
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: August 2000 archive - one BIG message

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 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 log0008.
Part 1/1, total size 939901 bytes:
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jul 31 12:51:33 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA24242 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 12:51:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA07852 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 12:51:33 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 12:51:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: AP: Convention Coverage All Over Web (7 Major Sites Listed)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0007311250050.17859-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(C) Copyright 2000 The Associated Press

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/
aponline/20000731/aponline011143_000.htm](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/aponline/20000731/aponline011143_000.htm)

Monday, July 31, 2000; 1:11 a.m. EDT

Convention Coverage All Over Web

By Anick Jesdanun, AP Internet Writer

AUSTIN, Texas -- George W. Bush loyalists and other political junkies with Internet hookups can log on for a flavor of this week's Republican National Convention in Philadelphia.

Scores of news organizations -- from veteran ABC News to newcomer Pseudo -- want to fill a void created as TV networks scale back coverage.

Web sites will let visitors choose a vantage point for video and decide whether to hear speeches uninterrupted or with commentary. Unlike the TV networks, many sites are Webcasting the conventions live, gavel to gavel. Some are adding such interactive features as chat rooms.

Among the highlights:

-- Pseudo, at <http://Pseudopolitics.com>, lets viewers control 360-degree cameras by clicking a mouse to pan up or down, left or right. The site is offering commentary all week from a skybox.

-- America Online, at <http://aol.com>, compares candidates on the issues. Visitors can replay speeches they missed. Through chat rooms, viewers can shape discussions during AOL's nightly pre-convention coverage, which begins at 6 p.m.

-- ABC's Sam Donaldson hosts a Web-only show nightly at 7:30 p.m. and leads a live chat at 11 p.m., at <http://abcnews.go.com>.

-- MSNBC, at <http://decision2000.msnbc.com>, offers news articles, commentary and video feeds. A Web show, *PoliticsOnly*, appears at 1 p.m. and 7 p.m. daily. At <http://speakout.msnbc.com>, the site will try to measure what viewers like or dislike about each speech.

-- Philadelphia's daily newspapers offer coverage at <http://gop2000.philly.com>.

Or check <http://gopconvention.com> for information straight from the Republican Party.

Web sites plan similar coverage of the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles.

Although dot-coms had a limited convention presence four years ago, today's technology is much better.

Who'll be watching this week? Likely the tech-savvy already interested in politics, media analysts say.

Unclear is how much impact the dot-coms will have in shaping politics and sparking the interest of potential voters. After all, most Americans still get their news primarily from TV.

"I think the Internet is on its way to becoming an important campaign tool, but I don't think it is there yet," said William L. Benoit, a communications

professor at University of Missouri.

A Pseudo executive, Jeanne Meyer, calls this year a dry run for covering conventions four, eight, even 12 years down the road. By then, she said, the technology should be better and easier for a mainstream audience to use.

Even the fastest computers will need special software, or plug-in, to view Pseudo's 360-degree cameras. Such software can be cumbersome for computer novices to install. The cameras and other video feeds might not work well -- or at all -- on older computers.

Bush supporter Natalie Shafer, 28, of Austin, plans to stick with highlights on television.

"Being able to watch live video (on the Internet) is advantageous -- if you have the time to sit down to do it."

(C) Copyright 2000 The Associated Press

>From BDumont@apcoassoc.com Mon Jul 31 12:54:48 2000
Received: from apco_dc_xchange.apcoassoc.com (smtp.apcoassoc.com [12.40.161.66])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA26188 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 12:54:47 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by apcoassoc.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21) id <P007YLG6>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 15:52:04 -0400
Message-ID: <0189724583D8D111A72D00805F85C1D0023F0BBF@apcoassoc.com>
From: "Dumont, Bryan" <BDumont@apcoassoc.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 15:52:02 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01BFFB28.CC054740"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----=_NextPart_001_01BFFB28.CC054740
Content-Type: text/plain

This kind of gossip-mongering is totally inappropriate for AAPOR-net. Please keep personal feelings toward Mr. Lutz to yourself.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Ross, Robert [SMTP:rross@csuchico.edu]
> Sent: Monday, July 31, 2000 3:45 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
>

> Since Frank Lutz is again a subject for AAPORNET, I thought I might
> add a personal touch. I taught with Lutz about 10 years ago in a
> summer program held at Georgetown for outstanding high school
> students. He had just returned from England and was a real ball of
> energy, quite excited about being in the classroom. He related quite
> well with his students, but not so
> well with his colleagues, with whom he shared very little. For example,
> when I found out that he had done some polling in New York, I tried on
> several occasions to talk with him about it, but I couldn't get any
> answers
> from him--he wouldn't even tell me the supplier of his telephone numbers.
> But my favorite Frank Lutz story had to do with a bet he made with his
> students. It seems the class was talking about drugs and their
> availability. Frank said he could score within 15 minutes of leaving the
> Georgetown campus and his students took him up on the bet. So Frank
> cruised
> the neighborhood with a carload of students from his class--and he won!
> Needless to say, the program administrators were horrified when they found
> out about it.

>
> Robert S. Ross
> Professor and Chair
> Department of Political Science
> California State University, Chico

>
> > -----
> > From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
> > Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Sent: Monday, July 31, 2000 11:55 AM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

> >
> > The Lutz focus group is nothing more than PR for Lutz. His claim
> > for
> > the
> > first
> > "study" of independent voters, and his rank audacity in giving UPI
> > a tally on the vote for president by 25 non-representative
> > Republican young voters, is
> > outrageous! I know it is difficult for AAPOR to respond to this
> > violation
> > of
> > basic opinion polling principles (and, incidently, erroneous use of
> > focus
> > groups), but I would love to hear some ideas. For now, we can thank
> > Jim for bringing this to our attention. Perhaps AAPOR should once
> > again release its
> > condemnation of one of Lutz's previous violations. If ever we needed
> > sanctions,
> > now is the time for it.

> >
> > Best,
> >
> > Sid
> >

> >
> >

----- _ = NextPart_001_01BFFB28.CC054740
Content-Type: text/html
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Dus-ascii"> <META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server
version = 5.5.2650.12">
<TITLE>RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney</TITLE>
</HEAD> <BODY>
```

```
<P><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF" SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">This kind of =
gossip-mongering is totally inappropriate for AAPOR-net. Please keep =
personal feelings toward Mr. Luntz to yourself.</FONT></P> <UL> <P><FONT
SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">-----Original Message-----</FONT> <BR><B><FONT
SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">From:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT = SIZE=3D1
FACE=3D"Arial">Ross, Robert [SMTP:rross@csuchico.edu]</FONT> <BR><B><FONT
SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Sent:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT = SIZE=3D1
FACE=3D"Arial">Monday, July 31, 2000 3:45 PM</FONT> <BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 =
FACE=3D"Arial">To:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT SIZE=3D1 =
FACE=3D"Arial">'aapornet@usc.edu'</FONT>
<BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 =
FACE=3D"Arial">Subject:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT>=
</B> <FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises =
Concerns About Cheney</FONT> </P>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Since Frank Luntz is again a subject = for
AAPORNET, I thought I might add a</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2
FACE=3D"Arial">personal touch.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; I taught with = Luntz about 10 years
ago in a summer program</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">held at
Georgetown for outstanding = high school students.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; He had just</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">returned from England and was a real =
ball of energy, quite excited about</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2
FACE=3D"Arial">being in the classroom.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; He = related quite well with
his students, but not so</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">well with
his colleagues, with whom = he shared very little.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; For example,</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">when I found out that he had done = some
polling in New York, I tried on</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2
FACE=3D"Arial">several occasions to talk with him = about it, but I couldn't
get any answers</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">from him--he
wouldn't even tell me = the supplier of his telephone numbers.</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">But my favorite Frank Luntz story had = to
do with a bet he made with his</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2
FACE=3D"Arial">students.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; It seems the class = was talking about drugs
and their</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">availability.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Frank
said he = could score within 15 minutes of leaving the</FONT> <BR><FONT
SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Georgetown campus and his students = took him up on
the bet.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; So Frank cruised</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">the
neighborhood with a carload of = students from his class--and he won!</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Needless to say, the program =
administrators were horrified when they found</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2
FACE=3D"Arial">out about it.</FONT> </P>
```


Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAENNCJAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
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
In-Reply-To: <8525692D.006A0ACE.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>

Frank Luntz is generally respected within Republican circles because he has provided useful insights to those he works with. He can be dynamic and innovative, and people enjoying watching him work. He doesn't put his viewers to sleep. In these latest focus groups, he found something that is NOT particularly good news for the Republican Party. I suspect this is what made it a bit interesting and perhaps news worthy. Why is it important for AAPOR to remind reporters that focus groups, including those by Luntz, are not representative? This is not news. And the article states this fact clearly-yet, the reporter chose to run the story anyway (Is this worse than interviewing 6-8 people and writing a whole article around these sources?).

Is there any quantitative data on the same subject? Bush campaign spokesman Dan Bartlett is probably right when he says "The voters will decide based on "Gov. Bush and his ideas and his agenda"... mark

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Bill Thompson
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2000 3:18 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

How about a letter to UPI and major newspapers from AAPOR leadership explaining why FG's are not representative and why Frank should be ignored?

This just goes to show Luntz really is just a "media-whore". He'll do anything to get his mug in the paper.

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Mon Jul 31 13:11:17 2000
Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
 by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
 id NAA05513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 13:11:03 -0700
 (PDT)
Received: from default (mxusw5x82.chesco.com [209.195.228.82])
 by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id e6VKAx214864
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 16:11:00 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <003a01bffb2b\$434abc00\$25e4c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 16:09:39 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

I think you've just proved that he was correct in not talking about much of anything with you.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Ross, Robert <rross@csuchico.edu>
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, July 31, 2000 3:45 PM
Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

>Since Frank Lutz is again a subject for AAPORNET, I thought I might
>add a personal touch. I taught with Lutz about 10 years ago in a
>summer program held at Georgetown for outstanding high school students.
>He had just returned from England and was a real ball of energy, quite
>excited about being in the classroom. He related quite well with his
>students, but not
>so
>well with his colleagues, with whom he shared very little. For
>example, when I found out that he had done some polling in New York, I
>tried on several occasions to talk with him about it, but I couldn't
>get any answers from him--he wouldn't even tell me the supplier of his
>telephone numbers. But my favorite Frank Lutz story had to do with a
>bet he made with his students. It seems the class was talking about
>drugs and their availability. Frank said he could score within 15
>minutes of leaving the Georgetown campus and his students took him up
>on the bet. So Frank
>cruised
>the neighborhood with a carload of students from his class--and he won!
>Needless to say, the program administrators were horrified when they
>found out about it.

>
>Robert S. Ross
>Professor and Chair
>Department of Political Science
>California State University, Chico

>
>> -----
>> From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
>> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
>> Sent: Monday, July 31, 2000 11:55 AM
>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>> Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

>>
>>
>>
>> The Lutz focus group is nothing more than PR for Lutz. His claim for
>> the first "study" of independent voters, and his rank audacity in
>> giving UPI a tally on

>> the vote for president by 25 non-representative Republican young voters,
>> is
>> outrageous! I know it is difficult for AAPOR to respond to this
violation
>> of
>> basic opinion polling principles (and, incidently, erroneous use of
focus
>> groups), but I would love to hear some ideas. For now, we can thank
>> Jim for bringing this to our attention. Perhaps AAPOR should once
>> again release its
>> condemnation of one of Lutz's previous violations. If ever we needed
>> sanctions,
>> now is the time for it.
>>
>> Best,
>>
>> Sid
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Jul 31 13:22:59 2000
Received: from imo-r13.mx.aol.com (imo-r13.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.67])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA11758 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 13:22:58 -0700
(PDT)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
by imo-r13.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.6e.1a4c074 (4400)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 16:22:10 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <6e.1a4c074.26b739f1@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 16:22:09 EDT
Subject: More of the Same
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 118

Mindful of the presence of far more pressing issues for aapor-netters to think about, I continue every so often to monitor AOL's practice of mucking up the name of our organization.

Internet Explorer continues to produce the following in response to "AAPOR" and the longer version of the name. Still, for those of the half-a-loaf-is-better-than-none persuasion, the fourth entry may provide some comfort:

MATCHING SITES (1 - 8 of 8)

The following results are from the World Wide Web and may contain objectionable material that AOL does not endorse.

91% Public Opinion Quarterly Index:
Psychological Warfare .
<http://www.aapor.org/poq/POQINDEX/PSYCHWAR.HTM>

Show me more like this

91% American Association of Public Opinion Resources
Provides guides, standards, definitions, recommended and condemned practices

for public policy survey data collection.

<http://www.aapor.org/main.html>

Show me more like this

89% WorldOpinion - The World's Market Research Web Site Award-winning market research information center with huge directory and classifieds section, latest research news and photos, global calendar of events, reference section, book reviews and more.

<http://www.worldopinion.com/home.taf>

75% Public Opinion Quarterly

Interdisciplinary journal for studies of the role of communication research,

current public opinion, as well as the theories and methods underlying opinion research. Sponsored by the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Tables of content available on-line.

<http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/POQ>

Show me more like this

The Google search engine, in contrast, has done its usual very competent job in carrying out this not-terribly-challenging task:

AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion ResearchRN) www.aapor.org/ - 1k - Cached - Similar pages

The Home Page of American Association for Public

...1999 American Association for Public Opinion...

Description: Provides guides, standards, definitions, recommended and condemned practices for public policy survey...

Category: Science > Social Sciences > Political Science > Data Resources

www.aapor.org/main.html - 6k - Cached - Similar pages

[More results from www.aapor.org]

JSTOR: American Association for Public Opinion

... American Association for Public Opinion...

...INFORMATION: American Association for Public Opinion...

www.jstor.org/journals/aapor.html - 3k - Cached - Similar pages

JSTOR: Public Opinion Quarterly

...the American Association for Public Opinion...

... Research Moving Wall: 5 years Since 1937 Public Opinion...

www.jstor.org/journals/0033362X.html - 4k - Cached - Similar pages

[More results from www.jstor.org]

Yahoo! Social Science > Social Research > Public

...category American Association for Public Opinion... ...Science > Social Research > Public Opinion...

dir.yahoo.com/Social_Science/Social_Research/Public_Opinion_Research/ - 4k -

Cached - Similar pages

Query: do we want to bag any further effort to get AOL to see the error of its ways (about which it may not, in any case, care)?

Phil Harding

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Jul 31 13:58:45 2000

Received: from tisch.mail.mindspring.net (tisch.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.157])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id NAA04448 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 13:58:44 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from w5y0s9.mindspring.com (user-38ld774.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.156.228])

by tisch.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id QAA12974

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 16:58:40 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000731164951.00c0e5c0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2

Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 16:57:00 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

In-Reply-To: <8525692D.006C957F.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="====_20834415==_ .ALT"

====_20834415==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Given Lutz's long term attachment to the Republican party one has to wonder why he would release focus group findings that were so seemingly negative about Cheney. Interesting also that Hillary Clinton and Gore were left standing in his political elimination game. What and whose agenda was he following? (forgetting for the moment whether or not the groups he spoke to were representative of anybody)

Dick Halpern

====_20834415==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

Given Lutz's long term attachment to the Republican party one has to wonder why he would release focus group findings that were so seemingly negative about Cheney. Interesting also that Hillary Clinton and Gore were left standing in his political elimination game. What and whose agenda was he following? (forgetting for the moment whether or not the groups he spoke to were representative of anybody)

 Dick Halpern

 </html>

====_20834415==_ .ALT--

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Mon Jul 31 14:10:16 2000

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA11495 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 14:10:15 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from default (mxusw5x82.chesco.com [209.195.228.82])
by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id e6VLAD227558
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 17:10:13 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <006401bffb33\$864d9b00\$25e4c3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Reply to Comment by Robert Ross

Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 17:08:48 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

I think you've just proved that he was correct in not talking about much of anything with you.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Jul 31 14:44:50 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 ESMTTP
id OAA05055 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 14:44:49 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from w5y0s9.mindspring.com (user-381c5g8.dialup.mindspring.com
[209.86.22.8])
by granger.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id RAA27254
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 17:44:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000731172106.00c1cae0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2

Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2000 17:35:59 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Attitudes toward the death penalty

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="=====
23603313==.ALT"

=====
23603313==.ALT

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Does anyone have -- or can point the way toward -- any up-to-date (more or less) survey findings dealing with attitudes toward the death penalty in various European countries? We'd like to make a comparison with findings from the US.

Please write me directly.

Thanks

Dick Halpern

```
*****
Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
*****
-----_23603313==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"
```

```
<html>
<font size=3>Does anyone have -- or can point the way toward -- any
up-to-date (more or less) survey findings dealing with attitudes toward the
death penalty in various European countries? We'd like to make a comparison
with findings from the US.<br> <br> Please write me directly.<br> <br>
Thanks<br> <br> Dick Halpern<br> </font><br>
```

```
<br>
<font size=1
color="#0000FF">*****
****<br>
Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. <br>
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research <br> Adjunct Professor,
Georgia Institute of Technology <br> 3837 Courtyard Drive <br> Atlanta, GA
30339-4248 <br> rshalpern@mindspring.com <br> phone/fax 770 434 4121 <br>
*****</font></h
tml>
```

```
-----_23603313==_ .ALT--
```

```
>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Tue Aug 1 16:55:03 2000
Received: from smtp.ufl.edu (sp28fe.nerdc.ufl.edu [128.227.128.108])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id QAA02321 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Aug 2000 16:55:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp.ufl.edu (ppp-s250-n118-as2.nerdc.ufl.edu
[128.227.250.118])
by smtp.ufl.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/2.2.1) with ESMTTP id TAA61292
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Aug 2000 19:54:59 -0400
Message-ID: <39876290.C0337DBD@hp.ufl.edu>
Date: Tue, 01 Aug 2000 19:51:43 -0400
From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
```

Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
References: <0189724583D8D111A72D00805F85C1D0023F0BBF@apcoassoc.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> "Dumont, Bryan" wrote:
>
> This kind of gossip-mongering is totally inappropriate for AAPOR-net.
> Please keep personal feelings toward Mr. Luntz to yourself.

I didn't think this was gossip. It's an interesting additional insight into the character of an influential celebrity.

Oh, that's right, I forgot....two years ago I was supposed to learn that character doesn't matter, that private behavior doesn't affect public performance. (Sorry, I never quite bought it.)

One might argue that it was a violation of privacy for Ross to recount this incident in a public forum. But is Luntz entitled to any privacy? He has chosen to make himself a public figure by conducting his career as such a publicity hound.

I didn't even see where there were any "personal feelings" expressed. It was a fairly straightforward recounting of incidents, without any namecalling--about as objective as any news reporter. "Ball of energy"? Hey, you can call me that any time.

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Ross, Robert [SMTP:rross@csuchico.edu]
> Sent: Monday, July 31, 2000 3:45 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About
> Cheney
>
> Since Frank Luntz is again a subject for AAPORNET, I thought I
> might add a
> personal touch. I taught with Luntz about 10 years ago in a
> summer program
> held at Georgetown for outstanding high school students. He had
> just
> returned from England and was a real ball of energy, quite
> excited about
> being in the classroom. He related quite well with his students,
> but not so
> well with his colleagues, with whom he shared very little. For
> example,

> when I found out that he had done some polling in New York, I
> tried on
> several occasions to talk with him about it, but I couldn't get
> any answers
> from him--he wouldn't even tell me the supplier of his telephone
> numbers.
> But my favorite Frank Luntz story had to do with a bet he made
> with his
> students. It seems the class was talking about drugs and their
> availability. Frank said he could score within 15 minutes of
> leaving the
> Georgetown campus and his students took him up on the bet. So
> Frank cruised
> the neighborhood with a carload of students from his class--and
> he won!
> Needless to say, the program administrators were horrified when
> they found
> out about it.

>
> Robert S. Ross
> Professor and Chair
> Department of Political Science
> California State University, Chico

>From JHall@mathematica-mpr.com Wed Aug 2 05:33:15 2000
Received: from mpr1.mathematica-mpr.com ([38.233.146.11])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
id FAA27455 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 05:33:15 -0700
(PDT)

Received: by MPR1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <MDHMF6R>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 08:32:49 -0400

Message-ID: <897E2332A97AD311AE8B00508B116D5401220147@MPR1>
From: John Hall <JHall@mathematica-mpr.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 08:32:48 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

I have deleted the original and replies, since I don't want to republish.
Let me just say that publishing a claim that someone committed a crime could
give that someone a basis for suing the "publisher." I don't think it would
be hard to convince a court that posting to AAPORNET is "publishing."
Whether "truth" could be raised as a defense, or "absence of malice" because
the defamed person is a public figure, I don't know. I would thus hesitate
to post such stories as I saw in the exchange about Lutz et. al. John Hall

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Aug 2 06:03:23 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
id GAA04892 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 06:03:23 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-72.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.72])
by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTMP id JAA09451
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 09:03:16 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39881BE8.1B83DAD6@jwdp.com>
Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 09:02:32 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
References: <897E2332A97AD311AE8B00508B116D5401220147@MPR1>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Nonsense!

First, Frank Lutz is a public figure and makes every effort to be one, which means that it is almost impossible for him to sue for libel.

His only grounds would be if someone were to knowingly post factually false material with the deliberate intent of maliciously harming him, without any evidence of being personal opinion or satire, both of which are protected forms of speech.

Mr. Lutz would have to show that he had the ability to prove: 1) that a story about him was false, and 2) that the poster knew it to be so, before he could even get a court to agree to heard such a suit.

Even then, the courts have ruled in cases involving AOL and Prodigy that in this respect an online service is like a newstand, not a publisher, which means that they cannot be sued for what someone posts in unmmoderated lists or newsgroups.

The only possibility of AAPOR exposure would be if Mr. Lutz were to file suit against an individual for libel under the extremely strict guidelines above, was able to convince a court that his case was strong enough to merit consideration and issue a court order to have the materials be removed from AAPORNET, and if AAPOR then refused to do so.

Jan Werner

John Hall wrote:

>

> I have deleted the original and replies, since I don't want to
>republish. Let me just say that publishing a claim that someone
>committed a crime could give that someone a basis for suing the
>"publisher." I don't think it would be hard to convince a court that
>posting to AAPORNET is "publishing." Whether "truth" could be raised
>as a defense, or "absence of malice" because the defamed person is a
>public figure, I don't know. I would thus hesitate to post such
>stories as I saw in the exchange about Lutz et. al. John Hall
>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Aug 2 07:02:14 2000
Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA25579 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 07:02:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (mxusw5x177.chesco.com [209.195.228.177])
by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id e72E1xm08649;
Wed, 2 Aug 2000 10:02:00 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <000e01bffc8a\$12eef5c0\$b1e4c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 10:00:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
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

Forget the legalistic speculation.

The fact is that the comments ("rank audacity," "my favorite FL story," "media whore") are plainly malicious.

Who's next?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, August 02, 2000 9:05 AM
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

>Nonsense!

>

>First, Frank Lutz is a public figure and makes every effort to be one,
>which means that it is almost impossible for him to sue for libel.

>

>His only grounds would be if someone were to knowingly post factually
>>false material with the deliberate intent of maliciously harming him,
>without any evidence of being personal opinion or satire, both of which
>are protected forms of speech.

>

>Mr. Lutz would have to show that he had the ability to prove: 1) that
>a story about him was false, and 2) that the poster knew it to be so,
>before he could even get a court to agree to heard such a suit.

>

>Even then, the courts have ruled in cases involving AOL and Prodigy
>that in this respect an online service is like a newstand, not a
>publisher, which means that they cannot be sued for what someone posts
>in unmmoderated lists or newsgroups.

>

>The only possibility of AAPOR exposure would be if Mr. Lutz were to
>file suit against an individual for libel under the extremely strict
>guidelines above, was able to convince a court that his case was strong
>enough to merit consideration and issue a court order to have the
>materials be removed from AAPORNET, and if AAPOR then refused to do so.

>

>Jan Werner

>
>

>John Hall wrote:

>>

>> I have deleted the original and replies, since I don't want to
>> republish. Let me just say that publishing a claim that someone
>> committed a crime

could

>> give that someone a basis for suing the "publisher." I don't think
>> it

would

>> be hard to convince a court that posting to AAPORNET is "publishing."

>> Whether "truth" could be raised as a defense, or "absence of malice"
because

>> the defamed person is a public figure, I don't know.

>> I would thus hesitate to post such stories as I saw in the exchange

>> about Lutz et. al. John Hall

>

>From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Aug 2 07:12:14 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 ESMTMP

id HAA29326 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 07:12:14 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

id <QDYMM5CF>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 10:08:33 -0400

Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DC3@AS_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney

Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 10:08:32 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

> Who's next?

I suggest that no-one should be unless they want to return
to what the purpose of this list is supposed to be.

If someone wants to defend or attack the methodology of Focus
Groups in general or of these focus groups in particular or
the conclusions drawn from them, fine, otherwise I think we
ought to just let this one drop.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>From rbrapo@wm.edu Wed Aug 2 07:44:00 2000

Received: from email.wm.edu (mars.wm.edu [128.239.10.11])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP

id HAA12571 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 07:43:59 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from MORT104DRR.wm.edu (wm83-110.admin.wm.edu [128.239.110.83])
by email.wm.edu (2.1.2/8.9.1/Execmail 2.1) with ESMTTP id KAA04309
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 10:37:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000802104318.01877fd0@mail.wm.edu>
X-Sender: rbrapo@mail.wm.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 10:43:39 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Ron Rapoport <rbrapo@wm.edu>
Subject: Re: Fw: Fwd:MORI Poll Digest 23 June 2000
In-Reply-To: <011b01bfdbfd\$cdf71bc0\$100210ac@rmw>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I would like to be on the list for the weekly report. Thanks.

Ron

At 11:28 PM 6/26/2000 +0100, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues

>

>If you click on the MORI Poll Digest, this week's is a comparison
>between the British and Americans on the religious impact on politics.

>If you'd like to be on the list for the free access to this weekly
>report, just email us back as indicated. No cost, no obligation, no
>salesman will call!

>

>Bob Worcester

>----- Original Message -----

>From: Worc <worc@mori.com>

>To: <worc@worc.demon.co.uk>

>Sent: Monday, June 26, 2000 12:25 PM

>Subject: Fwd:MORI Poll Digest 23 June 2000

>

>

> > =====

> >

> > Market & Opinion Research International Limited

> > 95 Southwark Street

> > London SE1 0HX

> >

> > Tel: +44 (0) 207 928 5955

> > Fax: +44 (0) 207 955 0070/1/2

> >

> > =====

> >

> > Disclaimer

> >

> > This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the
> > individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented
> > are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent
> > those of MORI Limited.

> >

> > If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have
> > received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination,

> > forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly
> > prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either
> > notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 207 928 5955
> > or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.
> >
> > =====
> >
> >
> >
> >

>Received: from mail0.netcom.net.uk
> ([194.42.236.2])
> by mori.com; Mon, 26 Jun 2000 12:24:45 +0100
>Received: from mori.com ([212.2.14.202]) by mail0.netcom.net.uk
>(8.8.8/8.7.3) with SMTP id MAA22850; Mon, 26 Jun 2000 12:30:02 +0100 (BST)
>Received: from MORI#u#DOMAIN-Message_Server by mori.com
> with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 26 Jun 2000 12:20:20 +0100
>Message-Id: <s9574a84.007@mori.com>
>X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
>Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2000 12:20:00 +0100
>From: "David Evans" <david.evans@mori.com>
>To: poll.digest@mori.com
>Subject: MORI Poll Digest 23 June 2000
>X-Guinevere: 1.0.13 ; MORI Ltd
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
>Content-Disposition: inline

>From jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Wed Aug 2 08:04:38 2000
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA21887 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 08:04:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from fgdfg.harvard.edu (sph186-72.harvard.edu [134.174.186.72])
by hsph.harvard.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id LAA26182
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 11:04:03 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.20000802110136.00977bb0@hsph.harvard.edu>
X-Sender: jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 11:02:41 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "John T. Young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: RE: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DC3@AS_SERVER>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

i agree with leo. let's move on.

john t. young

At 10:08 AM 08/02/2000 -0400, you wrote:

> > Who's next?

>

>I suggest that no-one should be unless they want to return
>to what the purpose of this list is supposed to be.

>
>If someone wants to defend or attack the methodology of Focus Groups in
>general or of these focus groups in particular or the conclusions drawn
>from them, fine, otherwise I think we ought to just let this one drop.
>
>--
>Leo G. Simonetta
>Art & Science Group, Inc.
>simonetta@artsci.com
>

>From barry@arches.uga.edu Wed Aug 2 08:17:33 2000
Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA28712 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 08:17:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from archa13.cc.uga.edu (arch13.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu
(LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0213D13B@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;
Wed, 2 Aug 2000 11:17:06 -0400
Received: from Hollander.Grady.uga.edu (bhollander01.grady.uga.edu
[128.192.35.230])
by archa13.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA47896
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 11:17:29 -0400
Message-ID: <001701bff94\$c37a6140\$e623c080@Grady.uga.edu>
From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <4.2.0.58.20000802110136.00977bb0@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 11:17:25 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Before we move on, does anyone know if the Lutz
UPI story received a lot of play? In my completely unscientific and
haphazard attention to the convention, I haven't come across it anywhere but
here.

Barry A. Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Phone: 706.542.5027 | FAX: 706.542.2183
Email: barry@arches.uga.edu <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

>From s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu Wed Aug 2 10:21:08 2000
Received: from notesmail1.csuohio.edu (csu-mail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.57])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id KAA19311 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 10:21:01 -0700
(PDT)
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
Received: by notesmail1.csuohio.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.6 (890.1
7-16-1999)) id 8525692F.005F903B ; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 13:23:48 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525692F.005F8DEC.00@notesmail1.csuohio.edu>
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 13:23:41 -0400
Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Luntz's Sunday Focus Group was referred to by Eric Schmitt in an article
about Dick Cheney in today's NYTimes, p A15.

Sid

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Aug 2 13:20:13 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA16773 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 13:20:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-72.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.72])
by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA18246
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 16:20:04 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39888248.B2671F36@jwdp.com>
Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 16:19:20 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Harris sues AOL
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

August 02, 2000 | A leading Internet-based polling company is suing America
Online Inc. and a dozen other Internet service providers for blocking
correspondence with some 2.7 million of its 6.6 million online members.

Harris Interactive Inc., which publishes the Harris poll, filed suit in
federal court here late Monday seeking unspecified damages from AOL,
Microsoft Corp., and other providers that it says subscribe to the "Realtime
Blackhole List" maintained by Mail Abuse Prevention System.

The nonprofit California company was established to fight e-mail abuse.
Harris Interactive was added to the list for purportedly sending unsolicited

bulk e-mail or "spam" - an accusation the market research company heatedly denies.

The listing prompted service providers to block Harris Interactive from corresponding with some 41 percent of members served by those providers, the lawsuit alleges. The Rochester-based company is also suing MAPS, based in Redwood City, Calif., and a market research competitor, Incon Research of Norwalk, Conn.

"Harris Interactive was sending mail to people who didn't want it," said Kelly Thompson, the MAPS list's project manager, "and they refused to change their procedures so that that could not happen." She declined to comment on the lawsuit.

Last week, Yesmail.com, a Chicago-based online marketer, won a temporary restraining order preventing MAPS from placing Yesmail on its list of spammers. The order was suspended after the two sides agreed to try to negotiate a settlement.

AOL spokesman Rich D'Amato said the suit has no merit. "We are confident that our spam-fighting techniques are entirely appropriate," he said.

Denying that it sends unsolicited e-mail to attract new members to its online survey panel, Harris Interactive maintains instead that members can join the panel only after registering at the company's site and 26 other recruiting sites.

Harris Interactive said its 6.6 million registered parties are surveyed on diverse issues ranging from online buying habits to public policy. Rather than being quizzed over the telephone, people now can call up a Web page e-mail message and fill out a questionnaire

Associated Press

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Aug 2 14:00:37 2000
Received: from mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (mx1.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.112.76])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA25310 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 14:00:37 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from s1.optonline.net (s1.optonline.net [167.206.112.6])
by mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA13824;
Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:00:34 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (d164-134.ynkrry.optonline.net
[24.189.164.134])
by s1.optonline.net (8.9.1/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA27825;
Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:00:34 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <39888C2B.1AF74B98@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 17:01:31 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.74 [en] (WinNT; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: jwerner@jwdp.com

CC: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Harris sues AOL

References: <39888248.B2671F36@jwdp.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

FYI--

Dear Jan:

I got an unbidden solicitation from Harris Interactive. I think they are buying e-mail lists and spamming.

I know I did not "register" at their site.

This is not for general distribution on AAPORNET for obvious reasons.

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 rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Aug 2 14:15:28 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 ESMTP
id OAA07521 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 14:15:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from w5y0s9.mindspring.com (user-37kac2j.dialup.mindspring.com
[207.69.48.83])
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id RAA13962
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:15:25 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000802171255.00c26a40@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 17:13:38 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Harris sues AOL
In-Reply-To: <39888C2B.1AF74B98@troll.soc.qc.edu>
References: <39888248.B2671F36@jwdp.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_6454719==_ .ALT"

====_6454719==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

But Andy, you just told us all!!!

At 05:01 PM 8/2/00, you wrote:

>FYI--

>

certain e-mail addresses. AOL, etc. I am sure has access to analysis software that will have info on the number of e-mails Harris sent, etc. This could be interesting!!!

It might even have sampling implications!!!

--

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 PAHARDING7@aol.com Wed Aug 2 14:50:50 2000
Received: from imo-r04.mx.aol.com (imo-r04.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.4])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA04016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 14:50:49 -0700
(PDT)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
by imo-r04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.bf.5aala5b (6153)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:49:46 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <bf.5aala5b.26b9f179@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:49:45 EDT
Subject: Re: Harris sues AOL
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 118

Andy...

Obvious, I suppose, but not compelling enough to override your CC to aapornet.
Stuff happens.

Phil Harding
>From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Aug 2 14:53:41 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 ESMTTP
id OAA05891 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 14:53:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QDYMM5FX>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:50:04 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DCA@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me?
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:50:03 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Here is the actual Harris Press Release

http://news.stockmaster.com/display_news.asp?mode=news&doc_id=BW20000731BW2863&ticker=HPOL&UPT=1964

Apparently they plan to sue MAPS, AOL, USWEST, Microsoft and others.

"The current Harris Interactive situation is a perfect example of why the government, and not self-appointed private groups, must create the rules which govern Internet communications."

I hang around in some of the Usenet abuse groups and there have been a number of complaints there about unsolicited email from Harris and the apparent inability to get off their lists once on them.

For information about MAPS <http://mail-abuse.org/>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Andrew A. Beveridge [<mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>]

> Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2000 5:38 PM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: Will Harris Sue Me?

>

>

> Dear All:

>

> Since litigation has become the main discussion point about AAPORNET,
> I did not want to make a statement without having back-up. But since
> I did not eliminate the reply to AAPORNET here are the circumstances
> as best as I can recall.

>

> One day (on a commercial account that is not published) I got an
> e-mail from Harris asking me to participate in their panel.

>

> They explained how it would work, what I would need to do, etc. If I
> wanted to enroll they told me what Web Site to go to.

>

> I was quite non-plussed, and I doubt if I saved the e-mail.

>

> Don't we all get spam. It was quite a number of months ago, probably
> early fall.

>

> Andy

>

>

> P.S. Buying e-mail lists is really no different than buying
> mail lists, except they can block you from sending to
> certain e-mail addresses. AOL, etc. I am sure has access to
> analysis software that will have info on the number of
> e-mails Harris sent, etc. This could be interesting!!!

>
> It might even have sampling implications!!!
>
> --
> 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 abider@american.edu Wed Aug 2 16:15:13 2000
Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.121.50])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id QAA02186 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 16:15:12 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-004varestP077.dialsprint.net [168.191.219.165])
by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3-EL_1_3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id QAA16621
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 16:15:10 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <3988AC04.A81F1C0B@american.edu>
Date: Wed, 02 Aug 2000 19:17:24 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Clucks' clicks (Was re: Harris sues. . .)
References: <39888248.B2671F36@jwdp.com>
<4.3.2.7.2.20000802171255.00c26a40@mail.mindspring.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has the term "clucks' clicks" seen use as a generic embracing such behaviors (of which I hope I am now completely cured) as:

- (a) replying to spam (including clicking on "Please remove me from. . .")
- (b) carelessly opening attachments
- (c) inadvertently broadcasting one's personal business (especially confidences) to an entire list group

Since they are being thus indoctrinated, isn't it going to be only dumb clucks who click vote boxes in pseudo polls on the Web?

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

dick halpern wrote:

>
> Part 1.1Type: Plain Text (text/plain)
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Aug 2 17:01:24 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id RAA29380 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:01:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTF
id RAA08725 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:01:23 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Wed, 2 Aug 2000 17:01:23 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me?
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DCA@AS_SERVER>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008021630320.3406-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The two things which both the online and hacker communities hate more than anything else, without question, are government interference with the Net, and spam. Few things are more universally popular, online, than anti-spam efforts, regardless of the source.

If Harris proceeds with its current strategy, I doubt the company could possibly make enough profits--nor purchase enough business insurance--to overcome its losses to the hacking, pranks and bad publicity this will generate, especially online, where the company intends to continue to operate. Would you want the name of your own research operation to become a synonym--online--for "spam"?

I hope that all of you who work for--or otherwise care about--Harris Interactive, as do I, will do whatever you can to make this case to anyone who might have influence in the company, and who will also listen to reason.

-- Jim

On Wed, 2 Aug 2000, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Here is the actual Harris Press Release
>
> http://news.stockmaster.com/display_news.asp?mode=news&doc_id=BW20000731BW2863&ticker=HPOL&UPT=1964
>
> Apparently they plan to sue MAPS, AOL, USWEST, Microsoft and others.
>
> "The current Harris Interactive situation is a perfect example of why
> the government, and not self-appointed private groups, must create the
> rules which govern Internet communications."
>
> I hang around in some of the Usenet abuse groups and there have been a
> number of complaints there about unsolicited email from Harris and the
> apparent inability to
> get off their lists once on them.
>
> For information about MAPS <http://mail-abuse.org/>

>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Andrew A. Beveridge [mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu]
> > Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2000 5:38 PM
> > To: AAPORNET
> > Subject: Will Harris Sue Me?
> >
> >
> > Dear All:
> >
> > Since litigation has become the main discussion point about
> > AAPORNET, I did not want to make a statement without having back-up.
> > But since I did not eliminate the reply to AAPORNET here are the
> > circumstances as best as I can recall.
> >
> > One day (on a commercial account that is not published) I got an
> > e-mail from Harris asking me to participate in their panel.
> >
> > They explained how it would work, what I would need to do, etc. If
> > I wanted to enroll they told me what Web Site to go to.
> >
> > I was quite non-plussed, and I doubt if I saved the e-mail.
> >
> > Don't we all get spam. It was quite a number of months ago,
> > probably early fall.
> >
> > Andy
> >
> >
> > P.S. Buying e-mail lists is really no different than buying
> > mail lists, except they can block you from sending to
> > certain e-mail addresses. AOL, etc. I am sure has access to
> > analysis software that will have info on the number of
> > e-mails Harris sent, etc. This could be interesting!!!
> >
> > It might even have sampling implications!!!
> >
> > --
> > 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 kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Thu Aug 3 06:09:55 2000
Received: from rly-ip02.mx.aol.com (rly-ip02.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.160])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id GAA16220 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 06:09:54 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from tot-tj.proxy.aol.com (tot-tj.proxy.aol.com [152.163.213.131])
by rly-ip02.mx.aol.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/AOL-5.0.0)
with ESMTP id JAA26010 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:08:35 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from oemcomputer (ACA3CF55.ipt.aol.com [172.163.207.85])
by tot-tj.proxy.aol.com (8.10.0/8.10.0) with SMTP id e73D8XL21757
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:08:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <002301bffd4b\$dfffc6d60\$55cfa3ac@oemcomputer>
From: "Karen Donelan" <kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008021630320.3406-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:08:09 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
X-Apparently-From: FAIRMONT59@aol.com

For the record, I have done a number of surveys with Harris Interactive. I have been a respondent in one on-line survey they conducted for a foundation. I have an excite account and found it easy to decline inclusion in their panels (and I did decline) when I registered at excite.

Of note, I currently have a remote email account that I access using AOL when I am on the road. My very legitimate email messages are frequently rejected as spam with a reference to go to mailabuse.org to find out why. It is clear that someone out there considers me a spammer and I have yet to figure out why.

I have no way of stopping mailabuse from interfering with my correspondence. I have contacted both AOL and the host of the server I am trying to access and they can't help me either.

So, at the moment, I feel far more abuse than assistance from mailabuse.org and despite any number of access points to me over the last three years have never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a legitimate study.

If anyone has any other experience with/influence on mailabuse.org I would be interested.

Karen Donelan

----- Original Message -----

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2000 8:01 PM
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me?

>
>
>
> The two things which both the online and hacker communities hate more
> than anything else, without question, are government interference with
> the Net, and spam. Few things are more universally popular, online,
> than anti-spam efforts, regardless of the source.
>
> If Harris proceeds with its current strategy, I doubt the company
> could possibly make enough profits--nor purchase enough business
> insurance--to overcome its losses to the hacking, pranks and bad
> publicity this will generate, especially online, where the company
> intends to continue to operate. Would you want the name of your own
> research operation to become a synonym--online--for "spam"?
>
> I hope that all of you who work for--or otherwise care about--Harris
> Interactive, as do I, will do whatever you can to make this case to
> anyone who might have influence in the company, and who will also
> listen to
reason.
>
> -- Jim
> *****
>
> On Wed, 2 Aug 2000, Leo Simonetta wrote:
>
> > Here is the actual Harris Press Release
> >
> >
[http://news.stockmaster.com/display_news.asp?mode=news&doc_id=BW20000731BW28](http://news.stockmaster.com/display_news.asp?mode=news&doc_id=BW20000731BW2863&ticker=HPOL&UPT=1964)
> > 63&ticker=HPOL&UPT=1964
> >
> > Apparently they plan to sue MAPS, AOL, USWEST, Microsoft and others.
> >
> > "The current Harris Interactive situation is a perfect example of
> > why
the
> > government, and not
> > self-appointed private groups, must create the rules which govern
Internet
> > communications."
> >
> > I hang around in some of the Usenet abuse groups and there have been
> > a number of complaints there about unsolicited email from Harris and
> > the apparent inability to
> > get off their lists once on them.
> >
> > For information about MAPS <http://mail-abuse.org/>
> >
> > --
> > Leo G. Simonetta
> > Art & Science Group, Inc.
> > simonetta@artsci.com
> >
> >
> > > -----Original Message-----
> > > From: Andrew A. Beveridge [<mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>]

> > > Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2000 5:38 PM
> > > To: AAPORNET
> > > Subject: Will Harris Sue Me?
> > >
> > >
> > > Dear All:
> > >
> > > Since litigation has become the main discussion point about
> > > AAPORNET, I did not want to make a statement without having
> > > back-up. But since I did not eliminate the reply to AAPORNET here
> > > are the circumstances as best as I can recall.
> > >
> > > One day (on a commercial account that is not published) I got an
> > > e-mail from Harris asking me to participate in their panel.
> > >
> > > They explained how it would work, what I would need to do, etc.
> > > If I wanted to enroll they told me what Web Site to go to.
> > >
> > > I was quite non-plussed, and I doubt if I saved the e-mail.
> > >
> > > Don't we all get spam. It was quite a number of months ago,
> > > probably early fall.
> > >
> > > Andy
> > >
> > >
> > > P.S. Buying e-mail lists is really no different than buying
> > > mail lists, except they can block you from sending to
> > > certain e-mail addresses. AOL, etc. I am sure has access to
> > > analysis software that will have info on the number of
> > > e-mails Harris sent, etc. This could be interesting!!!
> > >
> > > It might even have sampling implications!!!
> > >
> > > --
> > > 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 RSantos@ui.urban.org Thu Aug 3 06:45:38 2000
Received: from uint3.urban.org (uint3.urban.org [4.22.172.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA27592 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 06:45:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by webmail.urban.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <P6T9ZM1H>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:39:28 -0400
Message-ID: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B012F061@uint4.urban.org>
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Washington-Baltimore Chapter fall schedule
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:40:58 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings, fellow AAPORNETers!

Happy summer!

This is an EMail to those in the Washington-Baltimore area on behalf of the Washington-Baltimore Chapter to highlight our fall 2000 schedule of lunch time presentations.

They appear below:

-- John Dixon, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Predicting Interviewer Nonresponse," Thursday, September 14, 12:30-2:00 PM. (Jointly sponsored with WSS)

-- Manuel de la Puente, Bureau of the Census, "Colonias along the US-Mexico Border: an Ethnographic Study," Thursday, October 12, 12:30-2:00 PM.

-- Clyde Tucker, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Advances in Telephone Sample Designs," Thursday, November 16, 12:30-2:00 PM.

-- Jim Norman, USA Today, "Putting the Elections in Perspective," Thursday, December 7, 12:30-2:00 PM. (TENTATIVE)

For more information about these, or other questions/comments about the Chapter, or to join our Chapter, please contact Rob Santos at:

rsantos@ui.urban.org

Thanks!

Rob Santos

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Thu Aug 3 06:56:44 2000
Received: from mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (mx1.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.112.76])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA02368 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 06:56:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from s1.optonline.net (s1.optonline.net [167.206.112.6])
by mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id JAA26195;
Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:55:48 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (d164-134.ynkryny.optonline.net
[24.189.164.134])
by s1.optonline.net (8.9.1/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id JAA19372;
Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:55:48 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39897A1F.D320B7E7@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Thu, 03 Aug 2000 09:56:47 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.74 [en] (WinNT; U)
X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008021630320.3406-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
<002301bffd4b\$dfffc6d60\$55cfa3ac@oemcomputer>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear All:

Does the following quotation only trouble me?

> never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a legitimate
> study.
>

This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."

Spam is spam!!!!

What if someone said:

"I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser toner,
pornography, or a dream vacation."

Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
history.

Andy

>From RSantos@ui.urban.org Thu Aug 3 07:13:53 2000
Received: from uint3.urban.org (uint3.urban.org [4.22.172.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA08969 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:13:53 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by webmail.urban.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <P6T9ZMMQ>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:06:39 -0400
Message-ID: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B012F064@uint4.urban.org>
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Washington-Baltimore Chapter fall schedule -- REVISED
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:08:11 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Hi folks!

I previously sent a non-final version of the schedule... my apologies!

Below is the REVISED SCHEDULE (The dates of the first two sessions have
been revised)

thanks for your patience and to all who have expressed their interest thus
far,

Rob Santos
Chapter President

>
>Greetings, fellow AAPORNETers!
>
>Happy summer!
>
>This is an EMail to those in the Washington-Baltimore area on
>behalf of the
>Washington-Baltimore Chapter to highlight our fall 2000
>schedule of lunch
>time presentations.
>
>They appear below:
>
>-- John Dixon, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Predicting Interviewer
>Nonresponse," TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 12:30-2:00 PM. (Jointly sponsored
>with WSS)
>
>-- Manuel de la Puente, Bureau of the Census, "Colonias along the
>US-Mexico Border: an EthnographicStudy," WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11,
>12:30-2:00 PM.
>
>-- Clyde Tucker, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Advances in Telephone
>Sample Designs," THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 12:30-2:00 PM.
>
>-- Jim Norman, USA Today, "Putting the Elections in Perspective,"
>THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 12:30-2:00 PM. (TENTATIVE)
>
>
>For more information about these, or other questions/comments about the
>Chapter, or to join our Chapter, please contact Rob Santos at:
>
>rsantos@ui.urban.org
>
>
>Thanks!
>
>Rob Santos
>
>From rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu Thu Aug 3 07:25:33 2000
Received: from mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com (mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com [24.2.7.74])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA13142 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:25:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from spenser ([24.2.109.195]) by mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.00 201-229-121) with SMTP
id <20000803142417.HUHO19901.mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com@spenser>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:24:17 -0700
Reply-To: <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
From: "Robert Wyatt" <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me?
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:24:18 -0500
Message-ID: <NCBBIFHAELIHNKGGKNBICEECCEAA.rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>

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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <39897A1F.D320B7E7@troll.soc.qc.edu>

so, why aren't random phone calls spam????

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew A. Beveridge
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 8:57 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?

Dear All:

Does the following quotation only trouble me?

> never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a legitimate
> study.
>

This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."

Spam is spam!!!!

What if someone said:

"I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."

Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to history.

Andy

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Aug 3 07:30:10 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA15116 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:30:09 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-72.bellatlantic.net [151.203.192.72])
by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA16792
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:29:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <398981A1.175AD9D3@jwdp.com>
Date: Thu, 03 Aug 2000 10:28:49 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008021630320.3406-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
<002301bffd4b\$dfffc6d60\$55cfa3ac@oemcomputer>
<39897A1F.D320B7E7@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL**** survey contacts are unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.

Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all unsolicited junk mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found something they wanted in a catalog received from a previously unknown merchant can readily testify.

Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal mail, but it is surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an unsolicited phone call from even the most respectable survey research organization.

But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a footnote to history if this keeps up.

Jan Werner

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

>
> Dear All:
>
> Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>
> > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
> > legitimate study.
> >
>
> This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>
> Spam is spam!!!!
>
> What if someone said:
>
> "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
> toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>
> Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
> history.
>
> Andy
>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Thu Aug 3 07:35:19 2000
Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA17312 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:35:18 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (mxusw5x57.chesco.com [209.195.228.57])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id e73EZGm06145
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:35:16 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <001f01bffd57\$e3143e40\$39e4c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:34:08 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
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

>From the point of view of the recipient -- what is the difference
>between
unsolicited e-mail messages for a legitimate study and unsolicited telephone
calls that result from RDD sampling (for a legitimate study) except,
possibly, that the e-mail is less bothersome?

Granted one is associated with a rational sampling procedure while the other
apparently is not. But that is under our control. Did RDD bring about the
end of telephone surveys?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 03, 2000 9:57 AM
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?

>Dear All:
>
>Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>
>> never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
>> legitimate study.
>>
>
>
>This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>
>Spam is spam!!!!
>
>What if someone said:
>
>"I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
>toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>
>Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
>history.

>
>Andy
>

>From lshiman@opiniondynamics.com Thu Aug 3 07:40:06 2000
>Received: from odcmail.opiniondynamics.com (odcmail.opiniondynamics.com
>[140.186.154.98])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
> id HAA19578 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:40:05 -0700
>(PDT)
>Received: from tom172 ([192.168.0.172]) by odcmail.opiniondynamics.com
>(Post.Office MTA v3.5 release 215 ID# 0-52003U100L2S100V35)
> with SMTP id com; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:47:46 -0400
>Reply-To: <lshiman@opiniondynamics.com>
>From: "Larry" <lshiman@opiniondynamics.com>
>To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
>Subject: RE: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
>Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:43:59 -0400
>Message-ID: <000101bffd59\$428e4540\$ac00a8c0@odc>
>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 CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
>In-Reply-To: <398981A1.175AD9D3@jwdp.com>
>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Unsolicited phone calls are considered acceptable - no rules are broken.
Unsolicited e-mail, for any reason, is not considered acceptable. It may be
irrational, we may not like it, but it is the rule under which we must
operate - at least, that's what we tell our clients.

I was recently at a convention where several of the exhibitors called,
e-mailed, and sent regular mail to attendees - all unsolicited. People I
spoke with were far more annoyed by the e-mail than they were by regular
mail or even telephone calls. I believe people think of their e-mail as
more "private" than their telephones or their regular mail. To send
unsolicited e-mails invades their privacy.

Larry Shiman
Opinion Dynamics

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Jan
Werner
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:29 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)

Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL**** survey contacts are
unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.

Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all unsolicited junk
mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found something they wanted in

a catalog received from a previously unknown merchant can readily testify.

Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal mail, but it is surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an unsolicited phone call from even the most respectable survey research organization.

But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a footnote to history if this keeps up.

Jan Werner

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

>
> Dear All:
>
> Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>
> > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
> > legitimate study.
> >
>
> This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>
> Spam is spam!!!!
>
> What if someone said:
>
> "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
> toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>
> Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
> history.
>
> Andy

>From simonetta@artsci.com Thu Aug 3 07:46:14 2000
Received: from as_server.artsci.com
(tw5nl-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 HAA21806 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:46:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QF5JLZMX>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:42:49 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DD0@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:42:48 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

The problem with Spam in the minds of those who have a problem with it is that someone else is using their resources that they pay for without their permission to (usually) sell me something.

At least with junk mail the sender pays to send it to me - thus preventing him from sending me a catalog every week. With junk email there is virtually no cost to send (it cost about as much to send it to one person as it does to send it to 1,000,000). Since according to the US Chamber of Commerce there are over 10 million business in the US imagine what would happen if all of them sent you just 2 emails a year.

What about phone surveys? Well, fortunately for us they have a relatively long history of acceptance.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
> Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:29 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
>
>
> Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL****
> survey contacts
> are unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.
>
> Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all unsolicited
> junk mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found something
> they wanted in a catalog received from a previously unknown merchant
> can readily testify.
>
> Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal
> mail, but it is
> surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an unsolicited
> phone call from even the most respectable survey research
> organization.
>
> But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a
> footnote to
> history if this keeps up.
>
> Jan Werner
> _____
> "Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
> >
> > Dear All:
> >
> > Does the following quotation only trouble me?
> >
> > > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of
> > a legitimate
> > > study.
> > >
> >

> > This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
> >
> > Spam is spam!!!!
> >
> > What if someone said:
> >
> > "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of
> > laser toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
> >
> > Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote
> > to history.
> >
> > Andy
>

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Thu Aug 3 07:53:58 2000
Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA25065 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 07:53:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (mxusw5x57.chesco.com [209.195.228.57])
by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id e73Erim09956;
Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:53:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <003601bffd5a\$77ffccc0\$39e4c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <lshiman@opiniondynamics.com>, <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:52:37 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
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

It sounds like they were called and mailed at work, which is different from
(at least) calls at home. A valid comparison would be all three intrusions
on a personal level to the recipient's residence.

Maybe people are bothered by unsolicited e-mail because they sense the
messages are comingled in their computers with highly personal stuff. As if
the intruder could eavesdrop on their investments or love letters. Absent
that, why would they care?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry <lshiman@opiniondynamics.com>
To: jwerner@jwdp.com <jwerner@jwdp.com>; aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:40 AM
Subject: RE: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)

>Unsolicited phone calls are considered acceptable - no rules are

>broken. Unsolicited e-mail, for any reason, is not considered
>acceptable. It may
be
>irrational, we may not like it, but it is the rule under which we must
>operate - at least, that's what we tell our clients.
>
>I was recently at a convention where several of the exhibitors called,
>e-mailed, and sent regular mail to attendees - all unsolicited. People
>I spoke with were far more annoyed by the e-mail than they were by
>regular mail or even telephone calls. I believe people think of their
>e-mail as more "private" than their telephones or their regular mail.
>To send unsolicited e-mails invades their privacy.
>
>Larry Shiman
>Opinion Dynamics
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
>Of Jan Werner
>Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:29 AM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
>
>
>Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL**** survey contacts
>are unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.
>
>Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all unsolicited
>junk mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found something they
>wanted in a catalog received from a previously unknown merchant can
>readily testify.
>
>Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal mail, but it
>is surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an unsolicited
>phone call from even the most respectable survey research organization.
>
>But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a footnote to
>history if this keeps up.
>
>Jan Werner
>
>-----
>
>"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
>>
>> Dear All:
>>
>> Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>>
>> > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
>> > legitimate study.
>> >
>>
>> This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>>
>> Spam is spam!!!!
>>
>> What if someone said:

>>
>> "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
>> toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>>
>> Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote
>> to history.
>>
>> Andy
>
>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Aug 3 08:01:49 2000
>Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
>[199.45.39.157])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id IAA28799 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 08:01:49 -0700
>(PDT)
>Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-72.bellatlantic.net
>[151.203.192.72])
> by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA10870;
> Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:01:40 -0400 (EDT)
>Message-ID: <39898928.D0778ABF@jwdp.com>
>Date: Thu, 03 Aug 2000 11:00:56 -0400
>From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
>Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
>X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
>X-Accept-Language: en
>MIME-Version: 1.0
>To: lshiman@opiniondynamics.com
>CC: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
>References: <000101bffd59\$428e4540\$ac00a8c0@odc>
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Larry wrote:

>
> Unsolicited phone calls are considered acceptable - no rules are
> broken. Unsolicited e-mail, for any reason, is not considered
> acceptable. It may be irrational, we may not like it, but it is the
> rule under which we must operate - at least, that's what we tell our
> clients.
>

That's because your primary business is selling telephone polls. People in the online polling business say exactly the opposite.

Of course unsolicited telephone calls have one advantage from the recipient's point of view: there is actually someone at the other end who can be told just where to go and how to get there, thus relieving some of the aggravation.

> I was recently at a convention where several of the exhibitors called,
> e-mailed, and sent regular mail to attendees - all unsolicited.
> People I spoke with were far more annoyed by the e-mail than they were
> by regular mail or even telephone calls. I believe people think of
> their e-mail as more "private" than their telephones or their regular

> mail. To send unsolicited e-mails invades their privacy.
>

You are confusing anecdotal evidence with quantitative results.

Jan Werner

> Larry Shiman
> Opinion Dynamics
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf
> Of Jan Werner
> Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:29 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
>
> Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL**** survey
> contacts are unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.
>
> Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all unsolicited
> junk mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found something
> they wanted in a catalog received from a previously unknown merchant
> can readily testify.
>
> Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal mail, but it
> is surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an
> unsolicited phone call from even the most respectable survey research
> organization.
>
> But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a footnote
> to history if this keeps up.
>
> Jan Werner
> _____
>
> "Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
> >
> > Dear All:
> >
> > Does the following quotation only trouble me?
> >
> > > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
> > > legitimate study.
> > >
> >
> > This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
> >
> > Spam is spam!!!!
> >
> > What if someone said:
> >
> > "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of
> > laser toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
> >
> > Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote

> > to history.

> >

> > Andy

>From simonetta@artsci.com Thu Aug 3 08:27:47 2000
Received: from as_server.artsci.com
(tw5nl-hfc-0252-d1db038b.rdc1.md.comcastatwork.com [209.219.3.139])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA19239 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 08:27:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QF5JLZNH>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:24:21 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DD2@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me?
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:24:20 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Here is MAPS press release in response to Harris Interactive:

<http://mail-abuse.org/pressreleases/2000-08-02.html>

Reuters, the NY Times, MSNBC, AP and USA Today all have stories on this.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Thu Aug 3 08:58:18 2000
Received: from elf.soc.qc.edu (elf.soc.qc.edu [149.4.70.237])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA24705 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 08:58:12 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll [149.4.70.239])
by elf.soc.qc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id LAA09365
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:58:10 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id LAA26385
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:58:10 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:58:10 -0400 (EDT)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?) (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.10008031157310.26378-100000@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Larry wrote:

>

> Unsolicited phone calls are considered acceptable - no rules are
> broken.

But call blocking is a possibility, though apparently it does not work with

T-1 or ISDN lines.

The Harris solicitation is junk e-mail or spam. Hundreds of thousands are sent out. They would not be on the spam list, if they only sent e-mail to people that had been qualified and agreed to do their surveys.

Andy

