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 (usually Ctrl-F).

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 and indexed 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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9808.
Part 1/1, total size 220870 bytes:

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Sun Aug  2 11:06:27 1998
Received: from camel14.mindspring.com (camel14.mindspring.com
[207.69.200.64])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA19253 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Aug 1998 11:06:25 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-37kbnpm.dialup.mindspring.com
[207.69.223.54])
   by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA18877;
   Sun, 2 Aug 1998 14:06:12 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <35C4AA8E.8FA3DA0@mindspring.com>
Date: Sun, 02 Aug 1998 14:06:06 -0400
From: "RICHARD S. HALPERN" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: In Census Issue, Partisanship Cancels Out Logic
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-------------162C7F88E2945F7BF33BE6CD"
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

More about the census debate in today's Times:

http://search.nytimes.com/search/daily/bin/fastweb?getdoc+site+iib-site+69+0+wAAA+census

In Census Issue, Partisanship Cancels Out Logic

By STEVEN A. HOLMES

In Census Issue, Partisanship Cancels Out Logic
WASHINGTON -- For years, the late Speaker Thomas O'Neill's famous dictum that all politics is local has been gospel in this capital, believed in the soul, repeated early and often. But Tip O'Neill hadn't seen this year's fight over statistical sampling to augment the 2000 Census and to account for those who are generally missed by traditional head-counting methods.

As if defying the laws of politics -- and some might even say logic -- the pitched battle over what seems an arcane subject has not been marked by the regional divisions that normally define fights over how to count the country's population.

Instead, the current imbroglio has been a purely partisan affair, so much so that some of the principals seem to be putting party loyalty above the interests of their state or region. Republicans are fighting -- and Democrats are staunchly supporting --
the Census Bureau's plans to use statistical sampling even though there is evidence that the states that will be helped the most by sampling will be the strongholds of their own party.

"I do not understand the Republican opposition to sampling," said David Bositis, a senior policy analyst at the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, who is studying the impact of the use of sampling on the Census. "The states that would be hurt the most are much more Democratic than the states that are Republican."

The proposed methodology is straightforward. The Census Bureau plans to count at least 90 percent of all households in every census tract -- neighborhoods of roughly 1,700 dwellings. The results of that large "sample" will be used to estimate the number and characteristics of the people in the remaining 10 percent. To provide a quality check, statisticians will compare their estimates with the result of a national survey of 750,000 households.

But if the method seems clear-cut, the lineups for and against sampling seem bizarre.

If the 1990 Census had been adjusted using sampling methods, Georgia's population would have been boosted by about 300,000. Some demographers feel the same result would probably happen in 2000. Yet sampling is opposed by all the members of the state's Republican delegation, including Speaker Newt Gingrich, who has filed suit in federal court to have the Census Bureau's plans declared unconstitutional.

A 1997 study by the Congressional Research Service suggests that if the Census Bureau does not use sampling in 2000, Mississippi could lose a congressional seat. Yet the technique is vigorously opposed by the Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, R-Miss. "No one is served well by having some computer in Washington guess how many people live in Buckatunna, Mississippi," Lott's spokesman said.

Democratic proponents of sampling exhibit their own incongruities. A study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies indicates that some of the states with the most to lose from sampling are Ohio, Michigan, Massachusetts and Missouri. But some of the staunchest proponents of the method are people like Rep. Dick Gephardt, D-Mo., the House minority leader, and Rep. Thomas Sawyer, D-Ohio.

"I do think that everybody on both sides of the aisle ought to look closer at what sampling might do to their respective states," said Gov. Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania, a sampling opponent who was the ranking Republican on the House committee that oversaw the 1990 Census. "Some people favor sampling. But if their numbers go up a little bit because of sampling, and the numbers go up substantially in other states, they may lose."

An explanation for the positions might be that politicians, like generals, are fighting an old war. Like many issues where race is involved -- and it is minorities who are disproportionately undercounted -- the assumption is that it is a problem of blacks in northern cities.

In fact, the 1990 Census showed that the undercount was becoming more an issue for the Sun Belt, a sign of how the South and West are being transformed by the influx of Latino immigrants.
"There was a real change from where the undercount was in 1990 from where it was in 1980," said Paula Duggan, a senior policy analyst for the Northeast-Midwest Institute, a research center for Northern lawmakers.

But ignorance of the country's demographic shifts is not the whole answer for the sharp partisanship that characterizes the current debate over sampling.

After the 1990 census many Sun Belt lawmakers, both Republicans and Democrats, were well aware of how their states would be short-changed in the allocation of federal funds. They pleaded with the Bush administration to adjust the population count upward based on numbers that had been derived through sampling.

Republicans now argue that they merely want a more accurate count when the data are used for disbursing federal funds. But, they say, the use of sampling to apportion seats in the House and draw congressional districts is illegal and could be manipulated for partisan advantage.

"You're allocating representation in Congress, where there are always winners and losers, which is much more fundamental than money," said Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, who opposes sampling.

Indeed, the current political dynamic may be pushing both parties toward positions on sampling that may be against their own regional or state interests.

Because such a large proportion of those who are missed by traditional counting methods are minorities, some analysts say, the Democratic Party, whose statewide and national candidates depend on black and Hispanic voters, have little or no choice but to support sampling.

"Could you imagine what would happen if the Democrats said we don't care if there is a black undercount or a Hispanic undercount?" Bositis said.

And with the Republicans holding a thin majority of 11 seats in the House, there may be a palpable fear that anything, including sampling, might cause them to lose power. After all, holding onto the chairmanship of a congressional committee that decides which federal programs are financed is probably more politically compelling than getting a few million additional dollars through funding formulas based on population counts.
Position Announcement

FIELD/DATA MANAGER
(Principal Investigators: Irv Garfinkel and Jim Kunz)
Columbia University School of Social Work

****

Duties:
I. Assist with initial training of interviewers and supervisors; provide on-going training and guidance to interviewers/supervisors; supervise, monitor, and evaluate interviewers/supervisors.

II. Monitor data collection by processing administrative data/shift documentation;
Monitoring includes tracking interviewer productivity, response rates, and managing cases/sample through CATI system.

III. Post data collection duties include formatting/outputting and cleaning data.
****

Data collection should begin in early October and last for one month. We will hire to begin immediately. This is a full-time temporary position until mid December or January if necessary. The position may become permanent. Pay is commensurate with experience.

Applicants should have experience with CATI systems and field management.

To send resumes and make inquiries contact:
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE is seeking a Program Associate II. The Program Director at the Iowa Social Science Institute is responsible for designing, planning, promoting and conducting social science survey research projects and programs. Working with and aiding clients in developing research proposals, survey designs and questionnaires. Supervising research personnel, coordinating research projects and field staff activities. Recruiting, training, supervising and evaluating service personnel. Designing, conducting and supervising the analysis of survey data applicable to project reporting. Writing grants, reports, technical materials, evaluations and presenting research findings to clients and other audiences. Position requires as minimum qualifications an MA in a related field, 1-3 years administrative, supervising and program experience desirable, experience in an academic setting desirable, as well as some experience in public speaking and technical writing.

Review of resumes will begin immediately. Send resume to Professor Arthur H. Miller, 123 N. Linn Street, 130 Brewery Square, Iowa City, Iowa 52242-1409. The University of Iowa is an AA/EO Employer. Minorities and women are encouraged to apply.
Hello,
I have a question for the experts in the market research area. I am assisting a group with their efforts to conduct market interviewing. They generally work with the Friedman organization, Opinion One and Heakin Research.

The group I am helping needs to work through established research entities that have an infrastructure across the nation. Their primary focus is to conduct interviews through "mall intercept" methods. Generally, they collect samples of approximately 150 individuals. They use about 20 market locations geographically dispersed across the country.

My main question is -- who is the best at conducting the field work for such market research efforts? I would appreciate any comments or suggestions that you may have. Also, please respond to me directly as not to overwhelm the listserver.

--- sgoold@unm.edu

Thanks in advance.
Scott

Scott Goold, PhD (abd)
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
sgoold@unm.edu
Yes, bibliofind.com is alive and well, and BTW has a number of copies of The Authoritarian Personality available. Thanks, Jennifer, for suggesting this resource.

