AAPOR members will save $30 by preregistering for the AAPOR conference and even more if you are attending both AAPOR and WAPOR. All registration materials can be downloaded from the AAPOR web site: www.aapor.org

2. Hotel Accommodations: Rooms are still available at discount rates. The "official" conference hotels, the Doubletrees Columbia River and Jantzen Beach, are full. However, the AAPOR Conference Operations has arranged for rooms in several nearby alternative hotels. The Holiday Inn Express at Portland-Jantzen Beach is just a few blocks from the conference hotels. They are offering AAPOR members a rate of $79 per night. You can sign up for the AAPOR meal plan at the conference regardless of where you are staying. You can call them at 503-283-8000, or access their website at http://www.basshotels.com/hiexpress?_franchisee=PDXNH
   Be sure to mention AAPOR.

Information on other hotels and airline information is also available on the AAPOR web site. We have several alternate hotels listed there.

3. Program: We have over 60 panels and roundtables devoted to the Internet, questionnaire design, the 2000 elections, the 2000 Census, update on nonresponse, research design, global research, and social and generational issues. There is an "Internet" panel in every time slot during the entire conference. The Friday evening plenary is devoted the "e-Revolution" as well.
An updated program is available on the AAPOR web site. The final program will be up shortly. Participants should check the updated program for panel times. We had to make a few time changes to accommodate all the panels.

4. Short courses: Registration is still available, but courses are filling up fast. Please register as soon as possible for the short courses to avoid being disappointed. The short courses, each taught by a leading expert, are on advanced questionnaire design (Krosnick), introduction to weighting (Brick), and design of mail and Internet surveys (Dillman). Short course descriptions are available on the AAPOR web site.

5. The Social Side: The AAPOR Conference is always a time for mingling, making new acquaintances and renewing old ones. This year's conference has several pre-dinner receptions, an AAPOR Jazz Cafe Thursday evening, and the "Saturday Night Fever" costume party Saturday night. We will also have the traditional Saturday evening sing-along, seminar in applied probabilities, and the Saturday morning fun-run.

We look forward to seeing you in Portland!

Mark Schulman
Chair, AAPOR Conference 2000

Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.
145 E. 32nd Street
Suite 500
New York, NY 10016
Voice: 212-779-7700
Fax: 2127798-7785
email: m.schulman@srbi.com

The University of Maryland Survey Research Center (SRC) will be beginning its Sixth National Omnibus survey in June.

The objective of the National Omnibus is to provide a vehicle for
researchers interested in collecting data on a small number of variables or who want to experimentally compare alternative versions of questions on a large sample.

Survey Design: 1,000 interviews (48 states), using a list-assisted sample, with random selection of one adult respondent within each sample household. Up to 20 callbacks; refusal conversion; two pretests and assistance with question construction.

Deliverables: ASCII data set and SPSS Windows systems file with researcher's items and standard SRC demographics (sex, age, race, income, education, marital status, household size, political party affiliation), sample design and poststratification weights, and a brief methods report.

Schedule: Questions due: June 9
Pretesting: June
Data collection: July-August
Data delivered: September 15

Cost: $975 per single response item. More complex questions, split ballot experiments, rotated items or response categories will be budgeted on an individual basis.

We expect to repeat this survey semi-annually or annually, depending on sponsor interest.

Respond to: src@srcmail.umd.edu
phone: 301.314.7831
fax: 301.314.9070
www.bsos.umd.edu/src/projects.html
Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?

Hi!

We are seeking leads on data bases that describe the current national population of college students including age, gender, degree path, and geographic region. Any suggestions where we might find such data?

Thanks, -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright ( Albright@Field.com )
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
550 Kearny Street
San Francisco, CA  94108
415 392 5763
The U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has a website which lists the various studies they conduct and published reports from those studies. That would be a good place to start. The url is nces.ed.gov, then click on "surveys and programs." Hope that helps!

Michael W. Link, Ph.D.
Survey Research Division
Research Triangle Institute
PO Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

-----Original Message-----
From: victoria albright [mailto:albright@field.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2000 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Seeking Profile of Am. College Students

Hi!

We are seeking leads on data bases that describe the current national population of college students including age, gender, degree path, and geographic region. Any suggestions where we might find such data?

Thanks, -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright (Albright@Field.com)
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
550 Kearny Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
415 392 5763

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Apr 25 10:54:25 2000
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with ESMTP
   id KAA16420 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 10:54:21 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp94.vgernet.net [205.219.186.202])
   by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA10041
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 14:26:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3905DBB0.11D74FD2@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2000 13:53:52 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Number of polls/surveys?
I am also be very interested in this, particularly if there is any useful way to gauge the reliability of the estimate.

In January 1999, a Washington Post article by Claudia Deane stated that "...every year, about 20 million Americans participate in opinion surveys, one-fourth of these in surveys sponsored by the federal government."

With Ms. Deane's help, I was able to trace the origin of this estimate back to Laure Sharpe's presidential address at the 1984 AAPOR conference, which means that even if it had been reasonably accurate at that time, it was at least 15 years out of date when printed in the Post and certainly did not take into account the enormous growth in commercial and political polling during that period.