```
>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Thu Aug  3 08:58:51 2000
Received: from elf.soc.qc.edu (elf.soc.qc.edu [149.4.70.237])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id IAA25236 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 08:58:49 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll [149.4.70.239])
    by elf.soc.qc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id LAA09353
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:57:27 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
    by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id LAA26380
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:57:26 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:57:26 -0400 (EDT)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me? (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.10008031156530.26378-100000@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

Robert Wyatt wrote:

>

> so, why aren't random phone calls spam????

They are. I hang up on them, and have requested to be dropped from telemarketing lists.

Isn't that why response rates are dropping? Isn't this why Harris, Intersurv, et al are claiming superiority for their methods?

Andy

```
>From MRK@cbsnews.com Thu Aug  3 08:59:47 2000
Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id IAA25889 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 08:59:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CBSNY-Message_Server by cbsnews.com
    with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 03 Aug 2000 11:59:02 -0500
Message-Id: <s9895e86.081@cbsnews.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Thu, 03 Aug 2000 11:58:55 -0500
From: MARLA KAYE <MRK@cbsnews.com>
To: jwerner@jwdp.com, lshiman@opiniondynamics.com, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Spam
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
```

Content-Disposition: inline

The difference between the phone calls and the e-mail can quite often be the expense on the receivers end. Being on a few lists, there are quite often messages sent out for people to be careful about not sending private messages to the list because of the space it takes up in people e-mail boxes, which varies according to your ISP. And for people who pay only for the time they're on-line, the extra time it takes to read or download unsolicited e-mail for later reading can cost them. It's more the equivalent of calling people's cell phones, where the receiver also bears some of the expense.

Marla R. Kaye

>From lamatsch@nevada.edu Thu Aug 3 10:04:05 2000
Received: from am-dew.nevada.edu (am-dew.nevada.edu [131.216.1.249])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA11933 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:04:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from cbc138 (b138c.lv-cbc.nevada.edu [131.216.79.86])
by am-dew.nevada.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA29621
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:04:04 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@nevada.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Palm Pilot
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 09:00:25 -0700
Message-ID: <NEBBLOJLGLBGLGECJGANIECLCAA.lamatsch@nevada.edu>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Does anybody have experience using Palm Pilots for CAPI surveys? I'd be interested what kind of software you are using and how well it works.

Thanks.

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.
Director
The Howard W. Cannon Center for Survey Research
University of Nevada - Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway - Box 455008
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-5008
Phone (702) 895-0167
Fax (702) 895-0165
Cellular (702) 561-8768

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Thu Aug 3 11:05:27 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA25281 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:05:26 -0700

(PDT)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscntl.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA27470
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:05:15 -0700
Message-Id: <200008031805.LAA27470@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:07:00 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?
In-reply-to: <001f01bffd57\$e3143e40\$39e4c3d1@default>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Most survey contacts are by definition unsolicited. Banning
unsolicited contacts for surveying and marketing is a ridiculous
idea no matter how politically popular it might be.

People who get all worked up about spam are computer pansies
who havn't figured out how to apply the filtering rules on their e-mail
software. They're like people who get all worked up about the fact
that surveyors come to their front door. They think everybody is
out to get them. I don't think we should legitimize paranoia on the
internet or anywhere else.

Date sent: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 10:34:08 -0400
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?

>From the point of view of the recipient -- what is the difference
>between
unsolicited e-mail messages for a legitimate study and unsolicited telephone
calls that result from RDD sampling (for a legitimate study) except,
possibly, that the e-mail is less bothersome?

Granted one is associated with a rational sampling procedure while the other
apparently is not. But that is under our control. Did RDD bring about the
end of telephone surveys?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 03, 2000 9:57 AM
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?

>Dear All:

>
>Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>
>> never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
>> legitimate study.
>>
>
>
>This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>
>Spam is spam!!!!
>
>What if someone said:
>
>"I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
>toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>
>Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
>history.
>
>Andy
>

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From abider@american.edu Thu Aug 3 11:19:06 2000
Received: from falcon.prod.itd.earthlink.net (falcon.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.74])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA07207 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:19:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-002varestP223.dialsprint.net [168.191.218.239])
by falcon.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3-EL_1_3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id
LAA13710
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:19:04 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <3989B821.F14A958@american.edu>
Date: Thu, 03 Aug 2000 14:21:21 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: How Spam Unlike RDD (Was: Will Harris Sue Me?)
References: <NCBBIFHAELIHNKGGKKBICEECCEAA.rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Why is Spam more objectionable than RDD? Lots of reasons, but here's some:

1. It is too easy and cheap to clutter a gazillion people's mailboxes with spam. The viability of the system, as well as its utility to each individual user, depends upon observing the categorical imperative with regard to not burdening the network unduly because it costs you nothing to do so. I never get 100 pieces of snailmail or 100 telephone calls in a day. Incidentally, that's why robot phone calls are an abomination. That's also why it's mistaken for us to think of itsy-bitsy rewards in surveys exclusively as "incentives." Perhaps people realize that a company isn't going to tuck dollar bills in 50 million envelopes unless it was terribly important to it to do so. The reciprocity gesture seems to me by far the more important function.

(Most SPAM does try to incorporate a reciprocity gesture.)

2. Cultural development of the system: I am astonished at how rapidly the consensus eroded against any commercial use at all of the Net.

3. I don't why, but people also were more concerned about junk overburdening their FDD's than their brains.

Robert Wyatt wrote:

>
> so, why aren't random phone calls spam????
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf
> Of Andrew A. Beveridge
> Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 8:57 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?
>
> Dear All:
>
> Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>
> > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
> > legitimate study.
> >
>
> This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>
> Spam is spam!!!!
>
> What if someone said:
>
> "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
> toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>
> Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
> history.
>
> Andy
> From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Aug 3 11:56:14 2000

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA03350 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:56:11 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA25167 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:56:11 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 11:56:11 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008030932050.5392-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Question of the Hour: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Answer: There are countless ways, of course (I'm still thinking of new ones--hours after I began pondering this most profound question).

The most salient of these ways, for our discussion of the universal hostility toward spam and spamming throughout the Internet:

The average high school student, working alone, and with only a few days of preparation (one week, max), could easily e-mail the exact same message to ten thousand people online with the stroke of a single finger (even using an aging and under-powered pc; she would need to have access to the Internet, however, or else to do this from school).

Now someone tell me, how long would it take the usual polling operations of the two Timeses (Los Angeles and New York)--combined--to RDD ten thousand households with the same survey instrument?

On the off-chance that you might not have an average high school student readily at hand (my own two are currently forced first to pass pre-school, which is interfering with their poetic calculus--analytic, not differential), here's how to spam:

Make a list of ten thousand names and e-address (this might take, say, six solid hours, working alone with only a pc). Many (if not most) public e-mail lists have subscriber lists (names and e-addresses) available--automatically by machine, in a matter of seconds--to anyone on Earth who requests a copy with a one-line command sent directly to the server (usually only a few words, like "list aapornet.usc.edu"). AAPORNET's subscriber list would indeed be available in this way today, had I not blocked that option when setting up the list, simply because we are open to AAPOR members only).

So, if our high-schooler wishes to spam/survey ten thousand pet owners, say, and the subscriber lists on every last one of the 500 largest pet-owner lists are blocked (there's zero probability that even 50 are), she need only to subscribe to each of those lists (might take a few hours), capture all messages posted to each list for the next few days, strip them of their e-addresses, alphabetize them, eliminate the duplicate addresses, combine

them with the other lists, et voila--the spam is ready to be perpetrated.

Is any such mailing list useful for a legitimate survey, that is, one intended to infer its findings to a larger population? Of course not--the population's not known, the sample is hardly random, there's no frame (and these are just a few of the minor problems). Spamming is good, however, for selling just about anything--because the costs are so low, even success rates of a fraction of one percent can mean considerable profits, after spamming hundreds of thousands of people in just a week or two, for less money than you probably carry home from the cash machine on a typical visit. Where is government to protect us consumers from this nightmare, this outrage!?

All that remains to be done, after the spam letter/instrument is written, is for our student to push down her one finger (any one will do, even the thumb). And, at that same moment, how might our interviewers at the two Timeses be doing with the ol' RDD survey, scientific though it of course will be?

And so, why do most people online care about such spamming--with a passion bordering on militant hostility? Because we get perhaps three times as much spam as we do personal messages, not even counting spam which we've "requested" in order to get something else which we want (the Dow Jones hourly newsletter, for example). I'm sure that I spend more time online deleting spam than I do anything else--perhaps all other online activities combined.

Professionals and others in public or highly visible occupations have an additional associated problem. Virtually every professor, at every level, for example, and at virtually every college or university with instruction in English or a language with its alphabet (I'm entirely ignorant of languages with other alphabets, and do so envy all of you who are not), has his or her full name and e-mail address online somewhere on that institution's Web site. And I very much approve of this practice--it helps us scholars find one another, it gives prospective students a chance to discuss possible classes and majors with their likely teachers, and it gives parents of students an easy opportunity to have private discussions with their children's teachers, to whose salaries they likely contribute. Fortunately for us faculty members, moreover, our names and e-addresses are carefully hidden behind the homepages of our institutions--outsiders wishing to spam us would need to be able to recognize the word "Directory" on a university homepage in order to reach us by e-mail (fat chance of that happening, hey!?).

Me, I get countless such messages each year, not only from virtually every last student on the planet wishing to get into some--any--college or graduate program, and also from certainly--certainly--every computer science major hoping for paid summer working helping me to process and analyze data (a nonexistent position, never advertised) on the shores of Santa Monica Bay, but of course!

So, would you wish to be associated with any organization which has drawn international publicity for spamming--and also for suing in court to make it still easier to spam--and still have to earn your very living from the Internet? Not I! I can't even imagine to what level of hell Dante would have assigned such an existence. Me, I'd advise against landing there.

-- Jim

>From MRK@cbsnews.com Thu Aug 3 13:46:55 2000
Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id NAA12599 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 13:46:54 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CBSNY-Message_Server by cbsnews.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 03 Aug 2000 16:46:20 -0500
Message-Id: <s989aldc.039@cbsnews.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Thu, 03 Aug 2000 16:46:04 -0500
From: MARLA KAYE <MRK@cbsnews.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Spam
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

I belong to a few lists and this has come up - particularly when there are too many items off-topic. First, there is a size limit for some e-mail boxes, depending upon your ISP and especially for the free Internet e-mail services. Having solicited e-mail bounce because your box is full of unsolicited e-mail is very frustrating. Second is the Cost to the receiver. Not everyone has unlimited on-line service. So to spend more time and money - whether it's to read, download for later reading, or taking the time to delete spam and make more room for the things you asked for - is more than frustrating. This is more akin to cell phone calls where the recipient bears some of the cost.

Marla R. Kaye

>From HOneill1536@aol.com Thu Aug 3 16:18:38 2000
Received: from imo-r13.mx.aol.com (imo-r13.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.67])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA22135 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 16:18:33 -0700
(PDT)
From: HOneill1536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill1536@aol.com
by imo-r13.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.30.87d535b (16934)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 19:17:59 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <30.87d535b.26bb57a7@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 19:17:59 EDT
Subject: Re: Harris sues AOL
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 106

well, Andy, it got general distribution.

>From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Thu Aug 3 20:26:24 2000
Received: from rly-ip02.mx.aol.com (rly-ip02.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.160])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA16900 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 20:26:23 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from tot-wk.proxy.aol.com (tot-wk.proxy.aol.com [205.188.198.131])
by rly-ip02.mx.aol.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/AOL-5.0.0)
with ESMTP id XAA27611 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 3 Aug 2000 23:25:33 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from oemcomputer (AC87C9BA.ipt.aol.com [172.135.201.186])
by tot-wk.proxy.aol.com (8.10.0/8.10.0) with SMTP id e743PWw22503
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Aug 2000 23:25:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <002b01bffd3\$98b7dde0\$bac987ac@oemcomputer>
From: "Karen Donelan" <kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008021630320.3406-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
<002301bffd4b\$dffc6d60\$55cfa3ac@oemcomputer>
<39897A1F.D320B7E7@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?
Date: Thu, 3 Aug 2000 23:25:09 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
X-Apparently-From: FAIRMONT59@aol.com

To Mr Beveridge and others:

The study I was asked to participate in by Harris Interactive was sponsored by a foundation for which I was a grantee and its purpose was to evaluate grantmaking processes. I has provided my email address to that Foundation.

I do not consider this type of study invitation as spam.

I enjoy AAPORNET. I do not enjoy personal attacks on my intelligence or my ability to assess for myself the legitimacy of a research study.

Karen Donelan

----- Original Message -----

From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 9:56 AM
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?

> Dear All:
>
> Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>
> > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
> > legitimate study.
> >
>
>
> This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>
> Spam is spam!!!!

>
> What if someone said:
>
> "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of laser
> toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>
> Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote to
> history.
>
> Andy
>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Aug 4 05:30:22 2000
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.156])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA20552 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 05:30:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-72.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.72])
by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id IAA10656
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:30:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <398AB728.DFFEE2FD@jwdp.com>
Date: Fri, 04 Aug 2000 08:29:28 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Harris & alleged spam
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

First, I do not consider Harris to be spamming in this case.

Whatever one may think of their methodology, they are a legitimate business attempting to recruit a panel for legitimate purposes, and they offer the option of joining or not, in which case you will not be recontacted at the same email address.

This is a far cry from the dozens of messages I receive every week from anonymous mailers in Russia or China offering \$10,000 a week income at home, the ability to spy on my neighbors, or cheap Viagra without a prescription.

Second, the deference by the major online services to the MAPS group is utter nonsense. What is clearly happening is that AOL, Microsoft and the others have seen that Harris has developed a profitable business jointly with their rival, Yahoo!, and they are staking their claim to their membership as their own property, which they will no doubt attempt to exploit by themselves as soon as they figure out how.

AOL and Microsoft have a long history of strongly supporting independent standards groups as long as it served their interest, then turning against them as soon as they could profit by doing so. See, for example, AOL's defense of closing their instant messaging to outsiders and their about-face on open access to cable internet connections within hours of signing a

merger agreement with Time-Warner.

AOL has recently added a feature to their system that identifies "official" email from AOL as opposed to that from any other source, which should give them an enormous advantage when it comes to marketing their subscriber base, which is the foundation of their business model, as Steve Case never fails to tell stock analysts.

It would only take a few lines of code for these organizations to allow Harris's email to be allowed through their blocking mechanisms, and they could easily make arrangements with Harris to impose any conditions they deemed necessary. The fact that they choose not to do so explains what they are up to.

Jan Werner

```
>From edithl@xs4all.nl Fri Aug 4 05:38:35 2000
Received: from smtp7.xs4all.nl (smtp7.xs4all.nl [194.109.127.133])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA23074 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 05:38:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hera (s340-isdn948.dial.xs4all.nl [194.109.183.180])
    by smtp7.xs4all.nl (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA10904
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 14:38:25 +0200 (CEST)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.20000804135516.00a4add0@pop.xs4all.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@pop.xs4all.nl
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Fri, 04 Aug 2000 14:30:26 +0200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>
Subject: RE: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DD0@AS_SERVER>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
```

SPAM costs money!

SPAM does not cost the sender, but in many countries (USA excepted) it costs the receiver.

Internet connections go often over phone lines, in many countries you pay for each call a flat rate PLUS a certain extra amount for each half minute. So when I download messages (also unwanted ones) it costs me. When I download a long message with a long attachment, it costs me more. Some 'SPAM' send you a message and when you open it, you are automatically connected again to the 'net' and see a whole lot of unwanted things at your cost.

It is comparable by phoning someone on his/her cell phone in the USA (the phone owner pays the costs) and let them hear a taped commercial! Real internet surveys are a nice tool, and good designers are conscious about the costs (both monetary and emotional, and cognitive).

On the other hand, I do hate any form of censure, and I really am against the AOL-practices.

In the words of an older and much wiser person:

I profoundly disagree with certain opinions, but I will always defend the free right to express them.

Warm greetings, edith

At 10:42 AM 8/3/00 -0400, you wrote:

>The problem with Spam in the minds of those who have a problem with it
>is that someone else is using their resources that they pay for without
>their permission to (usually) sell me something.

>

>At least with junk mail the sender pays to send it to me - thus
>preventing him from sending me a catalog every week. With junk email
>there is virtually no cost to send (it cost about as much to send it to
>one person as it does to send it to 1,000,000). Since according to the
>US Chamber of Commerce there are over 10 million business in the US
>imagine what would happen if all of them sent you just 2 emails a year.

>

>What about phone surveys? Well, fortunately for us they have a
>relatively long history of acceptance.

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta
>Art & Science Group, Inc.
>simonetta@artsci.com

>

>

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]

> > Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:29 AM

> > To: aapornet@usc.edu

> > Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)

> >

> >

> > Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL**** survey
> > contacts are unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.

> >

> > Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all
> > unsolicited junk mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found
> > something they wanted in a catalog received from a previously
> > unknown merchant can readily testify.

> >

> > Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal mail, but
> > it is surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an
> > unsolicited phone call from even the most respectable survey
> > research organization.

> >

> > But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a footnote
> > to history if this keeps up.

> >

> > Jan Werner

> >

> >

> > "Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> > >

> > > Dear All:

> > >

> > > Does the following quotation only trouble me?

> > >

> > > > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of
> > a legitimate

> > > > study.

> > > >

> > > >

> > >
> > > This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
> > >
> > > Spam is spam!!!!
> > >
> > > What if someone said:
> > >
> > > "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of
> > > laser toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
> > >
> > > Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a
> > > footnote to history.
> > >
> > > Andy
> >

>From gulicke@slhn.org Fri Aug 4 05:44:28 2000
Received: from ntserver.slhn.org (ntserver.slhn.org [205.147.244.5])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA24776 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 05:44:19 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by ntserver with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <3Z8WSADK>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:41:07 -0400
Message-ID: <7138ECDD5A46D11192AC00805F1930FF02CC8175@ntserver>
From: "Gulick, Elizabeth" <gulicke@slhn.org>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject:
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:41:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_=_NextPart_001_01BFFE11.4238FE56"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01BFFE11.4238FE56
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I beg you all indulge my ignorance by answering a question for me. What is
the operation definition of SPAM and how do I know if I am about to become a
victim of SPAM? This is actually two questions....Sorry. Thanks

Elizabeth P. Gulick, MBA
Quality Coordinator
St. Luke's Hospital
801 Ostrum St.
Bethlehem, PA 18015
(610) 954 - 4129
(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)
gulicke@slhn.org <mailto:gulicke@slhn.org>

-----_=_NextPart_001_01BFFE11.4238FE56
Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!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"> <META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange
Server version = 5.5.2650.12"> <TITLE></TITLE> </HEAD> <BODY>

<P>I beg you all indulge my ignorance by =
answering a question for me. What is the operation definition of =
SPAM and how do I know if I am about to become a victim of SPAM? =
This is actually two questions....Sorry.</P>

<P>Thanks
</P>

<P><I>Elizabeth P. Gulick, =
MBA</I>
Quality
Coordinator
St. Luke's
Hospital
801 Ostrum St.

Bethlehem, PA 18015

(610) 954 - 4129
<FONT
SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)
<U><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF" = SIZE=3D2
FACE=3D"Tahoma">gulicke@slhn.org</U>

</P>

</BODY>

</HTML>

-----_NextPart_001_01BFFE11.4238FE56--

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Fri Aug 4 05:45:03 2000

Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA25295 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 05:45:03 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mailserver.Princeton.EDU (mailserver.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.65])

by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id IAA29098
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:45:01 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from princeton.edu (wvs-9nkmv.Princeton.EDU [128.112.148.242])
by mailserver.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id IAA14785
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:45:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <398ABADA.3822044E@princeton.edu>

Date: Fri, 04 Aug 2000 08:45:14 -0400

From: Edward Freeland <efreelan@Princeton.EDU>

X-Sender: "Edward Freeland" <efreelan@smtp.princeton.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD Princeton University 05-99 (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

CC: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: AOL, Harris & alleged spam

References: <398AB728.DFFEE2FD@jwdp.com>

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----F9FFA40FE5BA5EDD385EAF43"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----F9FFA40FE5BA5EDD385EAF43

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The subtext here may be AOL's jockeying for dominance of the online survey market, a point Jim Beniger made when the AOL-Time Warner merger was first announced.

Jan Werner wrote:

> First, I do not consider Harris to be spamming in this case.
>
> Whatever one may think of their methodology, they are a legitimate
> business attempting to recruit a panel for legitimate purposes, and
> they offer the option of joining or not, in which case you will not be
> recontacted at the same email address.
>
> This is a far cry from the dozens of messages I receive every week
> from anonymous mailers in Russia or China offering \$10,000 a week
> income at home, the ability to spy on my neighbors, or cheap Viagra
> without a prescription.
>
> Second, the deference by the major online services to the MAPS group
> is utter nonsense. What is clearly happening is that AOL, Microsoft
> and the others have seen that Harris has developed a profitable
> business jointly with their rival, Yahoo!, and they are staking their
> claim to their membership as their own property, which they will no
> doubt attempt to exploit by themselves as soon as they figure out how.
>
> AOL and Microsoft have a long history of strongly supporting
> independent standards groups as long as it served their interest, then
> turning against them as soon as they could profit by doing so. See,
> for example, AOL's defense of closing their instant messaging to
> outsiders and their about-face on open access to cable internet
> connections within hours of signing a merger agreement with
> Time-Warner.
>
> AOL has recently added a feature to their system that identifies
> "official" email from AOL as opposed to that from any other source,
> which should give them an enormous advantage when it comes to
> marketing their subscriber base, which is the foundation of their
> business model, as Steve Case never fails to tell stock analysts.
>
> It would only take a few lines of code for these organizations to
> allow Harris's email to be allowed through their blocking mechanisms,
> and they could easily make arrangements with Harris to impose any
> conditions they deemed necessary. The fact that they choose not to do
> so explains what they are up to.
>
> Jan Werner

-----F9FFA40FE5BA5EDD385EAF43

Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="efreelan.vcf"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: Card for Edward Freeland

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="efreelan.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Freeland;Edward
tel;fax:609 258-0549
tel;work:609 258-1854
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Princeton University;Survey Research Center
version:2.1
email;internet:efreelan@princeton.edu
title:Associate Director
adr;quoted-printable;;;169 Nassau Street=0D=0A;Princeton;NJ;08542-7007;
x-mozilla-cpt:;-21120
fn:Edward Freeland
end:vcard

-----F9FFA40FE5BA5EDD385EAF43--

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fri Aug 4 05:45:41 2000
Received: from mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (mx1.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.112.76])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA25605 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 05:45:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from s1.optonline.net (s1.optonline.net [167.206.112.6])
by mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id IAA26701;
Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:44:15 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (dl64-134.ynkrry.optonline.net
[24.189.164.134])
by s1.optonline.net (8.9.1/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id IAA23695;
Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:44:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <398ABADC.51679CCB@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Fri, 04 Aug 2000 08:45:16 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.74 [en] (WinNT; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: jwerner@jwdp.com
CC: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Harris & alleged spam
References: <398AB728.DFFEE2FD@jwdp.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jan Werner wrote:

>
> First, I do not consider Harris to be spamming in this case.
>
> Whatever one may think of their methodology, they are a legitimate
> business attempting to recruit a panel for legitimate purposes, and
> they offer the option of joining or not, in which case you will not be
> recontacted at the same email address.

I think any distinction between "legitimate" and "illegitimate" businesses is very difficult. The Laser Toner ads are also legit, as are the porno ads, the travel deals, etc. It is because of this sort of stuff that the ISP's are now checking for SPAM.

If you don't like the spam you get from your own ISP, be it Yahoo or MSN or AOL you can always change ISP's.

That is why ISP's are using spam busters. If AOL starts spamming their own members, then people can quit.

Can you imagine Congress passing a freedom to spam law, or anyother measure that would continue to undercut internet privacy?

Can the survey industry survive only if they spam? The next version of the TCP/IP protocol will allow self-screening for spam, since there will be a nearly ineradicable tag identifying the message source.

Andy

Andy

```
>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Fri Aug 4 06:11:35 2000
Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id GAA02482 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 06:11:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])
    by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id JAA15003
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:11:34 -0400
Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.47);
    4 Aug 00 09:11:33 -0400
Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.47); 4 Aug 00 09:11:04 -0400
From: "Colleen K Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:11:04 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: RE: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
Message-ID: <398A88A7.22887.F737427@localhost>
In-reply-to: <4.2.0.58.20000804135516.00a4add0@pop.xs4all.nl>
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DD0@AS_SERVER>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
```

Edith de Leeuw wrote:

```
> SPAM costs money!
> SPAM does not cost the sender, but in many countries (USA excepted)
> it
> costs the receiver.
> [...]
> It is comparable by phoning someone on his/her cell phone in the USA (the
> phone owner pays the costs) and let them hear a taped commercial!
```

This was exactly the issue with junk faxes a decade ago in the USA. Federal statutes curbed the practice, and it's a precedent cited by anti-spam activists. (Except that while telephone lines have a geographical location in some identifiable jurisdiction, the Internet crosses all kinds of borders.)

> Real internet surveys are a nice tool, and good designers are
conscious
> about the costs (both monetary and emotional, and cognitive).

Amen!

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
>From vhbartot@midway.uchicago.edu Fri Aug 4 06:14:08 2000
Received: from midway.uchicago.edu (midway.uchicago.edu [128.135.12.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA03666 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 06:14:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from survey-lab-2 (juddpc2.spc.uchicago.edu [128.135.64.56])
by midway.uchicago.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1) with SMTP id e74DDrH18829;
Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:13:53 -0500 (CDT)
Message-ID: <055c01bffe15\$4e21ceb0\$38408780@survey-lab-2.uchicago.edu>
From: "Virginia H. Bartot" <vhbartot@midway.uchicago.edu>
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <lshiman@opiniondynamics.com>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:10:04 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Can you please stop this unsolicited email re: Harris sue me? I don't mind
seeing this on aapornet but not on my own email for my own professional
business, please!

-----Original Message-----

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: lshiman@opiniondynamics.com <lshiman@opiniondynamics.com>
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, August 04, 2000 2:01 AM
Subject: Re: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)

>Larry wrote:

>>

>> Unsolicited phone calls are considered acceptable - no rules are
>> broken. Unsolicited e-mail, for any reason, is not considered
>> acceptable. It may

be

>> irrational, we may not like it, but it is the rule under which we

>> must operate - at least, that's what we tell our clients.
>>
>
>That's because your primary business is selling telephone polls.
>People in the online polling business say exactly the opposite.
>
>Of course unsolicited telephone calls have one advantage from the
>recipient's point of view: there is actually someone at the other end
>who can be told just where to go and how to get there, thus relieving
>some of the aggravation.
>
>> I was recently at a convention where several of the exhibitors
>> called, e-mailed, and sent regular mail to attendees - all
>> unsolicited. People I spoke with were far more annoyed by the e-mail
>> than they were by regular mail or even telephone calls. I believe
>> people think of their e-mail as more "private" than their telephones
>> or their regular mail. To send unsolicited e-mails invades their
>> privacy.
>>
>
>You are confusing anecdotal evidence with quantitative results.
>
>Jan Werner
> _____
>
>> Larry Shiman
>> Opinion Dynamics
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf
>> Of Jan Werner
>> Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 10:29 AM
>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>> Subject: Spam (Was: Re: Will Harris Sue Me?)
>>
>> Except for self-selected "entertainment" polls, ****ALL**** survey
>> contacts are unsolicited, whether by telephone, email or in person.
>>
>> Spam refers to the email equivalent of junk mail, but all unsolicited
>> junk mail is not unwelcome, as anyone who has ever found something
>> they wanted in a catalog received from a previously unknown merchant
>> can readily testify.
>>
>> Unsolicited email may be more intrusive than junk postal mail, but it
>> is surely a lot less obnoxious than being interrupted by an
>> unsolicited phone call from even the most respectable survey research
>> organization.
>>
>> But you might yet be right about survey research becoming a footnote
>> to history if this keeps up.
>>
>> Jan Werner
>> _____
>>
>> "Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
>> >
>> > Dear All:

>> >
>> > Does the following quotation only trouble me?
>> >
>> > > never had unsolicited messages from Harris unless part of a
legitimate
>> > > study.
>> > >
>> >
>> > This is a defense of spam for a "legitimate study."
>> >
>> > Spam is spam!!!!
>> >
>> > What if someone said:
>> >
>> > "I never had unsolicited messages except for a special offer of
>> > laser toner, pornography, or a dream vacation."
>> >
>> > Keep this up and survey research, as we know it, will be a footnote
>> > to history.
>> >
>> > Andy
>

>From rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu Fri Aug 4 06:16:35 2000
Received: from mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com (mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com [24.2.7.74])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA04782 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 06:16:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from spenser ([24.2.109.195]) by mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.00 201-229-121) with SMTP
id <20000804131628.PBHS19901.mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com@spenser>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 06:16:28 -0700
Reply-To: <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
From: "Robert Wyatt" <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:16:13 -0500
Message-ID: <NCBBIFHAELIHNKGGKNBIIEEFCEAA.rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008030932050.5392-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

well, for empiricists, we seem to be offering a lot of "qualitative"
responses to the issue of how spam differs from rdd. anybody like to put the
question to the american people on a national survey?

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
James Beniger
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 1:56 PM
To: AAPORNET

Subject: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Question of the Hour: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Answer: There are countless ways, of course (I'm still thinking of new ones--hours after I began pondering this most profound question).

The most salient of these ways, for our discussion of the universal hostility toward spam and spamming throughout the Internet:

The average high school student, working alone, and with only a few days of preparation (one week, max), could easily e-mail the exact same message to ten thousand people online with the stroke of a single finger (even using an aging and under-powered pc; she would need to have access to the Internet, however, or else to do this from school).

Now someone tell me, how long would it take the usual polling operations of the two Timeses (Los Angeles and New York)--combined--to RDD ten thousand households with the same survey instrument?

On the off-chance that you might not have an average high school student readily at hand (my own two are currently forced first to pass pre-school, which is interfering with their poetic calculus--analytic, not differential), here's how to spam:

Make a list of ten thousand names and e-address (this might take, say, six solid hours, working alone with only a pc). Many (if not most) public e-mail lists have subscriber lists (names and e-addresses) available--automatically by machine, in a matter of seconds--to anyone on Earth who requests a copy with a one-line command sent directly to the server (usually only a few words, like "list aapornet.usc.edu"). AAPORNET's subscriber list would indeed be available in this way today, had I not blocked that option when setting up the list, simply because we are open to AAPOR members only).

So, if our high-schooler wishes to spam/survey ten thousand pet owners, say, and the subscriber lists on every last one of the 500 largest pet-owner lists are blocked (there's zero probability that even 50 are), she need only to subscribe to each of those lists (might take a few hours), capture all messages posted to each list for the next few days, strip them of their e-addresses, alphabetize them, eliminate the duplicate addresses, combine them with the other lists, et voila--the spam is ready to be perpetrated.

Is any such mailing list useful for a legitimate survey, that is, one intended to infer its findings to a larger population? Of course not--the population's not known, the sample is hardly random, there's no frame (and these are just a few of the minor problems). Spamming is good, however, for selling just about anything--because the costs are so low, even success rates of a fraction of one percent can mean considerable profits, after spamming hundreds of thousands of people in just a week or two, for less money than you probably carry home from the cash machine on a typical visit. Where is government to protect us consumers from this nightmare, this outrage!?

All that remains to be done, after the spam letter/instrument is written, is for our student to push down her one finger (any one will do, even the thumb). And, at that same moment, how might our interviewers at the two Timeses be doing with the ol' RDD survey, scientific though it of course will be?

And so, why do most people online care about such spamming--with a passion bordering on militant hostility? Because we get perhaps three times as much spam as we do personal messages, not even counting spam which we've "requested" in order to get something else which we want (the Dow Jones hourly newsletter, for example). I'm sure that I spend more time online deleting spam than I do anything else--perhaps all other online activities combined.

Professionals and others in public or highly visible occupations have an additional associated problem. Virtually every professor, at every level, for example, and at virtually every college or university with instruction in English or a language with its alphabet (I'm entirely ignorant of languages with other alphabets, and do so envy all of you who are not), has his or her full name and e-mail address online somewhere on that institution's Web site. And I very much approve of this practice--it helps us scholars find one another, it gives prospective students a chance to discuss possible classes and majors with their likely teachers, and it gives parents of students an easy opportunity to have private discussions with their children's teachers, to whose salaries they likely contribute. Fortunately for us faculty members, moreover, our names and e-addresses are carefully hidden behind the homepages of our institutions--outsiders wishing to spam us would need to be able to recognize the word "Directory" on a university homepage in order to reach us by e-mail (fat chance of that happening, hey!?).

Me, I get countless such messages each year, not only from virtually every last student on the planet wishing to get into some--any--college or graduate program, and also from certainly--certainly--every computer science major hoping for paid summer working helping me to process and analyze data (a nonexistent position, never advertised) on the shores of Santa Monica Bay, but of course!

So, would you wish to be associated with any organization which has drawn international publicity for spamming--and also for suing in court to make it still easier to spam--and still have to earn your very living from the Internet? Not I! I can't even imagine to what level of hell Dante would have assigned such an existence. Me, I'd advise against landing there.

-- Jim

>From rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu Fri Aug 4 06:17:43 2000
Received: from mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com (mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com [24.2.7.74])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA05683 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 06:17:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from spenser ([24.2.109.195]) by mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.00 201-229-121) with SMTP
id <20000804131737.PBKU19901.mail2.rdc1.tn.home.com@spenser>

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 06:17:37 -0700
Reply-To: <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
From: "Robert Wyatt" <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:17:22 -0500
Message-ID: <NCBBIFHAELIHNKGGKNBIMEEFCEAA.rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008030932050.5392-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

the fact that an average high-scholler could spam the world seems to be but another example of the leveling influence of the internet. this kid doesn't need all the economic and technical resources of a major telemarketer to ruin the day of millions of people.

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 1:56 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Question of the Hour: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Answer: There are countless ways, of course (I'm still thinking of new ones--hours after I began pondering this most profound question).

The most salient of these ways, for our discussion of the universal hostility toward spam and spamming throughout the Internet:

The average high school student, working alone, and with only a few days of preparation (one week, max), could easily e-mail the exact same message to ten thousand people online with the stroke of a single finger (even using an aging and under-powered pc; she would need to have access to the Internet, however, or else to do this from school).

Now someone tell me, how long would it take the usual polling operations of the two Timeses (Los Angeles and New York)--combined--to RDD ten thousand households with the same survey instrument?

On the off-chance that you might not have an average high school student readily at hand (my own two are currently forced first to pass pre-school, which is interfering with their poetic calculus--analytic, not differential), here's how to spam:

Make a list of ten thousand names and e-address (this might take, say, six

solid hours, working alone with only a pc). Many (if not most) public e-mail lists have subscriber lists (names and e-addresses) available--automatically by machine, in a matter of seconds--to anyone on Earth who requests a copy with a one-line command sent directly to the server (usually only a few words, like "list aapornet.usc.edu"). AAPORNET's subscriber list would indeed be available in this way today, had I not blocked that option when setting up the list, simply because we are open to AAPOR members only).

So, if our high-schooler wishes to spam/survey ten thousand pet owners, say, and the subscriber lists on every last one of the 500 largest pet-owner lists are blocked (there's zero probability that even 50 are), she need only to subscribe to each of those lists (might take a few hours), capture all messages posted to each list for the next few days, strip them of their e-addresses, alphabetize them, eliminate the duplicate addresses, combine them with the other lists, et voila--the spam is ready to be perpetrated.

Is any such mailing list useful for a legitimate survey, that is, one intended to infer its findings to a larger population? Of course not--the population's not known, the sample is hardly random, there's no frame (and these are just a few of the minor problems). Spamming is good, however, for selling just about anything--because the costs are so low, even success rates of a fraction of one percent can mean considerable profits, after spamming hundreds of thousands of people in just a week or two, for less money than you probably carry home from the cash machine on a typical visit. Where is government to protect us consumers from this nightmare, this outrage!?