RMSchwarz

Jennifer Hochschild wrote:

> also try bibliofind.com -- they are more likely to have used books, 
> since that is what they specialize in. (I haven't used it for some 
> months -- can 
> anyone update us on its existence/effectiveness...?) JH
> 
> Date: Wed, 29
> Jul 1998 07:05:21 EDT Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu From:
> MILTGOLD@aol.com To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Seek '50 
> book: Authoritarian Personality
> 
> Why not try http://www.amazon.com: perhaps that online book seller has 
> it?
> 
> Milton Goldsamt
I would appreciate hearing from or about a Spanish-speaking focus group moderator to assist us with an Arizona project involving about 15 focus groups, half in Spanish (all with Hispanics).

We need to find someone immediately. Respond either by e-mail or by phone.
602.967-4441    (ask to speak to Mike, Julie or Brian)
Fax 602.967.6171 or 602.967.6171 fax 602.967.6171
Email: oneil@speedchoice.com or surveys@primenet.com

Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Ave
Tempe AZ 85282

I would appreciate hearing from or about a Spanish-speaking focus group moderator to assist us with an Arizona project involving about 15 focus groups, half in Spanish (all with Hispanics).

We need to find someone immediately. Respond either by email or by phone to 602.967-4441 (ask to speak to Mike, Julie or Brian), fax 602.967.6171 or email: oneil@speedchoice.com or surveys@primenet.com

Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Ave
Tempe AZ 85282
Mike,

You might Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles. A long established firm that I have used in the past.

lb

On Wed, 5 Aug 1998, Michael O'Neil wrote:

> I would appreciate hearing from or about a Spanish-speaking focus group moderator to assist us with an Arizona project involving about 15 focus groups, half in Spanish (all with Hispanics).
> We need to find someone immediately. Respond either by e-mail or by phone to
> 602.967-4441 (ask to speak to Mike, Julie or Brian)
> fax 602.967.6171 or
> email: oneil@speedchoice.com or surveys@primenet.com
> Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
> O'Neil Associates, Inc.
> 412 East Southern Ave
> Tempe AZ 85282
>

>From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Sat Aug  8 07:55:47 1998
Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA00039 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Aug 1998 07:55:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (aroobb@localhost)
    by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id KAA08732
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Aug 1998 10:55:43 -0400 (EDT)
Dear Everyone,

I write to seek advice and suggestions about materials to be used in undergraduate and graduate courses in research methods:

1) listservs that you have found particularly useful (aside from ours, of course)
2) Web-based research methods courses or "stuff" (articles, etc.) you have used and found to be excellent.

I'm fairly familiar with statistical sources available at various web sites, so data files don't need to be included unless you found them particularly good. What follows is a brief overview of the courses. The key is that these courses are being prepared for web-based distance learning, which my School of Information Studies is deeply involved in. As I told Fritz Scheuren earlier, it will be quite something to be able to teach and have students do field work in a distance environment. I plan to incorporate evaluation of the learning experience as part of the student activities. We'll have to see whether I can pull it off, and I promise to share whatever I learn.

During the Spring semester (1999), I will be teaching research methods through our distance education program in the School of Information Studies. Preparation is so extensive that planning must be carried out beginning now. One course will be directed to Masters level adult students who principally come out of the humanities, nearly all of whom have been out of school for many years, work full time, have families, and are generally terrified of technology and numbers. The other research methods course will be designed for our new undergraduate degree program. Our undergraduates are much more technologically sophisticated than our grad students, so there is somewhat less to contend with than with our grad students; however, with only a few exceptions, they are generally math-phobic (what's new, right?). I will also have the benefit of face-to-face classroom and lectures and discussion groups with the undergrads, whereas the grad students are completely distance ed.

I will have experienced TA's (doctoral students who are savvy in research methods and statistics). The expected N's for registration in the distance ed program is around 200 (don't gasp) and undergraduate, at least 40-60 (because it's a required course). So, efficiency in course instruction is a very high priority (aside from the fact that distance ed is extremely time intensive and involves a lot of student interaction beyond the usual in
face-to-face settings).

Enough. I hope you will be able to help with ideas. I thank you all very much in advance. Please respond privately to me at: arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu

P.S. If you have any articles or materials that you wish to share, copyright permission will be sought. Access to all materials placed on "electronic reserve" will be restricted only to those students who are registered in the course.

*****************************************************************************
* Alice Robbin                                *
* School of Information Studies                *
* Florida State University                     *
* 240 Louis Shores Building                   *
* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100              *
* Office: 850-644-8116  Fax:  850-644-6253     *
* email:  arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu              *
*****************************************************************************

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Sun Aug  9 04:54:37 1998
Received: from asa1.asan.com (asa1.asan.com [206.20.111.11])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id EAA06736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Aug 1998 04:54:36 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ppp46-1.asan.com (ppp46-1.asan.com [206.20.111.46]) by
asa1.asan.com (NTMail 3.03.0017/1.aehb) with ESMTP id ua931964 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Aug 1998 07:54:21 -0400
Message-Id: <4.0.2.19980809073912.008bc990@asan.com>
Message-Id: <4.0.2.19980809073912.008bc990@asan.com>
Message-Id: <4.0.2.19980809073912.008bc990@asan.com>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Sun, 09 Aug 1998 07:53:54 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: some help, please (Methods course materials)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.93.980808102745.6848C-100000@mailer>
References: <1E164712D2DBD111B32A08A0C921A213051501@psg.ucsf.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

At 10:55 AM 8/8/98 -0400, ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:
>Dear Everyone,
> I write to seek advice and suggestions about materials to be used in
> undergraduate and graduate courses in research methods:
> 
> 1) listservs that you have found particularly useful (aside
>  from ours, of course)
> 2) Web-based research methods courses or "stuff" (articles, etc.)
you have used and found to be excellent.

I trust that you are on the "Methods" list (methods@mail.unm.edu). If not, then you want to be.

As to web sites:
Start with Bill Trochim at Cornell: "This website is for people involved in applied social research and evaluation. In addition to my own work, you'll find lots of links to other locations on the Web that deal in applied social research methods." http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/index.html and
(has not been updated in a while but still useful)

You may also want to look at my own stuff at
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/cgi-bin/eres/viewbyinstr2.pl?KUECHLER

Or look at Earl's (Babbie) stuff at
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babble/

And then there is this British site
http://www.shef.ac.uk/uni/academic/R-Z/socst/
Sounds very interesting, but they don't want to let you look at their real stuff unless you pay. But maybe your charm works better than mine. Extremely uncooperative folks.

So, plenty out there, but still room for better and more sophisticated stuff. Part of my game.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: from SRC/ISR-UMich
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.3.95.980810094909.6431A-100000@frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 7 Aug 1998 17:19:00 -0400
Subject: Job posting to put on AAPORnet

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

Senior Research Associate
Data Collection and Processing Services, Division of Surveys and Technologies Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

Duties: Participate in the development of new research proposals and direct research projects for ISR/SRC Division of Surveys and Technologies (DST).

Developing new research: respond to requests from foundations and funding agencies to develop research proposals for survey research projects, work with scientific investigators and research clients to develop research hypotheses and design specifications for new and continuing studies, supervise the creation of the proposed project budget, direct/contribute to the writing of the research proposal, administer all activities of the formal proposal submission process.

Directing research projects: assume responsibility for contract and work scope negotiation for funded projects, serve as DST administrative and scientific liaison to researchers and research clients, monitor project costs and budget, prepare interim and final reports and technical documentation for projects, manage all aspects of the survey research process including research design and methodology, coordinate sampling, questionnaire development, pretesting, interviewer training, data collection, data coding and editing, data processing, data archiving and production of study documentation.

This position reports to the Associate Director for Operations and Planning, DST. Individuals appointed to this position will work semi-independently in the Data Collection and Processing Services unit. Specific work assignments and responsibilities will be determined by the Associate Director, DST.

Necessary Qualifications: B.A. in social science or related fields; five years experience managing survey research projects (from proposal development and research design through data collection, analysis and reporting of results); demonstrated experience with the process of applying for and managing large scale contracts; excellent oral and written
communication skills.