Jan Werner

---

Howard Schuman wrote:
>
> Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?
>
> From simonetta@artsci.com Tue Apr 25 10:56:42 2000

Received: from as_server.artsci.com (twsn1-hfc-0252-dldb038b.rdc1.md.comcastatwork.com [209.219.3.139]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA19095 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 10:56:41 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3) id <J4B6FK5P>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 13:55:05 -0400

Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F36E31@AS_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Seeking Profile of Am. College Students

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2000 13:55:05 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

You might try Digest of Education Statistics, 1999


though the data tends to be a couple of years old.

There is also the Higher Education Research Institute

http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/

which conduct a number of surveys at participating schools.
Hi!

We are seeking leads on data bases that describe the current national population of college students including age, gender, degree path, and geographic region. Any suggestions where we might find such data?

Thanks, -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright (Albright@Field.com)
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
550 Kearny Street
San Francisco, CA  94108
415 392 5763

Call the Higher Education Research Institute at the Graduate School of Education, UCLA, 310/ 825-1925. (Alexander Astin and Helen Astin.) They collect freshmen norms--trends back to 1967 or so. cheers, mark richards
Hi!

We are seeking leads on data bases that describe the current national population of college students including age, gender, degree path, and geographic region. Any suggestions where we might find such data?

Thanks, -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright (Albright@Field.com)
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
550 Kearny Street
San Francisco, CA  94108
415 392 5763

Howard,

Considering what one now finds virtually everywhere on the Web, even under names like "Newsweek" and "MSNBC," I'd like to see someone even attempt to *define* your term "polls/surveys". Would you be content to confine your question to efforts *not* conducted on the Web?

This is an unjustly unkind oversimplification, I admit, but not an unreasonable one, considering the likely imprecision of any such estimate.
of all U.S. polls in a year, from the start.

It's also unclear, by "carried out in the U.S.," whether you wish to include international and foreign polls conducted by American researchers.

Also worth clarifying, I suppose, is whether you really mean to include not only national polls, but also those regional, state, county, local, city, neighborhood, precinct, school system, corporation, etc. or, if not, at which level would you draw your line?

Hope this helps at least more than it complicates.

-- Jim

******

On Tue, 25 Apr 2000, Howard Schuman wrote:

> Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?

I have not gotten a lot of response to my previous emails concerning "organized" transportation on Friday night and Saturday afternoon. If there is anyone else who is interested in this, please email me a note at TSHIRT2000_1999@yahoo.com and let me know the number of people and the day you are interested in.

If there is not enough interest in this, we will have sign up sheets for folks who would like to share cabs into the city at registration.

Thanks,

Katherine "Kat" Lind
AAPOR Social Activities Coordinator
LIND@IOPA.SC.EDU
We are seeking leads on data bases that describe the current national population of college students including age, gender, degree path, and geographic region. Any suggestions where we might find such data?

Vicky (and others who may be interested),

Try CASE (the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education) in Washington, DC. You might want to start by calling John Abrahams, its Director of Research and Information, at 202-328-5900x5575. (And say hi for me.) CASE's web site is at: http://www.case.org/

If CASE doesn't have the info you need, try AIR (the Association for Institutional Research) at 850-644-4470. If you go to its web site, there is a link to a bunch of other resources on higher education statistics. http://www.airweb.org/

Hope this helps.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford University
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/
The mind boggles at the magnitude of this task. Effective operational definition of 'polls/surveys of all kinds' would be a challenge. All I know is that CASRO has done surveys asking the public if they've participated in a (telephone?) survey in the past year. Harry O'Neill has the details on that. This could give you a kind of prevalence figure, but I don't know how to go about estimating 'incidence.'

Gallup has made a claim that they conduct some (large) percentage of all polling done in the world; you could ask them for how they calculate the denominator in that fraction.

Tom

On Tue, 25 Apr 2000 12:21:59 -0400 (EDT) Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> wrote:

> Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?

Thomas M. Guterbock .................... Voice:(804) 924-6516 Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028 University of Virginia ................................. 539 Cabell Hall ................................. Charlottesville, VA 22903 ......... e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From vector@sympatico.ca Tue Apr 25 14:22:22 2000 Received: from smtp13.bellglobal.com (smtp13.bellglobal.com [204.101.251.52]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id OAA12028 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 14:22:21 +0700 (PDT)
Received: from blwhca10 (ppp1270.on.bellglobal.com [206.172.225.118]) by smtp13.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA10661 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 17:25:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <001d01bfaefc$884b6fa8$76elacce@blwhca10>
Reply-To: "Marc Zwelling" <marc@vectorresearch.com>
From: "Marc Zwelling" <vector@sympatico.ca>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References:
Subject: Re: Number of polls/surveys?
Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2000 17:23:41 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
No, but couldn't someone could put a question on a national omnibus and ask respondents how many times they've been polled this/last year.

- Marc Zwelling -
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991
http://www.vectorresearch.com/

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2000 12:21 PM
Subject: Number of polls/surveys?

> Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all
> kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?
>
>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Tue Apr 25 16:54:16 2000
Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.6])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id QAA18419 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 16:54:14 -0700
(PDT)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
   by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v25.3.) id 5.50.4825658 (3939)
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 19:53:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <50.4825658.263789fe@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2000 19:53:34 EDT
Subject: Re: Seeking Profile of Am. College Students
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1_50.4825658.263789fe_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 104

--part1_50.4825658.263789fe_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi, Vicky...