All that remains to be done, after the spam letter/instrument is written, is for our student to push down her one finger (any one will do, even the thumb). And, at that same moment, how might our interviewers at the two Timeses be doing with the ol' RDD survey, scientific though it of course will be?

And so, why do most people online care about such spamming--with a passion bordering on militant hostility? Because we get perhaps three times as much spam as we do personal messages, not even counting spam which we've "requested" in order to get something else which we want (the Dow Jones hourly newsletter, for example). I'm sure that I spend more time online deleting spam than I do anything else--perhaps all other online activities combined.

Professionals and others in public or highly visible occupations have an additional associated problem. Virtually every professor, at every level, for example, and at virtually every college or university with instruction in English or a language with its alphabet (I'm entirely ignorant of languages with other alphabets, and do so envy all of you who are not), has his or her full name and e-mail address online somewhere on that institution's Web site. And I very much approve of this practice--it helps us scholars find one another, it gives prospective students a chance to discuss possible classes and majors with their likely teachers, and it gives parents of students an easy opportunity to have private discussions with their children's teachers, to whose salaries they likely contribute. Fortunately for us faculty members, moreover, our names and e-addresses are carefully hidden behind the homepages of our institutions--outsiders wishing to spam us would need to be able to recognize the word "Directory" on a university homepage in order to reach us by e-mail (fat chance of that happening, hey!?).

Me, I get countless such messages each year, not only from virtually every last student on the planet wishing to get into some--any--college or graduate program, and also from certainly--certainly--every computer science major hoping for paid summer working helping me to process and analyze data (a nonexistent position, never advertised) on the shores of Santa Monica Bay, but of course!

So, would you wish to be associated with any organization which has drawn international publicity for spamming--and also for suing in court to make it still easier to spam--and still have to earn your very living from the Internet? Not I! I can't even imagine to what level of hell Dante would have assigned such an existence. Me, I'd advise against landing there.

-- Jim

>From ASafir@ui.urban.org Fri Aug 4 07:09:15 2000
Received: from uint3.urban.org (uint3.urban.org [4.22.172.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA21706 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 07:09:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by webmail.urban.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <P6T9ZSGF>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:03:03 -0400
Message-ID: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B0030958@uint4.urban.org>
From: "Safir, Adam" <ASafir@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: AOL, Harris & alleged spam
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:04:34 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Digital Marketing Services (www.dmsdallas.com) is an AOL company that "offers a proven way to conduct online custom research among AOL's 22+ million accounts representing over 40 million people."

No doubt they would prefer "their" respondent pool to be undisturbed by the research efforts of other online survey organizations.

Adam Safir
Urban Institute

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Edward Freeland [mailto:efreelan@Princeton.EDU]

>Sent: Friday, August 04, 2000 8:45 AM

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Cc: AAPORNET

>Subject: AOL, Harris & alleged spam

>

>

>The subtext here may be AOL's jockeying for dominance of the

>online survey
>market, a point Jim Beniger made when the AOL-Time Warner
>merger was first
>announced.
>
>Jan Werner wrote:
>
>> First, I do not consider Harris to be spamming in this case.
>>
>> Whatever one may think of their methodology, they are a legitimate
>> business attempting to recruit a panel for legitimate
>purposes, and they
>> offer the option of joining or not, in which case you will not be
>> recontacted at the same email address.
>>
>> This is a far cry from the dozens of messages I receive
>every week from
>> anonymous mailers in Russia or China offering \$10,000 a week
>income at
>> home, the ability to spy on my neighbors, or cheap Viagra without a
>> prescription.
>>
>> Second, the deference by the major online services to the
>MAPS group is
>> utter nonsense. What is clearly happening is that AOL,
>Microsoft and the
>> others have seen that Harris has developed a profitable
>business jointly
>> with their rival, Yahoo!, and they are staking their claim to their
>> membership as their own property, which they will no doubt attempt to
>> exploit by themselves as soon as they figure out how.
>>
>> AOL and Microsoft have a long history of strongly supporting
>independent
>> standards groups as long as it served their interest, then turning
>> against them as soon as they could profit by doing so. See, for
>> example, AOL's defense of closing their instant messaging to
>outsiders
>> and their about-face on open access to cable internet
>connections within
>> hours of signing a merger agreement with Time-Warner.
>>
>> AOL has recently added a feature to their system that identifies
>> "official" email from AOL as opposed to that from any other source,
>> which should give them an enormous advantage when it comes
>to marketing
>> their subscriber base, which is the foundation of their
>business model,
>> as Steve Case never fails to tell stock analysts.
>>
>> It would only take a few lines of code for these
>organizations to allow
>> Harris's email to be allowed through their blocking
>mechanisms, and they
>> could easily make arrangements with Harris to impose any
>conditions they
>> deemed necessary. The fact that they choose not to do so

>explains what
>> they are up to.
>>
>> Jan Werner
>
>From BDumont@apcoassoc.com Fri Aug 4 07:45:42 2000
Received: from apco_dc_xchange.apcoassoc.com (smtp.apcoassoc.com
[12.40.161.66])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA05002 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 07:45:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by apcoassoc.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QG4XM73M>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:42:56 -0400
Message-ID: <0189724583D8D111A72D00805F85C1D00402F7DC@apcoassoc.com>
From: "Dumont, Bryan" <BDumont@apcoassoc.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: FW: Job Posting
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:42:55 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01BFFE22.46A1C000"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01BFFE22.46A1C000
Content-Type: text/plain

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Benson, Mark
> Sent: Friday, August 04, 2000 10:18 AM
> To: Dumont, Bryan
> Subject: Job Posting
>
>
> Global Research Opportunity
>
>
> APCO Insight, the research and message development division of APCO
> Worldwide, based in Washington, DC. is adding research professionals.
> APCO is a subsidiary of New York based Grey Global Group. APCO
> maintains offices in 21 cities throughout North America, Europe, and
> Asia.
>
> Insight is a fast-growing research organization offering a wide range
> of opinion and market research services. We provide research and
> strategic communications consulting for Fortune 500 companies, trade
> associations, NGO's and other clients from around the world. We are
> adding research associates to our Washington office, with
> opportunities in London and Brussels planned. Ideal candidates would
> have the following attributes:
>
> * Strong methodological background
> * Exceptional client communications and presentation skills.

> * Excellent writing skills
> * Working experience with business software and statistical packages
> (primarily SPSS)
> * An ability to form cooperative relationships with APCO colleagues
> around the world
>
> Insight seeks to offer an excellent work environment with exciting
> opportunities for motivated research professionals. If this interests
> you, please send a resume to:
>
> Mark Benson
> President, APCO Insight
> 1615 L Street NW
> Suite 900
> Washington, DC 20036
> mbenson@apcoinsight.com
>
>

-----_=_NextPart_001_01BFFE22.46A1C000
Content-Type: text/html
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>  
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =  
charset=3Dus-ascii"> <META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server  
version = 5.5.2650.12">  
<TITLE>FW: Job Posting</TITLE>  
</HEAD>  
<BODY>  
<BR>  
<BR>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">-----Original Message-----</FONT>  
<BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">From:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT =  
SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Benson, Mark </FONT> <BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1  
FACE=3D"Arial">Sent:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT = SIZE=3D1  
FACE=3D"Arial">Friday, August 04, 2000 10:18 AM</FONT> <BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1  
= FACE=3D"Arial">To:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT SIZE=3D1 =  
FACE=3D"Arial">Dumont, Bryan</FONT> <BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 =  
FACE=3D"Arial">Subject:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT>=  
</B> <FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Job Posting</FONT>  
</P>  
<BR>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Global Research Opportunity</FONT> </P>  
<BR>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">APCO Insight, the research and message =  
development division of APCO Worldwide, based in Washington, DC. is = adding  
research professionals.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; APCO is a subsidiary of New York = based Grey  
Global Group.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; APCO mainitains offices in 21 cities = throughout North  
America, Europe, and Asia.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; </FONT></P>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Insight is a fast-growing research =
```

organization offering a wide range of opinion and market research = services. We provide research and strategic communications = consulting for Fortune 500 companies, trade associations, NGO's and = other clients from around the world. We are adding research = associates to our Washington office, with opportunities in London and = Brussels planned. Ideal candidates would have the following = attributes:</P>

- Strong methodological = background Exceptional client communications and = presentation skills. Excellent writing skills Working experience with business = software and statistical packages (primarily SPSS) An ability to form cooperative = relationships with APCO colleagues around the world <P>Insight seeks to offer an excellent = work environment with exciting opportunities for motivated research = professionals. If this interests you, please send a resume = to:</P>

<P>Mark Benson

President, APCO Insight
1615 L Street NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC
mbenson@apcoinsight.com
</P>

<P>
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

----- =_NextPart_001_01BFFE22.46A1C000--
>From simonetta@artsci.com Fri Aug 4 08:03:24 2000
Received: from as_server.artsci.com
(tw5nl-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 IAA11122 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:03:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QH7GJ9L1>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:58:03 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DDE@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:58:03 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I don't think RDD is that popular either.

When I was at Georgia State in 1997 we (Hi Gary) did a survey of adults in the state asking people whether they though they ought to be able to put their name on a list that would block; telemarketing calls, charity calls,

polls by political organization and scientific research polls conducted by government or scientific organizations. In all cases the majority thought they ought to be able to block these calls (to the best of my recollection the highest number was around 90% and was for telemarketers and the lowest was 70% for scientific research polls). The state was considering a state-wide registry of people who did not want to be called for any of these reasons.

At its very worst before I started using email filters, before CAUCE (an anti-spam organization), before MAPS and ORBS (another anti-spam list), before AOL and others started suing spammers and before Virginia, California and Washington state all passed laws against certain types of spam I was receiving on average just under 4 Email spams a day. And this was back in 1998 when the online population was much smaller than it is now. The fact that I am a Usenet user means that it is relatively for someone to collect my email address.

In the last year I have received three calls for telephone surveys, all from the same organization (I agreed to participate in a series of surveys on use of the web and the Internet). I told them I was a pollster - but they said that's OK your opinions count, too!

Andy below mentioned some other easy ways to collect addresses in a previous message but by far the easiest is to buy a list. There are web sites that will sell you a CD of millions of "verified valid" online address for \$99.95 and the software necessary to automatically send your message to those addresses for perhaps another \$200. I can send a 200 million emails for much less than the cost of conducting 200 telephone surveys.

On one of those CDs there were 7 addresses of mine - some as old as seven years old and only two still valid ones.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Robert Wyatt [mailto:rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu]

> Sent: Friday, August 04, 2000 9:16 AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: RE: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

>

>

> well, for empiricists, we seem to be offering a lot of "qualitative"
> responses to the issue of how spam differs from rdd. anybody like to
> put the question to the american people on a national survey?

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

> [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of

> James Beniger

> Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 1:56 PM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

>

>
>
>
> Question of the Hour: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
>
>
> Answer: There are countless ways, of course (I'm still thinking of new
> ones--hours after I began pondering this most profound question).
>
> The most salient of these ways, for our discussion of the universal
> hostility toward spam and spamming throughout the Internet:
>
> The average high school student, working alone, and with only
> a few days
> of preparation (one week, max), could easily e-mail the exact
> same message
> to ten thousand people online with the stroke of a single finger (even
> using an aging and under-powered pc; she would need to have
> access to the
> Internet, however, or else to do this from school).
>
> Now someone tell me, how long would it take the usual polling
> operations
> of the two Timeses (Los Angeles and New York)--combined--to RDD ten
> thousand households with the same survey instrument?
>
> On the off-chance that you might not have an average high
> school student
> readily at hand (my own two are currently forced first to pass
> pre-school, which is interfering with their poetic calculus--analytic,
> not differential), here's how to spam:
>
> Make a list of ten thousand names and e-address (this might
> take, say, six
> solid hours, working alone with only a pc). Many (if not most) public
> e-mail lists have subscriber lists (names and e-addresses) available--
> automatically by machine, in a matter of seconds--to anyone
> on Earth who
> requests a copy with a one-line command sent directly to the server
> (usually only a few words, like "list aapornet.usc.edu"). AAPORNET's
> subscriber list would indeed be available in this way today, had I not
> blocked that option when setting up the list, simply because
> we are open
> to AAPOR members only).
>
> So, if our high-schooler wishes to spam/survey ten thousand
> pet owners,
> say, and the subscriber lists on every last one of the 500 largest
> pet-owner lists are blocked (there's zero probability that
> even 50 are),
> she need only to subscribe to each of those lists (might take a few
> hours), capture all messages posted to each list for the next
> few days,
> strip them of their e-addresses, alphabetize them, eliminate
> the duplicate
> addresses, combine them with the other lists, et voila--the
> spam is ready

> to be perpetrated.
>
> Is any such mailing list useful for a legitimate survey, that is, one
> intended to infer its findings to a larger population? Of course
> not--the population's not known, the sample is hardly random, there's
> no frame (and these are just a few of the minor problems).
> Spamming is good,
> however, for selling just about anything--because the costs
> are so low,
> even success rates of a fraction of one percent can mean considerable
> profits, after spamming hundreds of thousands of people in
> just a week or
> two, for less money than you probably carry home from the
> cash machine on
> a typical visit. Where is government to protect us consumers
> from this
> nightmare, this outrage!?
>
> All that remains to be done, after the spam letter/instrument
> is written,
> is for our student to push down her one finger (any one will
> do, even the
> thumb). And, at that same moment, how might our interviewers
> at the two
> Timeses be doing with the ol' RDD survey, scientific though
> it of course
> will be?
>
> And so, why do most people online care about such
> spamming--with a passion
> bordering--on militant hostility? Because we get perhaps
> three times as
> much spam as we do personal messages, not even counting spam
> which we've
> "requested" in order to get something else which we want (the
> Dow Jones
> hourly newsletter, for example). I'm sure that I spend more
> time online
> deleting spam than I do anything else--perhaps all other
> online activities
> combined.
>
> Professionals and others in public or highly visible
> occupations have an
> additional associated problem. Virtually every professor, at
> every level,
> for example, and at virtually every college or university
> with instruction
> in English or a language with its alphabet (I'm entirely ignorant of
> languages with other alphabets, and do so envy all of you who
> are not),
> has his or her full name and e-mail address online somewhere on that
> institution's Web site. And I very much approve of this practice--it
> helps us scholars find one another, it gives prospective
> students a chance
> to discuss possible classes and majors with their likely
> teachers, and it

> gives parents of students an easy opportunity to have private
> discussions
> with their children's teachers, to whose salaries they likely
> contribute.
> Fortunately for us faculty members, moreover, our names and
> e-addresses
> are carefully hidden behind the homepages of our
> institutions--outsiders
> wishing to spam us would need to be able to recognize the
> word "Directory"
> on a university homepage in order to reach us by e-mail (fat chance of
> that happening, hey!?).
>
> Me, I get countless such messages each year, not only from virtually
> every last student on the planet wishing to get into
> some--any--college or graduate program, and also from
> certainly--certainly--every computer science major hoping for paid
> summer working helping me to process and analyze data (a nonexistent
> position, never advertised) on the shores of
> Santa Monica Bay, but of course!
>
> So, would you wish to be associated with any organization
> which has drawn
> international publicity for spamming--and also for suing in
> court to make
> it still easier to spam--and still have to earn your very
> living from the
> Internet? Not I! I can't even imagine to what level of hell
> Dante would
> have assigned such an existence. Me, I'd advise against
> landing there.

>

>

-- Jim

>

> *****

>

>

>From gandres@dutkogroup.com Fri Aug 4 08:11:51 2000
Received: from ntserver3.dutkogroup.com ([63.83.39.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA14936 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:11:50 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by NTSERVER3 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Q16JB72B>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:12:11 -0400
Message-ID: <9779000A81E4D311A5C700508BA368472A16BA@NTSERVER3>
From: Gary Andres <gandres@dutkogroup.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: list
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:12:10 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Somehow I got on your e-mail list and I'm getting copied on everybody's
e-mail. I'm getting over 60 messages a day from people I've never heard of.
How do I get off??

>From gandres@dutkogroup.com Fri Aug 4 08:18:13 2000
Received: from ntserver3.dutkogroup.com ([63.83.39.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id IAB18222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 08:17:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by NTSERVER3 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Q16JB72L>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:18:00 -0400
Message-ID: <9779000A81E4D311A5C700508BA368472A16BB@NTSERVER3>
From: Gary Andres <gandres@dutkogroup.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me? (fwd)
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:17:59 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Hi. For some reason I got on an e-mail list at aapornet@usc.edu
<mailto:aapornet@usc.edu> and I'm being copied on everyone's e-mail. How
do I get off???? These copies are clogging my entire system. Help!!!

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew Beveridge [SMTP:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 11:57 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Re: Will Harris Sue Me? (fwd)

Robert Wyatt wrote:

>
> so, why aren't random phone calls spam????

They are. I hang up on them, and have requested to be dropped
from telemarketing lists.

Isn't that why response rates
are dropping? Isn't this why Harris, Intersurv, et al are claiming
superiority for their methods?

Andy

>From sflexo@deltanet.com Fri Aug 4 09:16:28 2000
Received: from server.suremail.com (root@server.suremail.com [207.48.17.1])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA17574 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:16:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from sflexo (dsl-35-249-186-216.cust.dslnetworks.net
[216.186.249.35]) by server.suremail.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id JAA24896
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:16:28 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Scott W. Flexo, Ph.D." <sflexo@deltanet.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:08:35 -0700
Message-ID: <LPBBIGOHOFLECAECJFJFLOELECAAA.sflexo@deltanet.com>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008030932050.5392-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Dearest AAPOR:

We could (and probably will) argue for days and days and days about how much more or less people like/dislike unsolicited email versus unsolicited phone calls. However, it's kind of like arguing about whether people would rather work or go to the Mexican Rivera. The answer is pretty obvious. Still, unsolicited stuff is unavoidable in a world with people and marketing research.

However, this is really not the point. The real issue about the practice of using unsolicited email for legitimate research purposes is that it is a convenience sample restricted to a readily accessible unit. As such, it is a textbook example of a non-probability sample. All members are self-selected. The chance of a population element being sampled is unknown. No element of random selection was involved.

As a non-probability sample, it has no basis in statistical theory. This means (as I am sure everyone knows) that margins of error, confidence intervals and other survey estimators cannot be developed (you can do it of course, but there is no basis in statistical theory that would guarantee the same results with another sample from the same population).

Some advocate that the way to make this a probability sample is to re-define our notions of non-response error. In this case, one would simply classify people who did not respond to the email as non-response error, just like people who are called and refuse to do a phone interview are classified as non-response error. If conceptualized in this way, we can use demographic and other significant variables to just "weight" away non-response error from the email sample (just as we often do with phone non-response error).

As an industry, are we prepared to re-conceptualize non-response error to include people who do not respond to unsolicited email, or do not click on a recruitment banner ad, or even, do not belong to a particular ISP? Are we prepared to equate this non-response error to phone non-response? If so, then it will surely make my life a lot easier and I'll be able to make a lot more money! I'll just simply walk out my office door, interview the first 100 or so people that walk by (and agree to be interviewed), and then, treat everyone who did not walk by as non-response error. I mean... isn't non-response error going up in phone surveys these days?

Please, Please Please, can we re-define non-response error. Even better, can we please, just get rid of the differences between non-probability and probability sampling? I mean, isn't the Internet supposed to be revolutionary? And, quite frankly, the rules of probability sampling just get in the way and I so need the money. You see, I'd rather not work and would prefer to spend all my days on the Mexican Rivera.

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of

James Beniger
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 11:56 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Question of the Hour: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

Answer: There are countless ways, of course (I'm still thinking of new ones--hours after I began pondering this most profound question).

The most salient of these ways, for our discussion of the universal hostility toward spam and spamming throughout the Internet:

The average high school student, working alone, and with only a few days of preparation (one week, max), could easily e-mail the exact same message to ten thousand people online with the stroke of a single finger (even using an aging and under-powered pc; she would need to have access to the Internet, however, or else to do this from school).

Now someone tell me, how long would it take the usual polling operations of the two Timeses (Los Angeles and New York)--combined--to RDD ten thousand households with the same survey instrument?

On the off-chance that you might not have an average high school student readily at hand (my own two are currently forced first to pass pre-school, which is interfering with their poetic calculus--analytic, not differential), here's how to spam:

Make a list of ten thousand names and e-address (this might take, say, six solid hours, working alone with only a pc). Many (if not most) public e-mail lists have subscriber lists (names and e-addresses) available--automatically by machine, in a matter of seconds--to anyone on Earth who requests a copy with a one-line command sent directly to the server (usually only a few words, like "list aapornet.usc.edu"). AAPORNET's subscriber list would indeed be available in this way today, had I not blocked that option when setting up the list, simply because we are open to AAPOR members only).

So, if our high-schooler wishes to spam/survey ten thousand pet owners, say, and the subscriber lists on every last one of the 500 largest pet-owner lists are blocked (there's zero probability that even 50 are), she need only to subscribe to each of those lists (might take a few hours), capture all messages posted to each list for the next few days, strip them of their e-addresses, alphabetize them, eliminate the duplicate addresses, combine them with the other lists, et voila--the spam is ready to be perpetrated.

Is any such mailing list useful for a legitimate survey, that is, one intended to infer its findings to a larger population? Of course not--the population's not known, the sample is hardly random, there's no frame (and these are just a few of the minor problems). Spamming is good, however, for selling just about anything--because the costs are so low, even success rates of a fraction of one percent can mean considerable profits, after spamming hundreds of thousands of people in just a week or two, for less money than you probably carry home from the cash machine on a typical visit. Where is government to protect us consumers from this nightmare, this outrage!?

All that remains to be done, after the spam letter/instrument is written, is for our student to push down her one finger (any one will do, even the thumb). And, at that same moment, how might our interviewers at the two Timeses be doing with the ol' RDD survey, scientific though it of course will be?

And so, why do most people online care about such spamming--with a passion bordering on militant hostility? Because we get perhaps three times as much spam as we do personal messages, not even counting spam which we've "requested" in order to get something else which we want (the Dow Jones hourly newsletter, for example). I'm sure that I spend more time online deleting spam than I do anything else--perhaps all other online activities combined.

Professionals and others in public or highly visible occupations have an additional associated problem. Virtually every professor, at every level, for example, and at virtually every college or university with instruction in English or a language with its alphabet (I'm entirely ignorant of languages with other alphabets, and do so envy all of you who are not), has his or her full name and e-mail address online somewhere on that institution's Web site. And I very much approve of this practice--it helps us scholars find one another, it gives prospective students a chance to discuss possible classes and majors with their likely teachers, and it gives parents of students an easy opportunity to have private discussions with their children's teachers, to whose salaries they likely contribute. Fortunately for us faculty members, moreover, our names and e-addresses are carefully hidden behind the homepages of our institutions--outsiders wishing to spam us would need to be able to recognize the word "Directory" on a university homepage in order to reach us by e-mail (fat chance of that happening, hey!?).

Me, I get countless such messages each year, not only from virtually every last student on the planet wishing to get into some--any--college or graduate program, and also from certainly--certainly--every computer science major hoping for paid summer working helping me to process and analyze data (a nonexistent position, never advertised) on the shores of Santa Monica Bay, but of course!

So, would you wish to be associated with any organization which has drawn international publicity for spamming--and also for suing in court to make it still easier to spam--and still have to earn your very living from the Internet? Not I! I can't even imagine to what level of hell Dante would have assigned such an existence. Me, I'd advise against landing there.

-- Jim

>From cmildner@marketdecisions.com Fri Aug 4 09:34:47 2000
Received: from smtp.gwi.net (smtp.gwi.net [207.5.128.11])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA28635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:34:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from pc3080 (d-207-5-174-189.gwi.net [207.5.174.189])
by smtp.gwi.net (8.10.1/8.10.1) with SMTP id e74GYhL07497
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 12:34:43 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <005201bffe32\$22a7b7a0\$bdae05cf@pc3080>
From: "Curtis Mildner" <cmildner@marketdecisions.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <LPBBIGOHOFLLCAECJFJFLOELECAAAA.sflexo@deltanet.com>
Subject: Re: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 12:36:25 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

I agree, lets go where the money is.

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott W. Flexo, Ph.D. <sflexo@deltanet.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 04, 2000 12:08 PM
Subject: RE: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?

> Dearest AAPOR:

>

> We could (and probably will) argue for days and days and days about
> how

much

> more or less people like/dislike unsolicited email versus unsolicited
> phone

> calls. However, it's kind of like arguing about whether people would
> rather

> work or go to the Mexican Rivera. The answer is pretty obvious. Still,
> unsolicited stuff is unavoidable in a world with people and marketing
> research.

>

> However, this is really not the point. The real issue about the
> practice

of

> using unsolicited email for legitimate research purposes is that it is
> a convenience sample restricted to a readily accessible unit. As such,
> it is

a

> textbook example of a non-probability sample. All members are
> self-selected.

> The chance of a population element being sampled is unknown. No
> element of random selection was involved.

>

> As a non-probability sample, it has no basis in statistical theory.

> This means (as I am sure everyone knows) that margins of error,

> confidence intervals and other survey estimators cannot be developed
> (you can do it

of

> course, but there is no basis in statistical theory that would
> guarantee

the

> same results with another sample from the same population).

>
> Some advocate that the way to make this a probability sample is to
re-define
> our notions of non-response error. In this case, one would simply
> classify people who did not respond to the email as non-response
> error, just like people who are called and refuse to do a phone
> interview are classified as non-response error. If conceptualized in
> this way, we can use demographic and other significant variables to
> just "weight" away non-response error from the email sample (just as
> we often do with phone non-response error).
>
> As an industry, are we prepared to re-conceptualize non-response
> error
to
> include people who do not respond to unsolicited email, or do not
> click on
a
> recruitment banner ad, or even, do not belong to a particular ISP? Are
> we prepared to equate this non-response error to phone non-response?
> If so, then it will surely make my life a lot easier and I'll be able
> to make a
lot
> more money! I'll just simply walk out my office door, interview the
> first 100 or so people that walk by (and agree to be interviewed), and
> then,
treat
> everyone who did not walk by as non-response error. I mean... isn't
> non-response error going up in phone surveys these days?
>
> Please, Please Please, can we re-define non-response error. Even
> better,
can
> we please, just get rid of the differences between non-probability and
> probability sampling? I mean, isn't the Internet supposed to be
> revolutionary? And, quite frankly, the rules of probability sampling
> just get in the way and I so need the money. You see, I'd rather not
> work and would prefer to spend all my days on the Mexican Rivera.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf
> Of James Beniger
> Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2000 11:56 AM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
>
>
> Question of the Hour: How Does Spam Differ from RDD?
>
>
> Answer: There are countless ways, of course (I'm still thinking of new
> ones--hours after I began pondering this most profound question).
>
> The most salient of these ways, for our discussion of the universal
> hostility toward spam and spamming throughout the Internet:
>
> The average high school student, working alone, and with only a few

> days of preparation (one week, max), could easily e-mail the exact
> same message to ten thousand people online with the stroke of a single
> finger (even using an aging and under-powered pc; she would need to
> have access to the Internet, however, or else to do this from school).
>
> Now someone tell me, how long would it take the usual polling
> operations of the two Timeses (Los Angeles and New York)--combined--to
> RDD ten thousand households with the same survey instrument?
>
> On the off-chance that you might not have an average high school
> student readily at hand (my own two are currently forced first to pass
> pre-school, which is interfering with their poetic calculus--analytic,
> not differential), here's how to spam:
>
> Make a list of ten thousand names and e-address (this might take, say,
> six solid hours, working alone with only a pc). Many (if not most)
> public e-mail lists have subscriber lists (names and e-addresses)
> available-- automatically by machine, in a matter of seconds--to
> anyone on Earth who requests a copy with a one-line command sent
> directly to the server (usually only a few words, like "list
> aapornet.usc.edu"). AAPORNET's subscriber list would indeed be
> available in this way today, had I not blocked that option when
> setting up the list, simply because we are open to AAPOR members
> only).
>
> So, if our high-schooler wishes to spam/survey ten thousand pet
> owners, say, and the subscriber lists on every last one of the 500
> largest pet-owner lists are blocked (there's zero probability that
> even 50 are), she need only to subscribe to each of those lists (might
> take a few hours), capture all messages posted to each list for the
> next few days, strip them of their e-addresses, alphabetize them,
> eliminate the duplicate addresses, combine them with the other lists,
> et voila--the spam is ready to be perpetrated.
>
> Is any such mailing list useful for a legitimate survey, that is, one
> intended to infer its findings to a larger population? Of course
> not--the population's not known, the sample is hardly random, there's
> no frame (and these are just a few of the minor problems). Spamming
> is good, however, for selling just about anything--because the costs
> are so low, even success rates of a fraction of one percent can mean
> considerable profits, after spamming hundreds of thousands of people
> in just a week or two, for less money than you probably carry home
> from the cash machine on a typical visit. Where is government to
> protect us consumers from this nightmare, this outrage!?
>
> All that remains to be done, after the spam letter/instrument is
> written, is for our student to push down her one finger (any one will
> do, even the thumb). And, at that same moment, how might our
> interviewers at the two Timeses be doing with the ol' RDD survey,
> scientific though it of course will be?
>
> And so, why do most people online care about such spamming--with a
> passion bordering on militant hostility? Because we get perhaps three
> times as much spam as we do personal messages, not even counting spam
> which we've "requested" in order to get something else which we want
> (the Dow Jones hourly newsletter, for example). I'm sure that I spend
> more time online deleting spam than I do anything else--perhaps all

> other online activities combined.
>
> Professionals and others in public or highly visible occupations have
> an additional associated problem. Virtually every professor, at every
> level, for example, and at virtually every college or university with
> instruction in English or a language with its alphabet (I'm entirely
> ignorant of languages with other alphabets, and do so envy all of you
> who are not), has his or her full name and e-mail address online
> somewhere on that institution's Web site. And I very much approve of
> this practice--it helps us scholars find one another, it gives
> prospective students a chance to discuss possible classes and majors
> with their likely teachers, and it gives parents of students an easy
> opportunity to have private discussions with their children's
> teachers, to whose salaries they likely contribute. Fortunately for us
> faculty members, moreover, our names and e-addresses are carefully
> hidden behind the homepages of our institutions--outsiders wishing to
> spam us would need to be able to recognize the word "Directory" on a
> university homepage in order to reach us by e-mail (fat chance of that
> happening, hey!?).
>
> Me, I get countless such messages each year, not only from virtually
> every last student on the planet wishing to get into
> some--any--college or graduate program, and also from
> certainly--certainly--every computer science major hoping for paid
> summer working helping me to process and analyze data (a nonexistent
> position, never advertised) on the shores of Santa Monica Bay, but of
> course!
>
> So, would you wish to be associated with any organization which has
> drawn international publicity for spamming--and also for suing in
> court to make it still easier to spam--and still have to earn your
> very living from the Internet? Not I! I can't even imagine to what
> level of hell Dante would have assigned such an existence. Me, I'd
> advise against landing there.
>
>
> Jim
>
> *****
>

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Fri Aug 4 09:59:22 2000
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA26713 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:59:22 -0700
(PDT)
From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu
Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
id <QHJ0KAHV>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:59:23 -0700
Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213024EC266@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Bigger Problem Than Luntz
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 09:59:20 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

To me the bigger implication about the latest Luntz news story (why do so many people, even his defenders, call him Lutz?) is that AAPOR still has a problem educating the press as well as the public. I acknowledge that the Luntz "focus group" story was probably printed because it was "topical" and it was actually a pretty slow news day. I also acknowledge that the newspaper article pretty much said generalizability of the findings was nil. However, "pretty much" isn't the same as bald-facedly saying it was a nice exercise but has no meaning whatsoever. Given ongoing misperceptions of the general public about the purpose of focus groups and how they are formed and how they are run, AND the apparently wide variance in these procedures, I think it behooves the writer to be very up front about how far you can take a set of results. All well and good. But I think AAPOR needs to re-open dialogue with the electronic and print media about both focus groups and polling. The issue to me is that as more and more media outlets are using findings based on less than optimal methodologies (sometimes WAY less) and giving them the same "play" in their stories without real qualification. If all results, regardless of methodology, are portrayed to the public as equivalent, I think public confidence in polling will continue to be undermined.

The coming presidential election promises to be close and the electorate has made it pretty clear they are simply not going to pay any attention until the fall. Under such conditions variations in methodology may yield widely varying results. Therefore, I think scrutiny of and dissemination of said methodologies is even more important now. Further, I believe media outlets need to understand this better, and that such disclosure protects their own credibility.

Earlier this week, on the CBS national news broadcast Dan Rather said that the Bush positive-feel good message was working with voters and new Democratic ads attacking him may well be hurting. His single piece of evidence was a poll by voter.com showing Bush's lead had increased to 8 or 9 percentage points. He did not say even in passing how the poll was conducted (telephone, on-line, length of time conducted, etc.) nor was any margin of error provided. There was no means at all to evaluate the "fact" he had just delivered, yet it was the primary piece of evidence underlying "movement" among the electorate. If, for example, it was an on-line non-panel poll, well we have already documented that such a group is not representative of the either the electorate or likely voters. All Mr. Rather said was "poll", which I assume in the viewers' minds means it's equivalent to all other polls reported by CBS. I have no idea if this is true or not. If it isn't, and other polls yield different results, what is the public to think? In such a case lack of disclosure really hurts, and I think it hurts pollsters more than CBS.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

>From caplanjr@bellsouth.net Fri Aug 4 10:04:10 2000
Received: from mail1.mia.bellsouth.net (mail1.mia.bellsouth.net
[205.152.144.13])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA01052 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 10:03:56 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from jrc (adsl-61-113-200.mia.bellsouth.net [208.61.113.200])
by mail1.mia.bellsouth.net (3.3.5alt/0.75.2) with SMTP id NAA11491
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 13:03:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <000201bffe35\$f4d6c1a0\$5393fea9@jrc>
Reply-To: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@iname.com>
From: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@bellsouth.net>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: RDD vs. Spam/Getting Sued/etc.
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 07:08:24 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0045_01BFFDE2.C7ACF3A0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0045_01BFFDE2.C7ACF3A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I can always tell when Summer is ending, school hasn't started and my =
colleagues are sitting around with way too much time on their hands =
<grin>.

Jim Caplan
Miami

-----_NextPart_000_0045_01BFFDE2.C7ACF3A0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>  
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" =  
http-equiv=3DContent-Type> <META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.3018.900"  
name=3DGENERATOR> <STYLE></STYLE> </HEAD> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>I can always tell when Summer is ending, school = hasn't  
started=20 and my colleagues are sitting around with way too much time on  
their = hands=20 &lt;grin>;.</FONT></DIV> <DIV>&nbsp;</DIV> <DIV><FONT  
size=3D2>Jim Caplan</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT  
size=3D2>Miami</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
```

-----_NextPart_000_0045_01BFFDE2.C7ACF3A0--

>From Michael_Mokrzycki@ap.org Fri Aug 4 11:11:53 2000
Received: from APRelay2.ap.org (APRelay2.ap.org [165.1.59.100])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA17693 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:11:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from nyc2.ap.org ([165.1.5.61])
by APRelay2.ap.org (Lotus Domino Release 5.0.2c (Intl))
with SMTP id 2000080414001175:184120 ;
Fri, 4 Aug 2000 14:00:11 -0400

Received: by nyc2.ap.org(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2 5-20-1999)) id
85256931.00645087 ; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 14:15:42 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: THEAP
From: "Michael Mokrzycki" <Michael_Mokrzycki@ap.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256931.0063B69F.00@nyc2.ap.org>
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 14:09:04 -0400
Subject: spam poll spam
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on APRelay2/TheAP(Release 5.0.2c
(Intl)|2 February
2000) at 08/04/2000 02:00:12 PM,
Serialize by Router on APRelay2/TheAP(Release 5.0.2c (Intl)|2 February
2000) at 08/04/2000 02:00:17 PM,
Serialize complete at 08/04/2000 02:00:17 PM
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

In light of the recent AAPORnet discussion, the attached may be of interest.
It managed to get through my sophisticated email filters and be spared my
ruthless delete key.

I especially like the bit near the bottom where they say they HAD to try to
spam absolutely everyone so as not to potentially bias the outcome.

Mike Mokrzycki
AP

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Fri, 02 Jun 00 04:49:18 EST
From: officialpolltaker7@hotmail.com
To: officialpolltaker2@hotmail.com
Subject: The I Love SpamMail/I hate SpamMail Official Poll -Pro Still
leads
3-1

Hi,

A Poll is being taken to settle the issue whether commercial e-mail or
SPAM is a good form of advertisement, which you would like more of or it's a
bad form of advertisement which you are against.

The arguments go more or less as follows:

Pro:

Commercial E-mail is a very efficient, cost effective means of
informing people about new goods and services. This translates into
substantial savings to the consumer. That the vast majority of internet
users don't mind Spam and want to hear about new goods and services.

That for Years now, more advanced bulk mailing software has allowed
bulk mailers to shoulder the full cost of Spamming. This cost has increased
and access has become much more difficult due to unfair and illegal
practices by the big providers (the later day Robber Barons) Who have a
vested interest in keeping Costs and Profits high for as long as possible,
and with the news media with whom most have formed alliances, have and
continue to wage a war of misinformation, deceptions, and out and out lies.

That through an unholy alliance with vix.com, individuals and companies have been targeted by cyber terrorists who have attacked their equipment, programming and subjected people to threats of violence by posting personal information on these legitimate companies employees and individuals home addresses, phone numbers, which leads to threats against them, there families and children.

Lastly, that the Robber Barons (Big Internet Providers) use special identification programs in their efforts to stop free trade that invades the privacy of all individuals by identifying, reading, and then determining whether or not you will get your mail or not (ask yourself this question, if AOL or SPRINT or AT&T or MicroSoftNetwork, (MSN), sent someone to your house to intercept your mail, open it, read it, and then arbitrarily decide whether they will put it in your mail box or not. Would you put up with that?) They call it filtering, we know it by its more insidious name, CENSORSHIP.

Why in the world should you be subjected to this, and have to pay higher prices !

Anti SPAM: (Info Coming In Slow)

Anti Spam arguments go something like this:
They don't like it.

Some genuinely want to be isolated from the world, others it seems are simply being misled. Spammers steal services and don't really pay for access, Spammers are evil because the big, rich, powerful, large internet service providers say so, and it's OK to target them for all kinds of bad things, legal or not. They don't like it.

And would rather have themselves and consumers everywhere continue to pay high inflated prices so that the Robber Barons may grow even richer and more powerful.

And finally, much like the Nazi's final solution to the Jewish problem, they are willing to act as the Robber Baron's Gestapo, ready to report for termination any Spammers or Spam sympathizers.

SIMPLE SOLUTION: Press the delete key, STUPID !

Have a different opinion, give us a call because, your opinion on how to make this kind of advertisement better & to increase its use, is vital. Or if this is a terrible form of advertisement and how it should be curtailed, regulated or ended all together.

Please call, 1-900-226-0388 and tell us.

The charges for registering your opinion are as follows:
Of the \$1.99 per minute charge,
1-dollar goes to the telephone service Bureau

19 cents to retrieve your opinion
79 cents to transcribe this information into a viable format Leaving a total
of 2 cents.

So do call if you wish to get your 2 cents worth in !

Poll results will be shared with the World !

Attention both Pro and Anti Spam Advocates and those of you who may have sought removal from any number of bulk mailing lists. If you have received this e-mail it is because it is a conscious decision on our part to try and include everyone in this important poll. To not have included those who profess a dislike for this form of advertisement would have eliminated those individuals from the process and provide an unfair advantage to one side of the poll. We sincerely hope that all interested individuals or entity's understand the necessity of inclusion.

This message is sent in compliance of the proposed bill: SECTION 301.
Per Section 301, Paragraph (a) (2) (C) of S. 1618, further transmissions to you by the sender of this email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a reply to this email address with the word remove in the subject line. This message is not intended for residents in the State of Washington, screening of addresses has been done to the best of our technical ability. If you are a Washington, Virginia, or California resident or otherwise wish to be removed from this list, further transmissions to you by the sender of this email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a reply to mstrsrvcs@mailme.org with the word remove in the subject line.

11-a-54

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Aug 4 11:18:14 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA22435 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:18:14 -0700
(PDT)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va@fscntl.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA14338
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:18:09 -0700

Message-Id: <200008041818.LAA14338@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 11:19:50 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: spam poll spam
In-reply-to: <85256931.0063B69F.00@nyc2.ap.org>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

I filter everything from hotmail -- that's were 90% of the junk I have received in the past comes from.

Date sent: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 14:09:04 -0400
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Michael Mokrzycki" <Michael_Mokrzycki@ap.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: spam poll spam

In light of the recent AAPORnet discussion, the attached may be of interest. It managed to get through my sophisticated email filters and be spared my ruthless delete key.

I especially like the bit near the bottom where they say they HAD to try to spam absolutely everyone so as not to potentially bias the outcome.

Mike Mokrzycki
AP

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Fri, 02 Jun 00 04:49:18 EST
From: officialpolltaker7@hotmail.com
To: officialpolltaker2@hotmail.com
Subject: The I Love SpamMail/I hate SpamMail Official Poll -Pro Still leads
3-1

Hi,

A Poll is being taken to settle the issue whether commercial e-mail or SPAM is a good form of advertisement, which you would like more of or it's a bad form of advertisement which you are against.

The arguments go more or less as follows:

Pro:

Commercial E-mail is a very efficient, cost effective means of informing people about new goods and services. This translates into substantial savings to the consumer. That the vast majority of internet users don't mind Spam and want to hear about new goods and services.

That for Years now, more advanced bulk mailing software has allowed bulk mailers to shoulder the full cost of Spamming. This cost has increased and access has become much more difficult due to unfair and illegal practices by the big providers (the later day Robber Barons) Who have a vested interest in keeping Costs and Profits high for as long as possible,

and with the news media with whom most have formed alliances, have and continue to wage a war of misinformation, deceptions, and out and out lies.

That through an unholy alliance with vix.com, individuals and companies have been targeted by cyber terrorists who have attacked their equipment, programming and subjected people to threats of violence by posting personal information on these legitimate companies employees and individuals home addresses, phone numbers, which leads to threats against them, there families and children.

Lastly, that the Robber Barons (Big Internet Providers) use special identification programs in their efforts to stop free trade that invades the privacy of all individuals by identifying, reading, and then determining whether or not you will get your mail or not (ask yourself this question, if AOL or SPRINT or AT&T or MicroSoftNetwork, (MSN), sent someone to your house to intercept your mail, open it, read it, and then arbitrarily decide whether they will put it in your mail box or not. Would you put up with that?) They call it filtering, we know it by its more insidious name, CENSORSHIP.

Why in the world should you be subjected to this, and have to pay higher prices !

Anti SPAM: (Info Coming In Slow)

Anti Spam arguments go something like this:
They don't like it.

Some genuinely want to be isolated from the world, others it seems are simply being misled. Spammers steal services and don't really pay for access, Spammers are evil because the big, rich, powerful, large internet service providers say so, and it's OK to target them for all kinds of bad things, legal or not. They don't like it.

And would rather have themselves and consumers everywhere continue to pay high inflated prices so that the Robber Barons may grow even richer and more powerful.

And finally, much like the Nazi's final solution to the Jewish problem, they are willing to act as the Robber Baron's Gestapo, ready to report for termination any Spammers or Spam sympathizers.

SIMPLE SOLUTION: Press the delete key, STUPID !

Have a different opinion, give us a call because, your opinion on how to make this kind of advertisement better & to increase its use, is vital. Or if this is a terrible form of advertisement and how it should be curtailed, regulated or ended all together.

Please call, 1-900-226-0388 and tell us.

The charges for registering your opinion are as follows:

Of the \$1.99 per minute charge,
1-dollar goes to the telephone service Bureau
19 cents to retrieve your opinion
79 cents to transcribe this information into a viable format Leaving a total
of 2 cents.

So do call if you wish to get your 2 cents worth in !

Poll results will be shared with the World !

Attention both Pro and Anti Spam Advocates and those of you who may have sought removal from any number of bulk mailing lists. If you have received this e-mail it is because it is a conscious decision on our part to try and include everyone in this important poll. To not have included those who profess a dislike for this form of advertisement would have eliminated those individuals from the process and provide an unfair advantage to one side of the poll. We sincerely hope that all interested individuals or entity's understand the necessity of inclusion.

This message is sent in compliance of the proposed bill: SECTION 301.
Per Section 301, Paragraph (a) (2) (C) of S. 1618, further transmissions to you by the sender of this email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a reply to this email address with the word remove in the subject line. This message is not intended for residents in the State of Washington, screening of addresses has been done to the best of our technical ability. If you are a Washington, Virginia, or California resident or otherwise wish to be removed from this list, further transmissions to you by the sender of this email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a reply to mstrsrvcs@mailme.org with the word remove in the subject line.

11-a-54

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error,

please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Aug 4 13:14:41 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA12294; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 13:14:37 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA15539; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 13:14:36 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 13:14:36 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: Robert Wyatt <rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Will Harris Sue Me?
In-Reply-To: <NCBBIFHAELIHNKGGKNBICEECCEAA.rwyatt@frank.mtsu.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008041153380.4701-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Thu, 3 Aug 2000, Robert Wyatt wrote:

> so, why aren't random phone calls spam????

They already are, Robert, and have been for at least four months (see Washington Post article, "Spammers' New Calling: Cell Phones; Unsolicited Ads Show Up in Area, and Some Recipients Scowl," immediately below my message here).

The steady digitization of all forms of telecommunication--with planning well along in even the U.S. Postal Service--is not likely to be reversed. If survey and market researchers don't voluntarily eschew spamming on the Net, portable cell phones will routinely disturb our everyday lives with spam text messages--sent directly to our phone screens--certainly within the next year to 18 months.

Legislation might well prevent this, of course, especially if the survey and market research communities were to support the effort, rather than taking to court nonprofit organizations already long at work toward the same ends.

Perhaps the steadily increasingly spamming of each individual, amid the masses of a mass society, is only inevitable in the new digital world just ahead. The best AAPOR can hope to do today, even though it might well be futile, is to stand tough against spamming on the Internet, where we already find a large and rapidly growing population and subculture of upscale (as in "digital divide") and highly educated consumers willing to assist us in the effort. Wouldn't they all be surprised if the same folks who interrupt their meals with all those unwanted phone calls actually rallied in their defense for once? The vast majority of legitimate researchers would have little if anything to lose in such an effort.

This might at least require looking beyond the bottom line at the end of each month, of course. Don't at least a few commercial researchers have

grandchildren whose future quality of life might at least be of some concern to them?

As for AAPOR, I think we first ought to decide whether we expect our organization to last for another ten years or for another half-century, at the least. Today's Internet spamming would not make for a particularly proud chapter in the AAPOR history which would likely be slated for publication in 2045, after all--if indeed there were then still a reason for independent researchers to come together in the name of professional education and standards in the first place.

But right now, I'm afraid, I must run. My cell phone just chirped, and we all know that those people--whoever they are--will just keep bugging me until I finally answer their questions.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 The Washington Post

April 11, 2000, Tuesday, Final Edition

'Spammers' New Calling: Cell Phones; Unsolicited Ads

Show Up in Area, and Some Recipients Scowl

Mike Musgrove , Washington Post Staff Writer

Mike Malarkey, a business-development manager for the District-based educational Web developer Blackboard Inc., was in the middle of a meeting last Thursday when his Nokia cell phone chirped, sounding a bit like the low-battery warning.

When he checked it after the meeting, he saw that the battery was fine, but he'd just received a text message on the phone's screen--an advertisement for a Web site selling cell-phone accessories.