Desired Qualifications: Master's degree in social science or related fields; scientific knowledge of and/or research background in one or more of the following fields: health and health care services, economics, aging, education; demonstrated experience in scientific research development; direct experience as investigator on a research grant or contract; record of research publication.

Interested individuals are encouraged to send a letter of introduction and their resume to: Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. The University of Michigan is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Informal inquiries can also be made by e-mail to bpennell@isr.umich.edu.

>From Dcolasanto@aol.com Tue Aug 11 06:26:17 1998
Received: from imo18.mx.aol.com (imo18.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.8])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA10539 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Aug 1998 06:26:16 -0700
(PDT)
From: Dcolasanto@aol.com
Received: from Dcolasanto@aol.com
   by imo18.mx.aol.com (IMOv14_b1.1) id FKJJa29489
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Aug 1998 09:25:16 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <b6578f28.35d0463e@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 11 Aug 1998 09:25:16 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Evans Witt is PSRA's new President
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 64

HI all,

I wanted to share PSRA's good news with everyone on AAPORNET. The press release copied below went out last week.

Diane Colasanto
August 6, 1998

Witt Named President of Princeton Survey Research Associates

G. Evans Witt has been named president of Princeton Survey Research Associates, Andrew Kohut, chairman of PSRA, announced today.

Witt takes over from Diane Colasanto, who will remain active in the firm, concentrating on research activities.
"We look forward enthusiastically to the leadership that Evans will provide based on his experience and background in the news and information businesses," Kohut said.

"I've worked with Evans for many years in the management of the American Association for Public Opinion Research and have the highest regard for him. I'm thrilled he has agreed to lead the company," Colasanto said.

Witt, 47, is an experienced pollster and journalist. In a 22-year career with The Associated Press, he helped lead the wire service in the use of public opinion polls and social science research methods. He was a co-founder of the AP/NBC News Poll in 1977. He was a national political writer, director of election planning and assistant chief of the AP Washington bureau. Witt directed the creation of two award-winning political Web sites in 1996, ElectionLine and PoliticsNow, for ABC News, The Washington Post and National Journal. He was executive director of Voter News Service from 1997 through 1998.

A Morehead Scholar and graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Witt was a National Endowment for Humanities Fellow at Stanford University in 1981-82.

Witt is the co-author, along with Sheldon Gawiser, of A Journalist's Guide to Public Opinion Polls from Praeger Press, and of Twenty Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results, from the National Council on Public Polls. He has written numerous articles on public opinion and lectured widely on the use of polls by the news media.


>From bthompso@bsmg.com Wed Aug 12 12:15:26 1998
Received: from bjke.com (firewall-user@ganymede.bjke.com [144.210.8.38])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id MAA24867 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Aug 1998 12:15:24 -0700
(PDT)
From: bthompso@bsmg.com
Received: by bjke.com; id OAA10552; Wed, 12 Aug 1998 14:15:15 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com(144.210.140.12) by gauntlet.bjke.com via
   smap (4.1)
      id xma009698; Wed, 12 Aug 98 14:14:12 -0500
Received: by eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
   id <QQ6JL9HC>; Wed, 12 Aug 1998 15:12:08 -0400
Message-ID: <24C3CEDAD424D11191BD00805F0D6C4DD70393@eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Conducting Research in the Orient
Date: Wed, 12 Aug 1998 15:12:07 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Greetings AAPORNETERS,

Do any of you have experience conducting research in the Orient?

We are working on a proposal for a client which apparently has a component that involves their desire to conduct research in Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea and China (I assume they differentiate between China and HK since the latter has more English speakers and has a different economy.

I would like to have some background information on conducting research in these countries...specifically...

1. is it doable, is anyone doing it?
2. What methodologies are used in these countries, telephone, door-to-door, FGI, in-person, intercepts, what?? 3. Are there any country-specific legal prohibitions 4. What are the language problems we would encounter (most prominent in China, I guess) 5. Rough length of time needed to conduct/arrange/etc.

Any information would be appreciated!

Please reply directly to me at bthompso@bsmg.com

Bill Thompson
Senior Associate
KRC Research
Washington, DC

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Aug 13 19:03:37 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id TAA00589 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Aug 1998 19:03:36 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from default (tr-ppp32.monmouth.com [209.191.24.64]) by shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id WAA23451 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Aug 1998 22:02:56 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <35D39C09.2404@monmouth.com>
Date: Thu, 13 Aug 1998 22:08:09 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Job openings: Vanderbilt Univ Inst for Public Policy, Washington DC]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline
The following job announcements are brought to you courtesy of the Washington Evaluators and the Eastern Evaluation Research Society.

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

The Washington Office of Vanderbilt University's Institute for Public Policy, Center for Mental Health Policy, has an opening for a Research Associate, effective November 1, 1998. The position will work on two major grants in the office involving housing and services for vulnerable populations. In particular, the primary responsibility of this position will be to manage a cross-site national collaborative project involving 8 studies of supported housing for persons with serious mental illness. The project is funded through a cooperative agreement by the Federal Government and is finishing the first of four years of funding.

The ideal candidate would be a recent or soon-to-be Ph.D. in the social sciences, with expertise and experience in quantitative methods. Experience in multi-level analyses and meta-analysis, as well as evaluation research, is desired. Knowledge of or experience in mental health research is a plus, but not a requirement.

The position has growth opportunity, with time and assistance to pursue further research opportunities and publications.
Salary is negotiable. Benefits included.

If interested, please contact Debra J. Rog, Ph.D., Director, Washington Office, 202-234-1190.

-----------------------------------------

STATISTICAL CONSULTANT WANTED

The Washington Office of Vanderbilt University's Institute for Public Policy, Center for Mental Health Policy, is looking for a statistician/researcher (mid-level or senior) to assist a small evaluation team on a cross-site national collaborative project involving 8 studies of supported housing for persons with serious mental illness. The project is funded through a cooperative agreement by the Federal Government and is finishing the first of four years of funding.

The position would require approximately 15-20% commitment on an annual basis, with considerable flexibility. Assistance will be especially needed in the design of the analyses, with more input required in later stages of the project. The ideal candidate would have a Ph.D. in the social sciences with expertise and experience in multivariate statistical analyses, including multi-level analyses (especially HLM), propensity scoring, and meta-analysis. Knowledge of or experience in mental health research is a plus, but not a requirement.

The position provides an exciting opportunity to work on a project with key analytic challenges and considerable policy and publication potential.

If interested, please contact Debra J. Rog, Ph.D., Director, Washington Office, 202-234-1
Good news - -

TWA has agreed to issue AAPOR two free flight coupons because of the detailed ticket information I sent them. It's not much, but it's something!

Thank you, AAPOR Conference attendees, for sending me this critical information.

Dawn

---------------------- Forwarded by Dawn Von Thurn/MCS/Price Waterhouse on 08/13/98 10:10 PM ---------------------------

dawn.von.thurn@us.pwcglobal.com on 07/24/98 12:48:11 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu
To:   aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject:  UPDATE: 1998 AAPOR Conference in St. Louis - - Did you fly on TWA?

Dear AAPORNET,

In addition to the two reasons offered by Milton and Jo, there are a number of reasons why AAPORites may not have used the TWA convention discount. TWA's convention discount rate is appealing for some, but not all. I have spoken to TWA and they are willing to review their files since it is clear from the messages I have received from AAPORites that more than 35 flew on TWA.

That's the good news.

The bad news - - I need to provide TWA with additional information.
For those flying with electronic tickets (e-tickets), I need to send TWA the following information: 1. passenger's name 2. departure date 3. departure city (e.g., Baltimore) 4. departure flight number 5. connecting city, if any (e.g., Baltimore to Detroit to St. Louis) 6. return date 7. return flight number.

For those flying with a ticket, I need to send TWA the following information:
1. passenger's name
2. ticket number (13 digits, starts with "015", usually located in bottom right corner of ticket)

If you paid by credit card and did not keep your ticket, the TWA representative noted that your TWA ticket number is usually included on your credit card bill.

If you are willing to send me the information requested above, I will forward it to our TWA representative.