This is the from the subscribers' site of the Chronicle of Higher Education an
d promises to help with at least some of your questions. For the princely
sum of $7.00, why not give it a shot?
Phil Harding
paharding7@aol.com

>From jklein@igc.org Tue Apr 25 21:35:08 2000
Received: from maynard.mail.mindspring.net (maynard.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.243])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id VAA29933 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Apr 2000 21:35:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jkleinigc (user-2ivea8e.dialup.mindspring.com
[165.247.41.14])
by maynard.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with SMTP id AAA24936
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 00:35:03 -0400 (EDT)

From: "jk" <jklein@igc.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Number of polls/surveys?
Date: Wed, 26 Apr 2000 00:30:08 -0400
Message-ID: <000701bfaf39$ce8ce4c0$0e29f7a5@jkleinigc.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
In-Reply-To:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10004251217110.23893-100000@moonpatrol.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I would love to talk with Honomichl, who is an expert on the market/survey
research industry, but I can't find him in the AAPOR directory or in The AMA
Greenbook. He is the guy who publishes the Honomichl 50 list of top survey
research firms, and as of 1995 had a company called Marketing Aid Center
Inc. in Barrington IL. Hope that helps.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Howard Schuman
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2000 12:22 PM
To: aapor
Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?

In any case, I would welcome any measure that anyone has of the profusion of polls/surveys, whether limited by mode (e.g., putting aside internet surveys); approached in a different way (e.g., proportion of the population that reports having been contacted to be in a survey [other than the U.S. Census!]; amount of money spent on carrying out surveys; growth of any of the preceding; or whatever.
Perhaps the census bureau could help with this inquiry. Now we have a question to add on to the 2010 census.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Thomas M. Guterbock
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2000 3:23 PM
To: AAPORnet List server
Subject: Re: Number of polls/surveys?

The mind boggles at the magnitude of this task. Effective operational definition of 'polls/surveys of all kinds' would be a challenge. All I know is that CASRO has done surveys asking the public if they've participated in a (telephone?) survey in the past year. Harry O'Neill has the details on that. This could give you a kind of prevalence figure, but I don't know how to go about estimating 'incidence.'

Gallup has made a claim that they conduct some (large) percentage of all polling done in the world; you could ask them for how they calculate the denominator in that fraction.

Tom

On Tue, 25 Apr 2000 12:21:59 -0400 (EDT) Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> wrote:

> Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?

Thomas M. Guterbock ................. Voice:(804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia .......................
539 Cabell Hall ............................. e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Apr 26 06:51:37 2000
Received: from as_server.artsci.com (twsn1-hfc-0252-d1db038b.rdc1.md.comcastatwork.com [209.219.3.139])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA14303 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 06:51:36 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
    id <JV49WQZ1>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 09:50:08 -0400
There is actually a more recent 1999-2000 Almanac Issue of the Chronicle that was published 8/27/99.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com
You can get in touch with Larry Gold. He's editor of Inside Research which was started by Honomicl. P.O. Box 296, Barrington, IL 60011 (847) 526-0707

Sorry, but I don't have an e-mail address for him.

Joyce Rachelson

--
"We do not see things as they are, we see things as we are." The Talmud

"Software without support is hardware" - JR/1999

Jack Honomichl can probably be reached through the American Marketing Association, for whom he produces the "Top 50" list each year. I believe he still publishes a newsletter called "Inside Research", but he has no web presence that I know of.

Jan Werner

---

jk wrote:

> I would try to talk with Honomichl, who is an expert on the market/survey research industry, but I can't find him in the AAPOR directory or in The AMA Greenbook. He is the guy who publishes the Honomichl 50 list of top survey research firms, and as of 1995 had a company called Marketing Aid Center Inc. in Barrington IL. Hope that helps.
>
Today's Washington Post has a major front page article on the Census under the headline: "Census to Start Hardest Job: Opening 42 Million Doors".

In the print edition (but not online), the headline is followed by this sublead: "GOP Letter adds to Concern about Resistance".

The article begins:

Hundreds of thousands of temporary census takers, carrying official black and white tote bags and red, white and blue ID badges, head out across the country tomorrow to begin the hardest phase of the 2000 count, asking questions of millions of people who were missed on the first round, or who would rather be left alone.

Even as census takers prepared to begin knocking on doors, Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt said a GOP fundraising letter that went out this month—in an envelope reading "Republican census document enclosed"—could make it harder for them to do their job.

So far, despite hurdles of apathy and suspicion, the response has gone better than Census Bureau officials expected. Sixty-five percent of households that were sent forms have mailed them back, the same as in 1990, halting a decades-long decline in participation. But officials worry that the 42 million households yet uncounted include many people
who will slam the door on enumerators.

The Republican mailing prompted Rep. Carolyn B. Maloney (N.Y.), ranking Democrat on the House census subcommittee, to ask the U.S. Postal Service yesterday to investigate whether the letter violates laws against deceptive mailings. In asking Republican Party Chairman Jim Nicholson to stop the mailing, she wrote, "Your tawdry efforts to use the Census to raise money cheapens our American ceremony."