"I'm just surprised that it's progressed to phones," said Malarkey. He was one of the first recipients of an apparently novel kind of unsolicited electronic advertising, or "spam," sent via the text-messaging service on his AT&T Wireless phone.

Another AT&T customer, Laurie Ann Ryan, a public relations director who asked that her firm not be identified, was infuriated to receive the same message last Thursday: "Clearly the sender knows it's going to interrupt somebody's day." She called the ad "excessively aggressive and invasive" because a cell phone is something users tend to carry with them all day--unlike the personal computers that e-mail spammers have targeted for years.

One veteran of the long-running fight against spammers said this abuse of AT&T's system should come as no surprise. "I expect to see more of it unless this kind of thing is controlled," said Nick Nicholas, an "evangelist" at the Mail Abuse Prevention System, an organization that tries to get Internet providers to cut off spammers' access.

Nicholas noted AT&T Wireless's configuration of its text-message system as a possible vulnerability: Its customers automatically get an e-mail address consisting of their phone number followed by "@mobile.att.net." "Because of the way AT&T sets up the e-mail account, all you need to do is just try consecutive numbers," he said. Nicholas said AT&T should have been able to detect this "war dialing" approach and block the spammers' access.

AT&T spokeswoman Alexa Graf hadn't heard of Plugout.com's unsolicited transmission until a reporter called yesterday afternoon. "The last thing we want to do is start spamming our customers," she said.

The text messaging service is an included feature with AT&T's service; customers are not billed for incoming text messages. Sprint PCS offers a similar service, while Verizon Wireless (formerly Bell Atlantic Mobile), Nextel and Cellular One charge extra for the ability to receive text alerts.

A spokesman for Sprint PCS reported no spamming incidents and said, "We have software that can detect a spam and is designed to prevent it from happening."

The company behind the ad, Plugout.com, is a Fort Lee, N.J.-based operation whose site has only been fully operational since February.

Rudy Temiz, the company's 22-year-old president, said yesterday afternoon that he didn't plan to repeat the exercise but expressed no remorse either, saying that the marketing technique had generated "quite a few" sales.

"One of the reasons we're doing this," said Temiz, "is because every single dot-com company isn't graced with venture capital and all us smaller Web sites have to find more creative ways to get on the map." He didn't reveal how many messages had been sent out or how he had obtained his list of phone numbers but said, "We're only doing it one time. Nobody in Washington, D.C., should ever hear from us again."

Nicholas, the anti-spammer, called Temiz's marketing, "more ignorance than anything, ignorance of the economics of the Internet or of the culture of the Internet."

Vincent Zahn, Plugout.com's director of strategy, further defended the text ads. "What better way to reach your target market?" he asked, saying, "We look at it as if we're doing these people a favor if they're looking for these kinds of products."

Responded AT&T customer Ryan, "They're not doing me any favors by soliciting me over my cell phone."

Copyright 2000 The Washington Post

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Aug 4 15:20:40 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA19786 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 15:20:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA27674 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 15:20:39 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 15:20:39 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Rob Pegoraro, as Everyman, With "The Lousy Aftertaste of Spam"
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008041446240.19809-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Just another heart-rending tale of Everyman's attempt to wrest back control of his very own personal computer from the selfish clutches of that most malicious scourge of the Internet--gasp--SPAM!.....

-- Jim

P.S. This piece suggests that, with the advent of e-mail filtering for personal computers, surveys conducted by spam-tionaire will be biased toward respondents less clever at setting up the filters (or less able to afford filters, or at least the better filters)--not that this would matter, of course, were the e-mail addresses not sampled randomly from a known universe in the first place. Anyone have such a list?

Copyright 2000 The Washington Post

July 21, 2000, Friday, Final Edition

The Lousy Aftertaste of Spam

Rob Pegoraro

Junk e-mail is the nails on the chalkboard of my Internet experience. Every day I am treated to sales pitches that would insult the intelligence of a 5-year-old: Make Money Fast! Find Out Anything About Anyone! Stealth E-Mailer! Free Cable TV! This Really Works!

The fact that I've been getting the same five messages from thousands of different senders only adds to my irritation: I didn't pay for my Internet account to get this kind of garbage dumped onto my hard drive. But the people who send out this spam are only looking to make a quick buck off the gullible fraction of a percent of recipients who actually fall for this nonsense.

Exterminating junk e-mail, however, is not without its collateral damage. Most e-mail programs will let you set up quite complicated filters to delete unwanted e-mail, but like any form of computerized pattern

recognition--say, speech recognition or Web content filtering--they can't catch everything. Worse, yet, sometimes they goes too far, trashing the things you do want to see.

For instance, for a long time, I've had a filter set up in my e-mail program to trash anything coming from the Hotmail Web-mail service that doesn't have my own e-mail address in any recipient headers--normally, a telltale sign of bulk e-mail. I also set up my e-mail program to forward these intercepted messages to abuse@hotmail.com, which has caused Hotmail to close quite a few junk e-mailers' accounts.

So far, so good--except that some of my friends have Hotmail accounts, and one sent along a party invitation in which my address, as a "blind carbon copy" recipient, was hidden. My e-mailer dutifully trashed the message and forwarded it to Hotmail's abuse department. No big deal: This had happened a couple of times earlier, but in each case Hotmail had taken no action.

I should have rearranged my filters the first time this happened, but I was lazy. And so after this last incident, I received a polite message from Hotmail: "We have closed the account you reported." A paralyzing guilt set in; beyond just nuking my friend's address, I'd also killed her saved correspondence and address book. I felt as if I'd just run over somebody's dog.

It took an hour and a half to persuade Hotmail to reopen the account the next day, between waiting on hold and groveling before the tech-support rep. (I should note that Hotmail has the worst hold music ever, it not being music at all--while you wait, you're verbally spammed with a stream of ads for Microsoft goods and services.)

But even the best-working e-mail filters can't actually prevent future outbreaks. "Any filtering which does not act as a deterrent to further transmission is automatically unsuccessful," wrote Paul Vixie, CEO of Mail Abuse Prevention System, a nonprofit anti-spam firm in Redwood City, Calif.

Indeed, a Hotmail spokeswoman reported that the service closes about 100 accounts a day for spamming--but because it costs nothing to sign up for a new account, why should a junk-mailer care?

What about laws? The House just passed an anti-spam bill this week, but I'm not wildly optimistic that it will be any more effective than the anti-spam laws passed by state legislatures from Washington to Virginia.

Because of these problems, several groups have instead tried to shut down the Internet facilities most abused by spammers--"open relay servers." These computers have been left open for anybody to send outgoing mail through, instead of being restricted to an Internet provider's own customers. Spammers hijack them to blast out their mail, masking their own identity in the process.

Vixie's MAPS is one such group targeting open relays; Palmerston North, New Zealand-based ORBS (Open Relay Behavior-Modification Service) is another. Both work to identify these open servers, then persuade their administrators to close them by blacklisting that site. Internet providers who subscribe to these blacklists can then choose not to accept any e-mail from the offending site, which tends to push an errant site to shape up.

Where these two sites part company, however, is in how they find these open servers. MAPS waits to get reports of spam sent through an open relay, then tests the site to confirm the report. ORBS doesn't wait for spam; if a relay is reported to be open, the group will send test e-mails to that server to see if they get sent along--a tactic that many other Internet sites consider a form of network abuse. ORBS has also drawn criticism for blacklisting mail servers that block its probes.

MAPS is one such anti-ORBS site, as is its own access provider, San Jose-based Above.Net--where Vixie is also a senior vice president for Internet services. What has ensued lately is a sort of Spy-vs.-Spy war between the two anti-spam groups. Above.Net has started refusing to carry the traffic of both ORBS and an affiliated Internet provider, which--since Above.Net provides the "backbone" access both firms rely on--has slowed incoming mail dramatically.

"They're also now killing all traffic to my ISP... this is a direct economic attack," ORBS administrator Alan Brown said in an e-mail.

ORBS says that it can't stop probing Above.Net's servers without detailed technical information that the firm won't provide; Above.Net, in turn, says ORBS should already have this routing data. Vixie said ORBS is violating Above.Net's terms-of-service agreement and is welcome to switch its Internet access arrangements, but Brown says Above.Net is "the only game in town." And so the squabble continues--as does the spam.

"When I started formally battling spam back in 1994, I thought we could stem the tide. Now I don't," Vixie wrote. "I don't know how to raise the costs sufficiently high that new fly-by-night spam-friendly ISPs won't continuously wink into and out of existence. We can kill them one at a time, but there's a new one born every minute."

Copyright 2000 The Washington Post

>From surveys@wco.com Fri Aug 4 17:36:24 2000
Received: from e4500a.callatg.com (qmailr@e4500a.atgi.net [216.174.194.60])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id RAA06052 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 17:36:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (qmail 17301 invoked from network); 5 Aug 2000 00:36:22 -0000
Received: from unknown (HELO Default) (216.174.193.24)
by e4500a.callatg.com with SMTP; 5 Aug 2000 00:36:22 -0000
Message-ID: <015d01bffe5c\$36f2ee80\$05c8a8c0@dummy.net>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008041446240.19809-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Are surveys Spam?
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 17:37:33 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

I think organizations such as AAPOR and CASRO have been largely successful in getting laws that restrict telemarketing to exempt legitimate surveys. What can we do to move the current public perception that ALL unsolicited e-mail is Spam toward exempting real surveys?

I was actually able to convince my ISP of the difference. It took a bit of effort, but it worked. They first blocked an e-mail survey as SPAM, but after discussion they agreed to let it go out.

Clearly the anti-spam movement is not primarily energised by e-mail surveys or invitations to Web page surveys, just as the push for anti-unsolicited-phone call laws was not primarily motivated by surveys. While some AAPOR members have pointed out the significant sampling problems with surveys on the net, it is to our long-term benefit to have the public see real research as different from marketing. I urge any AAPOR representatives or members that worked to exempt research from telemarketing laws to do the same for any proposed anti-spam laws. I also hope we can work to convince the existing anti-spam services to make a distinction.

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
<http://www.surveysystem.com>

>From martin.gilens@yale.edu Fri Aug 4 18:50:23 2000
Received: from pantheon-po02.its.yale.edu (pantheon-po02.its.yale.edu [130.132.143.33])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA02269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 18:50:22 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from MG.cis.yale.edu (net231-165.its.yale.edu [130.132.231.165])
by pantheon-po02.its.yale.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id VAA24710
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 21:50:19 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.20000804214548.006cba4c@mg43.mail.yale.edu>
X-Sender: mg43@mg43.mail.yale.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)
Date: Fri, 04 Aug 2000 21:45:48 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Martin Gilens <martin.gilens@yale.edu>
Subject: unsubscribe
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008041446240.19809-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

>From gfrigo19@idt.net Fri Aug 4 19:27:39 2000
Received: from u2.farm.idt.net (root@u2.farm.idt.net [169.132.8.11])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id TAA12379 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 19:27:39 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from gfrigo19.ios.com (ppp-10.ts-1.por.idt.net [169.132.156.10])
by u2.farm.idt.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id WAA05903

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 22:27:35 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 22:27:35 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200008050227.WAA05903@u2.farm.idt.net>
X-Sender: gfrigo19@idt.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.5
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: gfrigo19@idt.net (Chris D. Frigon & Camille Roman)
Subject: unsubscribe

>From KKrotki@intersurvey.com Fri Aug 4 21:43:59 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id VAA15249 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Aug 2000 21:43:58 -0700
(PDT)
Message-ID: <56c6be2dd2d5e2a6d2bef84bd2f78bb4398b9ccf@inter-survey.com>
From: Karol Krotki <KKrotki@intersurvey.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Job Announcement
Date: Fri, 4 Aug 2000 21:43:57 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Senior Statistician

Preamble:

InterSurvey is developing cutting-edge methodologies involving the application of Internet surveying to a probability sample of households. We believe that this new technique is breaking exciting new ground in the area of survey research and will offer researchers a powerful alternative to the traditional survey research modes such as telephone, mail, and face-to-face.

InterSurvey needs to strengthen its Statistics Group by adding a mid- to senior-level statistician with strong background and experience in survey research.

Job Description:

Under the supervision of the Director, Statistics, the successful applicant will be responsible for the following activities:

- * Become familiar with the InterSurvey Panel and the Production Database. Maintain constant and up-to-date information on the Panel's characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses. Suggest and help implement methods for overcoming the weaknesses.
- * Design, implement, and maintain a Quality Assurance program with respect to the Panel data. This program will aim to maintain the Panel data at the highest possible level of quality.
- * The program will provide cross-sectional and longitudinal descriptions of the Panel characteristics such as basic demographic profile, survey taking behavior, drop-out patterns, evidence of bias, and future

projections.

- * Develop imputation techniques and model-based adjustments for item and unit nonresponse.

- * Collaborate on the profiling strategy and help develop strategies for the efficient and useful implementation of profiles, the use of profiling data in sample selection, and the use of these data in weighting and analyzing client survey data.

- * Collaborate with colleagues in the Statistics Group on tasks such as drawing the RDD sample, processing the sample for recruitment, suggesting ways to improve the recruitment process, drawing client survey panels, weighting output data, and statistical modelling.

- * Provide technical support to InterSurvey analysts and clients in issues related to statistical analysis, especially .

Qualifications:

- * Ph.D. or Masters with at least 5 years experience in statistics, a quantitative social science, or market research.

- * Experience and familiarity with, and good working knowledge of, survey research methodology and applied statistics (including methods for handling missing data and nonresponse)

- * Fluency with computer software for data processing and statistical analysis, especially for sample selection, imputation, weighting, and sampling error calculations.

- * Energy, eagerness to confront new challenges, and ability to find creative solutions.

- * Ability to interact and work well with colleagues, clients, and the public, including the explanation of complex statistical techniques for the layperson.

karolKROTKI
Director, Statistics
kkrotki@intersurvey.com
interSURVEY
1360 Willow Rd, Suite 101
Menlo Park, CA 94025-1516
P: 650-289-2062
F: 650-289-2001
www.intersurvey.com

```
>From altschul@Oswego.EDU Sat Aug 5 06:19:20 2000
Received: from rocky.oswego.edu (rocky11.oswego.edu [129.3.11.16])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id GAA29613 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Aug 2000 06:19:19 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (altschul@localhost)
    by rocky.oswego.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id JAA13419
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Aug 2000 09:19:18 -0400 (EDT)
X-Authentication-Warning: rocky.oswego.edu: altschul owned process doing -bs
Date: Sat, 5 Aug 2000 09:19:18 -0400 (EDT)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Are surveys Spam?
In-Reply-To: <015d01bffe5c$36f2ee80$05c8a8c0@dummy.net>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0008050914260.13305-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
```

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

This morning NPR had a story about email SPAM focusing on MAPS which has declared Harris Interactive to be spam thereby preventing it from reaching about 2 million computers. Gordon Black argued that Harris Interactive allows people to refuse the email with about 5 seconds of keystrokes but this does not meet MAPS standards. Harris is now suing. All this raises yet another question about Harris' sample. How accurate can it be if its sample starts out by excluding 2 million computers?

Bruce Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Aug 6 23:37:59 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id XAA23938 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 6 Aug 2000 23:37:59 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id XAA29016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 6 Aug 2000 23:37:57 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sun, 6 Aug 2000 23:37:57 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Polls Say Palestinians Favor Declaring State in September?
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008062318070.10505-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Anyone know anything about the survey operations of the Palestinian Authority-owned State Information Service?

And what does the word "independent" mean, in the closing paragraph, in its opening phrase "Another independent Palestinian poll Wednesday...".

I have no good reason--other than the ones which would be on any journalist's mind--to question the quality of these polls, I am simply ignorant of the polling operations involved.

-- Jim

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000806/wl/mideast_palestinians_dc_1.html

Sunday August 6 8:42 AM ET

Poll: Palestinians Favor Declaring State in Sept.

GAZA (Reuters) - An overwhelming majority of Palestinians support the

declaration of an independent Palestinian state in September, the deadline for a peace treaty with Israel, according to a Palestinian poll issued Sunday.

The survey by the Palestinian Authority-owned State Information Service found 71.5 percent of 1,470 Palestinians polled in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, including Arab East Jerusalem, favored declaring a state on September 13.

Six percent wanted the Palestinian leadership to keep negotiating with Israel to achieve progress, and then declare a state after September.

Palestinian President Yasser Arafat has said he will declare a Palestinian state this year on lands that Israel occupied in the 1967 Middle East war, with or without a peace deal.

President Clinton, a key broker in Middle East peace moves, has said he will review relations with Palestinians if Arafat declares a state unilaterally. Israel has threatened to retaliate by annexing lands still under its control.

Eighty-eight percent of those surveyed backed Arafat following his U.S.-sponsored summit at Camp David with Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak. The summit ended in disagreement.

Another independent Palestinian poll Wednesday indicated that a majority of Palestinians would opt for violent confrontation with Israel should the sides fail to nail down a deal by mid-September.

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Aug 7 10:11:55 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA10906 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 10:11:55 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA17633 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 10:11:56 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 7 Aug 2000 10:11:56 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NYT: Lieberman Is Gore's Pick for Running Mate, Democrats Say
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008071007270.17121-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

[http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/
late/07cnd-vp-choice.html](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/late/07cnd-vp-choice.html)

August 7, 2000

LIEBERMAN IS GORE'S PICK FOR
RUNNING MATE, DEMOCRATS SAY

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

NASHVILLE, Aug. 7 -- Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut is Vice President Al Gore's pick as his running mate, Democratic officials said today.

Mr. Lieberman, 58, is a Democratic centrist much like Mr. Gore, although he is perceived to be more conservative on matters like welfare reform. He also has a reputation for moral rectitude. Like Mr. Gore, he was one of the few Democrats to vote in favor of the Persian Gulf War.

Most importantly, Mr. Lieberman was the first Democrat to publicly criticize President Clinton's behavior in the Monica Lewinsky scandal, a move that should help Mr. Gore in his attempt to separate himself from the President and win over independents and moderate Republicans.

"Voters like the Clinton-Gore policies, but some are disillusioned with the president," one Democratic official said.

Mr. Lieberman is the first Orthodox Jew to be named to a national ticket, part of the reason that Mr. Gore liked this choice, officials said. "It's a history-making pick," one said.

Republicans had made clear at their convention that they would attack Mr. Gore on the integrity issue, in part because of his fundraising activities. Officials hope the choice of Mr. Lieberman, a two-term Senator and former Connecticut attorney general, will help squelch this line of attack.

They also hope that his pro-consumer activity as attorney general will reinforce Mr. Gore's campaign theme that he is "for the people, not the powerful."

Mr. Gore made the decision in the early hours of

Monday morning after holding two rounds of meetings here, first with his closest aides, then with his wife, Tipper, and brother-in-law, Frank Hunger.

The news leaked out shortly before 7:00 AM East Coast time Monday. Mr. Gore is to call Mr. Lieberman, who is at his home in New Haven, at noon to make the offer. The Senator is then scheduled to join the vice president in Nashville for an official announcement Tuesday at noon. The two are expected to travel together through Friday, then make their ways separately to the Democratic convention in Los Angeles.

Democratic officials noted that it was at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles 40 years ago that John F. Kennedy was nominated. He became the first Catholic to be elected president. Gore backers hope that Mr. Lieberman's selection will be perceived as just as ground-breaking and will add some excitement to Mr. Gore's campaign, which is trailing that of Gov. George W. Bush, the Republican nominee, in the polls.

One senior Republican strategist said that Mr. Lieberman's support for school vouchers, which Mr. Gore opposes, could be a problem for Mr. Gore as well as his backers in the teachers' unions. This strategist said of the Lieberman pick that Mr. Gore appeared to be trying to appeal directly to independents but was bypassing his base of labor, liberals and women, whom Mr. Gore is losing to Mr. Bush.

"This is a good move if you've got your base locked down, but Gore doesn't," this Republican said.

Mr. Lieberman was one of six candidates considered by Mr. Gore as a running mate. The others were Senator Evan Bayh of Indiana, Senator John Edwards of North Carolina, Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts, Rep. Richard Gephardt of Missouri, the House minority leader, and Gov. Jeanne Shaheen of New Hampshire.

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

>From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Mon Aug 7 14:04:43 2000
Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net [216.233.66.186])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA02007 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 14:04:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
id <QA19Z6LV>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 14:02:40 -0700
Message-ID:
<FFA752642AD0D3118E4600A0249EACBE08D2BF@node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net>
From: Kathryn Cirksena <KathrynC@socialresearch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Asian Americans and Political Participation
Date: Mon, 7 Aug 2000 14:02:29 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings fellow AAPORites-
Does anyone have a ready reference for poll data or a summary of research on Asian-Americans' political participation...especially broken out by Asian nationality or with reference to generational differences?
Thanks in advance for your help.

Kathy

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
Research Services Manager
Communication Sciences Group/
Survey Methods Group
140 Second Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 495-6692 ext. 269

>From mkshares@mcs.net Mon Aug 7 14:18:40 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net ([192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA12810 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 14:18:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P56-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.120])
by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id QAA93743
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 16:18:32 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <398EE167.67517586@mcs.net>
Date: Mon, 07 Aug 2000 16:18:50 +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: Asian Americans and Political Participation
References:
<FFA752642AD0D3118E4600A0249EACBE08D2BF@node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

National 1996 exit poll data from CNN/Time appears here:

<http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1996/elections/natl.exit.poll/index1.html>

Kathryn Cirksena wrote:

> Greetings fellow AAPORites-
> Does anyone have a ready reference for poll data or a summary of
> research on Asian-Americans' political participation...especially
> broken out by Asian nationality or with reference to generational
> differences? Thanks in advance for your help.
>
> Kathy
>
> Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
> Research Services Manager
> Communication Sciences Group/
> Survey Methods Group
> 140 Second Street, Suite 400
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> (415) 495-6692 ext. 269

>From ande271@attglobal.net Mon Aug 7 15:56:19 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 PAA15828 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 15:56:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from attglobal.net ([32.101.254.65]) by prserv.net (out2) with
SMTP
id <200008072255232290121s18e>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 22:55:23 +0000
Message-ID: <398F6A22.C37CE845@attglobal.net>
Date: Mon, 07 Aug 2000 19:02:11 -0700
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Bigger Problem Than Luntz
References: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213024EC266@psg.ucsf.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Luntz appeared on "The Newshour with Jim Lehrer" one night last week. The other people on the panel made it clear that his "focus group" that had watched the Republican convention every night was a biased sample. They were pretty knowledgeable. However, he remained confident and gave all sorts of tidbits as to what his respondents felt.

LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu wrote:

> To me the bigger implication about the latest Luntz news story (why do
> so many people, even his defenders, call him Lutz?) is that AAPOR
> still has a problem educating the press as well as the public. I

> acknowledge that the Luntz "focus group" story was probably printed
> because it was "topical" and it was actually a pretty slow news day. I
> also acknowledge that the newspaper article pretty much said
> generalizability of the findings was nil. However, "pretty much" isn't
> the same as bald-facedly saying it was a nice exercise but has no
> meaning whatsoever. Given ongoing misperceptions of the general public
> about the purpose of focus groups and how they are formed and how they
> are run, AND the apparently wide variance in these procedures, I think
> it behooves the writer to be very up front about how far you can take
> a set of results. All well and good. But I think AAPOR needs to
> re-open dialogue with the electronic and print media about both focus
> groups and polling. The issue to me is that as more and more media
> outlets are using findings based on less than optimal methodologies
> (sometimes WAY less) and giving them the same "play" in their stories
> without real qualification. If all results, regardless of methodology,
> are portrayed to the public as equivalent, I think public confidence
> in polling will continue to be undermined.

>
> The coming presidential election promises to be close and the
> electorate has made it pretty clear they are simply not going to pay
> any attention until the fall. Under such conditions variations in
> methodology may yield widely varying results. Therefore, I think
> scrutiny of and dissemination of said methodologies is even more
> important now. Further, I believe media outlets need to understand
> this better, and that such disclosure protects their own credibility.

>
> Earlier this week, on the CBS national news broadcast Dan Rather said
> that the Bush positive-feel good message was working with voters and
> new Democratic ads attacking him may well be hurting. His single piece
> of evidence was a poll by voter.com showing Bush's lead had increased
> to 8 or 9 percentage points. He did not say even in passing how the
> poll was conducted (telephone, on-line, length of time conducted,
> etc.) nor was any margin of error provided. There was no means at all
> to evaluate the "fact" he had just delivered, yet it was the primary
> piece of evidence underlying "movement" among the electorate. If, for
> example, it was an on-line non-panel poll, well we have already
> documented that such a group is not representative of the either the
> electorate or likely voters. All Mr. Rather said was "poll", which I
> assume in the viewers' minds means it's equivalent to all other polls
> reported by CBS. I have no idea if this is true or not. If it isn't,
> and other polls yield different results, what is the public to think?
> In such a case lack of disclosure really hurts, and I think it hurts
> pollsters more than CBS.

>
> Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
> University of California, San Francisco
> lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

>From ccollet@uci.edu Mon Aug 7 16:16:03 2000
Received: from taurus.oac.uci.edu (root@taurus.oac.uci.edu [128.200.80.23])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA27322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 16:16:03 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from 23ng9 (dialin53a-83.ppp.uci.edu [128.195.186.93])
by taurus.oac.uci.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA03621
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Aug 2000 16:16:01 -0700 (PDT)

From: "Christian Collet" <ccollet@uci.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Asian Americans and Political Participation
Date: Mon, 7 Aug 2000 16:16:01 -0700
Message-ID: <NDBBIIIMJLKJILDMHDEDEEFMCIAA.ccollet@uci.edu>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To:
<FFA752642AD0D3118E4600A0249EACBE08D2BF@node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Kathy,

For Asian Americans in general, you should consult the exit polls conducted in 1996 and 1998 by the Asian Pacific American Legal Center in Los Angeles. Despite some methodological limitations, they have large samples of the major ethnic groups -- Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino and Vietnamese American -- that you should find useful.

In addition, we recently completed a comprehensive study of political participation in the Vietnamese American community for THE ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER. If you -- or anyone else -- would like copies of the articles and/or the results, please contact me directly (ccollet@uci.edu).

You might also consult the series of polls on the Vietnamese, Chinese, and Korean American communities conducted by Susan at the LA TIMES in the mid-1990s.

Some of the best quantitative work on the subject is done by Pei-te Lien at the University of Utah. See her THE POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF ASIAN AMERICANS on Garland Press.

Yours,

Christian Collet, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science
University of California, Irvine
3151 Social Science Plaza
Irvine, CA 92697-5100
OFFICE: (949) 857-0477
DIRECT: (949) 370-6331
FAX: (949) 857-0518

:-----Original Message-----

:From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
:Kathryn Cirksena
:Sent: Monday, August 07, 2000 2:02 PM
:To: aapornet@usc.edu
:Subject: Asian Americans and Political Participation

:
:

:Greetings fellow AAPORites-
:Does anyone have a ready reference for poll data or a summary of :research
on :Asian-Americans' political participation...especially broken out by
Asian :nationality or with reference to generational differences? :Thanks in
advance for your help.

:
:Kathy
:
:Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
:Research Services Manager
:Communication Sciences Group/
:Survey Methods Group
:140 Second Street, Suite 400
:San Francisco, CA 94105
:(415) 495-6692 ext. 269
:

>From hschuman@umich.edu Tue Aug 8 06:48:21 2000
Received: from berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.2.162])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA22658 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 06:48:20 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.2.147])
by berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTTP id
JAA27765
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 09:48:18 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
by gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTTP id JAA07538
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 09:48:18 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 09:48:17 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: A Prediction
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data: If the
Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably well), there will be
a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the proportion of Jews who report
that they observe the sabbath.

>From ratledge@udel.edu Tue Aug 8 07:01:43 2000
Received: from zekel.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.23])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA26539 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 07:01:42 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by exchange.chep.udel.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Q39ZTVWVM>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 10:01:51 -0400
Message-ID: <FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E5899502C3@exchange.chep.udel.edu>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@udel.edu>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Bigger Problem Than Luntz
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 10:01:49 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Several of the networks had their own focus groups on during the convention and on the weekend news shows. They seemed to be perfectly happy drawing all sorts of conclusions. In fact, I think they may even have dropped their usual disclaimer that its not scientific. If the media accepts this as a legitimate method as well as a more entertaining and lower cost method of taking the pulse of the "public", we will definitely be living in "interesting times".

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeanne Anderson Research [mailto:ande271@attglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, August 07, 2000 10:02 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Bigger Problem Than Luntz

Luntz appeared on "The Newshour with Jim Lehrer" one night last week. The other people on the panel made it clear that his "focus group" that had watched the Republican convention every night was a biased sample. They were pretty knowledgeable. However, he remained confident and gave all sorts of tidbits as to what his respondents felt.

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Tue Aug 8 09:07:32 2000
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA21072 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 09:07:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mitofsky.mindspring.com
(adsl-151-202-105-236.bellatlantic.net [151.202.105.236])
by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id MAA06075
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 12:07:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000808115426.00d0a6b0@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2000 12:06:37 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: NCPP on MSNBC-Luntz
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_1348095==_ .ALT"

====_1348095==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

A Statement by the National Council on Public Polls' Polling Review

Board
August 4, 2000

MSNBC's QUESTIONABLE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION POLLS

NBC News for many years was widely known for reliable news reporting. At this year's Republican National Convention it is giving the public unreliable reports of public opinion about events at the convention. In a two-pronged assault on its own credibility NBC is reporting results of focus groups conducted by Republican pollster and consultant, Frank Luntz. On opening night of the convention he called the focus group's utterances "representative" opinion.

Also, on its MSNBC.com web page, it has what it calls a National Internet Focus Group run by SpeakOut.com. This web focus group gives anyone who chooses to participate the opportunity to express a second-by-second reaction to key prime-time speeches. Erik Sorenson, the head of MSNBC said, "we'll be able to go directly to the people and find out what they're thinking." If he means a representative sample we disagree.

Focus groups usually consist of moderated discussions among small groups of people. They are generally chosen because of some background characteristic related to the topic being studied. The Luntz panel includes 36 voters who said when selected that they were uncommitted in their presidential preference this year. The SpeakOut panel includes as many web surfers as care to take the time to give their opinions.

While focus groups are useful for supplying context and nuance about a variety of issues or topics they are not a reliable gauge of public opinion on these subjects. Conclusions about what percentage of the general public holds a particular view, or any generalizations about the public, cannot be made from a focus group. Luntz talks about Republicans', Democrats' and independents' opinions as though they applied to all members of those groups in the general public. In fact, those are only the opinions of those in his focus group. There is nothing scientific about these focus groups. They are more akin to a parlor game than to a public opinion poll.

While many news organizations have their news polling conducted by non-partisan pollsters (or a bi-partisan pairing) Luntz is widely known for his work in behalf of Republicans. YROCK.com, a Web site and Internet service run by the National Young Republicans, sponsors the Luntz focus group. Luntz was instrumental in conducting research for the Contract With America. The American Association for Public Opinion Research found Luntz, in violation of its ethics code when he repeatedly refused to make public essential facts that supported the conclusions promoted by the Newt Gingrich led GOP caucus.

Live reports of Luntz focus group are part of the MSNBC convention coverage. The group, when urged by Luntz, has voiced its opinions on its current leanings for President, its opinions of Vice President designate, Dick Cheney, and its reactions to Colin Powell's speech on opening night. An MSNBC press release said the opinions of the Luntz effort would be compared to the reactions of the SpeakOut panel - a meaningless exercise, if ever there was one.

For more information about this and other polling issues see:
<http://www.ncpp.org/home.htm>

To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: [Fwd: Re: Death Penalty Question Wording]
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 13:00:30 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

We implemented the proposed sequence in an issues survey for the News Journal Papers (Gannett) last month here in Delaware (RDD, 15 call backs, refusal conversion).

The basic results were:

Death Penalty

Favor	67.6%
Oppose	25.1
No Opinion	7.3

Life in Prison

Favor	72.7%
Oppose	20.9
No Opinion	7.3

Choice (Death or Life)

Death Penalty	45.5%
Life in Prison	38.6
No Opinion	15.3

Interesting.

> >Nick,
> I would like to see an experiment. I would like to see the following
> two questions asked, where the order in which they are asked is
> rotated: 1)
> "do
> you favor or oppose the death penalty sentence in cases of murder?" 2)
> "do you favor or oppose life in prison without parole sentence in
> cases of murder?" Then the third question would be: 3) "Do you favor
> the death penalty or life in prison without parole as the sentence in
> cases of murder?" My feeling is the first two questions are weighted
> in favor of which ever one is asked first. However, I think the third
> question would be the most valid measure of the two possible
> sentences, IF they follow
> the
> first two questions. My reasoning is that I believe the first two
> questions
> make the respondent think about the two alternatives and their own
> position, before posing the two alternatives in a single question.
> warren
>
> >There is a great deal of experimental research that shows that
> >balancing
> a

> >question usually produces more choices of the added alternative (in
> >this case "life without parole"). However, there is no single way
> >balance a question, e.g., another alternative might point out the
> >possibility of an innocent person being put to death. And these
> >results might be still different. Therefore, the best approach is
> >probably to ask a number of questions on this or any important issue,
> >and to draw conclusions as best one can from the results, rather than
> >to think of any single way of framing a question as measuring "public
> >sentiment."

> >
> >Since validity is often best conceived as the relation of answers to
> >whatever else one is interested in and believes should be related,
> >it's difficult to speak of validity in the abstract in a case like
> >this.

> >

> >

> >

> >On Sun, 27 Feb 2000, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> >

> > >

> > >

> > > AAPORites-

> > >

> > > Would any of you like to comment on the following issue?

> > >

> > > Rob Warden, who is copied on this message, would appreciate your
> > > thoughts regarding death penalty poll question wording. Rob is the
> > > former publisher and founder of Chicago Lawyer magazine, former
> > > chief assistant to Cook County States Attorney Jack O'Malley,
> > > current Executive Director for the Center On Wrongful Convictions
> > > at Northwestern University School of Law, and instrumental in *six
> > > of the recent thirteen* death row exonerations here in Illinois.

> > >

> > > The question "do you favor or oppose the death penalty sentence in
cases

> > > of murder?" is the question form most commonly used. But I suspect
that

> > > when the question is so stated, many people are in favor because

> > > of

the

> > > *absence of an alternative* sentence.

> > >

> > > The Gallup Organization has been asking the death penalty question
> > > in two different forms. In a February, 2000 survey, 66% were in
> > > favor of the death penalty and 28% were opposed. But in the
> > > *second form of the

> > > question* which offered respondents a choice between the death penalty

> > > or life in prison without parole, only 52% chose the death penalty and

> > > 37% chose life in prison. This has been the pattern in Gallup polls

over

> > > the past decade. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000224.asp>

> > >

> > > In a January, 2000 poll, ABC News found 64% in favor of the death
> > > penalty and 27% opposed. But response to ABC's choice question was
only

> > > 48% favoring the death penalty for murder and 43% favoring life in

> > > prison when offered as an alternative.

> > > <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/poll000119.html>
> > >
> > > Cliff Zukin's recent Star-Ledger poll in New Jersey, mirrors the
> > > ABC data above with a 7-point win for the death penalty when
> > > offered as a choice but a 40-point win when asked as favor/oppose.
> > > Recent credible polls in New York (Quinnipiac), Kentucky,
> > > Michigan, and Ohio (Eric Stewart, OSU) show greater support for
> > > life in prison without parole than the death penalty when both
> > > choices were given. Some of these states don't have a death
> > > penalty (e.g., MI) or just recently
reinstated
> > > it (NY)
> > >
> > > So which question form is the *more valid measure* of public
> > > sentiment on this issue?
> > >
> > > One could argue in favor of the choice question because life in
> > > prison without parole *is the alternative* in most states without
> > > a death penalty. Rob Warden says of 38 states which now have death
> > > penalty statutes, 33 provide life in prison without parole as an
> > > alternative. And of 12 states without the death penalty, 8 have
> > > life in prison without parole.
> > >
> > > Withholding an alternative already in place may lead respondents
> > > to inappropriately guess about an unacceptable alternative (e.g.,
> > > early parole, or whatever) which in turn leads to greater support
> > > for the death penalty.
> > >
> > > Is there a more valid form for asking this question? I think this
> > > is important because of the constant references in the media to
> > > "overwhelming support for the death penalty".
> > >
> > > Comments? I don't know what the protocol is on this listserve but
> > > you can reply to me or to both of us.
> > >
> > > Thanks
> > >
> > > Nick
> > >
>
> MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
>
> 212 980-3031
> 212 980-3107 fax
>
> e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com
> From mark@bisconti.com Tue Aug 8 11:09:01 2000
Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA07186 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 11:08:55 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mark (bay3-209.houston.ziplink.net [206.15.134.209]) by
pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service
Version 5.5.2650.21)
id Q34PKAM1; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 14:08:49 -0400

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Attitudes about voting
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 14:07:09 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBGEBOCKAA.mark@bisconti.com>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

Can anyone direct me to recent national data on public attitudes about voting-such as % think it is important to vote in elections; why people do and do not vote; any evidence showing more people tell pollsters they vote than actually do, etc. Thanks, Mark Richards

>From rusciano@rider.edu Tue Aug 8 12:15:28 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 ESMTTP
 id MAA21630 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 12:15:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
 id <01JSQD0A82SG000769@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 8 Aug
2000 15:16:27 EDT
Received: from rider.edu (fs90.rider.edu [204.142.224.90])
 by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
 with ESMTTP id <01JSQD09ZU4A000706@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Tue, 08 Aug 2000 15:16:27 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2000 15:19:39 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: A Prediction
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39905D4B.B4BA3CB1@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>

Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does anyone know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a Jewish candidate? I know this is a somewhat problematic question, since Jewish voters and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps it could be checked by comparing races in say, New York, when a Jewish candidate ran for Senate as opposed to a year when a non-Jewish candidate ran. Or, of course, we could always control for party id, especially across two races. Anyone have any information on this?

Frank Rusciano

Howard Schuman wrote:

> Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data: If
> the Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably well),
> there will be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the
> proportion of Jews who report that they observe the sabbath.

>From mkshares@mcs.net Tue Aug 8 12:28:30 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA00574 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 12:28:29 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P18-Chi-Dial-4.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.210])
by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id OAA09772
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 14:28:17 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)

Message-ID: <39901910.92E2512C@mcs.net>
Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2000 14:29:00 +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: A Prediction

References:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
<39905D4B.B4BA3CB1@rider.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Not just New York but California, Wisconsin, Michigan, plus more states I
believe.

1998 exit poll data for Senate are available here. But you will have to look
for them.

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/1998/>

1996 Senate Exit poll data are here:

<http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1996/polls/>

Frank Rusciano wrote:

> Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does
> anyone know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a
> Jewish candidate? I know this is a somewhat problematic question,
> since Jewish voters and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps
> it could be checked by comparing races in say, New York, when a Jewish
> candidate ran for Senate as opposed to a year when a non-Jewish
> candidate ran. Or, of course, we could always control for party id,
> especially across two races. Anyone have any information on this?
>

> Frank Rusciano

>

> Howard Schuman wrote:

>
> > Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data:
> > If the Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably
> > well), there will be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the
> > proportion of Jews who report that they observe the sabbath.

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Tue Aug 8 12:40:23 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA07338 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 12:38:30 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mitofsky.mindspring.com
(adsl-151-202-105-236.bellatlantic.net [151.202.105.236])
by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA12082
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 15:38:18 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000808153442.00d0f560@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2

Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2000 15:37:32 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: A Prediction

In-Reply-To: <39905D4B.B4BA3CB1@rider.edu>

References:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="=====
14005857==.ALT"

14005857==.ALT

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I will bet that Ruth Messinger did not do all that well among Jews in the last New York City mayoral race. On the other hand, I will bet Koch did get their support. I do not think you can test Howard's question this way.

At 03:19 PM 8/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does
>anyone know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a
>Jewish candidate? I know this is a somewhat problematic question, since
>Jewish voters and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps it could
>be checked by comparing races in say, New York, when a Jewish candidate
>ran for Senate as opposed to a year when a non-Jewish candidate ran.
>Or, of course, we could always control for party id, especially across
>two races. Anyone have any information on this?

>

>Frank Rusciano

>

>Howard Schuman wrote:

>

> > Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data:
> > If the Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably
> > well), there will be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the
> > proportion of Jews who report that they observe the sabbath.

References: <4.3.2.7.2.20000808115426.00d0a6b0@pop.mindspring.com>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----9CFAA947549A2A9DE0FF693C"

-----9CFAA947549A2A9DE0FF693C
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Glad this was written and circulated. In future, I think it would be wise not to refer to focus group research as "unscientific." No sense in identifying statements like this with "anti-focus group" ideology. Focus groups are extremely useful if conducted systematically and analyzed thoroughly. Which does not apply to Mr. Luntz's performance, it appears.

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> A Statement by the National Council on Public Polls' Polling Review
> Board August 4, 2000
>
> MSNBC's QUESTIONABLE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION POLLS
>
> NBC News for many years was widely known for reliable news reporting.
> At this year's Republican National Convention it is giving the public
> unreliable reports of public opinion about events at the convention.
> In a two-pronged assault on its own credibility NBC is reporting
> results of focus groups conducted by Republican pollster and
> consultant, Frank Luntz. On opening night of the convention he called
> the focus group's utterances "representative" opinion.
>
> Also, on its MSNBC.com web page, it has what it calls a National
> Internet Focus Group run by SpeakOut.com. This web focus group gives
> anyone who chooses to participate the opportunity to express a
> second-by-second reaction to key prime-time speeches. Erik Sorenson,
> the head of MSNBC said, "we'll be able to go directly to the people
> and find out what they're thinking." If he means a representative
> sample we disagree.
>
> Focus groups usually consist of moderated discussions among small
> groups of people. They are generally chosen because of some background
> characteristic related to the topic being studied. The Luntz panel
> includes 36 voters who said when selected that they were uncommitted
> in their presidential preference this year. The SpeakOut panel
> includes as many web surfers as care to take the time to give their
> opinions.
>
> While focus groups are useful for supplying context and nuance about a
> variety of issues or topics they are not a reliable gauge of public
> opinion on these subjects. Conclusions about what percentage of the
> general public holds a particular view, or any generalizations about
> the public, cannot be made from a focus group. Luntz talks about
> Republicans', Democrats' and independents' opinions as though they
> applied to all members of those groups in the general public. In fact,
> those are only the opinions of those in his focus group. There is
> nothing scientific about these focus groups. They are more akin to a
> parlor game than to a public opinion poll.
>

> While many news organizations have their news polling conducted by
> non-partisan pollsters (or a bi- partisan pairing) Luntz is widely
> known for his work in behalf of Republicans. YROCK.com, a Web site and
> Internet service run by the National Young Republicans, sponsors the
> Luntz focus group. Luntz was instrumental in conducting research for
> the Contract With America. The American Association for Public Opinion
> Research found Luntz, in violation of its ethics code when he
> repeatedly refused to make public essential facts that supported the
> conclusions promoted by the Newt Gingrich led GOP caucus.

>
> Live reports of Luntz focus group are part of the MSNBC convention
> coverage. The group, when urged by Luntz, has voiced its opinions on
> its current leanings for President, its opinions of Vice President
> designate, Dick Cheney, and its reactions to Colin Powell's speech on
> opening night. An MSNBC press release said the opinions of the Luntz
> effort would be compared to the reactions of the SpeakOut panel - a
> meaningless exercise, if ever there was one.

>
> For more information about this and other polling issues see:
> <http://www.ncpp.org/home.htm> NCPP Polling Review Board Members:

> Chairman: Harry O'Neill, Roper Starch
> Worldwide 609 921-3333 x228
> Warren Mitofsky, Mitofsky International212
> 980-3031
> Humphrey Taylor, Harris Interactive212 539-9657

>
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022

> 212 980-3031 Phone
> 212 980-3107 FAX
> mitofsky@mindspring.com
>

-----9CFAA947549A2A9DE0FF693C
Content-Type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html> Glad
this was written and circulated. In future, I think it would be wise
not to refer to focus group research as "unscientific." No sense in
identifying statements like this with "anti-focus group" ideology.
Focus groups are extremely useful if conducted systematically and analyzed
thoroughly. Which does not apply to Mr. Luntz's performance, it
appears. <p>Warren Mitofsky wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>A
Statement by the National Council on Public Polls' Polling Review
Board<x-tab></x-tab><x-tab></x-tab>

August 4, 2000
<p>MSNBC's QUESTIONABLE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION POLLS
<p>NBC News for many years was widely known for reliable news
reporting. At this year's Republican National Convention it is giving the
public unreliable reports of public opinion about events at the convention.
In a two-pronged assault on its own credibility NBC is reporting results of
focus groups conducted by Republican pollster and consultant, Frank Luntz.
On opening night of the convention he called the focus group's utterances

"representative" opinion.

Also, on its MSNBC.com web page, it has what it calls a National Internet Focus Group run by SpeakOut.com. This web focus group gives anyone who chooses to participate the opportunity to express a second-by-second reaction to key prime-time speeches. Erik Sorenson, the head of MSNBC said, "we'll be able to go directly to the people and find out what they're thinking." If he means a representative sample we disagree.

Focus groups usually consist of moderated discussions among small groups of people. They are generally chosen because of some background characteristic related to the topic being studied. The Luntz panel includes 36 voters who said ~~w~~hen selected that they were uncommitted in their presidential preference this year. The SpeakOut panel includes as many web surfers as care to take the time to give their opinions.

While focus groups are useful for supplying context and nuance about a variety of issues or topics they are not a reliable gauge of public opinion on these subjects. Conclusions about what percentage of the general public holds a particular view, or any generalizations about the public, cannot be made from a focus group. Luntz talks about Republicans', Democrats' and independents' opinions as though they applied to all members of those groups in the general public. In fact, those are only the opinions of those in his focus group. There is nothing scientific about these focus groups. They are more akin to a parlor game than to a public opinion poll.

While many news organizations have their news polling conducted by non-partisan pollsters (or a bi-partisan pairing) Luntz is widely known for his work in behalf of Republicans. YROCK.com, a Web site and Internet service run by the National Young Republicans, sponsors the Luntz focus group. Luntz was instrumental in conducting research for the Contract With America. The American Association for Public Opinion Research found Luntz, in violation of its ethics code when he repeatedly refused to make public essential facts that supported the conclusions promoted by the Newt Gingrich led GOP caucus.

Live reports of Luntz focus group are part of the MSNBC convention coverage. The group, when urged by Luntz, has voiced its opinions on its current leanings for President, its opinions of Vice President designate, Dick Cheney, and its reactions to Colin Powell's speech on opening night. An MSNBC press release said the opinions of the Luntz effort would be compared to the reactions of the SpeakOut panel - a meaningless exercise, if ever there was one.