Thank you,
Dawn

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: Re: 1998 AAPOR Conference in St. Louis -- Did you fly on TWA?

Dawn,

I'm posting this to the listserv for the same reason mentioned in Milton Goldsamt's message -- I remember now that my travel agent, who booked my TWA flight, said she could get me the same discount as the convention discount but with a refundable ticket. I assumed that AAPOR would still get credit for it, but now I realize that she may not have used the AAPOR convention discount code, since she didn't book my ticket that way.

Jo

> I flew on TWA because my federal agency's travel agency service
> (Carlson) selected TWA, and made my flight an official business flight.
It therefore was not reported to TWA on a convention discount basis.
Hope this insight and information helps your "undercounting" effort, another real life survey activity!

> Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D. 
----------------------------
Jo Holz                           Phone: (718) 499-3212
Holz Research & Consulting       Fax: (718) 499-3606
434 Fifth Street
Brooklyn, NY 11215

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

> From mbednarz@umich.edu Fri Aug 14 07:59:48 1998
Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA17530 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Aug 1998 07:59:47 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mbednarz.umich.edu (isr-207-32.isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.32])
   by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with SMTP id KAA06047
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Aug 1998 10:58:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <35D450D4.1AEC@umich.edu>
Date: Fri, 14 Aug 1998 10:59:32 -0400
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>
Some months ago, the AAPOR Secretariat received a request from an Austrian historian, Eckehard Quin (as well as a follow-up request). Dr. Quin is writing the history of the Red Cross in Austria from 1937 - 1947 (when it was part of the German Red Cross). In the archives of the German Red Cross he found a letter dated 1969, from a Joan Fredricks.

Ms. Fredricks wanted to get all available material about a transport of prisoners from the concentration camp Theresienstadt to Switzerland in February 1945. She wrote she had evidence of activities of the German Red Cross in Theresienstadt and wondered why and how long it worked there. She wrote that she had been working on this subject for three years and wanted to publish the results.

Consequently, Dr. Quin would like to find Ms. Fredricks and/or access her work and findings.

Ms. Fredricks in ’69 used letterhead which listed her company name on the top "Joan Fredricks Marketing Research & Field Service (St. Louis, MO); listed on the bottom of the letterhead, however, was "American Association for Public Opinion Research, American Marketing Association, American Statistical Association". Hence Dr. Quin contacted AAPOR inferring a relationship between AAPOR and Ms. Fredricks.

I have not been able to come up with anything helpful for Dr. Quin.

Can anyone help Dr. Quin? I have not found Joan Frederick in the AAPOR database, referenced anywhere, nor found her company in St. Louis, nor any people that can direct Dr. Quin appropriately. Dr. Quin would like names, phone and/or fax numbers, e-mail addresses, etc. (Something to go on.)

Please contact Dr. Quin directly, or pass any information you have on to me (mbednarz@umich.edu). Thanks.

Eckehard Quin
Gottschallgasse 8-10
2380 Perchtoldsdorf
Austria                 Fax:  43 1 8692241
Could I ask: what are the benefits of AAPOR's having "two free flight coupons"? Who is eligible to use them? Next year's officers? Needy graduate students? Winners of some intra-AAPOR competition? Non-officer members?

Thanks for expanding on the info you've given the membership. (By the way, my federal agency's now shifted to another travel agency, that now uses American Airlines!)

Milton Goldsamt
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

I was wondering if anyone can point me towards some recent data on public attitudes towards smoking bans in public spaces particularly, restaurants and bars.

I am also interested in the text of the questions.
Leo:

My former colleague @ the UMass-Boston Center for Survey Research <Lois Beiner> has collected data from samples in Mass. over the past several years (continuous monthly sampling) and has at least some data on these topics. The number @ CSR is 617-287-7200.

Leo G Simonetta <leos@christa.unh.edu> on 08/17/98 04:59:45 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To:  Mailing list <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc:   (bcc: Mike Massagli/Picker)
Subject:  Smoking survey info

I was wondering if anyone can point me towards some recent data on public attitudes towards smoking bans in public spaces particularly, restaurants and bars. I am also interested in the text of the questions.

--
Leo G. Simonetta                           leos@christa.unh.edu
I have a question for the experts in Hispanic (Spanish-speaking only) questionnaire development. The research group I am working with has found preliminary evidence suggesting that Spanish-speaking respondents may be inclined to overrate or inflate perceptions on Likert type scales when compared to English-speaking respondents.

Is there more formal research on this topic? Also, for those of you who work in this area, are there other methods of designing the questionnaire to compensate or correct for these biases (if present)?
For example, in a questionnaire that attempts to access perceptions, the research group traditionally uses the following scale:
Agree Completely, Agree Somewhat, Agree Slightly, Disagree Slightly, Disagree Somewhat, or Disagree Completely.

They have found evidence that the Spanish-speaking respondents are significantly more likely to select options near the endpoints.

Thanks in advance and please reply directly. I will be happy to supply AAPOR with a summary report.

Scott

-------------------------------------------------------------
Scott Goold, PhD (abd)
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
sgoold@unm.edu
Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"
-------------------------------------------------------------

>From kneuman.cra@cclgroup.ca Tue Aug 18 09:12:59 1998
Received: from cclgroup.ca (mail.cclgroup.ca [142.176.79.114])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA14121 for <aapor@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Aug 1998 09:12:58 -0700
(PDT)
Message-id: <fc.000f7cf7000dce3b9aca00c61b56e0.dcf2e@cclgroup.ca>
X-UID: 0000dce2e
Date: Tue, 18 Aug 1998 13:16:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Smoking survey info
To: leos@christa.unh.edu
Cc: aapor@usc.edu
From: kneuman.cra@cclgroup.ca (Keith Neuman)
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

We have conducted a couple of surveys over the past several years on public support for banning smoking in public places, in several jurisdictions here in Atlantic Canada (Halifax, Prince Edward Island). Questions have covered support both generally and in terms of specific public spaces (e.g. malls, taxi cabs), and have generally been of the "support-oppose" variety. Contact me directly if you are looking for specifics

Keith Neuman
POSITION OPENING

Assistant for Evaluation in the Research Office of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) for 2-year position (with possible renewal) to provide quality evaluation of the programs and services of the denomination using mail surveys, secondary analysis, and other methods. Requires masters degree in one of the social sciences; experience in program evaluation or applied social science research, interpretation of research results, and report writing; and knowledge of or willingness to learn about the Presbyterian Church. Salary up to $35,000. Excellent benefits. Submit vita and list of references by September 18, 1998 to Research Services, Room 2625, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville, KY 40202.

John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396; 502-569-5161; 502-569-5501 (fax); 4:48 pm Tue, Aug 18, 1998 **Join us in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Presbyterian Panel**
Can anyone provide me with a reference to literature discussing the merits of weighting data v. sampling based on population bases? That is, when conducting research across a multi-region area with wide differences in population totals, is the researcher better off to pull equal samples and weight the data afterwards or to pull varying sample sizes?

Thank you.

Margaret Roller
rmr@rollerresearch.com

Bill!!!

So here you are at...KRC Research? Not sure I'm familiar with them. What is their focus?

In October I travel to the Russian Far East (Vladivostok on the Sea of Japan)
to develop a research department and conduct a research study for an agency there. Given Vladivostok's proximity to China, Korea, and Japan, I may learn a thing or two about conducting research in this area. I'll keep you posted.

Margaret

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Wed Aug 19 06:07:24 1998
Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.31])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA12222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 06:07:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])
   by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id JAA16332
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:07:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980819130722.009e2c60@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:07:22 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Weighting & Sampling

If you are trying to make comparisons across areas *and* also represent some larger population defined by the areas, then you are most likely better off getting "equally large" samples per area (to provide more powerful tests of differences across areas) and then weight back to make the areas properly represented in characterizing the combined multi-area population.

At 08:47 AM 8/19/98 -0400, you wrote:
>Can anyone provide me with a reference to literature discussing the merits of weighting data v. sampling based on population bases? That is, when conducting research across a multi-region area with wide differences in population totals, is the researcher better off to pull equal samples and weight the data afterwards or to pull varying sample sizes?
>
>Thank you.
>
>Margaret Roller
>rmr@rollerresearch.com
>
>********* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *********
>********* Professor of Journalism & Communication *********
Margaret!!!!