But Republican Party spokesman Mike Collins said "it would be impossible to be fooled" into thinking the envelope was a census document, and Chip Walker, a spokesman for House census subcommittee Chairman Dan Miller (R-Fla.), called Maloney's criticism "much ado about nothing."

Both accused Maloney of playing partisan politics instead of working with the GOP to persuade people to complete their forms. Walker noted that the mailing did not go out until April 10, after most people had sent in their forms.

But Prewitt said the mailing could confuse some people into thinking the Census Bureau was asking them inappropriate questions--the letter asks their views on subjects including abortion and homosexuality--and that might make them less welcoming when the census taker arrives.

"Any distraction, any confusion," Prewitt said, "puts higher barriers to us to finish the task that we are trying to do for a bipartisan U.S. Congress."

The article goes on much longer and includes a thumbnail history of the Census, explanations of how Census data is used with illustrations from D.C. area communities. It may be read in full at:


>From kagay@nytimes.com Wed Apr 26 09:29:18 2000
Received: from gatekeeper.nytimes.com (gatekeeper.nytimes.com [199.181.175.201])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA13516 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 09:29:17 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mailgate.nytimes.com (mailgate.nytimes.com [170.149.200.253])
    by gatekeeper.nytimes.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA19558
    for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 12:16:35 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from oemcomputer ([170.149.211.87])
    by mailgate.nytimes.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA15652
    for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 12:36:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.1.20000426120051.00936500@mail.nytimes.com>
X-Sender: kagay@mail.nytimes.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Wed, 26 Apr 2000 12:20:43 -0400
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
From: Michael Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com>
Subject: Winners of AAPOR Elections
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

All best wishes to you.

I am pleased to announce our seven new officers and Council members:

Vice-President & President-Elect..............Don Dillman
Associate Secretary-Treasurer..................Rob Santos
Associate Conference Chair......................Dick Kulka
Councillor-at-Large...................................Diane Colasanto
Assoc. Standards Chair.........................Scott Keeter
Assoc. Publications & Info Chair.............Larry McGill
Assoc. Membership &
Chapter Relations Chair............................Dawn Von Thurn Nelson

Congratulations to the Winners !!

And many thanks to the other seven candidates who stood for election and who were also willing to serve AAPOR.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
Nominations Committee Chair

---

>From bwiggins@irss.unc.edu Wed Apr 26 11:02:52 2000
Received: from irss.unc.edu (vance.irss.unc.edu [152.2.32.88])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA28616 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Apr 2000 11:02:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from bwiggins.irss.unc.edu (bwiggins.irss.unc.edu [152.2.32.128])
by irss.unc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA24241;
Wed, 26 Apr 2000 14:02:37 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200004261802.OAA24241@irss.unc.edu>
Date: Wed, 26 Apr 2000 14:02:15 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)
From: bwiggins@irss.unc.edu (Bev Wiggins)
To: aapornet@usc.edu, nnsp@vance.irss.unc.edu
Subject: SAPOR student paper competition
In-Reply-To: <38BB633E.451BF6A6@polisci.tamu.edu>; from "bwiggins" at Wed Apr 26 14:02:15 2000
X-Mailer: Siren Mail (Windows Version 4.0.2 (Windows 95/NT))
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET="US-ASCII"

If you know of students who have written good papers this year on any public
opinion topic, or using survey data, please encourage them to apply for SAPOR's James W. Prothro student paper award. Deadline for submissions is June 15, 2000. More information can be found at www.irss.unc.edu/sapor

Also available at that URL is information about the October SAPOR conference and call for paper abstracts.

Beverly B. Wiggins
Associate Director for Research Development
Odum Institute for Research in Social Science
Manning Hall, CB#3355
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3355
phone: 919-966-2350
tax: 919-962-4777
temail: bwiggins@irss.unc.edu

I received today a thoroughly pro mailing that belongs in the Slick SUGgers Hall of Fame, the "2000 Sleep Survey sponsored by the Sleep Education Council . . . co-sponsored by Sleep OnAir," a mattress company.

Should I be sending this on to Mitofsy as Standards Chair or some other AAPOR committee?
Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu
I would send it both to Warren and to Janice Ballou, incoming Standards Chair.

-----Original Message-----
From: OM [mailto:abider@american.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2000 7:09 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Slick "Sleep" SUG"Survey"

I received today a thoroughly pro mailing that belongs in the Slick SUGgers Hall of Fame, the "2000 Sleep Survey sponsored by the Sleep Education Council . . . co-sponsored by Sleep OnAir," a mattress company.