For more information about this and other polling issues

see:

<http://www.ncpp.org/home.htm>

NCPP Polling Review Board Members:

Chairman: Harry O'Neill, Roper Starch Worldwide

921-3333 x228

Warren Mitofsky, Mitofsky International

980-3031

Humphrey Taylor, Harris Interactive

539-9657

<center>Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022
<p>212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com</center>
</blockquote>
</html>

-----9CFAA947549A2A9DE0FF693C--

>From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Tue Aug 8 13:38:14 2000
Received: from maill.doit.wisc.edu (maill.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
id NAA12751 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 13:38:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [24.10.212.149] by maill.doit.wisc.edu
id PAA287876 (8.9.1/50); Tue, 8 Aug 2000 15:38:10 -0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu
Message-Id: <p04320403b5b61ba1723f@[24.10.212.149]>
In-Reply-To: <39905D4B.B4BA3CB1@rider.edu>
References:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 15:38:05 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject: Political correctness and respondent honesty
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

I heard in several reports yesterday on the picking of Joseph Lieberman as Gore's VP that now only 3% of the electorate (no poll cited) stated they would never vote for a Jew for higher office. One pundit picked up on that number and asked rhetorically how honest people really are with pollsters these days in divulging certain politically incorrect opinions to anonymous strangers over the telephone. Has any recent research been done in this area of respondent truthfulness/self censorship?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

>From RobertH877@aol.com Tue Aug 8 13:55:53 2000
Received: from imo-d07.mx.aol.com (imo-d07.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.39])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
id NAA23067 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 13:55:50 -0700
(PDT)
From: RobertH877@aol.com
Message-Id: <200008082055.NAA23067@usc.edu>
Received: from RobertH877@aol.com
by imo-d07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.6e.1ee9f82 (15864)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 16:55:13 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from web43.aolmail.aol.com (web43.aolmail.aol.com
[205.188.161.4]) by air-id06.mx.aol.com (v75_b3.11) with ESMTMP; Tue, 08 Aug
2000 16:55:13 -0400
Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2000 16:55:12 EDT

Subject: Re: Attitudes about voting
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Unknown

Don't forget about Florida.

>From simonetta@artsci.com Tue Aug 8 14:23:57 2000
Received: from as_server.artsci.com
(twsnl-hfc-0252-dldb038b.rdc1.md.comcastatwork.com [209.219.3.139])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA10047 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 14:23:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QRCYWZYN>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 17:19:29 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DEB@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Harris drops AOL from suit
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 17:19:29 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

"NEW YORK (Reuters) - Online market research firm Harris Interactive Inc. (HPOL.O) said on Tuesday it dropped its lawsuit against America Online Inc. (AOL.N) after the top Internet services provider restored Harris's ability to communicate with users who want to participate in its surveys."

<http://news.lycos.com/headlines/Technology/Internet/article.asp?docid=RTNET-HARRIS-AOL-DC&date=20000808>

This leaves MAPS, hotmail and Qwest among others.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

>From HOneill1536@aol.com Tue Aug 8 15:48:34 2000
Received: from imo-r13.mx.aol.com (imo-r13.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.67])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA01712 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 15:48:33 -0700
(PDT)
From: HOneill1536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill1536@aol.com
by imo-r13.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.c4.791b7a8 (9613)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 18:47:43 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <c4.791b7a8.26c1e80e@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 18:47:42 EDT
Subject: Re: NYT: Lieberman Is Gore's Pick for Running Mate, Democrats Say
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 106

why use AAPORnet to send out an article on Gore's pick as VP candidate? can we look forward to more political messages?

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Aug 8 18:02:09 2000

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA12369 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 18:02:08 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA06110 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 18:02:08 -0700
(PDT)

Date: Tue, 8 Aug 2000 18:02:08 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup: Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in polls

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008081748410.3215-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/134.htm>

08/08/00- Updated 01:07 PM ET

Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in polls

By Laurence McQuillan, USA TODAY

NASHVILLE -- Vice President Gore on Monday chose Connecticut Sen. Joe Lieberman, a political centrist sometimes called "the conscience of the Senate," to be his running mate on the Democratic ticket.

"The vice president asked me if I would do him the honor of running with him, and I said, 'Believe me, it's my honor,' " said Lieberman, the first Orthodox Jew chosen to be on a major party's national ticket.

A USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll Monday night after Lieberman's selection shows that Texas Gov. George Bush's lead has almost disappeared among registered voters.

Bush's lead was reduced to 2 points, 45%-43%, in the poll that included Lieberman on the Democratic ticket. That's down from 19 points among registered voters in a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll Friday and Saturday.

Gallup Poll senior editor David Moore says polls of registered voters are not as accurate as those of likely voters. Among that group, Bush led by 17 points in the Friday-Saturday poll.

Moore also notes that one-day polls are subject to errors not found in polls taken over more than a day. But "clearly there has been a narrowing of the race."

The announcement comes less than two weeks after Bush selected former defense secretary Dick Cheney as his running mate and just days after the end of the Republican convention.

Bush spokesman Ari Fleischer praised Lieberman "for his intelligence, his integrity, and for many of the positions he has taken" that he said conflict with Gore's views. Those issues include school vouchers and the privatization of Social Security.

Lieberman is perhaps best known for rising on the Senate floor in 1998 to denounce President Clinton's conduct with Monica Lewinsky as "not just inappropriate; it is immoral." The rebuke was particularly pointed for Clinton, who has known Lieberman for 30 years. But Clinton on Monday called him "one of the most outstanding figures in public life."

Lieberman also has criticized the entertainment industry for failing to reflect higher ethical and moral standards in movies and TV programs.

The two-term Democratic senator, who is up for re-election this year, has served the past five years as chairman of the Democratic Leadership Council, a group that has aimed to move the party to the middle of the political spectrum.

The poll has a margin of error of +/- 4 percentage points.

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

>From caplanjr@bellsouth.net Tue Aug 8 21:10:38 2000
Received: from mail3.mia.bellsouth.net (mail3.mia.bellsouth.net [205.152.144.15])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id VAA25767 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Aug 2000 21:10:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jrc (adsl-61-113-167.mia.bellsouth.net [208.61.113.167])
by mail3.mia.bellsouth.net (3.3.5alt/0.75.2) with SMTP id AAA14234
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 00:10:36 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <023a01c001b7\$c7d76940\$5393fea9@jrc>
Reply-To: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@iname.com>
From: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@bellsouth.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
<39905D4B.B4BA3CB1@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: A Prediction
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 00:10:37 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Isn't the more general question whether voters are more likely to vote for candidates who share some prominent demographic characteristic (race, religion, ethnicity), (thus being "one of us") than by candidates' party, platform, or issues?

This is not my field but I suspect if true, it also varies with the degree each voter identifies with that group.

If memory serves, a man named Martinez was elected governor of Florida a few years ago who only spoke a few words of high school Spanish. That didn't keep him from landslide votes in the Latin precincts.

Jim Caplan
Miami

----- Original Message -----

From: "Frank Rusciano" <rusciano@rider.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 08, 2000 3:19 PM
Subject: Re: A Prediction

> Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does anyone
> know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a Jewish candidate?
> I know this is a somewhat problematic question, since Jewish voters
> and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps it could be checked
> by
comparing
> races in say, New York, when a Jewish candidate ran for Senate as
> opposed
to a
> year when a non-Jewish candidate ran. Or, of course, we could always
control
> for party id, especially across two races. Anyone have any
> information on this?
>
> Frank Rusciano
>
> Howard Schuman wrote:
>
> > Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data:
> > If
the
> > Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably well), there
will
> > be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the proportion of Jews
> > who report that they observe the sabbath.
>
>

>From JJanota@asha.org Wed Aug 9 00:03:45 2000
Received: from asha.org (external.asha.org [12.17.9.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id AAA07400 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 00:03:44 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from ASHA-Message_Server by asha.org
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 09 Aug 2000 03:00:48 -0400

Message-Id: <s990c960.065@asha.org>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 09 Aug 2000 03:00:42 -0400
From: "Jeanette Janota" <JJanota@asha.org>
Sender: Postmaster@asha.org
Reply-To: JJanota@asha.org
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Prediction
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 AAA07406

I will be away from the office until Aug. 15 and will reply after that date.

>From ghroberts@worldnet.att.net Wed Aug 9 02:07:50 2000
Received: from mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net
[204.127.131.52])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id CAA16856 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 02:07:49 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from hewlett-packard ([12.75.137.122])
by mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net
(InterMail vM.4.01.02.39 201-229-119-122) with ESMTTP
id
<20000809090718.TVQI14052.mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>;
Wed, 9 Aug 2000 09:07:18 +0000
From: "Glenn H. Roberts" <ghroberts@worldnet.att.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Warren Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>,
"Harry O'Neill" <HOneill1536@aol.com>,
Subject: Re: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup "Overnight Poll"
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 04:06:56 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Message-Id:
<20000809090718.TVQI14052.mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>

In regard to David Moore's comment on the Gallup "overnight poll" on
Lieberman, as reported below, I simply ask:

Why report the "overnight poll" since you say it is not comparable to your
earlier Gallup poll?

We are trying to educate the public on the value of good polling and this
type of reporting does not, in my opinion, add to this objective. The

overnights and all the assumptions with them clouds the value of polling and further confuses the public.

Can't the media sponsored polls wait a few days and do it right, so reliable comparisons can be made? I know the need to beat the competition but this is not the responsible way to meet this challenge.

As an NCPP member, I suggest the Polling Review Board add "overnight polls" and "tracking polls" to go along with its "Focus group" paper.

Glenn Roberts

Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/134.htm>

08/08/00- Updated 01:07 PM ET

Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in polls

By Laurence McQuillan, USA TODAY

NASHVILLE -- Vice President Gore on Monday chose Connecticut Sen. Joe Lieberman, a political centrist sometimes called "the conscience of the Senate," to be his running mate on the Democratic ticket.

"The vice president asked me if I would do him the honor of running with him, and I said, 'Believe me, it's my honor,' " said Lieberman, the first Orthodox Jew chosen to be on a major party's national ticket.

A USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll Monday night after Lieberman's selection shows that Texas Gov. George Bush's lead has almost disappeared among registered voters.

Bush's lead was reduced to 2 points, 45%-43%, in the poll that included Lieberman on the Democratic ticket. That's down from 19 points among registered voters in a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll Friday and Saturday.

Gallup Poll senior editor David Moore says polls of registered voters are not as accurate as those of likely voters. Among that group, Bush led by 17 points in the Friday-Saturday poll.

Moore also notes that one-day polls are subject to errors not found in polls taken over more than a day. But "clearly there has been a narrowing of the race."

The announcement comes less than two weeks after Bush selected former defense secretary Dick Cheney as his running mate and just days after the end of the Republican convention.

Bush spokesman Ari Fleischer praised Lieberman "for his intelligence, his integrity, and for many of the positions he has taken" that he said conflict with Gore's views. Those issues include school vouchers and the privatization of Social Security.

Lieberman is perhaps best known for rising on the Senate floor in 1998 to denounce President Clinton's conduct with Monica Lewinsky as "not just inappropriate; it is immoral." The rebuke was particularly pointed for Clinton, who has known Lieberman for 30 years. But Clinton on Monday called him "one of the most outstanding figures in public life."

Lieberman also has criticized the entertainment industry for failing to reflect higher ethical and moral standards in movies and TV programs.

The two-term Democratic senator, who is up for re-election this year, has served the past five years as chairman of the Democratic Leadership Council, a group that has aimed to move the party to the middle of the political spectrum.

The poll has a margin of error of +/- 4 percentage points.

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Wed Aug 9 05:32:13 2000
Received: from fwdmz.gallup.com ([205.219.140.49])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA22561 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 05:32:12 -0700
(PDT)
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
Received: from exchn7.gallup.com (exchn7.gallup.com [198.175.140.71])
by fwdmz.gallup.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id HAA11861
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 07:33:25 -0500 (CDT)
Received: by exchn7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <QFJADW39>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 07:29:21 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90EEF219@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: A Prediction
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 07:31:39 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Back to Howard's point, is anyone aware of polls showing an increase in the percentage of Americans willing to identify themselves as "born again Christian" after Jimmy Carter professed to be one in 1976? While not perfect, that might provide one indication of the power of religious "leadership" on a population.

Gallup's trend on this from the Carter/post-Carter period is not very persuasive (August 1976 is the earliest asking I could find, however, so perhaps too late for a true baseline to test Carter's effect.)

"Would you say that you have been 'born again' or have had a 'born again' experience--that is, a turning point in your life when you committed yourself to Christ?"

August 1976	35%
April 1978	37%
August 1980	39%
December 1980	36%
May 1983	33%
October 1984	40%
November 1984	35%

Lydia Saad

Gallup Princeton: 609-279-2219

-----Original Message-----

From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 08, 2000 3:38 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Prediction

I will bet that Ruth Messinger did not do all that well among Jews in the last New York City mayoral race. On the other hand, I will bet Koch did get their support. I do not think you can test Howard's question this way.

At 03:19 PM 8/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does anyone know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a Jewish candidate? I know this is a somewhat problematic question, since Jewish voters and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps it could be checked by comparing races in say, New York, when a Jewish candidate ran for Senate as opposed to a year when a non-Jewish candidate ran. Or, of course, we could always control for party id, especially across two races. Anyone have any information on this?

Frank Rusciano

Howard Schuman wrote:

> Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data: If
> the Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably well),
> there will be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the
> proportion of Jews who report that they observe the sabbath.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From mbocian@intersurvey.com Wed Aug 9 05:34:17 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA22883 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 05:34:17 -0700
(PDT)
Message-ID: <a96056c034edef074eba00536930cf0e399151e1@inter-survey.com>
From: Mike Bocian <mbocian@intersurvey.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Yahoo poll
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 05:34:08 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

CNN Newsstand reported the results of an online Yahoo "poll" last night of 54,000 respondents. The host even made the comment that some people consider these surveys very accurate. Peter Hart was one of the guests on the show and his comments were based on real polls, but I don't think he had an opportunity to explain the problem with Yahoo's "poll." Maybe AAPOR should explain it to CNN?

Mike Bocian

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Aug 9 05:43:40 2000
Received: from mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (mx1.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.112.76])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA24698 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 05:43:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from s1.optonline.net (s1.optonline.net [167.206.112.6])
by mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id IAA06536;
Wed, 9 Aug 2000 08:43:31 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from beveridg (d164-134.ynkry.optonline.net [24.189.164.134])
by s1.optonline.net (8.9.1/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA20962;
Wed, 9 Aug 2000 08:43:31 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: A Prediction
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 08:44:35 -0400
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGC PFJBP AEADCCAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0008_01C001DE.0B6AF3E0"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <4.3.2.7.2.20000808153442.00d0f560@pop.mindspring.com>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0008_01C001DE.0B6AF3E0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In fact, Messinger did much worse among Jewish voters than did David Dinkins, who is not Jewish!!

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky

Sent: Tuesday, August 08, 2000 3:38 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: A Prediction

I will bet that Ruth Messinger did not do all that well among Jews in the last New York City mayoral race. On the other hand, I will bet Koch did get their support. I do not think you can test Howard's question this way.

At 03:19 PM 8/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does anyone

know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a Jewish candidate?

I know this is a somewhat problematic question, since Jewish voters and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps it could be checked by comparing

elections in New York, when a Jewish candidate ran for Senate as opposed to a

non-Jewish candidate ran. Or, of course, we could always control

for party id, especially across two races. Anyone have any information on

this?

Frank Rusciano

Howard Schuman wrote:

> Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data: If the

> Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably well), there will

> be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the proportion of Jews who

> report that they observe the sabbath.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

-----=_NextPart_000_0008_01C001DE.0B6AF3E0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="us-ascii"

>From hschuman@umich.edu Wed Aug 9 07:22:04 2000
Received: from berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.162])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA24276 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 07:22:03 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from tempest.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@tempest.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.155])
by berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTTP id KAA25316
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 10:22:03 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
by tempest.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTTP id KAA06980
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 10:22:02 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 10:22:02 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@tempest.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The Lieberman challenge to surveys
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008091015590.6127-100000@tempest.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The selection of Lieberman presents both a problem and an opportunity for survey research.

First, it seems evident that Gore has not only chosen Lieberman despite his being Jewish, but is going to make a vote against the ticket almost a mark of intolerance. (This applies not only to support for the Republican ticket but also for Nader.) Assuming the indicators we have of a huge increase over the past half century in the self-image of most Americans as free of prejudice, this may well be effective politically and thus adds a new element that is important to assess carefully.

At the same time, we know from past elections involving black/white races that the polls may overstate support for minority candidates just because of current norms of tolerance. Therefore, it is going to be important to allow respondents to state preferences without feeling open to criticism. This may be a case where anonymous mail questionnaires can be useful in order to calibrate ordinary polls. In addition, an ancient study by Robinson and Rohde is of interest: in face-to-face interviewing on relevant issues, responses were influenced by whether the interviewer had a Jewish sounding name or appeared to be Jewish. Polling in 2000 suggests the value of similar creative efforts.

>From jcf3c@erols.com Wed Aug 9 08:10:46 2000
Received: from hestia.host4u.net (hestia.host4u.net [216.71.64.32])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA15290 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 08:10:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from erols.com ([209.3.2.162])
by hestia.host4u.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id KAA02403;

Wed, 9 Aug 2000 10:10:37 -0500
Message-ID: <399174E5.DB995860@erols.com>
Date: Wed, 09 Aug 2000 11:12:37 -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
CC: "John C. Fries" <JCF@SIRresearch.com>
Subject: Harsh Words for Focus Groups
References: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213024EC266@psg.ucsf.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Although I wouldn't consider myself a qualitative researcher, the following statement seems a little harsh. Without rejecting the idea that much of society functions on a herd mentality, I find it hard to believe that so many would spend so much money on a research method that has "no meaning whatsoever."

Also, am I incorrect in thinking that it is fairly common for survey researchers to rework questions and rearrange entire surveys based on focus group discussions (or at least on "ungeneralizable" samples)? Having been in many meetings where true experts in survey research have refused to give on particular phrases and question sequences, it would seem the ability of a focus group to significantly transform a questionnaire suggests it can be quite powerful for some purposes.

Anyway, the Luntz thread has confirmed that perhaps I need a refresher regarding the useful (and legitimate?) uses of focus groups. Anyone care to start?

John

LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu wrote:

>
> it was actually a pretty slow news day. I also acknowledge that the
> newspaper article pretty much said generalizability of the findings
> was nil. However, "pretty much" isn't the same as bald-facedly saying
> it was a nice exercise but has no meaning whatsoever. Given ongoing
> misperceptions of the general public about the purpose of focus groups
> and how they are formed and how they are run, AND the apparently wide
> variance in these procedures, I think it behooves the writer to be
> very up front about how far you can take a set of results.

--

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
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Aug 9 09:20:29 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA04162 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 09:20:29 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA15467 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 09:20:29 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 09:20:29 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: It's a Woman's Web After All -- No Niche They
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008090853150.13378-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Who would have predicted this, five years ago, when AAPORNET began? Not I, I must admit.

What I most appreciate about this USA Today account, as a father of two daughters (iMac, blue), is what we might call The Six Ages of Womanhood, at the very end. The sixth and final "Age" I find somewhat poignant, don't you agree?

-- Jim

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

<http://www.usatoday.com/life/cyber/tech/cti364.htm>

08/09/00- Updated 10:46 AM ET

WOMEN OUTNUMBER MEN ONLINE

By Elizabeth Weise, USA TODAY

The number of women on the Web has surpassed the number of men, and the dramatic growth is being fueled by teens and seniors.

"Women are not a minority online; they're not a niche," says analyst Anya Sacharow, co-author of the Media Metrix/Jupiter Communications study. The report, out Wednesday, is based on Media Metrix's sample of more than 55,000 Net users in U.S. homes and businesses.

In the first three months of this year, women edged out men 50.4% to 49.6%. Girls ages 12 to 17 increased their presence 126% in the past year--five times faster than the growth in overall Web population. The number of women older than 55 on the Net increased 110%. Web population overall grew 22%; Media Metrix counts 75.7 million Web users in the USA.

Women and men use the Web differently, the study found. Women "are really pressed for time," Sacharow says. "They're juggling many demands. For them, the Internet is really a productivity tool."

Men, on the other hand, "tend to be more interested in downloading software,

technology for technology's sake. They tend to spend more time online just playing around," she says.

The study also tracked sites whose audience includes the highest female proportions of each age group:

Among girls ages 12-17:

Cosmogirl.com, TeenPeople.com
Delias.com (clothing, fashion)
Seventeen.com.

Ages 18-24:

BigWords.com (a college portal site)
CollegeClub.com.

Ages 25-34:

BabyGear.com
Pampers.com
Walgreens.com
iBaby.com.

Ages 35-44:

Alka-Seltzer.com
Marketday.com (which raises funds for schools)
BirthdayExpress.com.

Ages 45-54:

OneHanesPlace.com
ColdWaterCreek.com (casual clothes)
HouseNet.com

Ages 55 and up:

AARP.org, Merck-Medco.com
Funstun.com (humor)
Genealogy.com.

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

>From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Wed Aug 9 10:52:32 2000
Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id KAA21446 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 10:52:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id

3058 ; Wed, 09 Aug 2000 13:52:15 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by
UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2d/1.8d) with BSMTTP id 8771; Wed, 9 Aug 2000
13:52:15 -0400
Date: Wed, 09 Aug 00 13:51:46 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Special Compendium of Data Posted
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <000809.135215.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research has posted selected data from its archives showing the declining stated importance to voters of a of a candidate's religious faith. Data concerning Jewish candidates date back to 1937 and extend to 1999. The posting compares these views to stated openness to candidates from a variety of backgrounds, and shows recent (1999) views of a variety of different demographic groups.

This is the first special posting of the campaign 2000 and will be supplemented from time to time as archived data become especially relevant to understanding the evolving campaign.

The Roper Center Web site is:
<http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/>

Located at the University of Connecticut, the Roper Center is the largest library of public opinion data in the world. The Center's mission focuses on data preservation and access, education and research.

>From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Wed Aug 9 11:09:52 2000
Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id LAA04361 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 11:09:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
3118 ; Wed, 09 Aug 2000 14:09:37 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by
UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2d/1.8d) with BSMTTP id 0072; Wed, 9 Aug 2000
14:09:38 -0400
Date: Wed, 09 Aug 00 14:08:09 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Special compendium of Data
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <000809.140937.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Apologies if this is a duplicate notice: My mail program "hiccuped".

The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research has posted selected data from its archives showing the declining stated importance to voters of a of a

candidate's religious faith. Data concerning Jewish candidates date back to 1937 and extend to 1999. The posting compares these views to stated openness to candidates from a variety of backgrounds, and shows recent (1999) views of a variety of different demographic groups.

This is the first special posting of the campaign 2000 and will be supplemented from time to time as archived data become especially relevant to understanding the evolving campaign.

The Roper Center Web site is:
<http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/>

Located at the University of Connecticut, the Roper Center is the largest library of public opinion data in the world. The Center's mission focuses on data preservation and access, education and research.

>From jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Aug 9 11:20:37 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 ESMTTP
id LAA11228 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 11:20:31 -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 NAA16392
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 13:20:26 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 09 Aug 2000 13:18:43 -0500

Message-Id: <s9915a33.072@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 09 Aug 2000 13:14:25 -0500
From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Employment opportunity - Chicago

The Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois has an immediate opening for a Visiting Project Coordinator at its Chicago office to design, manage, and coordinate survey projects. Responsibilities include working with research investigators and staff on survey design, proposal development, budgeting, questionnaire construction and programming, interviewer training, data analysis, and report writing.

Minimum Requirements: BA/BS in social science area with demonstrated survey supervisory training or experience. Excellent oral and written communication skills are required; familiarity with SPSS or SAS a plus.

For full consideration, send your resume and a detailed letter outlining your qualifications by September 1 to:

Jennifer Parsons
Assistant Director
Survey Research Laboratory (MC 336)
412 South Peoria, 6th floor
Chicago, IL 60607
Fax: 312-996-3358

NO PHONE CALLS OR E-MAILS WILL BE ACCEPTED. To learn more about the Survey Research Laboratory, visit our web site at www.srl.uic.edu.

The University of Illinois is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity

Employer.

>From s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu Wed Aug 9 12:41:08 2000
Received: from notesmail1.csuohio.edu (csu-mail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.57])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id MAA05010 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 12:41:08 -0700
(PDT)
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
Received: by notesmail1.csuohio.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.6 (890.1
7-16-1999)) id 85256936.006C63A1 ; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 15:43:53 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256936.006C628A.00@notesmail1.csuohio.edu>
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 15:43:50 -0400
Subject: Re: A Prediction
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Let's remember that Howard Metzenbaum, a Jew, became a US Senator from Ohio, Sabbath or no Sabbath.

Best,

Sid

>From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Wed Aug 9 13:53:39 2000
Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id NAA20703 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 13:53:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
3789 ; Wed, 09 Aug 2000 16:53:24 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by
UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2d/1.8d) with BSMTP id 3689; Wed, 9 Aug 2000
16:53:25 -0400
Date: Wed, 09 Aug 00 16:45:50 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Re: NCPP on MSNBC-Luntz
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
In-Reply-To: <4.3.2.7.2.20000808115426.00d0a6b0@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <000809.165324.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

In general, I applaud strongly the "polling panels" statement about the focus groups, which distinguishes clearly between the value of focus groups as qualitative research and their complete failure to replace quantified "projectible" results.

While it is altogether appropriate to re-cite AAPOR's censure, it might be useful to note that, in addition to Luntz's refusing to divulge critical

material, as I recall it, a basic "sin" was referring to the points of the Contract as all having high support (I don't remember the number cited, but there was one) on "national polls" when in fact they had been vetted by focus groups.

It is true that Luntz has a partisan axe to grind, and I would caution news organizations to try to rely on non-partisan or "balanced" efforts (though the third parties would complain about the latter). But his affiliation as such is not the problem with the "results". I don't think the statement says or implies this, but we will all do well to avoid even the appearance of that charge.

>From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Wed Aug 9 14:19:05 2000
Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA07387 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 14:19:05 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from [24.10.212.149] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu
id QAA165506 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 9 Aug 2000 16:19:01 -0500

Mime-Version: 1.0

X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu

Message-Id: <p04320400b5b77ae4292d@[24.10.212.149]>

In-Reply-To: <p04320403b5b61ba1723f@[24.10.212.149]>

References:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.10008080937200.23956-100000@gorf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>

Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 16:18:49 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>

Subject: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

A new study shows that, for the first time, more women in the U.S. use the Web than men. The only exception is in the 18 to 24 age range, a demographic that seems to be losing interest.

<http://www.wired.com/news/culture/0,1284,38126,00.html?tw=wn20000809>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Aug 9 14:54:16 2000

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA29413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 14:54:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id OAA18462 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 14:54:17 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 14:54:16 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: FOR: Howard Schuman, on The Lieberman challenge to surveys

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008091450030.17260-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Forwarded for Howard Schuman; please reply to him, at his address below, or else to: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu> -- Jim

Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 16:44:44 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The Lieberman challenge to surveys

The selection of Lieberman presents both a problem and an opportunity for survey research.

First, it seems evident that Gore has not only chosen Lieberman despite his being Jewish, but is going to make a vote against the ticket almost a mark of intolerance. (This applies not only to support for the Republican ticket but also for Nader.) Assuming the indicators we have of a huge increase over the past half century in the self-image of most Americans as free of prejudice, this may well be effective politically and thus adds a new element that is important to assess carefully.

At the same time, we know from past elections involving black/white races that the polls may overstate support for minority candidates just because of current norms of tolerance. Therefore, it is going to be important to allow respondents to state preferences without feeling open to criticism. This may be a case where anonymous mail questionnaires can be useful in order to calibrate ordinary polls. In addition, an ancient study by Robinson and Rohde is of interest: in face-to-face interviewing on relevant issues, responses were influenced by whether the interviewer had a Jewish sounding name or appeared to be Jewish. Polling in 2000 suggests the value of similar creative efforts.

>From ghroberts@worldnet.att.net Wed Aug 9 18:07:18 2000
Received: from mtiwmhc26.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc26.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.51])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA01709 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Aug 2000 18:07:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from hewlett-packard ([12.75.137.77])
by mtiwmhc26.worldnet.att.net
(InterMail vM.4.01.02.39 201-229-119-122) with ESMTTP
id
<20000810010645.EMZJ9297.mtiwmhc26.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 01:06:45 +0000
From: "Glenn H. Roberts" <ghroberts@worldnet.att.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup: Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in polls
Date: Wed, 9 Aug 2000 20:06:21 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Message-Id:
<20000810010645.EMZJ9297.mtiwmhc26.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>

In regard to David Moore's comment on the Gallup "overnight poll" on Lieberman, as reported below, I simply ask:

4. The inclusion of tracking polls in Glenn's criticism is totally without justification, as least as far as the CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking polls are concerned. In fact, these tracking polls allow us to following a sampling management strategy that is clearly as good, if not better, than one can with 3-day and 4-day polls. There is much misconception about tracking polls -- that new samples are used nightly, that minimal call-backs are made, that they are essentially a series of one-night polls, and that we have day-of-interviewing effects. But all of those assumptions are just wrong. In the 1996 tracking polls we conducted, a minimum of 5 call-backs were made for every respondent, new sample was added only as the old sample was completed, and there were absolutely no day-of-week effects. Methodologically, the tracking polls are very, very sound!

David

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hulfish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-9600
david_moore@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Glenn H. Roberts [mailto:ghroberts@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2000 9:06 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup: Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in polls

In regard to David Moore's comment on the Gallup "overnight poll" on Lieberman, as reported below, I simply ask:

Why report the "overnight poll" since you say it is not comparable to your earlier Gallup poll?

We are trying to educate the public on the value of good polling and this type of reporting does not, in my opinion, add to this objective. The overnights and all the assumptions with them clouds the value of polling and further confuses the public.

Can't the media sponsored polls wait a few days and do it right, so reliable comparisons can be made? I know the need to beat the competition but this is not the responsible way to meet this challenge.

As an NCPP member, I suggest the Polling Review Board add "overnight polls" and "tracking polls" to go along with its "Focus group" paper.

Glenn Roberts

Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net

Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Aug 10 07:36:03 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA22634 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 07:36:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA08885 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 07:36:02 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 07:36:02 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Most German teenagers ignorant of Holocaust - poll
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008100729080.8155-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(C) 2000 Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

<http://news.excite.com/news/r/000810/08/holocaust-germany>

Updated 8:42 AM ET August 10, 2000

Most German teenagers ignorant of Holocaust - poll

BERLIN (Reuters) - About two thirds of German teenagers do not understand the word Holocaust although a majority know that Auschwitz, Dachau and Treblinka were sites of Nazi concentration camps, a poll showed Thursday.

Pollsters from the Emnid research institute asked 350 German teenagers if they knew what the word Holocaust meant and more than 65 percent could not answer the question. The results of the poll were published in Die Zeit weekly Thursday.

"The older and more educated the teenagers were the more likely they were to be able to give us an answer, but we were surprised by the level of ignorance about the Holocaust," Emnid's Dieter Walz told Reuters.

However, Walz said that more than 60 percent knew that the Nazis forced Jews to wear a yellow Star of David on their clothes and more than half of those surveyed thought they should spend more time in school learning about the Holocaust.

Walz said a parallel survey conducted in France had shown that teenagers there were similarly ignorant of the Holocaust, if not even more so than their German counterparts.

(C) 2000 Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Thu Aug 10 08:28:16 2000
Received: from harumscarum.mr.itd.umich.edu (harumscarum.mr.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.125.17])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA23502 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 08:28:15 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from umich.edu (isr-207-32.isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.32])
by harumscarum.mr.itd.umich.edu (8.9.3/3.3s) with ESMTTP id LAA27809
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:28:16 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3992CA0E.9EF99BED@umich.edu>
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:28:14 -0400
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Hi and just a question
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008100729080.8155-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm getting tons more "error" messages to do with the listserve. Do you know why?

m

>From bryantb@bus.umich.edu Thu Aug 10 08:57:03 2000
Received: from stayawayjoe.mr.itd.umich.edu (stayawayjoe.mr.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.144.15])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA13155 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 08:57:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from umbs-ex01.bus.umich.edu (umbs-ex01.bus.umich.edu
[141.211.239.194])
by stayawayjoe.mr.itd.umich.edu (8.9.3/3.3rav) with ESMTTP id LAA02336
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:57:03 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by umbs-ex01.bus.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2650.21)
id <QQPHM6HV>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:57:01 -0400
Message-ID:
<F53C23490B87D3118C6400902786141E018E6E23@umbs-mail01.bus.umich.edu>
From: "Bryant, Barbara" <bryantb@bus.umich.edu>
To: "AAPOR (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Getting Duplicate Messages
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:57:02 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I recently reconnected to AAPOR.net using my new e-mail bryantb@umich.edu <mailto:bryantb@umich.edu> . However, I am getting all messages in duplicate. Would you check that my old e-mail Barbara_Bryant@ccmail.bus.umich.edu <mailto:Barbara_Bryant@ccmail.bus.umich.edu> has been deleted. Apparently the University is still supporting forwarding messages from that. Barbara Everitt Bryant

>From tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu Thu Aug 10 10:18:17 2000
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id KAA11324 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 10:18:16 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa22504;
10 Aug 2000 13:18 EDT

Received: from gj9k20b.Virginia.EDU (bootp-178-196.bootp.Virginia.EDU
[128.143.178.196])
by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA01887
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 13:18:16 -0400 (EDT)

From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men
In-Reply-To: <p04320400b5b77ae4292d@[24.10.212.149]>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10008101214.D@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 12:19:14 +0000 (!!!First Boot!!!)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Forgive my skepticism, but:

I don't see where the authors of this study have revealed anything about the nature of their sample of 55,000 people. Is this a probability sample of adults or some kind of voluntary on-line panel? If it's the latter, generalization to the web-using public is hazardous at best. Anybody have info on this?

Tom

On Wed, 9 Aug 2000 16:18:49 -0500 Robert Godfrey
<rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu> wrote:

> A new study shows that, for the first time, more women in the U.S. use
> the Web than men. The only exception is in the 18 to 24 age range, a
> demographic that seems to be losing interest.
> <http://www.wired.com/news/culture/0,1284,38126,00.html?tw=wn20000809>

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 HOneill1536@aol.com Thu Aug 10 11:46:00 2000
Received: from imo-d10.mx.aol.com (imo-d10.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.42])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA19581 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:45:59 -0700
(PDT)
From: HOneill1536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill1536@aol.com
by imo-d10.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.60.5de7e96 (4185)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 14:45:19 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <60.5de7e96.26c4523e@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 14:45:18 EDT
Subject: Re: Yahoo poll
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 106

The National Council on Public Polls has put out releases to journalists about this proble. See ncpp.org.

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Thu Aug 10 11:47:24 2000
Received: from mail01-lax.pilot.net (mail-lax-1.pilot.net [205.139.40.18])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA21640 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:47:24 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-150.latimes.com
[204.48.23.150]) by mail01-lax.pilot.net with ESMTTP id LAA08542 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:47:20 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from pegasus.latimes.com (localhost [127.0.0.1])
by mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id LAA21848
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:47:20 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from vireo.latimes.com (vireo.latimes.com [172.24.18.37])
by pegasus.latimes.com (Pro-8.9.3/Pro-8.9.3) with ESMTTP id LAA01466
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:47:20 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by vireo.latimes.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Q4XJGPN6>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:47:19 -0700

Message-ID: <5520FFE1207ED211AC8300805FEA2FF6B56E00@dove.latimes.com>

From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: The Lieberman challenge to surveys

Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 11:47:11 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

This may be an interesting challenge for all of us. I remember in 1982 polling the Bradley/Deukmejian gubernatorial race in Calif. Bradley as you may know was (is now deceased) an African-American and was at the time a popular LA city mayor. Our pre-election polling and even our exit poll had Bradley winning (he lost by 83,000 votes) - however we (LA Times Poll and at that time under the direction of Bud Lewis) didn't call Bradley the winner because it was within margin of error and we felt Deukmejian was really winning. (Also at that election there was a gun control initiative that had voters come out of the woodwork to vote against the measure, which also might not have helped Bradley.) We also tried to get at discrimination by the respondents by asking questions to form a discrimination index - but, unfortunately, people know the politically way to answer. We also looked at it by interviewers' race and respondents' race to see if there was something going on there. It was a huge challenge.

I hope that is not the case now! I also hope that we, as a people, are more tolerant of other racial and ethnic groups that it won't make a difference

as it did between the black/white candidates in 1982 in Calif.

Susan

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard Schuman [SMTP:hschuman@umich.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2000 7:22 AM

To: aapor

Subject: The Lieberman challenge to surveys

The selection of Lieberman presents both a problem and an opportunity for survey research.

First, it seems evident that Gore has not only chosen Lieberman despite his being Jewish, but is going to make a vote against the ticket almost a mark of intolerance. (This applies not only to support for the Republican ticket but also for Nader.) Assuming the indicators we have of a huge increase over the past half century in the self-image of most Americans as free of prejudice, this may well be effective politically and thus adds a new element that is important to assess carefully.

At the same time, we know from past elections involving black/white races that the polls may overstate support for minority candidates just because of current norms of tolerance. Therefore, it is going to be important to allow respondents to state preferences without feeling open to criticism. This may be a case where anonymous mail questionnaires can be useful in order to calibrate ordinary polls. In addition, an ancient study by Robinson and Rohde is of interest: in face-to-face interviewing on relevant issues, responses were influenced by whether the interviewer had a Jewish sounding name or appeared to be Jewish. Polling in 2000 suggests the value of similar creative efforts.

>From durandc@SOCIO.UMontreal.CA Thu Aug 10 12:13:49 2000

Received: from ulyS.POSTE.UMontreal.CA (ulyS.POSTE.UMontreal.CA

[132.204.2.41])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id MAA11747 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 12:13:49 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from duranc.socio.umontreal.ca (duranc.SOCIO.UMontreal.CA

[132.204.112.63])

by ulyS.POSTE.UMontreal.CA (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id PAA16355815;

Thu, 10 Aug 2000 15:13:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000810150548.00b5d7c0@poste.umontreal.ca>

X-Sender: durandc@poste.umontreal.ca
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 15:13:49 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Claire Durand <durandc@SOCIO.UMontreal.CA>
Subject: RE: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup: Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in
poll s
In-Reply-To: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90992EA5@EXCHNG3>
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 MAA11753

I fully agree with Glenn's comments. An overnight poll can only be representative of the people who were at home that night. The fact that they may sometimes be comparable (in what sense?) to polls conducted in a more appropriate way can be attributed to pure chance... It may not, and should not normally, always be the case. It may even depend on the night they are conducted. A Thursday may differ from a Sunday...

At 07:28 2000-08-10 -0500, David_Moore@gallup.com wrote:

>In response to Glenn's comments:

>

>1. The overnight poll Gallup reported IS comparable to previous polls.
>The overnight poll did not identify likely voters, because of shortness
>of time, but it did identify registered voters. Comparisons were made
>with registered voters from our previous poll.

>

>2. In the article I was quoted as saying the polls based on registered
>voters are not as "accurate" as polls based on likely voters. I am not
>sure "accurate" was the word I used (since that implies how well the
>sample of registered voters represented the larger population of
>registered voters), but I did say that using likely voters would give a
>better picture of the presidential race. I know this is a technical
>difference, but for pollsters the difference is not without some
>importance.

>

>3. The question of whether a polling organization should ever conduct
>a one-night poll is more difficult to answer. Initially, the CNN/USA
>Today/Gallup poll was very reluctant to conduct such polls, especially
>with trend questions, in the fear that the trends could be distorted by
>the special problems of one-night polls. But empirically we found that
>the responses on one-night polls did NOT seem to be distorted. Very
>much like Andy Kohut's recent study, showing that repeated call-backs
>and a more intensive effort to get respondents did not make much
>difference in the results, we found much to our surprise that the
>nature of our samples and the responses we got on trend questions were
>very similar in the one-night polls as in the 2-day and 3-day and 4-day
>polls. Thus, the exigencies of reporting the news seemed to outweigh
>the theoretical (but not empirically
>validated) notion that such one-day polls would provide distorted results.

>

>4. The inclusion of tracking polls in Glenn's criticism is totally
>without justification, as least as far as the CNN/USA Today/Gallup
>tracking polls are concerned. In fact, these tracking polls allow us
>to following a sampling management strategy that is clearly as good, if
>not better, than one can with 3-day and 4-day polls. There is much

>misconception about tracking polls -- that new samples are used
>nightly, that minimal call-backs are made, that they are essentially a
>series of one-night polls, and that we have day-of-interviewing
>effects. But all of those assumptions are just wrong. In the 1996
>tracking polls we conducted, a minimum of 5 call-backs were made for
>every respondent, new sample was added only as the old sample was
>completed, and there were absolutely no day-of-week effects.
>Methodologically, the tracking polls are very, very sound!
>
>David
>
>David W. Moore
>The Gallup Organization
>47 Hulfish Street
>Princeton, NJ 08542
>(609) 924-9600
>david_moore@gallup.com
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Glenn H. Roberts [mailto:ghroberts@worldnet.att.net]
>Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2000 9:06 PM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup: Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in
>polls
>
>
>In regard to David Moore's comment on the Gallup "overnight poll" on
>Lieberman, as reported below, I simply ask:
>
>Why report the "overnight poll" since you say it is not comparable to
>your earlier Gallup poll?
>
>We are trying to educate the public on the value of good polling and
>this type of reporting does not, in my opinion, add to this objective.
>The overnights and all the assumptions with them clouds the value of
>polling and further confuses the public.
>
>Can't the media sponsored polls wait a few days and do it right, so
>reliable comparisons can be made? I know the need to beat the
>competition but this is not the responsible way to meet this challenge.
>
>As an NCPP member, I suggest the Polling Review Board add "overnight
>polls" and "tracking polls" to go along with its "Focus group" paper.
>
>Glenn Roberts
>
>
>Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
>515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net
>
>

>
>

>Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
>515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net

Claire Durand
Universit  de Montr al

durandc@socio.umontreal.ca <http://alize.ere.umontreal.ca/~durandc>

"Si vous connaissez une seule soci t , vous n'en connaissez aucune." "If you know only one society, you don't know any".

>From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Thu Aug 10 12:51:48 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 MAA10805 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 12:51:47 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com

by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id PAA09267
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 15:53:59 -0400

Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2 5-20-1999)) id 85256937.006CF2BC ; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 15:50:00 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI

From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <85256937.006CF0C3.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>

Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 15:49:54 -0400

Subject: RE: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup: Lieberman lifts Gore's standing in poll

s

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Disposition: inline

While it is certainly true that "Thursday may be different from a Sunday", most political pollsters would trust a one night poll on any Sun-Thursday night and would avoid them on Fri-Sat. Those two nights are "different" in that those who are "usually" home on a work or school night might be out and about on the weekend, leaving a sample that could slant more toward certain demographic/SES groups.

If a one night poll has to be done, the middle of the week is best in that realm.

>From simonetta@artsci.com Thu Aug 10 14:12:44 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 OAA24178 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 14:12:44 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

id <Q4HW1N3G>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 17:08:53 -0400

Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DF5@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 17:08:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

I went to the two web sites involved Jupiter Communications and Media Metrix (which appear to be merging).

This is one of the things have to say about their methodology:
<http://www.mediametrix.com/products/methodologies.jsp>

"At the core of our audience measurement business is Media Metrix' patented metering methodology, which captures actual usage data from randomly recruited, representative samples of tens-of-thousands of people in homes and businesses around the world. The meter is a software application that works with the PC operating system to passively monitor all user activity in real time-click-by-click, page-by-page, and minute-by-minute. The usage data are aggregated to create the most extensive and comprehensive database of actual Digital Media usage available today."

Whether this is the "survey" mention in the CNN story who knows.
<http://www.cnn.com/2000/TECH/computing/08/09/women.reut/index.html>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu [mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu]
> Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2000 8:19 AM
> To: AAPORnet List server
> Subject: Re: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men
>
>
> Forgive my skepticism, but:
> I don't see where the authors of this study have revealed
> anything about
> the nature of their sample of 55,000 people. Is this a
> probability sample
> of adults or some kind of voluntary on-line panel? If it's
> the latter,
> generalization to the web-using public is hazardous at best.
> Anybody have
> info on this?
>
> Tom
>
> On Wed, 9 Aug 2000 16:18:49 -0500 Robert Godfrey
> <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu> wrote:
>
> > A new study shows that, for the first time, more women in

> the U.S. use
> > the Web than men. The only exception is in the 18 to 24 age range, a
> > demographic that seems to be losing interest.
> >
> <http://www.wired.com/news/culture/0,1284,38126,00.html?tw=wn20000809>
>
> 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 jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Aug 10 14:30:46 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.157])
 by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
 id OAA09885 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 14:30:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-72.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.72])
 by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id RAA01755
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 17:30:38 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39931ECA.FB78AFB1@jwdp.com>
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 17:29:46 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098DF5@AS_SERVER>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yes, this is the survey mentioned in many different news stories today.

Media Metrix (which is in fact merging with Jupiter Communications) is a syndicated provider of web site usage information.

Their technology resembles Nielsen's TV ratings, in that they recruit a panel and pay them to place a "meter" on their PC that captures online usage, just as the Nielsen meter captures what the TV is tuned to and when.

The sampling itself is extremely rigorous. Whether the results are depends on a lot of other factors, which rival measurement providers will be glad to tell you about.

For one thing, I believe they only include Windows PCs in their panel, which excludes a lot of Mac and Linux users, and probably greatly underestimates shared usage points, such as libraries and schools.

I tend to take their results with a grain of salt, but they probably are less awful than most of what passes for web usage measurement.

Jan Werner

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>
> I went to the two web sites involved Jupiter Communications and Media
> Metrix (which appear to be merging).
>
> This is one of the things have to say about their methodology:
> <http://www.mediametrix.com/products/methodologies.jsp>
>
> "At the core of our audience measurement business is Media Metrix'
> patented metering methodology, which captures actual usage data from
> randomly recruited, representative samples of tens-of-thousands of
> people in homes and businesses around the world. The meter is a
> software application that works with the PC operating system to
> passively monitor all user activity in real time-click-by-click,
> page-by-page, and minute-by-minute. The usage data are aggregated to
> create the most extensive and comprehensive database of actual Digital
> Media usage available today."
>
> Whether this is the "survey" mention in the CNN story who knows.
> <http://www.cnn.com/2000/TECH/computing/08/09/women.reut/index.html>
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
> > [<mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>]
> > Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2000 8:19 AM
> > To: AAPORnet List server
> > Subject: Re: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men
> >
> >
> > Forgive my skepticism, but:
> > I don't see where the authors of this study have revealed
> > anything about the nature of their sample of 55,000 people. Is this
> > a probability sample
> > of adults or some kind of voluntary on-line panel? If it's
> > the latter,
> > generalization to the web-using public is hazardous at best.
> > Anybody have
> > info on this?
> >
> > Tom
> >
> > On Wed, 9 Aug 2000 16:18:49 -0500 Robert Godfrey
> > <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu> wrote:
> >
> > > A new study shows that, for the first time, more women in
> > > the U.S. use
> > > the Web than men. The only exception is in the 18 to 24 age range,
> > > a demographic that seems to be losing interest.
> > >
> > <http://www.wired.com/news/culture/0,1284,38126,00.html?tw=wn20000809>
> >
> > 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 abider@american.edu Thu Aug 10 14:34:28 2000
Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.121.50])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA12718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 14:34:12 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-003varestP299.dialsprint.net [168.191.217.165])
by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3-EL_1_3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id OAA22675
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 14:34:10 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <3993206F.324808D0@american.edu>
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 17:36:47 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Prediction
References: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90EEF219@EXCHNG3>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lydia Saad's comment on Schuman's prediction is a welcome return to illuminating the behavioral dynamics issues of Schuman's concern as well as offering some data bearing on it. Her extension of the discussion to "born agains" presumes that the unstated theoretical suppositions of his prediction are not specific to Jews in the U.S. or but rather apply also to a group whose position in American society is as different from Jews' as is "born agains'." Her reference to questions about willingness to identify oneself with a religious group or practice assumes also a more specific dynamic than Schuman did; the presentation of oneself in a national public context, including a survey, may not necessarily be identical with what one says, does or feels of a religious nature within one's immediate community. (Incidentally, one could adduce some evidence regarding this issue by comparing discussions in focus groups composed exclusively of co-religionists from a particular community and in groups composed of a "representative selection" of people.)