Good to hear from you. Sorry I have been out of touch (though I haven't heard from you either.....(he stomps his foot impatiently)

Yes, I left POS at the end of 1996 you may recall (technically they laid me off), went to Woelfel Research in Vienna, VA for four months (a true 9 to 5 market research job) and got laid off there too!

I temped for the summer at my cousin's company then landed here almost a year ago.

KRC is a subsidiary of what is now called BSMG Worldwide, formerly Bozell Sawyer Miller Group which is based in NYC. I work in KRC's small DC office in shared space with our sister companies. BSMG was recently bought by True North, so the corporation is an international firm that is the 6th largest advertising/communications firm in the world. KRC is the research arm, with about 20-25 people, mostly in NYC.

We do full service qualitative and quantitative, as well as online research. In DC our primary focus is public policy/issue research as well as corporate crisis management/reputation management/etc. Very much like POS without the political work, though the President (Steve Lombardo, formerly of market
Strategies) is, like me a former GOP pollster and we have just hired a former DEM pollster here. No campaign work though, so I work relatively normal hours!

Give me a call today if you're free. I'd love to chat with you. I'll be here until about 3PM, then we're off to Baltimore for focus groups. My number should be on my signature. if not, write back and I'll call you or give you my number.

--------
From: Margaret R. Roller
SMTP:71501.716@compuserve.com
Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 1998 8:47 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Conducting Research in t

Bill!!!

So here you are at...KRC Research? Not sure I'm familiar with them. What is their focus?

In October I travel to the Russian Far East (Vladivostok on the Sea of Japan) to develop a research department and conduct a research study for an agency there. Given Vladivostok's proximity to China, Korea, and Japan, I may learn a thing or two about conducting research in this area. I'll keep you posted.

Margaret

From bthompso@bsmg.com Wed Aug 19 06:37:45 1998
Received: from bjke.com (firewall-user@ganymede.bjke.com [144.210.8.38]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id GAA16585 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 06:37:44 -0700 (PDT)
From: bthompso@bsmg.com
Received: by bjke.com; id IAA28286; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 08:37:42 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com(144.210.140.12) by gauntlet.bjke.com via smap (4.1)
    id xma028172; Wed, 19 Aug 98 08:37:32 -0500
Received: by eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
    id <RF6D8J6Q>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:35:06 -0400
Message-ID: <24C3CEDAD424D11191BD00805F0D6C4DD70405@eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Apologies
Date: Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:35:06 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
My apologies to the NET for replying to the list when my previous post should have been directed to one person.

YIKES!

> From Silberstein_A@BLS.GOV Wed Aug 19 06:49:21 1998
> Received: from blsmail.bls.gov (dcgate.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])
>         by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
>         id GAA18029 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 06:49:20 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from psbmail3.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.25]) by mailgate.bls.gov (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
>         id AA04586; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:45:47 -0400
> Received: by PSBMAIL3 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
>         id <Q97WVJ6D>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:48:25 -0400
> Message-Id: <8119A6330C0CD0119F9A00805F38C2098DA742@psbmail2>
> From: Silberstein_A <Silberstein_A@BLS.GOV>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: Spanish-only questionnaires
> Date: Wed, 19 Aug 1998 09:51:29 -0400
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
> Content-Type: text/plain

Monica
can respondents tell between "somewhat" and "slightly"?

> ---------
> From: sgoold@mail.unm.edu[SMTP:sgoold@mail.unm.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 1998 10:57 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Spanish-only questionnaires
>
> I have a question for the experts in Hispanic (Spanish-speaking only)
> questionnaire development. The research group I am working with has
> found preliminary evidence suggesting that Spanish-speaking
> respondents may be inclined to overrate or inflate perceptions on
> Likert type scales when compared to English-speaking respondents.
>
> Is there more formal research on this topic? Also, for those of you
> who work in this area, are there other methods of designing the
> questionnaire to compensate or correct for these biases (if present)?

> For example, in a questionnaire that attempts to access perceptions,
> the research group traditionally uses the following scale:
> Agree Completely, Agree Somewhat, Agree Slightly, Disagree
> Slightly,
> Disagree Somewhat,
> or Disagree Completely.
They have found evidence that the Spanish-speaking respondents are significantly more likely to select options near the endpoints.

Thanks in advance and please reply directly. I will be happy to supply AAPOR with a summary report.

Scott

-=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*
Scott Goold, PhD (abd)
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
sgoold@unm.edu
Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"
-=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*

Since I don't know if my first apology note went through I am once again sending my apologies to the entire AAPOR list for accidentally sending personal correspondence to the list.

I am usually more careful, believe it or not. Sorry for the inconvenience.
Yikes, I am really sorry. I was sure I had inputted Bill's personal address but, obviously, I had directed my message to aapornet instead. That's what I get for trying to take care of my email during plane travel. Again, I am really sorry for bothering everyone with my carelessness.

Margaret Roller
Roller Marketing Research

Hello. I have just received a demo version of Inquisite, a software application for designing and administering surveys via internet/intranet, email, LAN/WAN, and diskette. It is a product of Catapult Systems, Austin, TX.

Is there anyone out there who has used this software and can provide any information as to how well it has worked for you?
Do any of you know of other similar products with which I can compare Inquisite?

Thanks!

John P. Nordbo, Office of Organizational Development Services Wisconsin Department of Transportation jnordbo@mail.state.wi.us 608.245.1095

I am forwarding the following message for John Kovar, the chair of the organizing committee for the next International Conference on Establishment Surveys, being held in June 2000 in Buffalo, NY. Please send all replies to John Kovar at kovar@statcan.ca.

--------------
From:      John Kovar[SMTP:kovar@STATCAN.CA]
Sent:      Wednesday, August 19, 1998 11:40 AM
Subject:   International Conference on Establishment Surveys II

I would like to bring to your attention the following Invited Paper Session Competition. PLEASE REPLY DIRECTLY TO JOHN KOVAR at kovar@statcan.ca Your help in distributing this announcement would be greatly appreciated.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ESTABLISHMENT SURVEYS - II
Survey Methods for Businesses, Farms, and Institutions
June, 2000 - Buffalo, New York

>From BCox@Mathematica-Mpr.com Wed Aug 19 14:14:30 1998
Received: from relay1.smtp.psi.net (relay1.smtp.psi.net [38.8.14.2])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA23225 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 14:14:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [38.233.146.17] (helo=mpr5.MATHINC)
   by relay1.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
   for aapornet@usc.edu
   id 0z9FYc-0003yc-00; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 17:14:14 -0400
Received: by mpr5.MATHINC with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63)
   id <01BDCB95.58EDB160@mpr5.MATHINC>; Wed, 19 Aug 1998 17:18:13 -0400
Message-ID: <c=US%a=_%p=Mathinc%l=MATH3-980819211701Z-29043@mpr5.MATHINC>
From: Brenda Cox <BCox@Mathematica-Mpr.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "'John Kovar'" <kovar@statcan.ca>
Subject: International Conference on Establishment Surveys II
Date: Wed, 19 Aug 1998 17:17:01 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63

I am forwarding the following message for John Kovar, the chair of the organizing committee for the next International Conference on Establishment Surveys, being held in June 2000 in Buffalo, NY. Please send all replies to John Kovar at kovar@statcan.ca.

---------
INVITED PAPER SESSION COMPETITION

Deadline for proposals: December 1, 1998

BACKGROUND AND GOALS

A second International Conference on Establishment Surveys (ICES-II) is being planned for June, 2000, in Buffalo, New York. The first ICES held in Buffalo in June, 1993 convened more than 400 experts in the area of business, agriculture and institutional surveys. The monograph papers were published by J. Wiley in 1995 in a volume entitled Business Survey Methods, edited by B. Cox et al. Since the first ICES, many new techniques have been implemented by practitioners around the globe. The first conference set the stage by formally documenting the state of the art at that time. With the new millennium upon us, it is time for a forward look at methods for surveying businesses, farms, and institutions. Both invited as well as contributed sessions are planned, in addition to workshops and software demonstrations.