Should I be sending this on to Mitofsy as Standards Chair or some other AAPOR committee?
Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

The following job posting was forwarded to me by a recruiter. While I am not familiar with the company, it seems like an interesting opportunity for the right person. Please do not respond to
PE Biosystems, a PE Corporation company, we’re committed to ensuring that biological information plays a pivotal role in the future of medicine and the well being of humankind. From genomic information to instrument systems, we enable Science for Life. We are currently recruiting for a MARKET RESEARCH ANALYST in the Bay Area:

**Responsibilities:**
Support the Director of Market Research and the Planning Department in the objective of integrating and leveraging cross-departmental market research projects for Applied Biosystems: interface is focused on, but not exclusively limited to, Applied Biosystems departments, particularly product marketing and marketing communications in support of their efforts. Coordinates with the product marketing groups in outlining a plan of action for individual research projects, including objectives, method, time line and costs for the implementation of market research studies, conducted either in-house or through outside vendors as appropriate. Coordinates with internal ABI groups to keep projects on track time-wise, ensuring that all members of research project team meet jointly agreed upon, realistically established deadlines associated with their particular contributions to the projects. Reviews primary research reports produced by outside consultants, both past (for tracking purposes) and current; summarizes results for internal groups, interpreting findings within ABI's business context (based on input from Director); may or may not be asked to give project specific research finding presentations to internal groups.

**Skills Required:**
Minimum Bachelor's Degree in social science discipline (psychology, sociology, anthropology, methodology). Life science background a plus. Minimum 3 years of market research experience, with at least one of those years having occurred in a market research firm. Experience in researching international markets desirable.

Interested candidates should Email their resumes to: ccadloni@earthlink.net or call on: 650-554-2094. For more information on this and other career opportunities, visit our website at www.pecorporation.com or send your resume to Staffing, PE Corp. MS 401-1, 850 Lincoln Centre, Foster City, CA 94404.

We provide generous compensation and one of the industry’s most comprehensive benefit plans. PE Corporation is an Equal Opportunity Employer and welcomes diversity in the workplace.
OM wrote:
>
> I received today a thoroughly pro mailing that belongs in the Slick SUGgers Hall of Fame, the "2000 Sleep Survey sponsored by the Sleep Education Council . . . co-sponsored by Sleep OnAir," a mattress company.
>
> Should I be sending this on to Mitofsy as Standards Chair or some other AAPOR committee?
>
> Albert Biderman
>
> abider@american.edu

--
"We do not see things as they are, we see things as we are." The Talmud

"Software without support is hardware" - JR/1999

>From jklein@igc.org Thu Apr 27 07:35:31 2000
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
  id HAA11540 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Apr 2000 07:35:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jkleinigc (user-2ivebgh.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.46.17])
  by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA01367
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Apr 2000 10:35:29 -0400 (EDT)
From: "jk" <jklein@igc.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Number of polls/surveys?
Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2000 10:40:53 -0400
Message-ID: <000501bfb056$db287140$112ef7a5@jkleinigc.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
In-Reply-To: <3906FD77.8D81B70F@concentric.net>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Another thought about where to look is the authoritative (though dated)
Uses and Abuses of Surveys has a section on the Size of the Industry which
says there is no reliable info for comprehensive estimate of survey industry
size. The references might help you get something more current.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Joyce Rachelson
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2000 10:30 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Number of polls/surveys?

You can get in touch with Larry Gold. He's editor of Inside Research
which was
started by Honomicl. P.O. Box 296, Barrington, IL 60011
(847) 526-0707

Sorry, but I don't have an e-mail address for him.

Joyce Rachelson

--
"We do not see things as they are, we see things as we are." The Talmud

"Software without support is hardware" - JR/1999
Hi Harry,

Sorry for the late response. Of course, I know that not all academic polls are good and commercial polls bad. My point was that many times political consultants deliberately mislead to advantage their candidates. Certainly not all political pollsters do that, but my direct experience is that a large number do. Also, they manipulate polling data for their own advantage. Obviously many political pollsters understand polling methodology quite well and because they do, they are better situated to manipulate the data in their efforts to win elections.

Thanks for the information about the National Council on Public Polls.

Terry

-----Original Message-----
From: HOneill536@aol.com [mailto:HOneill536@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2000 3:39 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Newspaper Pollsters Guild

Dr. Madonna- Please keep in mind that all academic polls are not necessarily good nor are all commercial polls necessarily bad. I hope you agree, but your comments seem to suggest this.

There is a formal organization for those who conduct polls that are released in the media. The organization is the National Council on Public Polls, established in 1969 with the primary purpose of working with the media to promote a better understanding of polls and polling methodology and the accurate reporting there of. We would welcome your membership.

Harry O'Neill
Howard...

Honomichl's the guy you want. His phone is 847-382-3246, and AMA's website devotes some space to him at: http://www.ama.org/pubs/mn/honomichl/

This doesn't meet the challenge of e-mailing Jack directly, but here AMA's standard boilerplate may be of use.

Contacts at AMA

311 S. Wacker Dr.
Suite 5800
Chicago, IL 60606
(800) AMA-1150
(312) 542-9000
Fax: (312) 542-9001
For questions or comments about the website, contact Webmaster@ama.org

Should you still not be able to reach Jack, get hold of Larry Gold (to whom you've already been directed) at...

INSIDE RESEARCH
P.O. Box 296
Barrington, IL 60011
847-526-1224
847-526-0707

Here, the telephone trumps e-mail, but, if you must, you can always get the e-mail address from whoever answers either phone. Assuming someone does.

Good luck.

Phil Harding
paharding7@aol.com

--part1_b2.46adfa0.2639dab3_boundary
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Disposition: inline
Jack Honomichl can probably be reached through the American Marketing Association, for whom he produces the "Top 50" list each year. I believe he still publishes a newsletter called "Inside Research", but he has no web presence that I know of.