We might generalize the issue further by asking whether the theory at issue here is specific to religion. Are the dynamics we are talking about relevant also to the consequences for the circulation of Playboy magazine of Jimmy Carter's Playboy interview? How about the effects that may follow for the magazine's circulation and Playboy channel viewing from the Gore campaign's pressure for cancellation of the Hispanic Democrats' event planned for convention week at the Playboy Club. (One wouldn't need to do a survey to get relevant data, although a survey might help avoid fallacious post hoc interpretations of such data.) Are we dealing with the same or yet different dynamics if we ask whether vehement political rhetoric will drive {further} underground the not inconsiderably small minority who are devoted to porn and who make sex stuff the only profitable internet business? To

be sure, I do not expect in the near future that even a priapic political leader will proudly avow publicly to being a porn fan.

Saad laments the absence of baseline data that limits the persuasiveness of the polls she found for illuminating "the power of religious 'leadership' on a population." What she presents is more persuasive, however, with regard to how Carter's public professions effected the willingness of polls to include questions asking about being "born again."

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>
> Back to Howard's point, is anyone aware of polls showing an increase
> in the percentage of Americans willing to identify themselves as "born
> again Christian" after Jimmy Carter professed to be one in 1976?
> While not perfect, that might provide one indication of the power of
> religious "leadership" on a population.

>
> Gallup's trend on this from the Carter/post-Carter period is not very
> persuasive (August 1976 is the earliest asking I could find, however,
> so perhaps too late for a true baseline to test Carter's effect.)

>
> "Would you say that you have been 'born again' or have had a 'born
> again' experience--that is, a turning point in your life when you
> committed yourself to Christ?"

>
> August 1976 35%
> April 1978 37%
> August 1980 39%
> December 1980 36%
> May 1983 33%
> October 1984 40%
> November 1984 35%

> Lydia Saad

> Gallup Princeton: 609-279-2219

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]

> Sent: Tuesday, August 08, 2000 3:38 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: A Prediction

>
> I will bet that Ruth Messinger did not do all that well among Jews in
> the last New York City mayoral race. On the other hand, I will bet
> Koch did get their support. I do not think you can test Howard's
> question this way.

> At 03:19 PM 8/8/00 -0400, you wrote:

>
> Howard makes an interesting observation, but I have a question-- does
> anyone know if Jewish voters are indeed more likely to vote for a
> Jewish candidate? I know this is a somewhat problematic question,
> since Jewish voters and candidates tend to be Democrats, but perhaps

> it could be checked by comparing races in say, New York, when a Jewish
> candidate ran for Senate as opposed to a
> year when a non-Jewish candidate ran. Or, of course, we could always
> control
> for party id, especially across two races. Anyone have any information on
> this?
>
> Frank Rusciano
>
> Howard Schuman wrote:
>
> > Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data:
> > If the Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably
> > well), there will be a highly significant ($p < .01$) increase in the
> > proportion of Jews who report that they observe the sabbath.
>
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
>
> 212 980-3031 Phone
> 212 980-3107 FAX
> mitofsky@mindspring.com
>From tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu Thu Aug 10 15:14:10 2000
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id PAA12019 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 15:14:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa14847;
10 Aug 2000 18:13 EDT
Received: from gj9k20b.Virginia.EDU (bootp-178-196.bootp.Virginia.EDU
[128.143.178.196])
by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA01406;
Thu, 10 Aug 2000 18:11:23 -0400 (EDT)
From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Cc: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: More women in the U.S. use the Web than men
In-Reply-To: <39931ECA.FB78AFB1@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10008101721.I@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 17:12:21 +0000 (!!!First Boot!!!)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Thanks for the info about the sample, Jan & Leo.

The conclusion itself is quite credible. An RDD survey we conducted last December, statewide in Virginia, showed 51% of men and 44% of women saying they had "accessed the internet or WWW in the last 12 months." (Since that survey somewhat over-represented female respondents, I won't report the 'row percentage' of women as a percent of users from the survey). The survey population was licensed drivers/vehicle-owners, not all households. If we apply these percentages of usage to an adult population that is 53% female, we get a result of 49% of web users being women. This assumes that the gender mix of users among non-drivers is the same as among those in the study population of our survey.

Since the presence of women among web users is undoubtedly rising, it is certainly plausible that women are just now achieving a majority among web users.

Tom

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 cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Aug 10 18:47:59 2000
Received: from smtp.ufl.edu (sp28fe.nerdc.ufl.edu [128.227.128.108])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA08273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 18:47:59 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp.ufl.edu (ppp-s161-n89-as1.nerdc.ufl.edu [128.227.161.89])
by smtp.ufl.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/2.2.1) with ESMTTP id VAA41538
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 21:47:57 -0400
Message-ID: <41195831.605666CF@hp.ufl.edu>
Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2004 19:20:17 -0400
From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: MORE women in the U.S. use the Web than men
References: <SIMEON.10008101721.I@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

How can anyone be surprised that more women would use the web, when it makes shopping so much easier, and women traditionally do most of the shopping for their family?

And it's not just buying books I don't really need from amazon:) Today there is an interaction between real-life and the web...I use a mail-order pharmacy (yes, it's the one mentioned) and check the status of the order by using the web. Before we make an actual trip to the public library, we check on the web to see what books/videos are due.

Also, increasingly women in "traditionally female" clerical jobs are using the web at work--and that home or work split should be specified in any survey of the subject. At our university, many paper forms are now electronic, or you download the form to print out.

FWIW, five years ago I put most of my favorite recipes on the web, which really saves on those phone calls from the grown-up kids asking for this or that.

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration

Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Aug 10 21:45:44 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id VAA00140 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 21:45:44 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id VAA22700 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Aug 2000 21:45:44 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2000 21:45:44 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: MEDIA GROK: Women Unite, Take Back the Site
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008102141340.17947-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Considering the interesting discussion generated on AAPORNET by my posting of the summary of the results of the Media Metrix/Jupiter Communications study itself in

Women Outnumber Men Online
<http://www.usatoday.com/life/cyber/tech/cti364.htm> ,

I think you might also be interested in this assessment of the same findings--and their coverage by both the American and European media--by Jen Muehlbauer <jen@englishmajor.com>, a writer for The Industry Standard's Media Grok: A Review of Press Coverage of the Internet Economy.
-- Jim

THE INDUSTRY STANDARD'S
M E D I A G R O K

A Review of Press Coverage of the Internet Economy

<http://www.thestandard.com/article/display/0,1151,17561,00.html>

Thursday, August 10, 2000

TOP GROKS
~~~~~  
Women Unite, Take Back the Site

Jen Muehlbauer

According to Media Metrix and Jupiter Communications, female Internet users in the U.S. outnumber men by a whopping 0.8 percent. There's no denying that the Net used to be heavily male-dominated, and it's nice to see the numbers even out. But the way the media reacted, you might think we'd just elected a

woman president.

The Metrix/Jupiter study said 50.4 percent of U.S. Net users are female. "That's still below the percentage of women in the overall U.S. population, which according to Census figures is 51.1 percent," noted the AP. It was close enough for the Washington Post, which rejoiced that women's online "presence is actually in line with the general population." No one mentioned a possible margin of error for the study - wouldn't it be a PR drag if men had the 50.4 percent next year? - but the Post acknowledged that "(m) easuring Internet usage, of course, remains an imprecise science." We think the imprecision really got rolling when Media Metrix decided to count wired two-year-olds.

"Geoff, the featured hunk on Cosmogirl.com's 'boy-o-meter' Web page, is one reason teenage girls are flocking to the Internet," gushed the front page (front page!) of the Washington Post. Does it really make sense to applaud teenagers for visiting Cosmogirl.com? Women probably make up half of the TV-viewing population, too, but no one hails that as a feminist coup.

USA Today provided a bulleted list of the sites popular in each female age group, and the lists would lead no one to declare a fourth wave of feminism. "Check out the sites women aged 25-34 use," wrote MSNBC's Lisa Napoli. "Babygear.com. Pampers.com. Walgreens.com. Ibaby.com. Statefarm.com. You can see Madison Avenue honchos crying tears of joy!" Napoli also tried to put in a good word for female Netpreneurship, but the best example she could come up with was a porn site.

A less-trumpeted part of the study confirmed what many of us suspected: Women aren't really from Venus. They surf the same sites as Earth men. Fluff may be popular with specific age groups, but AOL, Microsoft and Yahoo sites were the most popular among women of all ages. That gave a kick in the pants to sites such as Women.com and Oxygen.com, which are being passed up in favor of gender-neutral portals. "Women are not a minority online; they're not a niche," said one co-author of the study.

The picture wasn't quite as rosy in Europe, said the Financial Times. (Most outlets didn't even mention a European study). Forty-four percent of Swedish women and 36 percent of U.K. women are online. The fastest-growing group of wired women can be found in Germany. For better or worse, the European study skipped the toddlers and started counting at age 14.

Even these not-so-revolutionary study results had some men grumbling. ZDNet's Talkback message board (a notorious haven for high-tech cranks) was awash with predictably sexist comments. Relax, guys. It's not like the study said women hold half the money, power or jobs in the Internet economy. Now that would be something to go page one with.

- Jen Muehlbauer

-----

Study: Women Surpass Men in Web Use  
<http://www.thestandard.com/article/display/0,1151,17513,00.html?nl=mg>

Women Rule, at Last!  
<http://www.msnbc.com/news/443897.asp>

Women Outnumber Men on the Web in U.S., Study Shows (Reuters)  
<http://www.cnn.com/2000/TECH/computing/08/09/women.reut/index.html>

US Women Exceed Men on Net  
<http://news.ft.com/ft/gx.cgi/ftc?pagename=View&c=Article&cid=FT3SSAAWPBC>

Women Outnumber Men Online  
<http://www.usatoday.com/life/cyber/tech/cti364.htm>

The World Women's Web?  
<http://www.abcnews.go.com/sections/tech/DailyNews/womenweb000809.html>

The New Web: More Women Than Men  
ZDNet

Survey Finds More Women Than Men Online (AP)  
New York Times

Women Surf Past Men on Net  
Washington Post

Women Warm Up to Web, Study Finds  
CBS MarketWatch

\*\*\*\*\*

>From DMMerke@aol.com Fri Aug 11 10:14:58 2000  
Received: from imo-d07.mx.aol.com (imo-d07.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.39])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA13222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Aug 2000 10:14:58 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: DMMerke@aol.com  
Message-Id: <200008111714.KAA13222@usc.edu>  
Received: from DMMerke@aol.com  
by imo-d07.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v27.12.) id 5.25.96329c8 (15905)  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Aug 2000 13:14:13 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from web46.aolmail.aol.com (web46.aolmail.aol.com  
[205.188.161.7]) by air-id09.mx.aol.com (v75\_b3.11) with ESMTTP; Fri, 11 Aug  
2000 13:14:13 -0400  
Date: Fri, 11 Aug 2000 13:14:13 EDT  
Subject: Re: The Lieberman challenge to surveys  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: Unknown

The notion that black candidates may be overstated in pre-election polls in black/white races because of "current norms of tolerance" seems to be the conventional wisdom. Does anyone know of any specific research that explicitly documents this as the reason or explores other possible explanations (for example, turnout models that might overstate black turnout)?

Any cites would be much appreciated.

Thanks,

Daniel Merkle

In a message dated Thu, 10 Aug 2000 3:08:21 AM Eastern Daylight Time, Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> writes:

<< The selection of Lieberman presents both a problem and an opportunity for survey research.

First, it seems evident that Gore has not only chosen Lieberman despite his being Jewish, but is going to make a vote against the ticket almost a mark of intolerance. (This applies not only to support for the Republican ticket but also for Nader.) Assuming the indicators we have of a huge increase over the past half century in the self-image of most Americans as free of prejudice, this may well be effective politically and thus adds a new element that is important to assess carefully.

At the same time, we know from past elections involving black/white races that the polls may overstate support for minority candidates just because of current norms of tolerance. Therefore, it is going to be important to allow respondents to state preferences without feeling open to criticism. This may be a case where anonymous mail questionnaires can be useful in order to calibrate ordinary polls. In addition, an ancient study by Robinson and Rohde is of interest: in face-to-face interviewing on relevant issues, responses were influenced by whether the interviewer had a Jewish sounding name or appeared to be Jewish. Polling in 2000 suggests the value of similar creative efforts.

>>

>From anna\_greenberg@Harvard.Edu Fri Aug 11 10:17:49 2000  
Received: from gsaw.harvard.edu (gsaw.harvard.edu [128.103.190.41])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA15339 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Aug 2000 10:17:48 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: anna\_greenberg@Harvard.Edu  
Received: from ksg.harvard.edu (ksghmail2.harvard.edu [128.103.190.33])  
by gsaw.harvard.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id NAA08881  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Aug 2000 13:28:47 -0400 (EDT)  
Subject: Re: The Lieberman challenge to surveys  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.3 March 21, 2000  
Message-ID: <OFDC2280BC.147BDD44-ON85256938.005EE6D7@harvard.edu>  
Date: Fri, 11 Aug 2000 13:18:05 -0400  
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on KSGMTA/KSG(Release 5.0.3 |March 21,  
2000) at 08/11/2000 01:18:07 PM  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Take a look at the 1991 POQ (Vol 55, No 3) article by Steve Finkel et al.

about the Wilder race.

DMMerkle@aol.com@usc.edu on 08/11/2000 01:14:13 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc:

Subject: Re: The Lieberman challenge to surveys

The notion that black candidates may be overstated in pre-election polls in black/white races because of "current norms of tolerance" seems to be the conventional wisdom. Does anyone know of any specific research that explicitly documents this as the reason or explores other possible explanations (for example, turnout models that might overstate black turnout)?

Any cites would be much appreciated.

Thanks,

Daniel Merkle

In a message dated Thu, 10 Aug 2000 3:08:21 AM Eastern Daylight Time, Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> writes:

<< The selection of Lieberman presents both a problem and an opportunity for survey research.

First, it seems evident that Gore has not only chosen Lieberman despite his being Jewish, but is going to make a vote against the ticket almost a mark of intolerance. (This applies not only to support for the Republican ticket but also for Nader.) Assuming the indicators we have of a huge increase over the past half century in the self-image of most Americans as free of prejudice, this may well be effective politically and thus adds a new element that is important to assess carefully.

At the same time, we know from past elections involving black/white races that the polls may overstate support for minority candidates just because of current norms of tolerance. Therefore, it is going to be important to allow respondents to state preferences without feeling open to criticism. This may be a case where anonymous mail questionnaires can be useful in order to calibrate ordinary polls. In addition, an ancient study by Robinson and Rohde is of interest: in face-to-face interviewing on relevant issues, responses were influenced by whether the interviewer had a Jewish sounding name or appeared to be Jewish. Polling in 2000 suggests the value of similar creative efforts.

>>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Aug 12 10:12:35 2000  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA03773 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 12 Aug 2000 10:12:35 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA05425 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 12 Aug 2000 10:12:35 -0700  
(PDT)  
Date: Sat, 12 Aug 2000 10:12:35 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Right to Privacy Too Often Overlooked--Or Only by U.S. Census?  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008120955230.78-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The fourth and third paragraphs from the end address U.S. Census instruments; the rest may be of general interest to AAPOR members.

Although my guess is that not even Rep. Ron Paul takes much of this very seriously, I find it useful to have these sobering messages from our poor fellow citizens who must struggle hard--using only their native wits and cash contributions--to keep their jobs, every other year.

-- Jim

---

<http://www.house.gov/paul/tst/tst2000/tst081400.htm>

August 14, 2000  
Right to Privacy Too Often Overlooked  
by U.S. Rep. Ron Paul

From time to time, some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives claim that the federal government needs the power to monitor Americans so it can operate more efficiently. While I do not doubt their good intentions, I would remind them that in the United States, the people should never be asked to sacrifice their liberties to make the job of government a little easier. The government is here to protect the freedom of the American people, not to invade their privacy in the name of efficient government.

With that in mind, I have introduced two key pieces of legislation aimed at curtailing governmental privacy invasions. The first is the "Freedom and Privacy Restoration Act" (HR 220). This bill forbids

federal or state governments from using your Social Security number for purposes not directly related to administering the Social Security system. When Social Security was introduced, the American people were told that their number would never become a form of national identifier. In fact, until the 1970s all Social Security cards stated on the back that the card was not an ID card. Unfortunately, cards issued today do not contain that same phrase, and Congress has been all too eager to expand the use of Social Security numbers.

For example, in 1998 over 200 members of Congress voted to allow states to force citizens to produce a Social Security number before they could exercise their right to vote. Also, day-to-day private business dealings are becoming increasingly difficult without a Social Security number. You cannot open a bank account, get married, or even obtain a fishing license without disclosing your Social Security number. My bill will restore privacy to Americans who currently are being abused by overreaching government.

The other piece of legislation I have introduced is the "Census Privacy Act" (HR 4085). This bill will prohibit the Census Bureau from collecting any information from citizens except for their name, address and the number of people per residence. That is all Congress needs for a head count of the population in order to re-draw congressional districts every ten years as is required by the Constitution.

I introduced this legislation after scores of calls to my office during the recent census process from constituents who thought the long forms were too intrusive. There is no reason why the federal government needs to know how much money you make or how many bathrooms you have in your home. This information is personal and private, and I am committed to restoring to Americans the peace of mind that comes from knowing that every detail of their lives is not being recorded.

On a more positive note, privacy advocates scored a major victory this summer when the House passed an amendment I proposed to an appropriations bill that will prohibit the federal government from imposing a uniform standard health identifier on the American people. As a doctor, I know how important it is to insure patient confidentiality, and I am very pleased my colleagues supported the amendment. It is the only way to guarantee that national medical IDs do not become a reality.

The other major privacy victory recently was when the federal government withdrew proposed Know Your Customer regulations which would have forced banks to report practically every customer transaction to the government. I was proud to lead the effort on the Banking Committee to stop this invasion of privacy with my "Bank Secrecy Sunset Act" (HR 518), would have overturned any such regulations. Fortunately, the proposal was withdrawn before the legislation was needed, but I believe this will be an ongoing battle. Those advocating more intrusion by the government will continue their legislative efforts, and we must stand ready to face that constant threat.

\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Aug 13 21:21:18 2000  
Received: from rcf-fs.usc.edu (root@rcf-fs.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id VAA23741 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 21:21:17 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.19.136])  
by rcf-fs.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id VAA10806 for <aapornet@rcf.usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 21:21:16  
-0700 (PDT)  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (root@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id VAA23737 for <aapornet@rcf.usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 21:21:17  
-0700 (PDT)  
Received: from rcf.usc.edu (dsl181-kferd.usc.edu [128.125.81.242])  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id VAA12284 for <aapornet@rcf.usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 21:21:15  
-0700 (PDT)  
Message-ID: <399772F0.D12DB67B@rcf.usc.edu>  
Date: Sun, 13 Aug 2000 21:17:53 -0700  
From: "James R. Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
Reply-To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 (Macintosh; U; PPC)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@rcf.usc.edu  
Subject: cnn/etc poll  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="-----83DAE3C288ACF57A67E1DB36"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.  
-----83DAE3C288ACF57A67E1DB36  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";  
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm#readmore>

-----83DAE3C288ACF57A67E1DB36  
Content-Type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1;  
name="205.htm"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline;  
filename="205.htm"  
Content-Base: "http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.  
htm"  
Content-Location: "http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.  
htm"

<!doctype html public "-//IETF//DTD HTML 3.2 Final//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>  
<meta name=3D"MOVERVERSION" content=3D"1.0.30">



```
<meta name=3D"Editor" content=3D"VNarayanan">
<meta name=3D"PUBDATE" content=3D"Aug 13, 2000">
<meta name=3D"PUBTIME" content=3D"10:52PM">
<meta name=3D"DESCRIPTION" content=3D"Poll: Gore trails by 16 points By K=
athy Kiely, USA TODAY LOS ANGELES &#151; Al Gore trails Republican presid=
ential rival George W. Bush 55%-39% in the latest USA TODAY/CNN/G=
allup Poll and appears to be struggling to emerg...">
</HEAD>
<BODY BGCOLOR=3D"#FFFFFF" LINK=3D"#0000FF" ALINK=3D"#0000FF" VLINK=3D"#00=
00FF"> <!--OAS SETUP=3D"@Ear2,FloatTop,FloatBottom,Box1,Copyright"-->
```

```
<!-- ##### -->
<!-- TOP NAVIGATION =
-->
```

```
<!-- ##### -->
<!--START TOPNAV-->
```

```
<MAP NAME=3D"topnav">
<AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT" COORDS=3D"438,0,520,14" HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.=
com/marketpl/mkthome.htm"> <AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT" COORDS=3D"371,0,437,14"
HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.= com/weather/wfront.htm"> <AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT"
COORDS=3D"315,0,370,14" HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.=
com/sports/sfront.htm"> <AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT" COORDS=3D"273,0,314,14"
HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.= com/life/lfront.htm"> <AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT"
COORDS=3D"214,0,272,14" HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.= com/money/mfront.htm">
<AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT" COORDS=3D"164,0,213,14" HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.=
com/news/nfront.htm"> <AREA SHAPE=3D"RECT" COORDS=3D"90,0,163,14"
HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.= com/usafront.htm"> </MAP> <IMG
SRC=3D"/library/topnav.gif" WIDTH=3D"600" HEIGHT=3D"15" BORDER=3D"0"=
USEMAP=3D"#topnav" VSPACE=3D"5"><BR CLEAR=3DALL> <!--END TOPNAV-->
```

```
<!-- ##### -->
<!-- LEFT SIDE NAVIGATION =
-->
```

```
<!-- ##### -->
<NOBR><TABLE WIDTH=3D"132" BORDER=3D"0" CELLPADDING=3D"0" CELLSPACING=3D"=
0" ALIGN=3D"LEFT"> <TR><TD WIDTH=3D"120" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP"
COLSPAN=3D"3"><!-- = BEGIN USA TODAY COMMERCE AD --><A
HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/RealMed=
ia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/30905/Ear2/16149a==
e-centives/120_1000_Spree2.gif/38303764353166323339373739306530" target=3D=
"_top"><IMG SRC=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream_lx.ads/=
www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/30905/Ear2/16149a-e-centives/120_1000_=
Spree2.gif/38303764353166323339373739306530" WIDTH=3D120 HEIGHT=3D60 ALT=
=3D"FREE coupons. Click here!" border=3D0 BORDER=3D0></A><!-- END USA TOD=
AY COMMERCE AD --><BR CLEAR=3DALL></TD>
<TD WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP">&nbsp;</TD></TR> =
```

```
<!-- ##### -->
<!-- MARKETPLACE CORNERSTORE =
-->
```

```
<!-- ##### -->
```

```
##### -->
  <!-- BEGIN USA TODAY COBRAND --><TR><TD WIDTH=3D"120" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" BGCOLOR=3D"#0000FF" COLSPAN=3D"3"><IMG SRC=3D"http://www=
=2Eusatoday.com/library/commerce/img/mn120x60.gif" WIDTH=3D"120" HEIGHT=3D=
"60" BORDER=3D"0" VSPACE=3D"0" ALIGN=3D"TOP"><BR CLEAR=3DALL></TD></TR>
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"5" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" BGCOLOR=3D"#0000FF"=
>&nbsp;</TD>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"110" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" BGCOLOR=3D"#0000FF"=
><FONT FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"1" COLOR=3D"#FFFFFF">
  <A HREF=3D"http://cgi.usatoday.com/cgi-bin/mp_redir.cgi?disccs"><FONT=
  SIZE=3D"2" COLOR=3D"#FFFFFF"><B>MSDW Online</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DAL=
L>Trade stocks on the go with your Palm(tm).<BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT
L>FACE=3D=
"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"1">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
  <A HREF=3D"http://cgi.usatoday.com/cgi-bin/mp_redir.cgi?ebalancecs"><=
FONT SIZE=3D"2" COLOR=3D"#FFFFFF"><B>eBalance</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DA=
LL>Manage all your accounts in one place.<BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT
LL>FACE=3D"he=
lvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"1">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
  <A HREF=3D"http://cgi.usatoday.com/cgi-bin/mp_redir.cgi?mysimoncs"><F=
ONT SIZE=3D"2" COLOR=3D"#FFFFFF"><B>mySimon</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL=
>Comparison Shop at mySimon!<BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT
>FACE=3D"helvetica,arial=
" SIZE=3D"1">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
  </FONT></TD>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"5" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" BGCOLOR=3D"#0000FF"=
>&nbsp;</TD>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP">&nbsp;</TD></TR>
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"120" ALIGN=3D"RIGHT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" BGCOLOR=3D"#FFFFFF"=
COLSPAN=3D"3"><FONT FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"1"><FORM ACTION=3D"=
http://my.lycos.com/setup.asp" METHOD=3DGET>
  <INPUT TYPE=3Dhidden NAME=3Dsrc VALUE=3Dusat><font FACE=3D"helvetic=
a,arial" SIZE=3D"1"><p>&nbsp;</font><br
  CLEAR=3D"ALL">
  </font><b><font FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" size=3D"2">Search</font><b=
r>
  </b><input type=3D"radio" name=3D"cat" value=3D"usatoday" checked><=
font FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"
  SIZE=3D"1">the site&nbsp;</font> <input type=3D"radio" name=3D"cat"=
value=3D"dir"><font FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"
  SIZE=3D"1">the Web</font><br CLEAR=3D"ALL">
  <input TYPE=3D"text" NAME=3D"query" SIZE=3D"10"><input type=3D"imag=
e" src=3D"/a/lycos/ly25x25.gif"
  border=3D"0" alt=3D"go Get It" width=3D"25" height=3D"25" align=3D"=
top" name=3D"I1"><br CLEAR=3D"ALL">
  <img src=3D"/a/lycos/ly112x18.gif" alt=3D"Powered by Lycos" width=3D=
"112" height=3D"18"><br
  CLEAR=3D"ALL">
  <img src=3D"/gen/lib/img/black.gif" width=3D"120" height=3D"1" vspa=
ce=3D"3"></font></p>
  </form>
  </td>
  <td WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP"></td>
<!-- END USA TODAY COBRAND -->

<!-- #####
##### -->
```

```
<!-- LEFT HAND NAVIGATION                                     =
-->
<!-- #####
##### -->
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"120" ALIGN=3D"RIGHT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"3"><FONT =
FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"1">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SI=
ZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>
  <!-- BEGIN NAVIGATION1 --><FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial">
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://congress.nw.dc.us/usa=
today/"><FONT COLOR=3D"#FF0000"><B>Guide to Government</B></FONT></FONT><=
/A><BR> </FONT><P>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"3" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>Inside News</B></FONT><B=
R>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial">
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://cgil.usatoday.com/cgi=
-bin/WebX?14@@.ee6ce3e"><B>Talk Politics</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/digest/nd1.htm"><B>Nationline</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/politics/polifront.htm"><B>Washington</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/world/nw1.htm"><B>Worldline</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/states/ns1.htm"><B>State news</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/politics/campfront.htm"><B>Campaign 2000</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/politics/townfront.htm"><B>Town Hall</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/comment/debate.htm"><B>Opinion</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/poll001.htm"><B>Polls and attitudes</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/comment/colindex.htm"><B>Columnists</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/comment/nctoons.htm"><B>Editorial cartoons</B></A><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news=
/e98/bios.htm"><B>USA TODAY political writers</B></A><BR>
</FONT><P><!-- END NAVIGATION1 -->

  <!-- BEGIN NAVIGATION2 --><!-- END NAVIGATION2 -->

  <!-- BEGIN NAVIGATION3 --> <FONT SIZE=3D"3" FACE=3D"helvetica,aria=
1"><B>Print Edition</B></FONT><BR>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,ari=
al"><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/usatonline/newsindex11.htm">Today<=
/FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
    <!--<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica=
,arial"><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/usatonline/sorry.htm">Today</F=
ONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>-->
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,ari=
al"><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/usatonline/newsindex21.htm">Yester=
day</FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
    <FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,ari=
al"><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/feedback/buyus.htm">Subscribe</FON=
T></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
```

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><A HREF=3D"http://usatoday.pqarchiver.com/">Archive</FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"> <BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<A HREF=3D"http://bn.bfast.com/booklink/click?sourceid=3D529184&categoryid=3Dhomepage"><IMG SRC=3D"/library/commerce/img/bn117x50.gif" WIDTH=3D="117" HEIGHT=3D"50" BORDER=3D"0" ALT=3D"B&N" VSPACE=3D"10"></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<P>

<FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>

<FONT SIZE=3D"3" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>Resources</B></FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"/commtouch/comm\_splash.htm">E-mail</A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"/leadpage/indexusa.htm">Site map</A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"/feedback/feedback.htm">Feedback</A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"/leadpage/credit/credit.htm">About us</A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"/leadpage/usajobs0.htm">Jobs at USA TODAY</A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

</B></FONT>

<P>

<FONT SIZE=3D"2" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>

<FONT SIZE=3D"3" FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"><B>Free premiums</B></FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"http://update.usatoday.com/"><FONT COLOR=3D"#FF0000">USA TODAY Update</FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

<FONT SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT> <A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/download/download.htm">Software</A><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

</B></FONT>

<P>

<!-- END NAVIGATION3 -->

</B></FONT></TD>

<TD WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP">&nbsp;</TD>

</TR>

<!-- ##### -->

<!-- BLACK RULE = -->

<!-- ##### -->

<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"5" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP"><HR WIDTH=3D"5" SIZE=3D"1" noshade></TD>

<TD WIDTH=3D"110" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP"><HR WIDTH=3D"110" SIZE=3D"1" noshade></TD>

<TD WIDTH=3D"5" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP"><HR WIDTH=3D"5" SIZE=3D"1" noshade></TD>

<TD WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP">&nbsp;</TD></TR>

<!-- ##### -->

<!-- BOTTOM AD = -->

```
<!-- #####
##### -->
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"120" ALIGN=3D"RIGHT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"3">
<!-- BEGIN AD2 --><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click_
lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/8230/Box1/16150i-MSDW/21725/383=
03764353166323339373739306530" target=3D"_top"><IMG SRC=3D"http://view.av=
enuea.com/view/usa_msdw_ba943_040300jk_03/direct/01" WIDTH=3D120 HEIGHT=3D=
90 ALT=3D"Click here for Morgan Stanley Dean Witter Online" BORDER=3D0><=
/A><!-- END AD2 -->
</TD>
<TD WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP">&nbsp;</TD></TR>

<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"120" ALIGN=3D"RIGHT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"3">
<!-- BEGIN AD3 --><!-- END AD3 -->
</TD>
<TD WIDTH=3D"12" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP">&nbsp;</TD></TR>
</TABLE><TABLE WIDTH=3D"468" BORDER=3D"0" CELLPADDING=3D"0" CELLSPACING=3D=
"0"> =

=

<!-- #####
##### -->
<!-- NAVIGATION / AD / BANNER
-->
<!-- #####
##### -->
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"468" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"3"><!-- =
BEGIN AD1 --><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ad=
s/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/32756/FloatTop/15134a/rosft.htm/3830=
3764353166323339373739306530&time=3D2000.08.14.04.19.33">
<IMG BORDER=3D0 WIDTH=3D468 HEIGHT=3D60 SRC=3D"http://gm.preferences.com/=
image;spacedesc=3DAllNewIn2000Tahoe_USAToday_468x60_RunOfSite_Any&time=3D=
2000.08.14.04.19.33"></A><!-- END AD1 --><!-- BEGIN AD5 --><!-- END AD5 --
--></TD></TR>
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"468" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"3"><!-- =
BEGIN USA TODAY BANNER --> <div align=3D"left"><img
src=3D"/library/banners/news/cv452x51.gif" width= =3D"468" height=3D"62"
usemap=3D"#convention" border=3D"0"><map name=3D"c= onvention"><area
shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"223,43,274,61" href=3D"http://w=
ww.usatoday.com/news/conv/photoindex.htm"><area shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"=
4,45,50,60" href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/campfront.htm">=
<area shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"51,43,111,60" href=3D"http://www.usatoday.=
com/news/conv/schedule.htm"><area shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"111,44,157,60"=
href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/index.htm"><area shape=3D"rect"=
coords=3D"157,44,223,60" href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/note=
book.htm"><area shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"273,44,346,60" href=3D"http://ww=
w.usatoday.com/news/conv/av.htm"><area shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"346,44,38=
6,60" href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/community/chat/e2000sked.htm"><area=
shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"385,43,464,61" href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/=
community/chat/e2000sked.htm#boards"><area shape=3D"rect" coords=3D"268,2=
,465,43" href=3D"/news/politics/campfront.htm"></map></div>
<!-- END USA TODAY BANNER --><BR CLEAR=3DALL></TD></TR>

<!-- #####
##### -->
<!-- DATE STAMP AND MAIL
=
```

```
-->
<!-- #####
##### -->
<!--Begin Removable Timestamp-->
<TR>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"239" ALIGN=3D"LEFT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"2"><FONT=
  SIZE=3D"1"><!--START TIME-->
    <font size=3D1>08/13/00- Updated 10:52 PM ET</font><br><!--END TIME=
--></FONT></TD>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"229" ALIGN=3D"RIGHT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"1"><FON=
  T SIZE=3D"1"><DIV ALIGN=3DRIGHT><A HREF=3D"http://cgil.usatoday.com/cgi-b=
  in/mail2friend.cgi" target=3D"popup" onClick=3D"window.open('', 'popup', 's=
  crollbars=3Dyes, width=3D505, height=3D500, left=3D5, top=3D5, resizable=3Dyes=
  ')"><IMG SRC=3D"/library/banners/feedback/mail.gif" WIDTH=3D"189" HEIGHT=3D=
  "12" BORDER=3D"0"></A></DIV><BR CLEAR=3DALL> <FONT FACE=3D"helvetica,arial"
  SIZE=3D"1">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL></=
  TD></TR>
<!--End Removable Timestamp-->
<!-- #####
##### -->
<!-- GUTTER / SANDBOX
-->
<!-- #####
##### -->
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"10" ALIGN=3D"LEFT" VALIGN=3D"TOP"><BR CLEAR=3DALL></TD>=

  <TD WIDTH=3D"458" ALIGN=3D"LEFT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"2">
    <!-- BEGIN DATA --><!--MOVER 2000-->
<!-- &use template&& --> <!-- &style=3Dnews_conv2000&& --> <!-- NEW DAS= H
(AP) &#151; --> =

<H3><FONT size=3D+2><a name=3D"Poll:_Gore_trails_by_16_points___By_Kathy_=
Kiely,_USA_TODAY"></a>Poll: Gore trails by 16 points<br>
  <br>
  <font size=3D"-1">By Kathy Kiely, USA TODAY </font></FONT></H3> <table
width=3D"438" border=3D"0">
  <tr> =

    <td height=3D"211" colspan=3D"2" valign=3D"top"> =

      <p> LOS ANGELES &#151; Al Gore trails Republican presidential rival=
George =

      W. Bush 55%-39% in the latest USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll and appea=
rs to =

      be struggling to emerge from the shadow of President Clinton as t=
he Democratic =

      convention opens Monday. </p>
      <p><b><a href=3D"#readmore"><font size=3D"-1">READ MORE (below)</fo=
nt></a></b> =

      <p><font size=3D"-1"><img src=3D"video.gif" width=3D"14" height=3D"=
14"> </font><font size=3D"-1"><a href=3D"javascript:OpenVideobig('http://=
play.rbn.com/?url=3Dusat/usat/g2demand/0813cuomol.smil&proto=3Drtsp')">Ho=
using =
```

Secretary Andrew Cuomo: Don't believe the polls</a></font><br>  
 =

---

|                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <div style="text-align: right;">  <br/>       (Photo: Luke Frazza, AFP)     </div> |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <p>           &lt;p&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font face=3D"Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif"&gt;Bush leads Gore i= n<br/>           key areas&lt;br&gt;<br/>           &lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt; Republican presidential candidate holds advantage &lt;br&gt;<br/>           &gt;<br/>           among women&lt;font face=3D"Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif"&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;fo=           nt size=3D"2" face=3D"Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif"&gt; =<br/>           and independents.&lt;br&gt;<br/>           &lt;a href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/208.htm" =           "&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"1"&gt;FULL =<br/>           STORY&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/a&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;<br/>           &lt;/td&gt;<br/>         &lt;/tr&gt;<br/>         &lt;tr&gt; =       </p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <p>           &lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"2" face=3D"Arial, Helve=           tica, sans-serif"&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"2" face=3D"Arial, Helvetic=           a, sans-serif"&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"2" face=3D"Arial, Helvetic=           a, sans-serif"&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"2" face=3D="           Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif"&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"2" face=3D="           Arial, Helvetic=           a, sans-serif"&gt;&lt;b&gt;&lt;font size=3D"2" face=3D"Arial, Helvetic=           a, sans-serif"&gt;=           &lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/b&gt;&lt;/font&gt;=           &lt;/td&gt;<br/>         &lt;tr&gt; =       </p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

life of Al Gore <br>
 </font></b> USA TODAY's Jill Lawrence traces the events and people =
 that =

shaped the vice president's life.<font size=3D"2" face=3D"Arial, He=
 lvetica, sans-serif"> =

```
<br>
  <a href=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/180.htm" =
"><b><font size=3D"1">FULL =
    STORY</font></b></a></font></td>
  </tr>
</table>
<br>
<a name=3D"readmore"></a> =
<hr size=3D"1" width=3D"248" ALIGN=3D"left" noshade>
<div ALIGN=3D"left"> =
  <p> =
  <table width=3D"207" border=3D"0" ALIGN=3D"right">
    <tr> =
      <td width=3D"10" valign=3D"top">&nbsp;</td>
      <td width=3D"187" bgcolor=3D"#DDE3E9" valign=3D"top"> =
        <p><font face=3D"Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif" size=3D"2"><b>Amon= g
likely =
      voters:</b><br>
      </font><font face=3D"Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif" size=3D"2"><=
!-- #BeginLibraryItem "/Library/Conv arrow.lbi" --><img src=3D"/news/conv=
arrow.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"14"><!-- #EndLibraryItem -->47% =
      said there is no chance that they will vote for Gore.<br>
      <!-- #BeginLibraryItem "/Library/Conv arrow.lbi" --><img src=3D=
"/news/convarrow.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"14"><!-- #EndLibraryItem -->=
30% =
      said there is no chance that they will vote for Bush.<br>
      <!-- #BeginLibraryItem "/Library/Conv arrow.lbi" --><img src=3D=
"/news/convarrow.gif" width=3D"10" height=3D"14"><!-- #EndLibraryItem -->=
<a href=3D"/news/politics/electionpoll/frame.htm" onClick=3D"window.open(=
','popu1','height=3D413,width=3D470,top=3D100,left=3D100')" target=3D"p=
opu1">Poll =
      trend lines</a> </font></p>
      <p><font face=3D"Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif" size=3D"1">Source:=
USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup =
      Poll</font></p>
    </td>
  </tr>
</table>
  In the poll conducted over the weekend, 68% rated Bill Clinton's presid=
ency =
  a success, although 73% said that he will mostly be remembered for the =
Monica =
  Lewinsky scandal. However, Clinton's popularity does not appear to be r=
ubbing =
```



off on his vice president. =

<p>Nearly half of all likely voters, 47%, said there is no chance that =  
they =

will vote for Gore; 30% said there is no chance that they will vote f=  
or Bush.</p>

<p>Clinton is expected to give an enthusiastic endorsement of Gore toni=  
ght when =

he addresses the convention's 4,979 delegates and alternates. </p>

<p>It will be Clinton's last appearance before the party faithful, and =  
he is =

clearly wistful.</p>

<p>&quot;I was thinking about how quickly it all passed and what an abs=  
olute =

joy it was even the bad days were good days,&quot; the president told=  
a crowd =

of about 1,000 supporters at a star-studded tribute Saturday that rai=  
sed \$1 =

million for the Senate campaign of his wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton.<=  
/p>

<p>The Clintons spent the weekend in Los Angeles partying with the ente=  
rtainment =

industry that Gore's running mate, Sen. Joe Lieberman, D-Conn., is we=  
ll known =

for criticizing.</p>

<p> In appearances on all five nationally televised Sunday news shows, =  
Lieberman =

made clear that his views on Hollywood have not mellowed. &quot;Too m=  
uch of =

what they do is not good for our children and not good for our cultur=  
e,&quot; =

he said on ABC's This Week . </p>

<p>Lieberman said that it is &quot;unfair&quot; to link Gore to Clinton=  
's &quot;personal =

mistakes,&quot; something many Democrats say Bush and his running mat=  
e, Dick =

Cheney, are trying to do when they tell audiences that they will &quo=  
t;restore =

honor to the White House.&quot;</p>

<p>&quot;The Bush-Cheney ticket seems to want to run against a guy who'=  
s not =

on the ballot this year," Lieberman said on Fox News Sunday. </p>

<p>He also said Cheney's reported \$20 million retirement package from Halliburton, =

the energy services company that he chairs until Wednesday, will "raise =

a question" about how "tough" a Republican White House would =

be on big oil companies. </p>

<p>Karen Hughes, Bush's communications director, has said such packages are =

standard in corporate America and that the public should be pleased to have =

such a successful vice presidential nominee. Clinton takes in L.A.'s sun, =

stars and fund-raisers.</p>

<p>&nbsp; =

</div>

<ul>

<li><a href=3D"/news/politics/campfront.htm">Go to Conventions 2000 front</a> =

</li>

</ul>

<hr>

<ul>

<li><a href=3D"/news/washdc/ncl.htm">Go to Washington news</a> </li>

<li><a href=3D"/news/nfront.htm">Go to News front page</a> </li> </ul>

<hr> <p> =

<font size=3D"2"><center>

<hr noshade><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

(Requires: <a href=3D"http://www.real.com/products/player/index.html">Real =

Player.</a><BR CLEAR=3DALL>

Having trouble? <a href=3D"http://service.real.com/index.html">Click here =

=2E</a> <p><a href=3D"http://www.real.com/products/player/index.html"><img src=3D=

"http://www.usatoday.com/money/photos/icon/getfree.gif" align=3Dbottom border=3D0 width=3D88 height=3D32></a> <p><a href=3D"http://www.real.com/products/player/index.html"><img src=3D=

"http://www.usatoday.com/money/photos/icon/rbnlogo.gif" align=3Dbottom border=3D0 width=3D100 height=3D64></a> <BR CLEAR=3DALL> <hr noshade>

</center></font> =

<p></p>

<!-- END DATA -->

</TD></TR>

<!-- #####

```

##### -->
<!-- RULES TO MAINTAIN COLUMN WIDTHS                                =
-->
<!-- #####=
##### -->
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"10" ALIGN=3D"LEFT" VALIGN=3D"TOP"><HR WIDTH=3D"10" SIZ=
E=3D"1" noshade></TD>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"229" ALIGN=3D"LEFT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"1"><HR WID=
TH=3D"229" SIZE=3D"1" noshade></TD>
  <TD WIDTH=3D"229" ALIGN=3D"LEFT" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"1"><HR WID=
TH=3D"229" SIZE=3D"1" noshade></TD></TR> =

=

<!-- #####=
##### -->
<!-- AD / NAVIGATION / COPYRIGHT                                    =
-->
<!-- #####=
##### -->
<TR><TD WIDTH=3D"468" ALIGN=3D"CENTER" VALIGN=3D"TOP" COLSPAN=3D"3">
  <!-- BEGIN AD4 --><A HREF=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/cl=
ick_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/13635/FloatBottom/16193USAT=
ODAY/468x60.gif/38303764353166323339373739306530" target=3D"_top"><IMG SR=
C=3D"http://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream_lx.ads/www.usatoday.c=
om/news/conv/205.htm/13635/FloatBottom/16193USATODAY/468x60.gif/383037643=
53166323339373739306530" WIDTH=3D468 HEIGHT=3D60 ALT=3D"" BORDER=3D0></=
A><!-- END AD4 --><BR CLEAR=3DALL>
  <!--START BOTNAV-->
  <FONT FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"1">
  <A HREF=3D"/usafront.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">Front page,</FONT><=
/A> =

  <A HREF=3D"/news/nfront.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">News,</FONT></A>=
=

  <A HREF=3D"/sports/sfront.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">Sports,</FONT>=
</A> =

  <A HREF=3D"/money/mfront.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">Money,</FONT></=
A> =

  <A HREF=3D"/life/lfront.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">Life,</FONT></A>=
=

  <A HREF=3D"/weather/wfront.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">Weather,</FON=
T></A>
  <A HREF=3D"/marketpl/mkthome.htm"><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF">Marketplace=
</FONT></A>
  <FONT FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DAL=
L>

  <!--END BOTNAV-->
  <!--BEGIN COPYRIGHT-->
  &#169; Copyright 2000 <A HREF=3D"/leadpage/indexusa.htm">USA TODAY</A=
>, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

```

```
<!--END COPYRIGHT-->
<FONT FACE=3D"helvetica,arial" SIZE=3D"4">&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DAL=
L></TD></TR>    =
```

```
<script language=3D"JavaScript">var _version =3D 10; </script> <script
language=3D"JavaScript1.1"> _version =3D 11; </script> <script
language=3D"JavaScript1.2"> _version =3D 12; </script>
```

```
<script language=3D"JavaScript">
```

```
var APlayerSrc =3D "";
```

```
function OpenAudio(url)
```

```
{
    APlayerSrc =3D url;
    if (_version < 12)
    {
```

```
        window.open("/audio/aplay1v2.htm", "RPlayer", "scrollbars=3Dno,menubar=3D=
no,toolbar=3Dno,status=3Dno,top=3D0,left=3D0,screenx=3D0,screeny=3D0,widt=
h=3D390,height=3D220,resizable=3Dno");
```

```
    }
    else =
```

```
    {
```

```
        window.open("/audio/aplay1v1.htm", "RPlayer", "scrollbars=3Dno,menubar=3D=
no,toolbar=3Dno,status=3Dno,top=3D0,left=3D0,screenx=3D0,screeny=3D0,widt=
h=3D390,height=3D220,resizable=3Dno");
```

```
    }
```

```
}
```

```
var VPlayerSrc =3D "";
```

```
function OpenVideo(url)
```

```
{
    VPlayerSrc =3D url;
    if (_version < 12)
    {
```

```
        window.open("/video/mplay5v2.htm", "RPlayer", "scrollbars=3Dno,menubar=3D=
no,toolbar=3Dno,status=3Dno,top=3D0,left=3D0,screenx=3D0,screeny=3D0,widt=
h=3D425,height=3D345,resizable=3Dno");
```

```
    }
```

```
    else =
```

```
    {
```

```
        window.open("/video/mplay5v1.htm", "RPlayer", "scrollbars=3Dno,menubar=3D=
no,toolbar=3Dno,status=3Dno,top=3D0,left=3D0,screenx=3D0,screeny=3D0,widt=
h=3D425,height=3D345,resizable=3Dno");
```

```
    }
```

```
}
```

```
function OpenVideobig(url)
```

```
{
    VPlayerSrc =3D url;
```

```

        if (_version < 12)
        {

window.open("/video/mplay6v2.htm", "RMPlayer", "scrollbars=3Dno,menubar=3Dno,toolbar=3Dno,status=3Dno,top=3D0,left=3D0,screenx=3D0,screeny=3D0,width=3D425,height=3D425,resizable=3Dno");

        }
        else =

        {

window.open("/video/mplay6v1.htm", "RMPlayer", "scrollbars=3Dno,menubar=3Dno,toolbar=3Dno,status=3Dno,top=3D0,left=3D0,screenx=3D0,screeny=3D0,width=3D425,height=3D425,resizable=3Dno");