At this time, the conference organizing committee is seeking proposals for the invited sessions. The sessions will be selected through a competitive process, with the aim of producing a balanced program. A call for contributed papers will follow at a later date.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INVITED SESSIONS

The ideal invited session will bring together both theory and practice on any of the topics listed below. Empirical work and evaluation studies are of particular interest. The focus must be on surveys of establishments, with evident links to the subject. In addition to proposals addressing the new millennium theme, the committee will give full consideration to all business survey related proposals. A hardcover, unedited, proceedings volume of the invited papers will be produced after the conference. The organizing committee is seeking funding to be able to partially subsidize those invited authors that may need some support.

LIST OF POTENTIAL TOPICS

Registers and Frames: profiling, classification, maintenance, evaluation, demographics of enterprises, coping with frame errors

Survey Design and Sampling: respondent burden, panel surveys, longitudinal surveys, area sampling, robustness over time, sample rotation, multi-phase-sampling, coordinating samples between surveys

Data collection: response rates, costs, electronic data reporting, questionnaire design, cognitive aspects, measurement errors, re-interview/evaluation
Data processing: editing, macro editing, imputation, data warehousing, cost benefit analyses, automated systems
Estimation: small area methods, Bayesian methods, mass imputation, variance estimation, outliers
Dissemination: presentation, disclosure control, on site facilities for micro-data research, remote access, web publishing, technology, public use files, data sharing, output quality indicators

Sector Specific Issues: surveys of health-care facilities, nursing homes, hospitals, schools and correctional and other institutions, agriculture surveys, education surveys, production of price indexes
Cross cutting issues: data warehousing, survey integration, derived products, meta analysis, administrative data use, time series methods, impact of deregulated industries, international comparisons, data quality measurement and evaluation

HOW TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS

Invited sessions will have four slots of 25 minutes each. Ideally, these would be used for three 25-minutes presentations, followed by a 15-minute formal discussion (invited discussant) and a 10-minute floor discussion. Special formats will be considered (e.g. four 25-minute talks, case study sessions, a panel discussion with three or four panelists using about half the allocated time followed by a floor discussion, etc.). The allocation of special-format invited sessions will be limited and thus the standard format is recommended. A 300 word description of the session and its format, and a list of possible speakers with preliminary paper topics and titles should be submitted to John Kovar organizing committee chair, at kovar@statcan.ca. Questions related to the submissions can be addressed in the same manner. The winners of the competition will be notified in the spring of 1999.

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:

John G. Kovar, Chair, Statistics Canada, 3-A, R.H. Coats Bldg., 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6 kovar@statcan.ca (613) 951-8615 (voice), (613) 951-5711 (fax)

David Archer, Statistics New Zealand

Silvia Biffignandi, Universita degli studi di Bergamo, Italia

David Binder, Statistics Canada

Patrick J. Cantwell, U.S. Bureau of the Census
Dear Fellow AAPORneters:

With a nod to Paul Lavarkas's comments earlier about poll results, does ANYONE have the Clinton numbers on reactions to his speech broken down by approval ratings, party id, etc. It would seem that if those who accepted his speech were the same ones who approved of him earlier, then it would just confirm what pollsters have been saying all along-- that people made up their minds about Clinton long ago, especially regarding this scandal, and nothing has really changed much in the past seven months. Does anyone have any data or comments? I think all of us would like to see data, but if you wish, you can post it directly to me.

Thanks.

Frank Rusciano
I'd like to strongly second Frank's timely request. I'd also like to encourage all our colleagues at news media organizations to encourage their reporters and editors to show opinion broken out by party affiliation so as to help illuminate some of the dynamics underlying the public reactions.

P.S. If you didn't see it, former AAPOR-president, Andy Kohut, had a very nice op ed piece in Monday's NYT warning the media and public alike to be careful in interpreting the public's immediate reactions to Clinton's problems as operationalized by poll data.

At 11:37 PM 8/19/98 -0400, you wrote:
> Dear Fellow AAPORneters:
>
> With a nod to Paul Lavrakas's comments earlier about poll results, does ANYONE have the Clinton numbers on reactions to his speech broken down by approval ratings, party id, etc. It would seem that if those who accepted his speech were the same ones who approved of him earlier, then it would just confirm what pollsters have been saying all along--that people made up their minds about Clinton long ago, especially regarding this scandal, and nothing has really changed much in the past seven months. Does anyone have any data or comments? I think all of us would like to see data, but if you wish, you can post it directly to me.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Frank Rusciano
> Rider University
As a bemused Canadian observer of this whole Clinton Lewinsky issue, I find the gender gap in reaction to the "scandal" very interesting. We know from the polls that women are about 20% more likely than men to forgive Clinton for his indiscretions and move on and that his approval ratings are also that much higher among women.

This is interesting because in all of the social values research my company (Environics) has conducted in both Canada and the United States, we have consistently found that men are much more tolerant than women of sexual permissiveness, affairs, pornography, sex between unmarried people etc... Men are also much more likely than women to be sceptical of charges of sexual harassment etc... We also know that men are infinitely more likely than women to engage in most of this type of behaviour. Therefore, one would almost expect the gender gap on Clinton to be in the opposite direction with women being much more outraged than men!!

Two possible explanations come to mind. One, this whole issue is really 100% political and so people who liked Clinton to begin with are quick to forgive him, while those who did not like him to begin with are less forgiving. We all know that Bill Clinton has always been more popular among
women than among men. The second hypothesis is more Freudian. Perhaps many American men would be only two happy to be carrying on with a 20 year old intern, they are jealous of Clinton and they project their own feelings of envy and guilt over their own lusts into a condemnation of Clinton's "character".

Any other theories?

>From lc262@columbia.edu Thu Aug 20 07:23:32 1998
Received: from mailrelay1.cc.columbia.edu (cu41754@mailrelay1.cc.columbia.edu [128.59.35.143])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA00693 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Aug 1998 07:23:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from 817-comp1.ssw.columbia.edu (surcent-admin.ssw.columbia.edu [128.59.204.80])
   by mailrelay1.cc.columbia.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA11808;
   Thu, 20 Aug 1998 10:23:30 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19980820102229.0068b558@pop.cc.columbia.edu>
X-Sender: lc262@pop.cc.columbia.edu
Date: Thu, 20 Aug 1998 10:22:29 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu, mwood@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu, ronirosner@aol.com
From: Lee Chung <lc262@columbia.edu>
Subject: position announcement
Cc: ig3@columbia.edu, sb5@columbia.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Would you please post? Thank you.

********************************************************************************
Position Announcement: Field/Data Manager

Social Indicators Survey Center
Columbia University School of Social Work
622 West 113th Street
New York, NY 10025
Director: Irv Garfinkel

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

Duties: Assist with initial training of interviewers and supervisors; provide on-going training and guidance to interviewers/supervisors; supervise, monitor, and evaluate interviewers/supervisors.

Monitor data collection and process administrative data/documentation in order to track interviewer productivity, case dispositions, data quality, and response rates.
Specifically: Prepare and process shift documentation; Manage cases and analyze/review data through CATI system; Present/report administrative data

Post data collection duties include formatting/outputting and cleaning data.

****

The position is for one year but likely to become permanent. Pay is commensurate with experience. The Field/Data Manager will eventually be reporting directly to the Project Director who will be hired late 1998 or early 1999.

Applicants should have experience with CATI systems and field management.

****

To send resumes and make inquiries contact:
Lee Chung
CUSSW
622 West 113th Street
New York, NY 10025
212/854-5217 (phone)
212/854-2975 (fax)
lc262@columbia.edu

Am I the only one who is getting a double copy of every email that goes out?

**********************************************
* Alice Robbin *
* School of Information Studies *
There was a Zogby poll whose results were published in the Hotline either Wednesday or Thursday that breaks down responses by party id and gender.