Jan Werner

________________

jk wrote:
>
> I would try to talk with Honomichl, who is an expert on the market/survey research industry, but I can't find him in the AAPOR directory or in The AMA Greenbook. He is the guy who publishes the Honomichl 50 list of top survey research firms, and as of 1995 had a company called Marketing Aid Center Inc. in Barrington IL. Hope that helps.
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Howard Schuman
> Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2000 12:22 PM
> To: aapor
> Subject: Number of polls/surveys?
Can anyone provide a rough estimate of the number of polls/surveys of all kinds carried out in the U.S. over a given period, e.g., during 1999?

--part1_b2.46adfa0.2639dab3_boundary--
> From mark@bisconti.com Thu Apr 27 11:39:46 2000
Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA28540 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Apr 2000 11:39:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mark (ip24.washington11.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.47.24]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2650.21)
    id JQ7DSADF; Thu, 27 Apr 2000 14:38:53 -0400
From: "Mark D. Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The "Eight is Enough Project"
Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2000 14:42:04 -0400
Message-ID: <DHEO1BBFBGFGOJOHGIDCEEGGCEAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="-----_NextPart_000_00C9_01BFB056.C13168A0"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MIMEOLE V5.00.2919.6700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_00C9_01BFB056.C13168A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I call this project/website to the attention of those interested in voting behavior and citizen activism to enforce clean voter lists.

Nick Kennan (Shaw, DC) and other DC citizens launched the "8 Is Enough" project due to a "little problem" that was identified related to residents of Maryland suburbs voting in DC elections (jokingly referred to as "Ward 9"-DC has 8 Wards). The first phase of the "8 Is Enough Project" is complete (http://www.conexos.com/anc/INDEX.HTM), providing names, addresses, and voting history of all DC registered voters, sorted by Ward and within Ward by the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (no telephone numbers or E-mail addresses...). The purpose of the "8 is Enough" project is "to allow residents to inspect the voting rolls of their own neighborhoods, in the hope that broad public scrutiny will lead to more accurate rolls."

Is anyone aware of similar citizen initiatives? One complaint I've heard is that fraudulent voter rolls inflate the number of registered voters, making it more difficult for citizens to put initiatives on the ballot (5% of voters, plus 5% in both Wards 5 and 8, must be gathered within 180 days to get an Initiative on the ballot-- http://www.dcboee.org/htmldocs/guide.htm).

Mark Richards

-----_NextPart_000_00C9_01BFB056.C13168A0
I call this project/website to the attention of those interested in voting behavior and citizen activism to enforce clean voter lists.
Nick Kennan (Shaw, DC) and other DC citizens launched the "8 Is Enough" project due to a "little problem" that was identified related to residents of Maryland suburbs voting in DC elections (jokingly referred to as Ward 9)&#8211;DC has 8 Wards). The first phase of the "8 Is Enough Project" is complete (<a href="http://www.conexos.com/anc/INDEX.HTM">http://www.conexos.com/anc/INDEX.HTM</a>), providing names, addresses, and voting history of all DC registered voters, sorted by Ward and within Ward by the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (no telephone numbers or E-mail addresses). The purpose of the "8 is Enough" project is "to allow residents to inspect the voting rolls of their own neighborhoods, in the hope that broad public scrutiny will lead to more accurate rolls." Is anyone aware of similar citizen initiatives? One complaint I’ve heard is that fraudulent voter rolls inflate the number of registered voters, making it more difficult for citizens to put initiatives on the ballot (5% of voters, plus 5% in both Wards 5 and 8, must be gathered within 180 days to get an Initiative on the ballot—<a href="http://www.dcbboe.org/htmldocs/guide.htm">http://www.dcbboe.org/htmldocs/guide.htm</a>).
Hello:

My name is Karen Wheeless, I'm the Acting Chief of the American Community Survey Analytic Staff at the Census Bureau.

A recent series of discussions on the American Community Survey on the AAPOR discussion group was brought to my attention. I'm wondering if you would find it useful to your list members to provide them the following info?

If you think this would interest them or be helpful in response to the questions they raised, I appreciate your sharing this info with them.

Thanks for considering this,

Karen Wheeless
Your recent discussions about the American Community Survey (ACS) were brought to my attention and I thought you might be interested in further information about this new survey, along with a few links you can use to keep up-to-date on the American Community Survey.

In regard to Ray Funkhouser's question about whether the Census Bureau has used or is considering the use of incentives to bolster participation in surveys and censuses, the short answer is yes. We've both considered and used incentives in relation to various survey and census work. For example, the decennial census is offering pre-paid phone cards to certain households in return for completing their census questionnaires. This is part of a Census 2000 experiment and anticipates 2010 Census development.

We've also tested the use of various types of incentives in conjunction with the Survey of Income and Program Participation. One paper that addresses the results of this test can be found at http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/workpapr/wp230.pdf. I can also send a couple of other papers on the topic to anyone interested. You'll find an e-mail address at the end of this message.

Please be aware that the Census Bureau has used incentive techniques on an experimental basis in conjunction with survey or census efforts where our response rates were less than desired. Since we've not had that problem in the first five years of testing the American Community Survey (our final weighted response rates are right around 97%), we do not plan to offer incentives in conjunction with ACS.