        }

}

</script>
</TABLE><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<!-- saved from url=3D(0046)file://G:\SPONSORS\2000\ditech\ditechcold2.htm -->
<!-- saved from url=3D(0046)file://G:\SPONSORS\1999\ditech\ditechcold2.htm --><!-- BEGIN COLUMN-D --><HTML><HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Dwindows-1252" http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<SCRIPT language=3DJavaScript>if((navigator.appVersion.charAt(0)>=3D4) && (navigator.appName!=3D"Netscape")){document.write("<SPAN ID=3DrightArea style=3Dposition:absolute;left:620;top:30;width:170>");}</SCRIPT>

<SCRIPT language=3DJavaScript>if(navigator.appVersion.charAt(0)>=3D4){document.write("</LAYER><LAYER ID=3Dcd LEFT=3D620 TOP=3D25 WIDTH=3D170 VISIBILITY=3DSHOW><TABLE WIDTH=3D170 BORDER=3D0 CELLPADDING=3D0 CELLSPACING=3D0 BGCOLOR=3D#EDEDDED><TR><TD WIDTH=3D170 ALIGN=3DCENTER VALIGN=3DMIDDLE BGCOLOR=3D#959595 COLSPAN=3D3><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#FFFFFF><B>ADVERTISER SPOTLIGHT</B></FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL></TD></TR><TR><TD WIDTH=3D10 ALIGN=3DLEFT VALIGN=3DTOP><BR CLEAR=3DALL>&nbsp;</TD><TD WIDTH=3D150 ALIGN=3DLEFT VALIGN=3DTOP><CENTER><A HREF=3Dhttp://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/38303764353166323339373739306530?_RM_REDIR_=3Dwww.ditech.com><IMG SRC=3Dhttp://usatoday.com/sponsors/2000/ditech/free_banners_120x60_e3.gif WIDTH=3D120 HEIGHT=3D60 BORDER=3D0 VSPACE=3D4></A></CENTER><HR WIDTH=3D150 SIZE=3D1 NOSHADE><A HREF=3Dhttp://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/38303764353166323339373739306530?_RM_REDIR_=3Dwww.ditech.com/whyditech/whyditech.asp><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#339900><B>Ditech Advantage</B></FONT>></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SIZE=3D2>Fast & Efficient Process, Customer Friendly Loans, No Upfront Fees, and Major Savings</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D1>&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><A HREF=3Dhttp://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/38303764353166323339373739306530?_RM_REDIR_=3Dwww.ditech.com/loansandrates3/default.asp><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#339900><B>Loans & Rates</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SIZE=3D2>Purchase, Refinance, No-Equity Second, Home-Equity Line of Credit, 125% Market</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D1>&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><A HREF=3D=

```

http://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/=conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i\_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/3830376435316632=3339373739306530?\_RM\_REDIRE=3Dwww.ditech.com/marketwatch5/default.asp><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#339900><B>Market Watch</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SIZE=3D2>Market Trends and Subscribe to ONT>'Ra=tewatch' for Weekly E-Mail Updates</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D1>&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><A HREF=3Dhttp://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i\_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/38303764353166323339373739306530?\_RM\_REDIRE=3Dhttps://www.ditech.com/freeloantools/free\_e-appraisal/><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#339900><B>Free E-Appraisal</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SIZE=3D2>Wondering What Your House is Worth? Try Our Online Home Appraisal.</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D1>&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><A HREF=3Dhttp://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i\_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/38303764353166323339373739306530?\_RM\_REDIRE=3Dwww.ditech.com/freecredit/personal.asp><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#339900><B>Free Credit Report</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SIZE=3D2>Ditech is offering a Free Online NT>Cr=edit Report with No Obligation.</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D1>&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><A HREF=3Dhttp://www.usatoday.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm/27308/Copyright/15771i\_Aug2/ditechcold2.htm/38303764353166323339373739306530?\_RM\_REDIRE=3Dhttps://www.ditech.com/applynow/><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D2 COLOR=3D#339900><B>Apply Now</B></FONT></A><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT SIZE=3D2>Apply and Get Approved Online, Its Fast, Free, and there is No Obligation.</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL><FONT FACE=3Dhelvetica,arial SIZE=3D1>&nbsp;</FONT><BR CLEAR=3DALL></TD><TD WIDTH=3D10 ALIGN=3DLEFT 1>VALIGN=3D=TOP>&nbsp;</TD></TR></TABLE></LAYER>");</SCRIPT>

```
<SCRIPT language=3DJavaScript>if((navigator.appVersion.charAt(0)>=3D4) && (navigator.appName!=3D"Netscape")) {document.write("</SPAN>");}</SCRIPT>
<!-- END COLUMN-D -->
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD>
<BODY></BODY></HTML> </NOBR> </body> </HTML>
```

-----83DAE3C288ACF57A67E1DB36--

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Aug 13 22:41:59 2000  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id WAA18111 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 22:41:59 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id WAA15605 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 22:41:58 -0700  
(PDT)  
Date: Sun, 13 Aug 2000 22:41:57 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll: Gore trails by 16 points  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008132235190.14191-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

---

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/205.htm#readmore>

08/13/00- Updated 10:52 PM ET

Poll: Gore trails by 16 points

Bush leads Gore in key areas  
Republican presidential candidate holds advantage  
among women and independents.

By Kathy Kiely, USA TODAY

LOS ANGELES -- Al Gore trails Republican presidential rival George W. Bush 55%-39% in the latest USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll and appears to be struggling to emerge from the shadow of President Clinton as the Democratic convention opens Monday.

---

Among likely voters:

47% said there is no chance that they will vote for Gore.  
30% said there is no chance that they will vote for Bush.

Source: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll

---

In the poll conducted over the weekend, 68% rated Bill Clinton's presidency a success, although 73% said that he will mostly be remembered for the Monica Lewinsky scandal. However, Clinton's popularity does not appear to be rubbing off on his vice president.

Nearly half of all likely voters, 47%, said there is no chance that they will vote for Gore; 30% said there is no chance that they will vote for Bush.

Clinton is expected to give an enthusiastic endorsement of Gore tonight when he addresses the convention's 4,979 delegates and alternates.

It will be Clinton's last appearance before the party faithful, and he is clearly wistful.

"I was thinking about how quickly it all passed and what an absolute joy it was even the bad days were good days," the president told a crowd of about 1,000 supporters at a star-studded tribute Saturday that raised \$1 million for the Senate campaign of his wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton.

The Clintons spent the weekend in Los Angeles partying with the entertainment industry that Gore's running mate, Sen. Joe Lieberman, D-Conn., is well known for criticizing.

In appearances on all five nationally televised Sunday news shows, Lieberman made clear that his views on Hollywood have not mellowed. "Too much of what they do is not good for our children and not good for our culture," he said on ABC's This Week .

Lieberman said that it is "unfair" to link Gore to Clinton's "personal mistakes," something many Democrats say Bush and his running mate, Dick Cheney, are trying to do when they tell audiences that they will "restore honor to the White House."

"The Bush-Cheney ticket seems to want to run against a guy who's not on the ballot this year," Lieberman said on Fox News Sunday.

He also said Cheney's reported \$20 million retirement package from Halliburton, the energy services company that he chairs until Wednesday, will "raise a question" about how "tough" a Republican White House would be on big oil companies.

Karen Hughes, Bush's communications director, has said such packages are standard in corporate America and that the public should be pleased to have such a successful vice presidential nominee. Clinton takes in L.A.'s sun, stars and fund-raisers.

---

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

(C) Copyright 2000 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

---

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/conv/208.htm>

08/13/00- Updated 09:58 PM ET

Bush leads Gore in key areas

By Richard Benedetto, USA TODAY

LOS ANGELES - The latest USA TODAY/CNN Gallup Poll showed why Democrat Al Gore trails Republican George W. Bush by 16 percentage points among likely voters on the eve of the Democratic National Convention.

@ The vice president has failed to win over enough women who traditionally vote Democrat. Bush led leads among women in the poll, 51%-42%.

@ Gore has been unable to convince independents that his brand of moderation is better than Bush's. Independents preferred the Texas governor, 52%-33%.



@ The Democrat is still viewed as a weaker leader and less visionary than Bush, 67%-53%,. even though survey respondents said issues are more important than leadership, 46%-36%.

"Gore has a lot of work ahead of him this week," says Shirley Anne Warshaw,. a political scientist at Gettysburg College in Pennsylvania. "He's got to show people he's firmly in control of his party and that Bush is sharply different from who they think he is." At the same time, she adds, the vice president has got to continue "to separate himself" from President Clinton's personal problems.

The survey of 641 likely voters Friday and Saturday had a margin of error of +/- 4 percentage points. The poll suggested that Clinton, despite his 58% job-approval rating and good economy, is a drag on Gore.

One in three likely voters (32%). said Gore's ties to Clinton make them feel less favorably toward his vice president; 7%. said more favorable. Among younger voters, ages 18-29, 42%. in the poll said Clinton makes made them less favorable toward the vice president. Bush led leads among that younger group, 58%-37%.

Apparently worried about his effect on the vice president, Clinton said last week voters should not blame Gore for his "mistakes."

Gore's campaign manager, William Daley, concedes that Gore is behind his Republican rival, but not by the double digits the USA TODAY poll suggests. "It is very fluid, mainly because people haven't paid a lot of attention yet," he says.

Many Democrats have pointed to a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll taken last Monday night that showed the Bush-Gore race almost even. However, unlike other USA TODAY polls, that one was taken on only one night and included registered voters, not likely voters. Overnight polls are less reliable than surveys taken over two or three days, and likely voters are considered a more reliable measurement than registered voters.

The latest poll further showed that only about half of all Americans (47%). are following the presidential race closely up to this point. The survey also offered an explanation as to why the vice president does not appear to be getting credit for the good economy, which boomed on the Clinton-Gore watch:

@ 62%. said Congress, the Federal Reserve and American entrepreneurs should get most of the credit.

@ 22%. in the poll said the administration deserves the bulk of the credit.

Gore's spokesman, Douglas Hattaway,. says he is confident Gore will close the gap significantly, starting this week. "We believe that as the people learn this week, and in the coming weeks, about Al Gore's fight for working families, they'll clearly see he's on their side."

\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Aug 13 23:03:21 2000  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id XAA23380 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 23:03:18 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP  
id XAA17727 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Aug 2000 23:03:15 -0700  
(PDT)  
Date: Sun, 13 Aug 2000 23:03:15 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: NYT/CBS Poll: Democratic Delegates to Left of Public, Party  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008132258100.14191-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

---

[http://www.nytimes.com/library/  
politics/camp/081400wh-dem-poll.html](http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/081400wh-dem-poll.html)

August 14, 2000

POLL FINDS DELEGATES TO THE LEFT  
OF BOTH PUBLIC AND PARTY

By ADAM CLYMER with MARJORIE CONNELLY

LOS ANGELES, Aug. 13 -- The Democratic delegates arriving here to nominate Vice President Al Gore for president think of themselves as moderates, but their views on issues from affirmative action to an activist federal government are more liberal than those of the public or even Democratic voters generally, a New York Times/CBS News Poll shows.

On one issue, the death penalty, a random sample of 1,042 of the 4,339 delegates was decisively more liberal than Mr. Gore, though 56 percent said they were moderates. Asked to choose between the death penalty and life in prison without parole, 20 percent of the delegates preferred

executions, compared with 46 percent of Democrats generally and 51 percent of the public. Mr. Gore is one of those supporters.

Kenneth R. Moore, a 72-year-old delegate from Sun Lakes, Ariz., explained that attitude. He said: "I've gone 180 degrees on the death penalty. I used to favor it. But with the questionable executions recently, particularly with the mentally retarded, I just can't support the death penalty without standards that require absolute proof and an adequate defense. Without that, there is no justice."

The ideological distance between the Democratic delegates and their rank and file was similar to the gap displayed two weeks ago in Philadelphia, where Republican delegates were strikingly more conservative than ordinary Republicans or ordinary Americans. Such gaps have also been found at past conventions.

The death penalty is an example of Democratic delegates being distant from public attitudes. Occasionally, though, they were closer than Republicans were. For example, 63 percent of Democratic delegates and 64 percent of the American public agreed with the statement that "We must protect the environment even if it means jobs in your community are lost because of it." Only 32 percent of Republican delegates agreed.

Donna I. King, a delegate from Norwalk, Conn., explained her view today: "Now is the right time to focus on the environment. The economy is strong, unemployment is low. Address this issue in the best of times, and focus on inspection, regulation and enforcement."

One distinct difference between the Democratic and Republican delegates was their confidence about the election. Only 51 percent of the Democrats said Mr. Gore was the favorite in their state, and just 27 percent called him a big favorite. Among Republicans, 68 percent said Gov. George W. Bush of Texas was a favorite in their state and 44 percent said he had a big edge.

The Democratic poll had a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points; the margin for the Republican survey was plus or minus two percentage points.

Most of the interviewing of the delegates was conducted in July, with no more than a few dozen interviews conducted after the selection of Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut as Mr.

Gore's running mate. That selection plainly made some delegates more hopeful.

Rosemary Trump, a labor organizer from Murrysville, Pa., who had called the Pennsylvania race a "tossup," said the Lieberman choice "will have a big impact."

"It's going to be a close election here in Pennsylvania, but this will energize those of us who feel empowered by this choice to work even harder," Ms. Trump said.

Stephen W. Long, a lawyer from Crestwood, Ky., had called his state a tossup as well. He said: "Lieberman being a moderate helps him here in Kentucky. I don't think the Jewish factor will be a problem at all here. His stances on taxes and education exemplify what Gore has been standing for and also strengthen Gore's personality as a straight shooter."

The surveys also showed major differences of sex, race and income in the two groups of delegates. Forty-eight percent of the Democrats are women, compared with 35 percent of the Republicans. Nineteen percent of the Democratic delegates, like 19 percent of Democratic voters, are African-American; 4 percent of Republican delegates are African-American, and 2 percent of Republican voters are.

While only 19 percent of all voters said their family incomes exceeded \$75,000 last year, 57 percent of both Democratic and Republican delegates did. And 17 percent of Republican delegates, compared with 6 percent of Democrats, would not answer the question. Almost twice as many Republicans, 23 percent to 12 percent for Democrats, called themselves millionaires. Thirty-one percent of Democratic delegates said they belonged to a labor union; only 4 percent of Republicans did. The median age of Democratic delegates was 51; for Republicans it was 53.

There was one major similarity on issues. Sixty-four percent of the public, with insignificant differences between Republicans and Democrats, said they thought the large, unregulated gifts to political parties from companies, unions and rich people, known as soft money, should be banned. Neither set of delegates was in step with that attitude. Republican delegates wanted them permitted, by 65 percent to 24 percent; Democratic delegates were split, with 44 percent wanting them allowed and 47 percent calling for a ban.

But more often one party or the other proved out of step with its own voters or the public. Among Democratic delegates, 83 percent said they favored affirmative action, compared with 51 percent of the public generally and 29 percent of Republican delegates. Deborah Goldberg, a Democratic delegate from Farmington, Mich., explained, "As long as there is discrimination, there should be affirmative action."

Democratic delegates strongly opposed tuition vouchers for private or religious schools, by 86 percent to 10 percent. Democrats in general were opposed, too, but only by 54 percent to 41 percent, and the public was about evenly split, with 47 percent in favor and 46 percent against. But Republican delegates, who favored vouchers by 71 percent to 20 percent, were almost as far out of step with the public uncertainty.

Democratic delegates were much closer to public attitudes than Republican delegates on questions of increasing safety and environmental regulation of business and requiring trigger locks on handguns. But while 73 percent of Democratic delegates said the government should do more to solve national problems, only 33 percent of the public did.

---

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

---

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/081400wh-poll-method.html>

August 14, 2000

#### ABOUT THE SURVEY

The New York Times/CBS News survey of delegates to the Democratic National Convention was conducted from July 6 to Aug. 10, mainly by telephone but also by fax, mail, e-mail message or Internet if individual delegates preferred.

Out of 4,339 Democratic delegates, 1,464 were

randomly sampled with 1,042 completing the questionnaire by the end of polling.

A parallel Times/CBS News survey of delegates to the Republican National Convention was conducted from June 26 to July 28. Out of 2,066 Republican delegates, 1,551 were randomly sampled with 1,055 completing the questionnaire by the end of polling.

The results of each survey have been weighted to account for state delegation size, gender and the number of delegates pledged to each presidential candidate. In addition, the survey of Democrats was weighted by type of delegate.

In theory, in 19 out of 20 cases, the results based on such samples will differ by no more than plus or minus three percentage points for Democratic delegates, and plus or minus two percentage points for Republican delegates, from what would have been obtained by surveying all delegates to each convention.

The practical difficulties of conducting any survey may also introduce other sources of error. For instance, delegates varied in how difficult they were to reach. Also variations in question wording or the order of questions can lead to somewhat different results.

Results for voters are from nationwide Times/CBS News polls of the public taken during July.

---

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Aug 15 21:56:57 2000  
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id VAA08783 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Aug 2000 21:56:55 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-74.bellatlantic.net [151.203.192.74])  
by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id AAA24309  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 00:56:31 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <399A1EB7.A49822DB@jwdp.com>  
Date: Wed, 16 Aug 2000 00:55:19 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Morin on Polls (Washington Post)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The following appears in today's Washington Post:

Telling Polls Apart  
By Richard Morin

Wednesday, August 16, 2000 ; A35

Here's the difference a day makes: 17 points in a presidential horse-race poll.

And here's the difference a week makes: eight points--in the opposite direction.

Or at least that's what the Gallup Organization via USA Today and CNN would have us believe. In barely a week, Gallup surveys reported that Republican presidential hopeful George W. Bush led Vice President Al Gore by 19 points on Monday, Aug. 7, by two points the very next day--and then back up by 10 points on Saturday among registered voters and a whopping 16 points among those most likely to vote.

Well, perhaps that really happened. And maybe monkeys will fly out of the exhaust vents of the Staples Center in Los Angeles.

Already it's been a silly season of statistical goofs and gaffes perpetrated in the name of news by clueless journalists and the pollsters who accommodate them.

Gallup isn't alone in building this Tower of Babel, one poll at a time. Depending on which of nine different national polls you read in the past week, Bush is up anywhere from three to nearly 20 points. Diversity is a good thing--but not in the results of candidate preference polls done at approximately the same time.

Of course this is a volatile period. During convention season, measures of candidate support--the horse race--quiver and bounce in response to alternating pulses of energy flowing from the two parties' big parties. The best polls--and Gallup usually does some of the very best--will vary during this unsettled time.

But don't let me or other media pollsters off the hook so easily. This year, many of us are contributing to the volatility by cutting corners and taking unprecedented risks to meet the needs of the Internet- and cable TV-driven 24-hour news day.

To meet these frenzied demands for content, polls have been downsized. CBS, for example, reported a survey of 503 registered voters over the weekend. These tiny samples come with correspondingly larger margins of sampling error, which about guarantees more

survey-to-survey variation in the horse race that has exactly nothing to do with actual changes in the race.

The current election cycle also marks the flowering of the one-day horse-race poll. Surveys done in a single night have their place, but they're simply too coarse a gauge to reliably estimate each candidate's share of the vote. Most polling organizations have steered clear of asking candidate preferences on one-nighters. Until now.

Also this year, the quickie polls are being done even more quickly. A case in point: last week's one-night Gallup poll that found Bush up by two points. Interviewing for this survey ended at 8:50 p.m. East Coast time, in order to make USA Today's deadline, said Frank Newport, editor in chief of Gallup.

That early quit may be okay for easterners. But you have to wonder whom Gallup poll-takers were interviewing in California before they stopped calling at 5:50 p.m. Pacific time. Shut-ins? Unemployed actors? Latchkey children?

The correct answer: Democrats. The Gallup one-nighter significantly overrepresented Democrats--39 percent of their sample were Democrats, compared with 33 percent in the previous poll. No wonder Bush had such a bad night (or afternoon, out West).

Other pollsters have risked similar train wrecks by conducting all or most of their interviews on Friday and Saturday, again to meet the demands of media clients. Those are notoriously bad days for interviewing, because people with actual lives are not at home, and their views often differ from those who are. (A confession: In response to breaking news, I've done polls for The Post on a Thursday-through-Saturday schedule, which is better but still risky.)

Newsweek routinely interviews on Thursday--a good night--and Friday, which is ghastly. Why doesn't the magazine simply start on Wednesday, another good night for calling? It's obvious: So the poll can be used to measure reaction to the latest news developments. We all want the freshest survey results. But there's a big difference between a poll that is fresh and one that is half-baked.

Then there's a raft of things pretending to be polls, such as most surveys conducted over the Internet and focus groups. Just last week, celebrity pollster Frank Luntz was officially censured by the National Council on Public Polls for allegedly claiming on MSNBC that the uncommitted voters who participated in his focus groups were representative of all independents.

I like focus groups. The insights that emerge often are revelatory and newsworthy--but not because the views expressed by 10 people chatting around a table are somehow "representative" of the opinions of any larger slice of the public.

So what's a dedicated poll-watcher to do? Lie low until after Labor Day. The polls--and the presidential race--will settle down as people's preferences solidify.



Alternatively, look at all the reputable polls, and compute your own average of the results. Academics suggest this "grand mean" usually is the best and most reliable estimate of what's really happening.

Some general rules: Larger samples of 750 or more registered voters are better than smaller samples. Polls conducted over three or four days are generally more reliable than polls done in two days, not to mention one-nighters. After Labor Day, pay more attention to samples of likely voters and less to results based on all registered voters.

Finally, remember that more polls are undone by margin of thinking error than by margin of sampling error. Make the reporter and pollster prove it, particularly if a survey result seems odd or counterintuitive, or contradicts the results of other recent polls.

The writer is The Post's director of polling.

i;½ 2000 The Washington Post Company  
>From KAF@cbsnews.com Tue Aug 15 23:10:12 2000  
Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP  
id XAA00944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Aug 2000 23:10:12 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from CBSNY-Message\_Server by cbsnews.com  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 02:09:24 -0500  
Message-Id: <s999f7d4.089@cbsnews.com>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
Date: Wed, 16 Aug 2000 02:06:53 -0500  
From: Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Morin on Polls (Washington Post) -Reply  
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 XAA00951

I hate being placed in a position of arguing with Rich Morin. But this time I will take issue with his reference to the CBS News Poll.

There's a difference between an overnight poll that uses a new sample, and a panel. The latter, whatever its weaknesses, at least can tell us about change. Rich wrote that the CBS News poll was just a small new cross-section which would guarantee, he says, greater survey-to-survey error.

Well of course that would be right if what Rich wrote were a true description of the survey. But a panel, which is what this was, would do the opposite. It would MINIMIZE any change. It seems to be that it's the right approach to deal with breaking news within the known limitations of the survey process.

I would welcome discussion of the difficulties involving news, survey timing and the limits of polls. And for those who may have missed the original poll, I have included the text of our release. The complete set of questions and answers should be available at [www.cbs.com](http://www.cbs.com).

Kathy Frankovic

CBS NEWS POLL

FOR RELEASE: August 11, 2000

6:30 P.M. EST

PUBLIC REACTION TO THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET

August 10, 2000

Vice President Al Gore\*s selection of Connecticut Senator Joe Lieberman as his running mate, along with the attention he is receiving in the days before the Democratic Convention, may have cut into Texas Governor George W. Bush\*s 15-point post-convention lead in the race for president.

PRESIDENTIAL VOTE

|      | Now | Aug 4-6 |
|------|-----|---------|
| Bush | 48% | 50%     |
| Gore | 38  | 35      |

In call-back interviews conducted Thursday night with the same voters who produced that lead last weekend, a CBS News Poll found Bush\*s lead over Gore has narrowed. 48% of registered voters now support Bush, while 38% favor Gore.

Lieberman\*s first impression on voters has been generally positive; those who have formed an opinion of him like him and say he is qualified for the job. But his religion has also registered with voters. While most voters say his being Jewish won\*t affect their vote, there are some voters who would be happier to vote for someone of their own religion rather than a Jewish person, and one in ten are dubious that America is ready to elect a Jewish Vice President.

With the naming of both running mates, voters have become somewhat more likely to admit the vice presidency will matter a great deal to their vote. Now, 30% say that -- up from 15% before Bush named former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney as his party\*s vice presidential nominee.

RUNNING MATES\* INFLUENCE ON THE VOTE

|                     | Now | July |
|---------------------|-----|------|
| Matter a great deal | 30% | 15%  |
| Don*t matter        | 67  | 81   |

EVALUATING LIEBERMAN

The news coverage of Tuesday\*s announcement that an Orthodox Jew would be on the Democratic ticket made voters very conscious of Lieberman\*s religion. Already, just two days after the announcement, three quarters of voters know that Lieberman is Jewish. That stands in stark contrast with 88% of voters who admit they have no idea of Republican Vice Presidential nominee Dick Cheney\*s religion. Just 8% correctly guess that Cheney is Protestant, and 2% say that Cheney is Jewish.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES\* RELIGION

|            | Lieberman | Cheney |
|------------|-----------|--------|
| Jewish     | 74%       | 2%     |
| Protestant | 1         | 8      |
| Catholic   | 0         | 0      |
| Don*t Know | 25        | 88     |

Voters\* overall reaction to the naming of Lieberman is somewhat more

positive than their reaction to Cheney two weeks ago. 45% are glad that Gore named Lieberman, while only 15% wish he had named someone else. Two weeks ago, 39% were glad that Cheney had been named, while 22% wished it had been someone else. But in both cases, eight in ten voters say their vote will not be affected by the pick.

Cheney has an edge with voters on the question of experience \* a trait that Bush highlighted in his announcement. When he was first named, 61% of voters said they believed Cheney had the right experience to be a good vice president. In the current poll, 54% say the same about Lieberman.

| DOES HE HAVE THE RIGHT EXPERIENCE TO BE VEEP? |     | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|
| Lieberman - now                               | 54% | 8   |    |
| Cheney - 7/27                                 | 61% | 8   |    |

Both vice presidential candidates are viewed positively, though many voters have yet to form an opinion about either. In Cheney's case, about half have yet to form an opinion; for Lieberman, more than six out of ten can't yet give their opinion.

In a head-to-head contest, Cheney currently edges Lieberman: when voters are asked to choose only among the vice presidential candidates, Cheney leads 43% to 38%.

#### VOTING FOR A JEWISH CANDIDATE

Hardly any voters admit that they would not vote for a well-qualified Jewish candidate for President. The percentage that say they would vote for a Jewish person for president has risen from 46% in a 1937 Gallup Poll to 95% today.

But, as has been the case when similar questions have been asked about black candidates and women candidates, the public's evaluation of other voters is less positive. While nearly all voters say they personally would vote for a qualified Jewish candidate, only 57% say that America is ready to elect a Jewish President. There is more openness to a Jewish Vice President, though 11% are still dubious.

#### ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWISH CANDIDATES

|                                         |     | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|
| Vote for Jewish presidential candidate? | 95% | 2   |    |
| America ready to elect a Jewish Pres.?  | 57% | 25  |    |
| America ready to elect a Jewish VP?     | 73% | 11  |    |

While most voters say that a candidate's religion wouldn't make a difference to them, 12% of non-Jewish voters admit that, given a choice, they would probably vote for a candidate of their own religion over a Jewish candidate, all things equal.

#### LIEBERMAN AND THE CLINTON SCANDALS

Lieberman was the first Democratic Senator to publicly criticize President Clinton in the wake of the President's grand jury testimony about Monica Lewinsky. But how much can this selection help Gore separate himself from Clinton administration problems?

For most voters, the Clinton scandals do not affect their opinion of Gore:

62% of voters say their opinion of Gore has little or nothing to do with their opinion of the Clinton scandals.

#### CLINTON SCANDALS AFFECTING OPINIONS OF GORE?

|            |     |
|------------|-----|
| A lot      | 21% |
| Some       | 16  |
| Not much   | 15  |
| Not at all | 47  |

But among those whose opinions are affected, Lieberman may help. Among the one in five voters who say their opinion of Gore has been affected - a lot - by Clinton administration scandals, half think the choice of Lieberman will help Gore distance himself. Among the 16% who say the scandals have affected their opinion of Gore \*somewhat,\* two-thirds say Lieberman will help.

#### EVALUATING THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

One potential impact of a vice presidential candidate is to change the public\*s view of the person at the top of the ticket. The impact of naming Lieberman on voters\* views of Gore has been limited, but positive.

Asked explicitly how Lieberman affects their opinion of Gore, three out of four voters say it has no impact. But more than three times as many say it has a favorable effect, as say the impact is unfavorable. And Gore\*s overall rating has risen ever so slightly -- from 33% favorable in the days following the Republican Convention among these same respondents, to 37% now.

But at the same time, while Bush may have lost some of his large lead in recent days, he has lost little of his underlying popularity. More than twice as many voters hold a favorable view of Bush as hold a negative view

One of George W. Bush\*s strengths in the campaign is that more voters view him as having strong qualities of leadership than view Gore that way. That perception may even have been exacerbated by events at the Republican National Convention.

In this poll, 73% of voters -- more than at any time previously -- describe Bush as having strong qualities of leadership, while just 51% describe Gore that way. Both candidates, however, are equally likely to be viewed as wanting to unite people, not divide them.

\*\*\*\*\*

This poll was conducted by telephone August 10, 2000, among 503 registered voters previously interviewed August 4-6, 2000. The error due to sampling could be plus or minus four percentage points for results based on the entire sample.

>From ghroberts@worldnet.att.net Wed Aug 16 01:13:06 2000

Received: from mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.52])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id BAA26970 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 01:13:05 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from hewlett-packard ([12.75.137.8])

by mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net

(InterMail vM.4.01.02.39 201-229-119-122) with ESMTPTP  
id  
<20000816081234.ZLHI14052.mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>;  
Wed, 16 Aug 2000 08:12:34 +0000  
From: "Glenn H. Roberts" <ghroberts@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Morin on Polls (Washington Post)  
Date: Wed, 16 Aug 2000 03:12:06 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Priority: 3  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Message-Id:  
<20000816081234.ZLHI14052.mtiwmhc27.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>

Morin's piece in the Post on polls is a breath of fresh air regarding the use of "overnight polls" and the conflict between the pollster and the media sponsoring the poll.

Morin's comments tend to reinforce my Aug. 9th comments critical of the GallupUSA Today "overnight" showing the one day change from 19 points to 2 points in the Gore-Bush race.

The professional pollster needs to have greater influence on the media client when faced with decisions reflecting negatively on the opinion polling profession, which the Gallup "overnight" clearly does.

Amen to the Morin article in all respects and maybe we can benefit from his insightful suggestions.

I must confess that dealing with the news side of newspapers in constructing and releasing political polls is not an easy task. In 25 years as Director of the Register's Iowa Poll, I had to deal with the "conflict of interest" issue facing the news side. However, I was fortunate having an Editor/Publisher who gave me "veto power" over everything in the poll. I realize it's a much tougher, competitive news world today and I have the highest professional respect for our AAPOR pollsters facing these challenges.

Glenn Roberts

Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939  
515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net  
>From mwolford@hers.com Wed Aug 16 06:20:55 2000  
Received: from herndon6.his.com (root@herndon6.his.com [209.67.207.9])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTPTP  
id GAA00817 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 06:20:54 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from herndon10.his.com (root@herndon10.his.com [209.67.207.13])  
by herndon6.his.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTPTP id JAA19694  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 09:20:46 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from hers.com (HIS2-GW.CUSTOMER.DSL.ALTER.NET [206.66.32.176])

by herndon10.his.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id JAA01410  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 09:20:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <399A94BC.6B42550A@hers.com>  
Date: Wed, 16 Aug 2000 09:18:53 -0400  
From: Monica Wolford <mwolford@hers.com>  
Reply-To: mwolford@hers.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Win98; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Morin on Polls (Washington Post)  
References: <399A1EB7.A49822DB@jwdp.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I have to express my disappointment with the article's emphasis on likely voter polls as a good thing. How can we compare poll results from one organization to another when they have different samples? At least registered voter polls are all sampling from the same population. How do we convert Gallup's likely voter to CBS's?

Jan Werner wrote:

> The following appears in today's Washington Post:  
>  
> Telling Polls Apart  
> By Richard Morin  
>  
> Wednesday, August 16, 2000 ; A35  
>  
> Here's the difference a day makes: 17 points in a presidential  
> horse-race poll.  
>  
> And here's the difference a week makes: eight points--in the opposite  
> direction.  
>  
> Or at least that's what the Gallup Organization via USA Today and CNN  
> would have us believe. In barely a week, Gallup surveys reported that  
> Republican presidential hopeful George W. Bush led Vice President Al  
> Gore by 19 points on Monday, Aug. 7, by two points the very next  
> day--and then back up by 10 points on Saturday among registered  
> voters and a whopping 16 points among those most likely to vote.  
>  
> Well, perhaps that really happened. And maybe monkeys will fly out of  
> the exhaust vents of the Staples Center in Los Angeles.  
>  
> Already it's been a silly season of statistical goofs and gaffes  
> perpetrated in the name of news by clueless journalists and the  
> pollsters who accommodate them.  
>  
> Gallup isn't alone in building this Tower of Babel, one poll at a  
> time. Depending on which of nine different national polls you read in  
> the past week, Bush is up anywhere from three to nearly 20 points.  
> Diversity is a good thing--but not in the results of candidate  
> preference polls done at approximately the same time.  
>  
> Of course this is a volatile period. During convention season,

> measures of candidate support--the horse race--quiver and bounce in  
> response to alternating pulses of energy flowing from the two  
> parties' big parties. The best polls--and Gallup usually does some of  
> the very best--will vary during this unsettled time.

>  
> But don't let me or other media pollsters off the hook so easily.  
> This year, many of us are contributing to the volatility by cutting  
> corners and taking unprecedented risks to meet the needs of the  
> Internet- and cable TV-driven 24-hour news day.

>  
> To meet these frenzied demands for content, polls have been  
> downsized. CBS, for example, reported a survey of 503 registered  
> voters over the weekend. These tiny samples come with correspondingly  
> larger margins of sampling error, which about guarantees more  
> survey-to-survey variation in the horse race that has exactly nothing  
> to do with actual changes in the race.

>  
> The current election cycle also marks the flowering of the one-day  
> horse-race poll. Surveys done in a single night have their place, but  
> they're simply too coarse a gauge to reliably estimate each  
> candidate's share of the vote. Most polling organizations have  
> steered clear of asking candidate preferences on one-nighters. Until  
> now.

>  
> Also this year, the quickie polls are being done even more quickly. A  
> case in point: last week's one-night Gallup poll that found Bush up  
> by two points. Interviewing for this survey ended at 8:50 p.m. East  
> Coast time, in order to make USA Today's deadline, said Frank  
> Newport, editor in chief of Gallup.

>  
> That early quit may be okay for easterners. But you have to wonder  
> whom Gallup poll-takers were interviewing in California before they  
> stopped calling at 5:50 p.m. Pacific time. Shut-ins? Unemployed  
> actors? Latchkey children?

>  
> The correct answer: Democrats. The Gallup one-nighter significantly  
> overrepresented Democrats--39 percent of their sample were Democrats,  
> compared with 33 percent in the previous poll. No wonder Bush had  
> such a bad night (or afternoon, out West).

>  
> Other pollsters have risked similar train wrecks by conducting all or  
> most of their interviews on Friday and Saturday, again to meet the  
> demands of media clients. Those are notoriously bad days for  
> interviewing, because people with actual lives are not at home, and  
> their views often differ from those who are. (A confession: In  
> response to breaking news, I've done polls for The Post on a  
> Thursday-through-Saturday schedule, which is better but still  
> risky.)

>  
> Newsweek routinely interviews on Thursday--a good night--and Friday,  
> which is ghastly. Why doesn't the magazine simply start on Wednesday,  
> another good night for calling? It's obvious: So the poll can be used  
> to measure reaction to the latest news developments. We all want the  
> freshest survey results. But there's a big difference between a poll  
> that is fresh and one that is half-baked.

>  
> Then there's a raft of things pretending to be polls, such as most

> surveys conducted over the Internet and focus groups. Just last week,  
> celebrity pollster Frank Luntz was officially censured by the  
> National Council on Public Polls for allegedly claiming on MSNBC that  
> the uncommitted voters who participated in his focus groups were  
> representative of all independents.

> I like focus groups. The insights that emerge often are revelatory  
> and newsworthy--but not because the views expressed by 10 people  
> chatting around a table are somehow "representative" of the opinions  
> of any larger slice of the public.

> So what's a dedicated poll-watcher to do? Lie low until after Labor  
> Day. The polls--and the presidential race--will settle down as  
> people's preferences solidify.

> Alternatively, look at all the reputable polls, and compute your own  
> average of the results. Academics suggest this "grand mean" usually  
> is the best and most reliable estimate of what's really happening.

> Some general rules: Larger samples of 750 or more registered voters  
> are better than smaller samples. Polls conducted over three or four  
> days are generally more reliable than polls done in two days, not to  
> mention one-nighters. After Labor Day, pay more attention to samples  
> of likely voters and less to results based on all registered  
> voters.

> Finally, remember that more polls are undone by margin of thinking  
> error than by margin of sampling error. Make the reporter and  
> pollster prove it, particularly if a survey result seems odd or  
> counterintuitive, or contradicts the results of other recent polls.

> The writer is The Post's director of polling.

> i;½ 2000 The Washington Post Company

--

~~~~~  
Monica Wolford mwolford@hers.com
Program on International Policy Attitudes www.pipa.org
A joint program of Center on Policy Attitudes www.policyattitudes.org and
the Center for Int'l & Security Studies at U Maryland 1779 Massachusetts Ave
NW #510 Washington, DC 20036

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Aug 16 08:29:38 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 ESMTTP
id IAA27020 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 08:29:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from w5y0s9.mindspring.com (user-381c6e2.dialup.mindspring.com
[209.86.25.194])
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id LAA04100
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Aug 2000 11:29:35 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000816105756.00af65d0@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Wed, 16 Aug 2000 11:17:18 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Frank Luntz -- and the Democratic convention
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.4.10.10008091015590.6127-100000@tempest.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Last night after the convention ended I happened on MS NBC and saw none other than Frank Luntz holding forth before a group consisting of both Republicans and Democrats. He was explaining a series of charts which showed second-by-second respondent responses to each of the different speeches given during the proceedings. He says he uses a sample of about 450 respondents spread around the country and consisting of both Republicans and Democrats. I didn't catch the beginning of his presentation and can't comment further on his methodology but I think most of you will recognize the process.

After explaining the charts, which are really quite interesting given the circumstances, he turned to the group (consisting of both Democrats and Republicans) and asked for their reactions to specific speakers along with their reactions to specific points. Whatever else Luntz is, he is quite a showman. I assume he will be on again this evening after the evening festivities.

Dick Halpern

>From KKrotki@intersurvey.com Thu Aug 17 05:54:31 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA25910 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 05:54:30 -0700
(PDT)
Message-ID: <d912d65f9a87f826ee358b3a7d50fe73399be42d@inter-survey.com>
From: Karol Krotki <KKrotki@intersurvey.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Position Announcement
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 05:54:30 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

InterSurvey seeks a survey research professional with 5-plus years of experience to lead questionnaire design for the company.

InterSurvey is developing cutting-edge methodologies involving the application of Internet surveying to a probability sample of households. We believe that this new technique is breaking exciting new ground in the area of survey research and will offer researchers a powerful alternative to the traditional survey research modes such as telephone, mail, and face-to-face.

Job Description:

Under the supervision of the Vice President, Survey Research, the successful applicant will be responsible for the following activities:

- * Design and implement experiments in questionnaire design,

resulting in recommendations for modifications to and maintenance of best-of-class Questionnaire Standards;

- * Continuously improve the company's Questionnaire Standards, which are used to assure high quality in all survey instrumentation.
- * Consult with company analysts and directors in devising solutions for their customers' projects.
- * Interface with Engineering for continuous improvement in the Internet interviewing software.
- * Analyze variations in questionnaire design that will optimize the response rate.

Qualifications:

- * B.A. with graduate school training in relevant social science or Masters with at least 5 years experience in survey research, statistics, a quantitative social science, or market research.
- * Work experience in survey design in commercial market research preferred.
- * Expertise in questionnaire development, particularly self-administered surveys.
- * Energy, eagerness to confront new challenges, and ability to find creative solutions.