Jeff Gulati
Survey Methodologist
Institutional Assessment and Studies
University of Virginia
gjg2h@Virginia.edu

On Wed, 19 Aug 1998 23:37:02 -0400 (EDT) rusciano@enigma.rider.edu wrote:

> Dear Fellow AAPORneters:
> 
> With a nod to Paul Lavarkas's comments earlier about poll results,
> does ANYONE have the Clinton numbers on reactions to his speech broken
down by approval ratings, party id, etc. It would seem that if those
who accepted his speech were the same ones who approved of him
earlier, then it would just confirm what pollsters have been saying
all along-- that people made up their minds about Clinton long ago,
especially regarding this scandal, and nothing has really changed much
in the past seven months. Does anyone have any data or comments? I
think all of us would like to see data, but if you wish, you can post
it directly to me.

Thanks.

Frank Rusciano
Rider University
email at rusciano@enigma.rider.edu

Jeff Gulati
Institutional Assessment and Studies

See the NYtimes article at:

--
Leo G. Simonetta leos@christa.unh.edu
UNH Survey Center
This is in reference to that NYtimes article I posted the site for earlier.

The more I thought about it the more it bothered me. Does anyone want to explain to me why they think such an innocuous change in wording brought about such a large swing in response?

Monday
"Now thinking about Bill Clinton as a person, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of him?"
40 percent favorable
48 percent unfavorable

Tuesday
"Now I'd like to get your opinion about some people in the news. As I read the name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of this person."
55 percent favorable
42 percent unfavorable

--
Leo G. Simonetta
leos@christa.unh.edu
UNH Survey Center
Do they have a web site and if so could you tell us what it is???

Many thanks!

At 11:41 AM 8/20/98 -0400, you wrote:
> There was a Zogby poll whose results were published in the
> Hotline either Wednesday or Thursday that breaks down
> responses by party id and gender.
> 
> Jeff Gulati
> Survey Methodologist
> Institutional Assessment and Studies
> University of Virginia
> gjg2h@Virginia.edu
> 
> 
> dick halpern, rshalpern@mindspring.com, Oxford study abroad program.
> From arumi@ppic.org Thu Aug 20 13:37:12 1998
Received: from [205.180.168.1] (ppic.org [205.180.168.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id NAA26358 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Aug 1998 13:37:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from eureka.ppic.org by [205.180.168.1]
    via smtpd (for usc-e0.usc.edu [128.125.1.45]) with SMTP; 20 Aug
1997 20:41:53 UT
Received: by eureka.ppic.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
    id <39A9PMTX>; Thu, 20 Aug 1998 13:39:35 -0700
Message-ID: <21358730B6BED011BDD500609714992248818C@eureka.ppic.org>
From: Ana Maria Arumi <arumi@ppic.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Change in question text on Clinton
Date: Thu, 20 Aug 1998 13:39:25 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

It's a much more personal / personalized opinion with think of " Bill
Clinton as a person" than the other, what is your which is more of a general
read of "your opinion". The first invites moral judgement by attempting to
remove him from the political context and focussing on his "personhood".
The Hotline can be found on the National Journal's web site: http://www.nationaljournal.com/. When here, go to the Cloakroom. It is for member's only, but I received a free trial membership.

Anyway, it was not the Zogby poll that presented the results by party id as I earlier said; it was the CNN/Time poll. I'll append the results below.

Jeff

==========================================
Copyright 1998 by National Journal Group Inc.

CNN/TIME:

Clinton, Lewinsky, Starr
Conducted 8/18; surveyed 1,042 adults; margin of error +/- 3.5% (release, 8/19).

How well do you think things are going in the country these days?

Very/Fairly Well 77% 67% 67% 67% 69% 76%

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the
way President Clinton is handling his job as President?

All Men Wom GOP Ind Dem 6/98 4/98 2/98
Approve 61% 59% 63% 34% 61% 62% 67% 66%
Disapprove 35 36 34 62 36 14 31 28 28

Next I'm going to read you the names of some political leaders in the news today. Please tell me whether you have generally favorable or generally unfavorable impressions of each.

Bill Clinton

51% 53% 56% 61% 58% 58% 60%
Unfavorable 44 38 38 34 37 36 36

Monica Lewinsky

15% 12% 12% 15% 7%
Unfavorable 65 66 69 56 48

Ken Starr

30% 24% 22% 22% 18% 21%
Unfavorable 48 50 51 42 33 29

Al Gore

50% 55% 55% 49% 56% 59% 54%
Unfavorable 27 28 29 31 28 24 27

Hillary Rodham Clinton

Favorable All 3/98 2/98 1/98 3/97 12/96 10/96
60% 60% 60% 54% 51% 53% 51%
Unfavorable 30 31 30 35 38 37 39

Regardless of how you feel about his political views, would you say you respect Clinton, or don't you feel that way?

All Men Wom GOP Ind Dem
Respect 48% 52% 45% 25% 43% 69%
Do not respect 50 47 53 73 54 30

Based on what you have read or heard, do you believe that President Clinton should be impeached and removed from office, or don't you feel that way?
As you may know, in a speech on television last night, Bill Clinton admitted to having an inappropriate relationship with Monica Lewinsky, but said he regretted misleading people about it. In general are you satisfied with what Clinton said?

Do you think Bill Clinton went far enough or not far enough in explaining his relationship with Monica Lewinsky?

In his speech, Bill Clinton said he regretted misleading people, but did not explicitly say he was sorry. Do you think Clinton should have used the words "I'm sorry" or "I apologize," or don't you think so?

Do you believe or not believe Clinton when he said he:

Didn't ask anyone to lie

Didn't ask anyone to hide or destroy evidence

His testimony in the Paula Jones case was legally accurate
Believe 33% 37% 30% 19% 32% 45%
Not believe 49 49 50 68 51 36

In your opinion, was it appropriate or inappropriate for Bill Clinton to criticize Independent Counsel Ken Starr's investigation in his speech?

All Men Wom GOP Ind Dem
Appropriate 38% 43% 33% 18% 36% 54%
Inappropriate 54 51 57 77 54 39

Do you think President Clinton has adequately taken personal responsibility for his actions, or don't you feel that way?

All Men Wom GOP Ind Dem
Yes, has 44% 47% 42% 22% 43% 63%
No, has not 50 47 51 74 51 32

Do you think Clinton's sexual relationship with Monica Lewinksy is a private matter between Clinton and his family, or do you think this is a legal matter that should be explored further in public?

All Men Wom GOP Ind Dem
Private matter 69% 68% 70% 47% 71% 84%
Legal matter 27 29 25 48 26 13

Which do you favor -- ending completely the Independent Counsel's investigation of President Clinton's sexual behavior, or continuing to investigate whether President Clinton lied under oath or covered up evidence?

All GOP Ind Dem
End investigation 58% 35% 58% 75%
Continue investigation 39 63 17 22

Do you think the news media has acted responsibly or irresponsibly in its coverage of the allegations against Bill Clinton?

All GOP Ind Dem
Responsibly 47% 52% 49% 41%
Irresponsibly 45 40 44 51

Do you think the grand jury investigation has diminished Bill Clinton's effectiveness as
President, or don’t you think so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All GOP</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think Americans hold public figures to moral standards that are too high or moral standards are not high enough?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All GOP</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not high enough</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you may know, the independent counsel law will expire next year. This will affect future independent counsels, not investigations in progress, such as that of Ken Starr. In your opinion, should Congress renew this law as it stands now, revise the law to reduce the authority of the independent counsel, or should Congress eliminate the position of the independent counsel completely?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All GOP</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should renew as it stands</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should renew, reduce authority</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should eliminate position</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you may know, in a brief statement in January, Bill Clinton said that he did not have sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky. Do you believe Bill Clinton thought he was telling the truth when he said this, or don’t you think so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Men</th>
<th>Wom</th>
<th>GOP</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in January, Hillary Clinton denied that her husband had sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky. Do you believe that Hillary thought she was telling the truth when she said this, or don’t you think so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Men</th>
<th>Wom</th>
<th>GOP</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now I'd like you to think about the election for President in the year 2000. If a candidate running for President had an extramarital affair in the past, would you consider voting for that candidate, or wouldn't you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Wom</th>
<th>GOP</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Asked of women only) If you were about to go on a vacation with your husband and he had just admitted having sex with a 21-year-old intern, would you still go on vacation with him?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOX NEWS:
Clinton, Lewinsky, Starr

On Thu, 20 Aug 1998 20:52:16 +0100 Richard Halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com> wrote:

> Do they have a web site and if so could you tell us what it is???
> Many thanks!
> At 11:41 AM 8/20/98 -0400, you wrote:
> There was a Zogby poll whose results were published in the Hotline either Wednesday or Thursday that breaks down responses by party id and gender.
> >Jeff Gulati
> >Survey Methodologist
> >Institutional Assessment and Studies
> >University of Virginia
> >gjg2h@Virginia.edu
> dick halpern, rshalpern@mindspring.com, Oxford study abroad program.