As Ed Ratledge pointed out, a second or follow-up questionnaire mailing combined with CATI and CAPI work are integral parts of the American Community Survey methodology, which we believe keeps our final, weighted response rates high. If you'd like to know more about the methodology of the American Community Survey, look at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/index_b.htm.

The current plan for the American Community Survey, if Congress approves, is to begin nationwide data collection in 2003. At the planned survey size of 3 million households a year, we would release long form equivalent data for communities larger than 65,000 in July 2004. For communities smaller than this, multi-year averages would be available every year beginning in either 2006 (for communities or population groups between 20,000 and 65,000 in size) or in 2008 (for communities/groups smaller than 20,000 in population). Information on multi-year averages can be accessed from the web page noted above.

Finally, we hope that others will do the same as Andy Beveridge and start working with American Community Survey data. Data is now available for 1996, 1997, and 1998 (see http://www.census.gov/acs/www/index_c.htm). Additional data for the 31 communities sampled in 1999 will be available this July. It's been through data users 'playing' with the data from these test sites and letting us know what worked and what didn't that we have been able to make improvements in the American Community Survey.
And, as Andy noted, it certainly is not a given that the American Community Survey will be funded at a level that will allow us to go nationwide in 2003 - thus, having ACS become a replacement for the decennial census long form in 2010. Our experience to date gives us hope that by continually working with data users such as yourselves, we will be able to produce a survey that meets the needs for timely data on current conditions, while resolving many of the problems associated with the census long form. Ultimately, though, that will be a question for Congress to decide as they wrestle with budget priorities and allocations in the coming years.

We hope you'll learn more about the American Community Survey and let us know how it could better meet your needs. You can always send questions, comments, and suggestions via e-mail to acs@census.gov or call us toll free at 1-888-456-7215.

Karen Wheeless
Acting Chief,
ACS Analytic Staff
We here, at The Program For Prevention research are trying to determine what people are currently using as a Socio-Economic Indicator. In the past we have used Hollingshead, Duncan..just occupation and income. We wish to standardize what we are doing, and make it comparable to what other researchers might be using. Help! Would you let me know what you use, and also, whether you use the 1990 Occupational Classification Code for Occupation, or something else. Thanks, your reply will be appreciated.

We here, at The Program For Prevention research are trying to determine what people are currently using as a Socio-Economic Indicator. In the past we have used Hollingshead, Duncan..just occupation and income. We wish to standardize what we are doing, and make it comparable to what other researchers might be using. Help! Would you let me know what you use, and also, whether you use the 1990 Occupational Classification Code for Occupation, or something else. Thanks, your reply will be appreciated.
An interesting commentary by Prof. Donald Ratajczak, Director of the Economic Forecasting Center at Georgia State University and probably one of the leading economic forecasters in the country. His remarks are not only valid but go to the heart of the issues surrounding privacy.

Dick Halpern

BUSINESS SUNDAY =95 April 30, 2000

Privacy concerns about census are all wet
Donald Ratajczak – For the Journal-Constitution
Sunday, April 30, 2000

Now that we are in phase two of the census, in which enumerators must go door-to-door to get people to fill out the forms, I would like to comment on all the bluster concerning privacy that has filled the airwaves.

There is no question that asking questions about the condition of your house, the foundation of your finances and the level of your wealth uncovers information that some people do not wish to reveal.

The fact that they do so for the property assessor, the tax collector and the investment adviser does not justify the claim that they also should do so for the census enumerator.

However, most of those data sources are independent. We may know income but not about the race or gender of the people with that income. Although studies are done through sampling that try to fill in the gaps, those...
studies are restrained by incomplete knowledge of the total population from
which the samples are drawn.

If you pick five black balls from an urn and also know how many balls are
in the urn, you can say a great deal about the likelihood of drawing
another black ball. If you do not know what is in the urn, you know a great
deal less about what that next ball may be.

Only the census has the capacity to make a strong sampling of the
characteristics of our people. Then we can determine if there are racial
discrepancies in economic well-being that persist. We can determine what is
the value of real property in which people live. We can determine the
sources of income by age.

In all the hullabaloo of invasive questions, few asked how the census
decided to ask such questions. First, economists and sociologists were
discovering that some of their studies were limited by the inability to
combine demographic and economic characteristics. They petitioned a
commitee in the census to see if some of these questions could be included.

Second, once the committee reviewed and decided on the requests, it sent
its recommendations to Congress. Members of Congress who were protesting
the invasion of privacy must have forgotten that at least two years before,
they (or more likely their staffs) reviewed the requests and approved them.

Third, the census then tested the questions on control groups before
sending them out to the general public.

No one appeared to object to the invasiveness of the questions until the
talk show circuit began to worry about what conclusions might be reached if
this information were known.

Once again, the choice was ignorance over informed but principled choice.
Even a libertarian host preferred the absence of knowledge over the use of
reason as a basis for challenging the long form of the census.

I received the long form and filled it out in a reasonable fashion. I used
my memory of my tax forms rather than go to my tax forms (which were not
yet complete on April 1) to answer some of the questions. Nevertheless, I
tried to provide appropriate information.