Jeff Gulati
Institutional Assessment and Studies
Leo,

The two questions are not comparable. The first asks to rate Clinton as a "person" the second just asks people to rate individuals, no designation as to with respect to what aspect of that individual, i.e. as president, or in terms of performance etc. The first question really should have evoked considerations of personal qualities (like honesty, truthfulness, etc.) that have been problems for Clinton, hence the lower approval.

Arthur Miller

At 03:39 PM 8/20/98 -0400, you wrote:
> This is in reference to that NYtimes article I posted the site for earlier.
>
> The more I thought about it the more it bothered me. Does anyone want to explain to me why they think such an innocuous change in wording brought about such a large swing in response?
>
> Monday
> "Now thinking about Bill Clinton as a person, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of him?" 40 percent favorable
> 48 percent unfavorable
>
> Tuesday
> "Now I'd like to get your opinion about some people in the news. As I read the name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of this person." 55 percent favorable
> 42 percent unfavorable
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta leos@christa.unh.edu
> UNH Survey Center
The CBS/NYT poll routinely releases results by party ID.

CBS NEWS/NEW YORK TIMES POLL
Reaction One Day After President's Statement
August 18, 1998

7. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bill Clinton is handling his job as President?
   **** Party ID ****   Same Respondents
   Total   Rep   Dem   Ind   8/11-13
   %       %     %     %     %
Approve   71     42    89    73    67
Disapprove 27     56    10    23    25
DK/NA     2      2     1     4     8

9. Is your opinion of Bill Clinton favorable, not favorable, undecided, or haven't you heard enough about Bill Clinton yet to have an opinion?

Favorable  46     17    69    44    48
Unfavorable 37     72    11    37    34
Undecided  14      8    16    17    16
Haven't heard enough  2      3    3     1     1
Refused    1      0     1     1     1

10. Do you think Bill Clinton shares the moral values most Americans try to live by or doesn't he?
11. Who do you blame MORE for CREATING the current situation surrounding the investigation into Bill Clinton's relationship with Monica Lewinsky - Bill Clinton himself, or his political enemies?

- Bill Clinton: 48 77 28 46 39
- Political enemies: 44 19 63 43 51
- Both (Vol.): 4 2 4 5 n/a
- Media (Vol.): 1 1 1 2 n/a
- DK/NA: 3 1 4 4 10

12. Who do you blame MORE for PROLONGING the current situation - Bill Clinton himself, or his political enemies?

- Bill Clinton: 51 73 38 48
- Political enemies: 39 22 52 38
- Both (Vol.): 4 2 4 7
- Media (Vol.): 2 0 2 2
- DK/NA: 4 3 4 5

13. Do you think of this whole situation MORE as a private matter having to do with Bill Clinton's personal life, or MORE as a public matter having to do with Bill Clinton's job as President?

- Private/Personal life: 64 34 79 70 66
- Public/Job as president: 31 62 16 25 30
- DK/NA: 5 4 5 5 4

14. Do you find it understandable or not understandable that Bill Clinton did not tell the truth about his relationship with Monica Lewinsky when the allegations were first made in January?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Ind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understandable</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not understandable</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you think Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr is mostly conducting an impartial investigation to find out if anything illegal occurred, or is mostly conducting a partisan investigation to damage Bill Clinton?
Same Respondents  
8/11-13  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impartial</th>
<th>Partisan</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. From what you've heard or read, do you think the claims that Bill Clinton ENCOURAGED MONICA LEWINSKY TO LIE UNDER OATH are probably true, or probably NOT true, or don't you know enough about it yet to say?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Probably true</th>
<th>Probably not true</th>
<th>Don't know enough yet</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If you HAD TO SAY, as of right now, do you LEAN more toward thinking the claims that Bill Clinton ENCOURAGED MONICA LEWINSKY TO LIE UNDER OATH are probably true, or probably not true?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination of Q16 &amp; Q17:</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not true</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. From what you know so far, would you say that the investigation of Bill Clinton's relationship with Monica Lewinsky should be dropped now or should the investigation be continued?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/19-21</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop now</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What about the other Whitewater investigations Kenneth Starr is conducting? Do you think they should be dropped now, or should those investigations be continued?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drop now</th>
<th>Continue</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Did you watch or listen to President Clinton's statement to the public last night after his grand jury testimony?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**** Party ID ****</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. From what you've heard or read, are you satisfied with what President Clinton said in his public statement, or does he need to say more?

Satisfied | 57 | 34 | 73 | 57 |
Needs to say more | 34 | 59 | 19 | 32 |
DK/NA | 9 | 7 | 8 | 11 |

22. Do you think Bill Clinton said what he really believed in his public statement, or do you think he only said what he thinks people wanted to hear?

Believed in statement | 35 | 19 | 45 | 35 |
People want to hear | 52 | 73 | 39 | 51 |
DK/NA | 13 | 8 | 16 | 14 |

23. Now that President Clinton has testified before Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's grand jury and made a public statement, what do you think should happen? 1. Clinton should resign, OR 2. Congress should begin impeachment proceedings, OR 3. The matter should be dropped?

Speech Reaction
8/17
Resign | 18 | 33 | 5 | 18 | 18 |
Impeach | 9 | 17 | 3 | 9 | 12 |
Drop the matter | 66 | 37 | 86 | 68 | 63 |
DK/NA | 7 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 7 |

24. IF it turns out that President Clinton obstructed justice by lying under oath, or by encouraging Monica Lewinsky to lie under oath, what do you think should happen? 1. Clinton should admit his mistakes and apologize, OR 2. He should resign, OR 3. Congress should begin impeachment proceedings, OR 4. The matter should be dropped?

Same Respondents
8/11-13
Apologize | 23 | 11 | 30 | 24 | 48 |
Resign | 33 | 50 | 19 | 35 | 15 |
Impeach | 17 | 32 | 9 | 14 | 11 |
Drop the matter | 24 | 7 | 37 | 23 | 21 |
DK/NA | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 |

Unweighted | Weighted
Total Number of Respondents | 509
"People in the news" strikes me as about the same as "list of names" while opinion of Clinton "as a person" suggests in distinction to other ways of thinking of him, e.g. as President, as politician, as statesman. While Clinton clearly IS a husband as well as those other things, I would expect different answers for each of them, especially granted the distinction HE has been drawing between his (allegedly irrelevant) personal characteristics and his record as leader.
I have seen many inquiries on this list serve about the pros and cons of the different CATI softwares and am adding one more to the pot. Specifically, we are using the Sawtooth Ci3/CATI DOS version still and are interested in upgrading to the newly released Sawtooth Windows version. Does anyone have experience with this, and if so, what are the pros and cons of such? Thanks!

Teri Nelson Research Operations Manager Social Research Laboratory Northern Arizona University PO Box 15301 Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5301 (520)523-1515 (520)523-6654 Fax Teri.Nelson@nau.edu

Susan Pinkus LA Times Poll

On Thu, 20 Aug 1998, Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote:

> I'd like to strongly second Frank's timely request. I'd also like to
> encourage all our colleagues at news media organizations to encourage
their reporters and editors to show opinion broken out by party affiliation so as to help illuminate some of the dynamics underlying the public reactions.

P.S. If you didn't see it, former AAPOR-president, Andy Kohut, had a very nice op ed piece in Monday's NYT warning the media and public alike to be careful in interpreting the public's immediate reactions to Clinton's problems as operationalized by poll data.

At 11:37 PM 8/19/98 -0400, you wrote:
> Dear Fellow AAPORneters:
> 
> With a nod to Paul Lavrakas's