Did I believe the census was asking questions more in depth than ever?
Of course I did.

Did I believe the information gleaned would aid research and advance
knowledge in the areas of sociology and economics? Of course I did. That is
the real reason that I filled out the forms.

Do I believe that some of the research generated by that information will
be used to support social programs that I do not support? Of course I do.

Then why did I fill out the forms? First, my own privacy is not seriously compromised. The information about me moving through the Internet is more invasive than this census form, and that is true of most people.

Second, some of my colleagues may discover approaches to social issues that might improve conditions, rather than merely treat symptoms.

Third, ignorance can never be more favorable than knowledge. We were given the power to reason. To do so well, we need to know the facts. Hiding the facts does not lead to sound reasoning.

Unfortunately, when I heard the accusation that privacy was invaded, I also sensed that the hidden agenda was blocking information from the decision makers.

For those one-third of Georgians who chose ignorance on their first attempt with the census, let's have the facts and then attack any undesirable programs that those facts may spawn. It's time to be counted.

Director of the Economic Forecasting Center at Georgia State University

e-mail: ratajczak@gsu.edu

AJC Newspaper Online brought to you in partnership with
An interesting commentary by Prof. Donald Ratajczak, Director of the Economic Forecasting Center at Georgia State University and probably one of the leading economic forecasters in the country. His remarks are not only valid but go to the heart of the issues surrounding privacy.

Dick Halpern

Now that we are in phase two of the census, in which enumerators must go door-to-door to get people to fill out the forms, I would like to comment on all the bluster concerning privacy that has filled the airwaves.

There is no question that asking questions about the condition of your house, the foundation of your finances and the level of your wealth uncovers information that some people do not wish to reveal.
the investment adviser does not justify the claim that they also should do so for the census enumerator.

However, most of those data sources are independent. We may know income but not about the race or gender of the people with that income. Although studies are done through sampling that try to fill in the gaps, those studies are restrained by incomplete knowledge of the total population from which the samples are drawn.

If you pick five black balls from an urn and also know how many balls are in the urn, you can say a great deal about the likelihood of drawing another black ball. If you do not know what is in the urn, you know a great deal less about what that next ball may be.

Only the census has the capacity to make a strong sampling of the characteristics of our people. Then we can determine if there are racial discrepancies in economic well-being that persist. We can determine what is the value of real property in which people live. We can determine the sources of income by age.

In all the hullabaloo of invasive questions, few asked how the census decided to ask such questions. First, economists and sociologists were discovering that some of their studies were limited by the inability to combine demographic and economic characteristics. They petitioned a committee in the census to see if some of these questions could be included.

Second, once the committee reviewed and decided on the requests, it sent its recommendations to Congress. Members of Congress who were protesting the invasion of privacy must have forgotten that at least two years before, they (or more likely their staffs) reviewed the requests and approved them.

Third, the census then tested the questions on control groups before sending them out to the general public.

No one appeared to object to the invasiveness of the questions until the talk show circuit began to worry about what conclusions might be reached if this information were known.

Once again, the choice was ignorance over informed but principled choice. Even a libertarian host preferred the absence of knowledge over the use of reason as a basis for challenging the long form of the census.

I received the long form and filled it out in a reasonable fashion. I used my memory of my tax forms rather than go to my tax forms (which were not yet complete on April 1) to answer some of the questions. Nevertheless, I tried to provide appropriate information.

Did I believe the census was asking questions more in depth than ever before? Of course I did.

Did I believe the information gleaned would aid research and advance knowledge in the areas of sociology and economics? Of course I did. That is the real reason that I filled out the forms.

Do I believe that some of the research generated by that information will
be used to support social programs that I do not support? Of course I do.
<br>
<br>Then why did I fill out the forms? First, my own privacy is not seriously compromised. The information about me moving through the Internet is more invasive than this census form, and that is true of most people. <br>
<br>Second, some of my colleagues may discover approaches to social issues that might improve conditions, rather than merely treat symptoms. <br>
<br>Third, ignorance can never be more favorable than knowledge. We were given the power to reason. To do so well, we need to know the facts. Hiding the facts does not lead to sound reasoning. <br>
<br>Unfortunately, when I heard the accusation that privacy was invaded, I also sensed that the hidden agenda was blocking information from the decision makers. <br>
<br>For those one-third of Georgians who chose ignorance on their first attempt with the census, let's have the facts and then attack any undesirable programs that those facts may spawn. It's time to be counted. <br>
<br>Director of the Economic Forecasting Center at Georgia State University <br>
<br>e-mail: ratajczak@gsu.edu <br>
<br>
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I would appreciate recommendations for two types of survey software:

1) For conducting surveys by e-mail.

2) For conducting Internet surveys

I am looking for software that allows surveys to be set up fairly quickly
and is practical for projects with fewer than 300 cases.

Please respond to me rather than to the list. I will be happy to share the
suggestions with anyone who is interested.

David Mingay
University of Chicago Medical Center
773/702-1185
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I have a feeling that all the reminders that Congress was given the option to object to questions on the Census and did not will only insure that there will be many objections to questions on the next census. For this, and other reasons, this may be the last long form census to be conducted.

Steve Salmore