This position will be based in the Menlo Park, CA office of InterSurvey. Please send applications of interest by email to mdennis@intersurvey.com

```
>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Aug 17 06:40:13 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.157])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id GAA09836 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 06:40:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-74.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.74])
    by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id JAA23216
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 09:39:58 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <399BEAEB.76C489B6@jwdp.com>
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 09:38:51 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: National Journal critique of current polls
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

The following critique of current election polling by Allan Rivlin of Peter D. Hart Research Associates appears in the online edition of National Journal, normally a subscription site, but opened up to all during the 2000 party conventions.

It can be read at: <http://nationaljournal.com/members/buzz/pollposition.htm>.

Instant Gratification
By Allan Rivlin
NationalJournal.com
Thursday, Aug. 17, 2000

Suddenly -- although not unexpectedly -- the world of politics, polling and the press has changed dramatically. We are arguably a year and a half into the race for the White House, but for only the second time in the campaign (the early primary contests was the other) there is actual news that is interesting and important enough to affect poll numbers.

By the end of this week, we will have seen the announcement of two vice presidential nominees, and the beginning, middle and spectacular finish of both parties' conventions in the span of just four weeks. The polls are responding to these events and it is natural to want to be up to date, but readers need to be cautioned that the highest standards of survey research are often compromised to feed the news services with instant measures of voters' reactions.

Telephone surveys make it clear that the Republicans went into their vice presidential announcement with a substantial lead and then earned a strong but short-lived bounce from their convention. More recent polls tell us the Republican bounce was mostly or even completely eroded by the start of the Democratic convention. But these results are already hours if not days old. What if you have a need to know what the public thinks of Al Gore's acceptance speech before you go to bed tonight?

The good news, perhaps, is that this election cycle has seen the introduction of several intriguing new methods for monitoring public reactions to the conventions as they unfold. There are ongoing focus groups, overnight polls, Internet polls and even moment-to-moment evaluations of the major speeches over the Internet.

The bad news is that these methods are far less reliable than traditional polling methods. And because the standards of the survey research profession are compromised (to what extent depends on the method), these approaches could be yielding biased, misleading or even false results.

Using some methods that have been available for years and others that were not even imagined in 1996, the news services are offering an unprecedented array of instant reactions to the evening's proceedings. By jumping to cable television or the Internet, you can see results of focus groups that have been assembled to watch the convention speeches as they are delivered, overnight telephone surveys of randomly selected adults or preselected panels of likely voters; Internet surveys weighted to look like the electorate; or even second-by-second reactions of people rating each line of a speech over the Internet.

The only problem is that, like most other sources of instant gratification, these surveys are in no way substitutes for the more wholesome surveys they are beating to the punch. If you cannot wait three or four days to get the results from a high-quality random telephone survey with repeat call-backs over several nights, then there is nothing wrong with taking a peek at these sorts of instant results -- as long as you keep one thing firmly in mind: They might be dead wrong.

Incredible Or Not Credible? CNN faced a tough editorial decision last week when the results of an overnight Gallup poll for the cable network and USA Today of 667 registered voters showed Gore pulling within two points of George W. Bush in the four-way trial heat, 43 percent to 45 percent (with Nader at 4 percent and Buchanan getting just 1 percent). The problem is that the poll was taken on one night, Aug. 7, just after Gore announced his selection of Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman as his choice for vice president. The result was hard to swallow because just days earlier the same poll, using different methods, showed a 17-point Bush lead following the Republican convention.

Educated poll readers should be highly suspect of poll results taken in just one evening of calling. Reliable surveys should be in the field for several nights, and several attempts should be made to reach specific respondents even if they are not at home the first time they are called. Overnight polls do not allow repeated call backs so they only survey the people who are home on a particular night. This often biases the results toward older respondents and, more subtly, toward respondents who have fewer things going on in their lives.

In the week that has followed the overnight poll showing Bush with a two-point lead, several other organizations have produced multi-night polls that show Bush holding a lead that varies from the low single digits to the low double digits. The strange thing is the most recent CNN/Gallup/USA Today poll of 641 likely voters taken August 11 and 12, has Bush's lead back up to 16 points, 55 percent to 39 percent.

Looking at all of the polling that has been done over the past few weeks yields a fairly consistent story: Bush's lead expanded to the high teens following the Republican convention, then slipped to the mid-single digits as the Republican glow faded and the Democrats began to gain momentum with Lieberman's selection. But the story that emerges from the CNN/Gallup/USA Today polling is not believable.

A Rebuke From The Deans Of Statistical Correctness In another polling controversy last week, the Polling Review Board of the National Council on Public Polls, took the unusual step of denouncing Republican pollster, Frank Luntz for his work on MSNBC during the Republican convention. The Board, comprised of Harry O'Neill of Roper Starch Worldwide, Warren Mitofsky of Mitofsky International, and Humphrey Taylor of Harris Interactive, monitors "the conduct and reporting of polls and issue[s] clarifying comment when appropriate." In a statement, the NCPP termed the focus groups and on-line assessment of Bush's acceptance speech that Luntz

presented on MSNBC a "two-pronged assault [NBC's] own credibility."

The cardinal sin, according to the board's statement, was Luntz's use of the word "representative" in describing the focus groups results.

"Focus groups are very useful in their place, but they are very easy to misuse. And they are being misused when people put a handful of folk together in a focus group or two, or three, and then suggest that there are representative of something," O'Neill said. "Really, what comes out of a focus group represents only the point of view of those people who are, for whatever reason, in the focus group."

The board also criticized the research conducted over the Internet for MSNBC by Speakout.com although that criticism was somewhat indirect. The statement quotes MSNBC's Erik Sorenson saying, "we'll be able to go directly to the people and find out what they're thinking." The board's response: "If he means a representative sample, we disagree."

Aaron Johnson, speaking for Speakout.com said, "we definitely made it clear that this was not a representative survey. This was for fun," and he pointed to a clear disclaimer to that effect that accompanied the presentation of the results on MSNBC's Web site.

Luntz could not be reached for comment, but he defended his position in an interview with Hotline last week by pointing out that he "never reported percentages" from the focus groups as the Polling Review Board seems to suggest. Luntz added that his focus group findings were corroborated by public opinion polls and that "there were two dozen journalists watching the focus group the entire time. They found the participants to be believable and helpful in understanding public reaction."

If it seems strange that the NCPP's Polling Review Board would come down so hard just because Luntz used the word "representative" to describe a focus group, it needs to be understood that the emphasis is well placed -- the real issue should be truth in labeling. The board members would risk appearing to be Luddites if they opposed all of the new forms of research that are emerging. Instead they focus attention on the real question, and that is how polls are identified. The best random telephone surveys offer a standard of reliability that the new research methods often fail to match. But that does not mean that the new methods have no value.

The moment to moment responses to Bush's speech last week may not be rock-solid research, but they do suggest a real problem for the Bush campaign that may play out over the next few weeks. Bush moved the Republicans who found their way to the Speakout.com rating group, but he did not move the Gore supporters or undecideds. Even though I know this research is a flawed, self-selected sample of voters who may not even be telling the truth about their views, I will be interested in seeing whether Gore does a better job of moving undecided voters.

Sophisticated news watchers have learned to discriminate between various types of news reporting in the modern cable and Internet

world. The high standards for journalism in the newspaper and network news days are lowered when a 24-hour cable network is covering a breaking news story as it happens. Even though there have been many recent examples of stories hitting the airwaves only to be subsequently retracted, few would argue that CNN, Fox News and MSNBC should close up shop. News junkies know there is a trade-off between immediacy and reliability in news reporting, and polling junkies (I know you are out there) must know the same is true for survey research.

Allan Rivlin, a NationalJournal.com contributing editor, is a senior vice president of Peter D. Hart Research Associates, a Democratic polling firm. His e-mail address is arivlin@nationaljournal.com.

>From mkshares@mcs.net Thu Aug 17 06:57:14 2000

Received: from uucphost.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA15195 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 06:57:14 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P37-Chi-Dial-1.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.37])
by uucphost.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id IAA28745
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 08:57:10 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)

Message-ID: <399BA8F5.55A7D075@mcs.net>

Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 08:57:25 +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: National Journal Article

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Instant Gratification - Don't Miss A Beat!

By Allan Rivlin

NationalJournal.com Thursday, Aug. 17, 2000

Suddenly -- although unexpectedly -- the world of politics, polling and the analysis press has changed dramatically. We are arguably a year and a half into the race for the White House, but for only the second time in the campaign (the early primary contests was the other) there is actual news that is interesting and important but the enough to affect poll numbers.

By the end of the week. we will have seen the announcement of two vice presidential nominees, and the beginning, middle and spectacular finish of both parties' conventions in the span of just four weeks. The polls are responding to these events and it is natural to want to be up to date, but readers need to be cautioned that the highest standards of survey research are often compromised to feed the news services with instant measures of voters' reactions.

Telephone surveys make it clear that the Republicans went into their vice presidential announcement with a substantial lead and then earned a strong but short-lived bounce from their convention. More recent polls tell us the

Republican bounce was mostly or even completely eroded by the start of the Democratic convention. But these results are already hours if not days old. What if you have a need to know what the public thinks of Al Gore's acceptance speech before you go to bed tonight?

The good news, perhaps, is that this election cycle has seen the introduction of several intriguing new methods for monitoring public reactions to the conventions as they unfold. There are ongoing focus groups, overnight polls, Internet polls and even moment-to-moment evaluations of the major speeches over the Internet.

The bad news is that these methods are far less reliable than traditional polling methods. And because the standards of the survey research profession are compromised (to what extent depends on the method), these approaches could be yielding biased, misleading or even false results.

Using some methods that have been available for years and others that were not even imagined in 1996, the news services are offering an unprecedented array of instant reactions to the evening's proceedings. By jumping to cable television or the Internet, you can see results of focus groups that have been assembled to watch the convention speeches as they are delivered, overnight telephone surveys of randomly selected adults or preselected panels of likely voters; Internet surveys weighted to look like the electorate; or even second-by-second reactions of people rating each line of a speech over the Internet.

The only problem is that, like most other sources of instant gratification, these surveys are in no way substitutes for the more wholesome surveys they are beating to the punch. If you cannot wait three or four days to get the results from a high-quality random telephone survey with repeat call-backs over several nights, then there is nothing wrong with taking a peek at these sorts of instant results -- as long as you keep one thing firmly in mind: They might be dead wrong.

Incredible Or Not Credible?

CNN faced a tough editorial decision last week when the results of an overnight Gallup poll for the cable network and USA Today of 667 registered voters showed Gore pulling within two points of George W. Bush in the four-way trial heat, 43 percent to 45 percent (with Nader at 4 percent and Buchanan getting just 1 percent). The problem is that the poll was taken on one night, Aug. 7, just after Gore announced his selection of Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman as his choice for vice president. The result was hard to swallow because just days earlier the same poll, using different methods, showed a 17-point Bush lead following the Republican convention.

Educated poll readers should be highly suspect of poll results taken in just one evening of calling. Reliable surveys should be in the field for several nights, and several attempts should be made to reach specific respondents even if they are not at home the first time they are called. Overnight polls do not allow repeated call backs so they only survey the people who are home on a particular night. This often biases the results toward older respondents and, more subtly, toward respondents who have fewer things going on in their lives.

In the week that has followed the overnight poll showing Bush with a two-point lead, several other organizations have produced multi-night polls that show Bush holding a lead that varies from the low single digits to the

low double digits. The strange thing is the most recent CNN/Gallup/USA Today poll of 641 likely voters taken August 11 and 12, has Bush's lead back up to 16 points, 55 percent to 39 percent.

Looking at all of the polling that has been done over the past few weeks yields a fairly consistent story: Bush's lead expanded to the high teens following the Republican convention, then slipped to the mid-single digits as the Republican glow faded and the Democrats began to gain momentum with Lieberman's selection. But the story that emerges from the CNN/Gallup/USA Today polling is not believable.

A Rebuke From The Deans Of Statistical Correctness In another polling controversy last week, the Polling Review Board of the National Council on Public Polls, took the unusual step of denouncing Republican pollster, Frank Luntz for his work on MSNBC during the Republican convention. The Board, comprised of Harry O'Neill of Roper Starch Worldwide, Warren Mitofsky of Mitofsky International, and Humphrey Taylor of Harris Interactive, monitors "the conduct and reporting of polls and issue[s] clarifying comment when appropriate." In a statement, the NCPP termed the focus groups and on-line assessment of Bush's acceptance speech that Luntz presented on MSNBC a "two-pronged assault [NBC's] own credibility."

The cardinal sin, according to the board's statement, was Luntz's use of the word "representative" in describing the focus groups results.

"Focus groups are very useful in their place, but they are very easy to misuse. And they are being misused when people put a handful of folk together in a focus group or two, or three, and then suggest that there are representative of something," O'Neill said. "Really, what comes out of a focus group represents only the point of view of those people who are, for whatever reason, in the focus group."

The board also criticized the research conducted over the Internet for MSNBC by Speakout.com although that criticism was somewhat indirect. The statement quotes MSNBC's Erik Sorenson saying, "we'll be able to go directly to the people and find out what they're thinking." The board's response: "If he means a representative sample, we disagree."

Aaron Johnson, speaking for Speakout.com said, "we definitely made it clear that this was not a representative survey. This was for fun," and he pointed to a clear disclaimer to that effect that accompanied the presentation of the results on MSNBC's Web site.

Luntz could not be reached for comment, but he defended his position in an interview with Hotline last week by pointing out that he "never reported percentages" from the focus groups as the Polling Review Board seems to suggest. Luntz added that his focus group findings were corroborated by public opinion polls and that "there were two dozen journalists watching the focus group the entire time. They found the participants to be believable and helpful in understanding public reaction."

If it seems strange that the NCPP's Polling Review Board would come down so hard just because Luntz used the word "representative" to describe a focus group, it needs to be understood that the emphasis is well placed -- the real issue should be truth in labeling. The board members would risk appearing to be Luddites if they opposed all of the new forms of research that are emerging. Instead they focus attention on the real question, and

that is how polls are identified. The best random telephone surveys offer a standard of reliability that the new research methods often fail to match. But that does not mean that the new methods have no value.

The moment to moment responses to Bush's speech last week may not be rock-solid research, but they do suggest a real problem for the Bush campaign that may play out over the next few weeks. Bush moved the Republicans who found their way to the Speakout.com rating group, but he did not move the Gore supporters or undecideds. Even though I know this research is a flawed, self-selected sample of voters who may not even be telling the truth about their views, I will be interested in seeing whether Gore does a better job of moving undecided voters.

Sophisticated news watchers have learned to discriminate between various types of news reporting in the modern cable and Internet world. The high standards for journalism in the newspaper and network news days are lowered when a 24-hour cable network is covering a breaking news story as it happens. Even though there have been many recent examples of stories hitting the airwaves only to be subsequently retracted, few would argue that CNN, Fox News and MSNBC should close up shop. News junkies know there is a trade-off between immediacy and reliability in news reporting, and polling junkies (I know you are out there) must know the same is true for survey research.

Allan Rivlin, a NationalJournal.com contributing editor, is a senior vice president of Peter D. Hart Research Associates, a Democratic polling firm. His e-mail address is arivlin@nationaljournal.com.

>From mark@bisconti.com Thu Aug 17 08:08:13 2000
Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA12391 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 08:08:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mark (dialup-209.244.230.64.Washington1.Level3.net
[209.244.230.64]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2650.21)
id Q8FQSRQ4; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:08:01 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: resource
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:05:59 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEGDCKAA.mark@bisconti.com>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

FYI-The Coalition Against Unsolicited Commercial E-mail is at
<http://www.cauce.org/>

Mark Richards

>From nancybelden@brspoll.com Thu Aug 17 08:14:18 2000
Received: from www.dbls.com ([209.8.216.50])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA15634 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 08:14:12 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by www.dbls.com from localhost
(router,SLMail V3.2); Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:06:33 -0400
Received: from nancy [209.9.139.93]
by www.dbls.com [209.8.216.50] (SLmail 3.2.3113) with SMTP
id F098C1C0739411D49BEF00104B0F537B
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:06:32 -0400
From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>
To: "aapornet" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: job opening
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:17:42 -0400
Message-ID: <NEBBIDL GALNEGBHACIMHKEECCEAA.nancybelden@brspoll.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
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 V5.00.2314.1300
X-SLUIDL: 6EC6A4DC-739411D4-9BEF0010-4B0F537B

Job Opening
Research analyst
Belden Russonello & Stewart

BRS is a very busy, small public opinion research firm based in Washington, DC. Our clients are largely non-profits and foundations supporting work in social causes and Democratic candidates. We are seeking applicants immediately for a new analyst position. Because we produce a lot of work with a few people, we are open to considering people with a variety of skills; however, applicants should know survey research especially data tabulation.

Applicants should have be able to contribute to some or all of the following areas:

1. Survey research: contributing to questionnaire design, especially questionnaire readiness for field work; pre-testing and monitoring interviewing (that is contracted out to telephone field firms); downloading CATI data from the field; determining needed weights and applying weighting; producing marginals and cross tabs; statistical testing; interfacing with the sample suppliers; summarizing methods; writing analysis.
2. Focus group research: observing and contributing to analysis and report writing; pulling quotes from transcripts; summarizing material from groups.
3. Generally: web searches, secondary analysis, contact with suppliers, etc.

Applicants should be interested in opinion research for the long haul, be a friendly team player and flexible, and have a good eye for detail.

Please email ASAP to Nancy Belden.

nancybelden@brspoll.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Aug 17 11:42:07 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA01106 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:42:06 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA21741 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:42:05 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 11:42:05 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Lester (AP): Gore Gets No 'Bounce' in Polls
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008171131070.19616-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(C) Copyright 2000 The Washington Post

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/
aponline/20000816/aponline190120_000.htm](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/aponline/20000816/aponline190120_000.htm)

(C) Copyright 2000 The Associated Press

By Will Lester
Associated Press Writer
Wednesday, Aug. 16, 2000; 7:01 p.m. EDT

LOS ANGELES -- The Democrats' decision to dedicate a night early in their national convention to shore up support within their party may delay any "bounce" of support Al Gore may get, a tracking poll suggests.

Republican George W. Bush led Democrat Gore in the presidential race by 11 points, 48 percent to 37 percent, in the Voter.com-Battleground tracking poll released Wednesday. Bush led Gore by 9 points Tuesday, so the race was essentially unchanged given the poll's 3 percentage point error margin.

Bush had a 21-point lead among independent voters in the poll of 1,000 likely voters taken Monday and Tuesday. Gore will have to target those swing voters now.

Bush saw a steady gain in the tracking poll through the week of his

Republican National Convention, which was aimed at moderates and independents. And he got a bounce of 10 points, finishing the week 18 points ahead of Gore in the presidential race. That lead had been trimmed to 9 points by the start of the Democratic convention.

Bush's strong support among Republicans, more than nine in 10, freed him to spend his convention week targeting moderates and independents. Democrats have been struggling to fire up their base voters, though polls indicate they are doing better and now have support from more than eight of 10.

After hearing from President Clinton on Monday, they heard speeches the next night by Democrats representing an earlier -- and more liberal -- Democratic Party. Sen. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, the Rev. Jesse Jackson, abortion rights advocates and a gay rights spokeswoman were among the speakers.

Gore saw a 10-point drop in the tracking poll Wednesday among conservative Democrats.

"They assumed they needed to solidify their liberal base," Republican pollster Ed Goetas said of the Democrats. "They drove away conservative Democrats."

Democratic pollster Celinda Lake didn't think her party made a strategic mistake by devoting a night of the convention to solidifying the party's base. But she conceded it may take time to see any poll bounce from this convention.

"True independents will be very hard to move until they see Al Gore," she said. "A lot of the bounce for Democrats will come at the end of the convention ... and may not show up until early next week."

(C) Copyright 2000 The Associated Press

(C) Copyright 2000 The Washington Post

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Thu Aug 17 12:46:27 2000
Received: from spdmraab.compuserve.com (ds-img-rel-2.compuserve.com [149.174.206.155])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA22009 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 12:46:22 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
by spdmraab.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-REL-1.3) id PAA09040
for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:45:45 -0400 (EDT)
Sender: mitofsky@mindspring.com
Received: from x.mindspring.com (mid-qbu-nqi-vty17.as.wcom.net

[216.192.101.17])

by spdmraab.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-REL-1.3) with ESMTTP id PAA09018

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:45:41 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000817154333.00bafd90@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2

Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:44:13 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: One night polls-NCPP statement

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="=====_748814==_ .ALT"

=====_748814==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

August 14, 2000

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

A statement by the National Council on Public Polls' Polling Review Board

ERRORS ASSOCIATED WITH "INSTANT" AND OVERNIGHT POLLS

One issue where news values and good polling methods clash is the media's appetite for "instant" polls which provide an immediate reaction to dramatic events such as the recent announcement of vice-presidential candidates, or the impact of presidential debates.

A key question for poll watchers, and the media who report polls, should always be "How many days was the survey in the field?" In general, the quality of a sample improves the longer the survey is in the field. Surveys conducted on one evening, or even over two days, have more sampling biases due to non-response and non-availability than surveys which are in the field for three, four or five days.

All surveys fail to interview many people who are not available when the survey is conducted, because they are on vacation, on a business trip, visiting, shopping, eating out or just too busy to take the call. That is why the most reliable telephone surveys make three, four or more calls, on different days, to try to complete an interview. Obviously this is not possible for polls which are conducted overnight or over a few hours, and their response rates are generally much lower.

Given the very real possibility that those who are not interviewed, because they are not available, have even slightly different opinions than those who are interviewed, overnight polls, with their very low response rates, are much more likely to have substantial biases than polls with multiple call-backs over several days.

Furthermore, because more people are at home on weekends, surveys that include both weekend and weekday interviewing are better than those that are only conducted on weekdays.

All reports of instant and overnight polls should mention the likelihood of increased errors because of their much lower response rates.

Also, bear in mind that percentages from one night polls for such things as presidential preference, or approval, or other characteristics cannot be compared to percentages from longer polls. The one night polls only represent the people at home that night. Furthermore, the reaction of those at home to a debate or a speech or some other event may only be meaningful for those who watched the event. Longer polls more nearly represent all people age 18 and over. Therefore, measurement of change in a characteristic or preference should be avoided.

For more information about this and other polling issues contact the NCPP Polling Review Board members:

Chairman: Harry O'Neill, Roper Starch Worldwide	609-921-3333
Warren Mitofsky, Mitofsky International	212-980-3031
Humphrey Taylor, Harris Interactive	212-539-9657
Warren Mitofsky	
Mitofsky International	
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor	
New York, NY 10022	

212 980-3031

212 980-3107 FAX

-----_748814==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

<div align="right">

August 14, 2000

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

</div>

A statement by the National Council on Public Polls' Polling Review Board

 <div align="center"> ERRORS ASSOCIATED WITH "INSTANT" AND OVERNIGHT POLLS

 </div> One issue where news values and good polling methods clash is the media's appetite for "instant" polls which provide an immediate reaction to dramatic events such as the recent announcement of vice-presidential candidates, or the impact of presidential debates.

 A key question for poll watchers, and the media who report polls, should always be <i>"How many days was the survey in the field?"</i> In general, the quality of a sample improves the longer the survey is in the field. Surveys conducted on one evening, or even over two days, have more sampling biases due to non-response and non-availability than surveys which are in the field for three, four or five days.

 All surveys fail to interview many people who are not available when the survey is conducted, because they are on vacation, on a business trip, visiting, shopping, eating out or just too busy to take the call. That is why the most reliable telephone surveys make three, four or more calls, on different days, to try to complete an interview. Obviously this is not possible for polls which are conducted overnight or over a few hours, and their response rates are generally much lower.

To: AAPOR net <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-version: 1.0
X-Priority: 3
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Message-Id: <E13PW9C-0003ci-00@smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net>

This is a question that the pollsters among us might pursue.
I haven't heard this theory raised yet, but I don't spend any time watching the nearly constant coverage but... It occurred to me that while very few people would change their votes based on the vice president nominee. But it could have an impact on voter turnout for those interested. If Jewish Democrats increased their turnout because of Lieberman, the big winner could be Hillary Clinton. Has anyone looked at this?

>From RobertH877@aol.com Thu Aug 17 14:02:06 2000
Received: from imo-d01.mx.aol.com (imo-d01.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.33])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA10621 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 14:01:50 -0700
(PDT)

From: RobertH877@aol.com
Message-Id: <200008172101.OAA10621@usc.edu>

Received: from RobertH877@aol.com
by imo-d01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.e6.9ba57be (15888)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 17:01:14 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from web29.aolmail.aol.com (web29.aolmail.aol.com
[205.188.222.5]) by air-id08.mx.aol.com (v75_b3.11) with ESMTP; Thu, 17 Aug
2000 17:01:14 -0400
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 17:01:14 EDT
Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Unknown

Increased Lieberman turnout could also carry NY, CA and Florida. How about Illinois?

>From SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Thu Aug 17 15:22:58 2000
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id PAA07966 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:22:58 -0700
(PDT)

Received: by UConnVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
8554 ; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 18:22:43 EDT

Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UConnVM) by
UConnVM.UConn.EDU (LMail V1.2d/1.8d) with BSMTP id 1414; Thu, 17 Aug 2000
18:22:43 -0400

Date: Thu, 17 Aug 00 18:19:43 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
In-Reply-To: <E13PW9C-0003ci-00@smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <000817.182243.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

It is a good idea to consider "spillover effects". However, if there is a differential impact on turnout based on Lieberman's candidacy, much depends on the balance between those pulled out by support and those pulled out by opposition. Specifically, in the case of Jewish voters in New York, it might depend on WHICH Jewish voters. Hillary Rodham Clinton's record is not unabashedly pro-Israeli, many would call her much more sympathetic to the Palestinian cause than most American politicians, and I recall that several months ago, when she was on her "listening tour" and came out in favor of Jerusalem as the "eternal, undivided capital of the state of Israel", this was met by outrage by those who felt she had betrayed her earlier stance, and some disbelief by those on the Israeli side since it seemed so opportunistic to them.

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Thu Aug 17 15:31:25 2000

Received: from mail01-lax.pilot.net (mail-lax-1.pilot.net [205.139.40.18])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA14370 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:31:25 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-150.latimes.com
[204.48.23.150]) by mail01-lax.pilot.net with ESMTTP id PAA16862 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:31:25 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from pegasus.latimes.com (localhost [127.0.0.1])
by mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id PAA21661
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:31:24 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from vireo.latimes.com (vireo.latimes.com [172.24.18.37])
by pegasus.latimes.com (Pro-8.9.3/Pro-8.9.3) with ESMTTP id PAA25841
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:31:24 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by vireo.latimes.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <RDC5V1KR>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:31:23 -0700

Message-ID: <5520FFE1207ED211AC8300805FEA2FF6B56E0E@dove.latimes.com>

From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:31:23 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain

It would be interesting to see in a NY poll the same voters who will vote for Gore and Hillary and what percentage are Jewish. And then look at the demos of the Jews who are going to vote for Gore and not for Hillary and vice versa and what the demos look like for the Jewish voters who are voting for both candidates.

Susan

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Don Ferree [SMTP:SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu]

> Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 3:20 PM

> To: Members of AAPORNET

> Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

>

> It is a good idea to consider "spillover effects". However, if there
> is a differential impact on turnout based on Lieberman's candidacy,
> much depends on the balance between those pulled out by support and
> those pulled out by opposition. Specifically, in the case of Jewish
> voters in New York, it might depend on WHICH Jewish voters. Hillary

>Rodham Clinton's record is not unabashedly pro-Israeli, many would call
>her much more sympathetic to the Palestinian cause than most American
>politicians, and I recall that several months ago, when she was on her
>"listening tour" and came out in favor of Jerusalem as the "eternal,
>undivided capital of the state of Israel", this was met by outrage by
>those who felt she had betrayed her earlier stance, and some disbelief
>by those on the Israeli side since it seemed so opportunistic to them.
>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Thu Aug 17 15:33:10 2000

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA15779 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:33:10 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from default (mxusw5x217.chesco.com [209.195.228.217])
by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id e7HMX3w22262
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 18:33:04 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <006401c0089a\$2bc8200\$d9e4c3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Low Response Rates

Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 18:31:53 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

Statements made by the NCPP (National Council on Public Polls) imply that certain types of surveys have characteristically low response rates which negatively affect their validity.

For example, from the recent release on "Instant and Overnight Polls:"

"...overnight polls, with their very low response rates, are much more likely to have substantial biases than polls with multiple call-backs over several days" and

"All reports of instant and overnight polls should mention the likelihood of increased errors because of their much lower response rates."

>From "20 Questions a Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results:"

"... mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more people fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect."

Since we are being told to ignore (or discount) results from surveys with inadequate response rates, this raises the question of what is an acceptable response rate . It seems to me that NCPP should not make statements like the above without addressing that issue. You can't have it both ways -- can you?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Aug 17 15:47:32 2000
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA25012 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:47:30 -0700
(PDT)
From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu
Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
id <QL6ZGHVD>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:47:30 -0700
Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A21302A379FA@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:47:29 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
Content-Type: text/plain

If you are going to start doing detailed analyses among Jewish voters, then you better make sure you ask if they describe themselves as conservative, orthodox, or reform. The fact that Lieberman is orthodox might (I say MIGHT) have a differential impact on Jewish respondents, one that probably does not arise with non-Jewish respondents.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

-----Original Message-----

From: Pinkus, Susan [SMTP: Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 3:31 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

It would be interesting to see in a NY poll the same voters who will vote for Gore and Hillary and what percentage are Jewish. And then look at the demos of the Jews who are going to vote for Gore and not for Hillary and vice versa and what the demos look like for the Jewish voters who are voting for both candidates.

Susan

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Don Ferree [SMTP:SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu]
> Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 3:20 PM
> To: Members of AAPORNET
> Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
>
> It is a good idea to consider "spillover effects". However, if

there

> is a differential impact on turnout based on Lieberman's candidacy,
> much depends on the balance between those pulled out by support and
> those pulled out by opposition. Specifically, in the case of Jewish
> voters in New York, it might depend on WHICH Jewish voters. Hillary
> Rodham Clinton's record is not unabashedly pro-Israeli, many would
> call her much more sympathetic to the Palestinian cause than most
> American politicians, and I recall that several months ago, when
> she was on her "listening tour" and came out in favor of Jerusalem
> as the "eternal, undivided capital of the state of Israel", this
> was met by outrage by those who felt she had betrayed her earlier
> stance, and some disbelief by those on the Israeli side since it
> seemed so opportunistic to them.

>From arobbin@indiana.edu Thu Aug 17 15:57:45 2000
Received: from fins.uits.indiana.edu (fins.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.6.185])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA00860 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 15:57:44 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from ariel.ucs.indiana.edu (arobbin@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu
[129.79.5.209])

by fins.uits.indiana.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/IUPO) with ESMTP id
e7HMvda00450
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 17:57:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)
by ariel.ucs.indiana.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/1.2ariel-imap4) with SMTP id
RAA15345

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 17:57:38 -0500 (EST)

Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 17:57:38 -0500 (EST)

From: Alice Robbin <arobbin@indiana.edu>

X-Sender: arobbin@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

In-Reply-To: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A21302A379FA@psg.ucsf.edu>

Message-ID:

<Pine.GSO.3.96.1000817175305.12139E-100000@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I agree that this is quite important. The differences are rather
significant and account for cleavages in the Jewish community. In addition,
recency of arrival, national origin, and the type of orthodoxy subscribed to
also account for differences. All "orthodox" are not the same... Andy
Beveridge, our resident expert on NYC, can no doubt discourse on this.

Alice Robbin
Indiana University

On Thu, 17 Aug 2000 LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu wrote:

> If you are going to start doing detailed analyses among Jewish voters,
> then you better make sure you ask if they describe themselves as
> conservative, orthodox, or reform.

>

> Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.

> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)

> University of California, San Francisco

> lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

>

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Thu Aug 17 16:16:53 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id QAA11566 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 16:16:53 -0700
(PDT)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscntl.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA31708
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 16:16:51 -0700
Message-Id: <200008172316.QAA31708@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 16:18:27 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Low Response Rates
In-reply-to: <006401c0089a\$f2bc8200\$d9e4c3d1@default>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

It's not about low response rates. It's about biases induced by obvious lifestyle differences between respondents and non-respondents to overnight polling. I see nothing misleading or erroneous in the NCPP statement; and the press and spin doctors need to be reminded of the dangers inherent in playing fast and loose with sampling.

Of course, what we are really talking about here is the entertainment value of polling. Polls that take days to complete provide information on population reactions to issues that often have gone stale. We can have less confidence in polls that are completed overnight, but the information they supply is fresh and likely to be topical. Add to that the inevitable competitive pressures in the news environment and you have instant polls. Junk science, junk facts -- who cares, the issues and parties will all be different the day after tomorrow anyway. In the meantime, we've all had something to spin.

Along these lines, I find the "audience meter" stuff Luntz is doing extremely interesting and a thousand times more disturbing than overnight polling. It's much more entertaining than numbers and percentages and so it plays a lot better on TV -- but what it tells you about voters and future voting behavior is highly questionable. Moreover, I'll bet its potential for manipulating public opinion is much greater than conventional polling.

While the technical criticisms that we in AAPOPR level at unconventional polling practices are clearly valid and on point, I fear they are largely irrelevant in a business focused on the entertainment value of the information.

Date sent: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 18:31:53 -0400
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Low Response Rates

Statements made by the NCPP (National Council on Public Polls) imply that certain types of surveys have characteristically low response rates which negatively affect their validity.

For example, from the recent release on "Instant and Overnight Polls:"

"...overnight polls, with their very low response rates, are much more likely to have substantial biases than polls with multiple call-backs over several days" and

"All reports of instant and overnight polls should mention the likelihood of increased errors because of their much lower response rates."

>From "20 Questions a Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results:"

"... mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more people fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect."

Since we are being told to ignore (or discount) results from surveys with inadequate response rates, this raises the question of what is an acceptable response rate . It seems to me that NCPP should not make statements like the above without addressing that issue. You can't have it both ways -- can you?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From ghroberts@worldnet.att.net Thu Aug 17 18:35:10 2000
Received: from mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.48])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA22472 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Aug 2000 18:35:09 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from hewlett-packard ([12.75.137.173])
by mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net
(InterMail vM.4.01.02.39 201-229-119-122) with ESMTTP
id
<20000818013437.URVP17157.mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 01:34:37 +0000
From: "Glenn H. Roberts" <ghroberts@worldnet.att.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Low Response Rates
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 20:34:14 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Message-Id:
<20000818013437.URVP17157.mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>

I suggest you read Rich Morin's August 16th "Telling polls Apart " in the Washington Post which was posted on AAPORNET. This will provide a few hints of the dangers of "overnight polls" as related to election polling.

And it's not just low response rates and hardly an "entertainment factor". If serious election polls are regarded for their "entertainment" by professional researchers, then we have real problems!

The election Focus Groups and "Overnight Polls" are equally unfair in giving the public a true measure of the electorate.

Glenn Roberts

Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net
>From JJanota@asha.org Fri Aug 18 07:02:48 2000
Received: from asha.org (external.asha.org [12.17.9.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id HAA15010 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 07:02:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ASHA-Message_Server by asha.org
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:59:27 -0400
Message-Id: <s99d08ff.049@asha.org>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:59:18 -0400
From: "Jeanette Janota" <JJanota@asha.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: DGammel@Asha.org, ELewis@asha.org, MGuerrieri@asha.org,
RMullen@asha.org,
SSlater@asha.ORG
Subject: SPSS software
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 HAA15013

Do any of you aapornet-ers have experience with an SPSS product called "Smart Viewer" (for Web or Windows). It's advertised by them as an "integral part of a complete report OLAP (Online Analytical Processing) solution" which "instantly delivers dynamic reports via the web cost effectively."

We've passed on some of their other products after closer scrutiny (beyond their promo brochures) revealed important shortcomings. It would be useful to know if anyone has used this product.

Thanks,

Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Survey Research Activities
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
10801 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852
Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175
Fax: 301-897-7358
Email: jjanota@asha.org
ASHA website: www.asha.org

>From charissa.mettler@wright.edu Fri Aug 18 07:30:32 2000
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA23823 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 07:30:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V5.2-33
#39224)
id <0FZH00001SAXVJ@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri,
18 Aug 2000 10:30:33 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from wright.edu (all131044.wright.edu [130.108.131.44])
by mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V5.2-33 #39224)
with ESMTP id <0FZH00KNBSAWIU@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Fri,
18 Aug 2000 10:30:33 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 10:30:14 -0400
From: Charissa Mettler <charissa.mettler@wright.edu>
Subject: A couple of survey questions
To: AAPOR <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <399D4875.D54391FD@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD (Win98; U)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en

I have a couple of questions pertaining to commonly asked survey questions.

1. What are the pros/cons of using a 4 point satisfaction scale (i.e., very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied) versus using a 5 point scale (i.e., very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied). We know the obvious (i.e., a 4 point forces a person to choose one side or the other, while a 5 point gives the person to stay in the middle), but is there literature supporting one way or another?

2. In the demographic question regarding income, how do researchers address earned versus unearned income? Does

anyone ask a separate question for unearned income?

Thanks for your help,

Charissa Brannon
Research Associate
Center for Urban and Public Affaris
Wright State University

>From hfienberg@stats.org Fri Aug 18 07:31:46 2000
Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net
[207.172.4.60])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA24484 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 07:31:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from 207-172-36-121.s121.tnt6.ann.va.dialup.rcn.com
([207.172.36.121] helo=howard)
by smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net with smtp (Exim 3.15 #2)
id 13PnBN-0000no-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 10:31:41 -0400
Reply-To: <hfienberg@stats.org>
From: "Howard Fienberg" <hfienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 10:28:35 -0400
Message-ID: <000601c00921\$0f2aae40\$7924accf@howard>
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
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
In-Reply-To: <E13PW9C-0003ci-00@smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net>

If I am not mistaken, Jews do not have much of a voter turnout problem. And a majority of us are solid Democratic voters anyhow, no matter the denomination. I can't imagine it will have more than the tiniest effect on Hillary's bid for office.

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
Kathleen & Ward Rakestraw Kay
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 4:24 PM
To: AAPOR net
Subject: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

This is a question that the pollsters among us might pursue.
I haven't heard this theory raised yet, but I don't spend any time watching
the nearly constant coverage but...
It occurred to me that while very few people would change their votes based

on the vice president nominee. But it could have an impact on voter turnout for those interested. If Jewish Democrats increased their turnout because of Lieberman, the big winner could be Hillary Clinton. Has anyone looked at this?

>From arobbin@indiana.edu Fri Aug 18 07:42:29 2000
Received: from fins.uits.indiana.edu (fins.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.6.185])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA29602 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 07:42:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ariel.uics.indiana.edu (aroBBin@ariel.uics.indiana.edu
[129.79.5.209])
by fins.uits.indiana.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/IUPO) with ESMTP id
e7IEgT906956
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:42:29 -0500 (EST)
Received: from localhost (aroBBin@localhost)
by ariel.uics.indiana.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/1.2ariel-imap4) with SMTP id
JAA02510
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:42:28 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:42:28 -0500 (EST)
From: Alice Robbin <aroBBin@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: aroBBin@ariel.uics.indiana.edu
To: AAPOR <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: A couple of survey questions
In-Reply-To: <399D4875.D54391FD@wright.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.GSO.3.96.1000818093613.29563A-100000@ariel.uics.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The "Survey of Income and Program Participation" asks very detailed income questions. (go to www.census.gov/)

There is a Census Bureau report that I use in teaching:
available at: <http://www.census.gov/srd/www/byyear.html>

"How Do People Answer Income Questions?" by
Laureen H. Moyer, Naomi E. Fansler, Meredith A. Lee, and Dawn VonThurn
(SM97/03)

"People do not always answer questions regarding their household's income the way the question designer expected them to. During 45 cognitive interviews conducted in the laboratory over the telephone, income and other household and demographic data were obtained from respondents..."

CITATION: 1997, Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.

A very informative analysis

On Fri, 18 Aug 2000, Charissa Mettler wrote:

>
> 2. In the demographic question regarding income, how do
> researchers address earned versus unearned income? Does
> anyone ask a separate question for unearned income?

>
> Thanks for your help,
>
>
> Charissa Brannon
> Research Associate
> Center for Urban and Public Affaris
> Wright State University
>
>

School of Library and Information Science
Indiana University
005A Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-2018 Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.edu

>From mkshares@mcs.net Fri Aug 18 07:52:51 2000
Received: from uucphost.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA04482 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 07:52:50 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P57-Chi-Dial-4.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.249])
by uucphost.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id JAA28077
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:52:50 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <399D0780.37B1DBC@mcs.net>
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:53:14 +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
CC: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
References: <000601c00921\$0f2aae40\$7924accf@howard>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What I thought was interesting about the choice of Lieberman was this. First of all, the Gore campaign dismissed possible anti-Semitism by saying that anti-Semites wouldn't vote for him anyway.

Which leads to the question: In which states would a Jewish candidate enjoy broad-based support?

How about states which have elected (and re-elected in most cases) Jews to Senate seats? They are: CA, OR, MN, WI, MI, OH, PA, NY, NJ, and CT. (Both Senators are Jewish in CA and WI. Ohio included here because Metzenbaum did serve three terms until his retirement in 1994.)

Most of these are the must win or swing/battleground states for Gore.

I realize that a Veep may not be the same as a Senator if there are any reservations about religion, but, this is still an interesting choice given Gore's target states.

Howard Fienberg wrote:

> If I am not mistaken, Jews do not have much of a voter turnout problem.
And
> a majority of us are solid Democratic voters anyhow, no matter the
> denomination. I can't imagine it will have more than the tiniest effect on
> Hillary's bid for office.
>
> Cheers,
> Howard Fienberg
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
> Kathleen & Ward Rakestraw Kay
> Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 4:24 PM
> To: AAPOR net
> Subject: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
>
> This is a question that the pollsters among us might pursue.
> I haven't heard this theory raised yet, but I don't spend any time
watching
> the nearly constant coverage but...
> It occurred to me that while very few people would change their votes
based
> on the vice president nominee. But it could have an impact on voter
turnout
> for those interested. If Jewish Democrats increased their turnout because
> of Lieberman, the big winner could be Hillary Clinton.
> Has anyone looked at this?

>From Vijay_Talluri@gallup.com Fri Aug 18 08:01:32 2000
Received: from fwdmz.gallup.com ([205.219.140.49])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA08096 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 08:01:32 -0700
(PDT)
From: Vijay_Talluri@gallup.com
Received: from exchn7.gallup.com (exchn7.gallup.com [198.175.140.71])
by fwdmz.gallup.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id KAA21580;
Fri, 18 Aug 2000 10:01:46 -0500 (CDT)
Received: by exchn7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <RBF1Q9HP>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:57:46 -0500
Message-ID: <F8F7E0FCE110D4119765009027A36AFF860E8E@exchn7.gallup.com>
To: mkshares@mcs.net, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:57:45 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Other states that have elected Jewish senators are NH (Warren Rudman), Maine

(Mike Cohen) and Delaware (I assume Sen. Roth is Jewish?).

- Vijay Talluri.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mkshares@mcs.net]
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2000 5:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

What I thought was interesting about the choice of Lieberman was this. First of all, the Gore campaign dismissed possible anti-Semitism by saying that anti-Semites wouldn't vote for him anyway.

Which leads to the question: In which states would a Jewish candidate enjoy broad-based support?

How about states which have elected (and re-elected in most cases) Jews to Senate seats? They are: CA, OR, MN, WI, MI, OH, PA, NY, NJ, and CT. (Both Senators are Jewish in CA and WI. Ohio included here because Metzenbaum did serve three terms until his retirement in 1994.)

Most of these are the must win or swing/battleground states for Gore.

I realize that a Veep may not be the same as a Senator if there are any reservations about religion, but, this is still an interesting choice given Gore's target states.

Howard Fienberg wrote:

> If I am not mistaken, Jews do not have much of a voter turnout problem.
> And
> a majority of us are solid Democratic voters anyhow, no matter the
> denomination. I can't imagine it will have more than the tiniest effect on
> Hillary's bid for office.

>
> Cheers,
> Howard Fienberg

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
> Kathleen & Ward Rakestraw Kay
> Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 4:24 PM
> To: AAPOR net
> Subject: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination

>
> This is a question that the pollsters among us might pursue.
> I haven't heard this theory raised yet, but I don't spend any time
watching
> the nearly constant coverage but...
> It occurred to me that while very few people would change their votes
based
> on the vice president nominee. But it could have an impact on voter
turnout

> for those interested. If Jewish Democrats increased their turnout because
> of Lieberman, the big winner could be Hillary Clinton.
> Has anyone looked at this?

>From SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Fri Aug 18 08:04:23 2000
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id IAA09397 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 08:04:22 -0700
(PDT)

Received: by UConnVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
4504 ; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 11:04:09 EDT

Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UConnVM) by
UConnVM.UConn.EDU (LMail V1.2d/1.8d) with BSMTMP id 9775; Fri, 18 Aug 2000
11:04:09 -0400

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 00 10:59:24 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <399D0780.37B1DBC@mcs.net>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <000818.110409.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

On Fri, 18 Aug 2000 09:53:14 +0000 Nick Panagaikis said

>
>How about states which have elected (and re-elected in most cases) Jews to
>Senate seats? They are: CA, OR, MN, WI, MI, OH, PA, NY, NJ, and CT. (Both
>Senators are Jewish in CA and WI. Ohio included here because Metzenbaum did
>serve three terms until his retirement in 1994.)

>
A quick political point. Possibly at least as relevant to willingness to
vote for a Jewish candidate for President or Vice-President would be
Governor, also an executive position and one where the incumbent is not
merely one of a broader body (e.g. a legislator). Connecticut, for
example, elected Abraham Ribicoff (also later a Senator, and HEW Secretary
for JFK) in the 1950s.

>From mkshares@mcs.net Fri Aug 18 08:13:10 2000
Received: from uucphost.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
id IAA13644 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 08:13:09 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P57-Chi-Dial-4.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.249])
by uucphost.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id KAA31525
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 10:13:04 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)

Message-ID: <399D0C3C.A8D82A6C@mcs.net>
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 10:13:27 +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: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
References: <F8F7E0FCE110D4119765009027A36AFF860E8E@exchng7.gallup.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

According to my set of past Political Almanacs, *William* Cohen was/is Unitarian and William Roth (like Barry Goldwater) is Episcopalian.

Incidentally, a quick check shows that the 10 states I listed add to 200 electoral votes (270 needed to win.)

Vijay_Talluri@gallup.com wrote:

> Other states that have elected Jewish senators are NH (Warren Rudman),
Maine
> (Mike Cohen) and Delaware (I assume Sen. Roth is Jewish?).
>
> - Vijay Talluri.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mkshares@mcs.net]
> Sent: Friday, August 18, 2000 5:53 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
>
> What I thought was interesting about the choice of Lieberman was this.
First
> of
> all, the Gore campaign dismissed possible anti-Semitism by saying that
> anti-Semites wouldn't vote for him anyway.
>
> Which leads to the question: In which states would a Jewish candidate
enjoy
> broad-based support?
>
> How about states which have elected (and re-elected in most cases) Jews to
> Senate seats? They are: CA, OR, MN, WI, MI, OH, PA, NY, NJ, and CT. (Both
> Senators are Jewish in CA and WI. Ohio included here because Metzenbaum
did
> serve three terms until his retirement in 1994.)
>
> Most of these are the must win or swing/battleground states for Gore.
>
> I realize that a Veep may not be the same as a Senator if there are any
> reservations about religion, but, this is still an interesting choice
given
> Gore's target states.
>
> Howard Fienberg wrote:
>
> > If I am not mistaken, Jews do not have much of a voter turnout problem.
> And
> > a majority of us are solid Democratic voters anyhow, no matter the
> > denomination. I can't imagine it will have more than the tiniest effect
on
> > Hillary's bid for office.
> >
> > Cheers,

> > Howard Fienberg
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
> > Kathleen & Ward Rakestraw Kay
> > Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2000 4:24 PM
> > To: AAPOR net
> > Subject: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
> >
> > This is a question that the pollsters among us might pursue.
> > I haven't heard this theory raised yet, but I don't spend any time
> watching
> > the nearly constant coverage but...
> > It occurred to me that while very few people would change their votes
> based
> > on the vice president nominee. But it could have an impact on voter
> turnout
> > for those interested. If Jewish Democrats increased their turnout
because
> > of Lieberman, the big winner could be Hillary Clinton.
> > Has anyone looked at this?

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Aug 18 08:40:32 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA25635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 08:40:32 -0700
(PDT)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscntl.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA11229
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 08:40:33 -0700
Message-Id: <200008181540.IAA11229@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 08:42:05 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Low Response Rates
In-reply-to:
<20000818013437.URVP17157.mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net@hewlett-packard>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

The point is overnight telephone polls and focus groups are not serious election polls -- they are entertainment. The media is full of junk science stories about crop circles, UFOs, Big Foot and ghosts -- just to name just a few obvious examples. Do you think these programs are designed to educate the public?

Now you might want to argue that there ought to be a higher standard in effect when the information can influence voting behavior. That's going to be a tough sell to the Supreme Court.

Date sent: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 20:34:14 -0500
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Glenn H. Roberts" <ghroberts@worldnet.att.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Low Response Rates

I suggest you read Rich Morin's August 16th "Telling polls Apart " in the Washington Post which was posted on AAPORNET. This will provide a few hints of the dangers of "overnight polls" as related to election polling.

And it's not just low response rates and hardly an "entertainment factor". If serious election polls are regarded for their "entertainment" by professional researchers, then we have real problems!

The election Focus Groups and "Overnight Polls" are equally unfair in giving the public a true measure of the electorate.

Glenn Roberts

Glenn Roberts; 6519 Washington Ave.; Des Moines, IA 50322-5939
515-276-7002 Fax: 515-276-0014 E-Mail: ghroberts@worldnet.att.net

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From hfienberg@stats.org Fri Aug 18 11:33:41 2000
Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net [207.172.4.60])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA11572 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 11:33:40 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from 207-172-36-121.s121.tnt6.ann.va.dialup.rcn.com ([207.172.36.121] helo=howard)
by smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net with smtp (Exim 3.15 #2)
id 13PqxX-0004e1-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 14:33:40 -0400

Reply-To: <hfienberg@stats.org>
From: "Howard Fienberg" <hfienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: revenge of the instant polls
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 14:30:50 -0400
Message-ID: <002901c00942\$dc7ac9e0\$7924accf@howard>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Go figure, like Quaker Oats on a cold morning. Nothing like an instant poll to start the day?

LA CROSSE, Wis., Aug. 18 - Less than nine hours after accepting the Democratic nomination with a populist call to arms, Vice President Al Gore hit the campaign trail again Friday, arriving in Wisconsin with running mate Sen. Joseph Lieberman for the start of a four-day tour down the Mississippi River. An overnight NBC News poll showed Gore benefiting from a "convention bounce," picking up 5 percentage points - enough to show a nominal lead but statistically still in a dead heat with rival George W. Bush.

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/444994.asp>

FORTY-SIX PERCENT of the 506 registered voters surveyed said they favored Gore at this point in the race, compared with 43 percent backing Bush. Since the poll had a margin of error of 4.4 percent, that puts the two candidates essentially even.

Pollster Peter Hart cautioned that the nature of the instant survey, conducted Thursday night for NBC News by himself and Robert Teeter, means it might overrepresent some groups, but said it nevertheless showed Gore receiving the same kind of convention bounce that Bush did in a similar NBC News poll conducted immediately after the Republican convention. In that survey, 44 percent backed Bush, 41 percent favored Gore.

Tim Russert, NBC News' chief political correspondent, said the neck-and-neck race means both Gore and Bush know they have to go after voters in a few key states, particularly in the Midwest.

Hart noted that Gore's improvement came by picking up more support from independents and even Democrats, some of whom had earlier given their support to Green Party candidate Ralph Nader.

Those surveyed were also asked to compare Bush and Gore on personal qualities, and Gore made gains here as well.

Best ideas for the future: Gore was behind Bush by 9 points in the pre-convention poll, and is now ahead

by 2.

Trustworthiness: Gore was behind by 6 points, and

is

now up by 3.

Hart said, but

Leadership: This is still a problem for Gore,

points

the margin for Bush over Gore has been cut from 17

own man

to 7.

On how well Gore portrayed himself as his

night

- a point made in his acceptance speech Thursday

said

- views didn't appear to change. In both the pre-convention and post-convention poll, 69 percent

percent

Gore had shown he is his own man.

In terms of how voters feel about Gore, 50

positive"

said they had "very positive" or "somewhat

in the

feelings about him, 8 percentage points more than

pre-convention poll. Bush came in at 53 percent, 2

percentage points more than a week earlier.

+++++

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service
2100 L. St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037

hfienberg@stats.org
http://www.stats.org

(202) 223-3193
FAX: 872-4014

ICQ#: 38550600

The Statistical Assessment Service is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to improving public understanding of scientific and social research.

+++++

>From abider@american.edu Fri Aug 18 11:59:27 2000
Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id LAA03387 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 11:59:27 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-001varestP251.dialsprint.net [168.191.217.13])

by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3-EL_1_3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id LAA19003

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 11:59:26 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <399D8842.5753C374@american.edu>

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 15:02:26 -0400

From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NCPP's influential effort
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My media exposures this (Friday) morning suggest the NCPP deserves congratulations for a successful effort at discouraging fast and loose media use of fast and loose quickie polls. I heard nor saw nothing like the usual morning-after reports of percentage ticks. As early as yesterday noon, I heard Bill Schneider on CNN refusing to give an estimate the public reaction to DNC2000's first 2 nights. He recited as reason for refusing what well might have been a succinct version of NCPP's statement on one-night polls. A broader measure of NCPP's influence might be a comparison with how media handled public reactions the morning after Bush's nomination. The NY Times, for instance, featured an August 4 overnight poll results on Bush's gain from the convention.

Does anyone now have more and, especially, more systematic information than this one media junkie's impressions of the effectiveness of NCPP's cautionary effort?

Here's a different cautionary note, however: Journalists are not shy about talking about public public reactions to major events whether they have poll data or not. My reaction yesterday to Bill Schneider's scientific caution, for instance, was tempered by my having also heard him a bit earlier that day, in discussing how voter impressions of Gore have developed [my quote is very close but may not be exactly word-for-word]:

"When Al Gore flipped on Elian Gonzalez, a gasp ran through the whole nation."

My impression of the coverage of Gore's speech is that it generally managed to convey the impression that he got a positive response from voters. I think it fair to ask whether NCPP's influence merely makes it easier for media figures to say whatever they are inclined to about public reactions to events unrestrained by any systematic data whatsoever? For instance, the Sunday morning TV and op ed experts will have wrapped up their influential stuff on whether Gore proved effective or ineffective as a "leader" before "acceptable" poll data are available. Supposing good research, or a quickie poll like was used on Bush's speech, indicates that Gore bombed. Would NCPP's intervention have been an unfair disservice to Bush's campaign. Supposing Gore scored absolutely Boffo and the Sunday bloviations, some of which are already in the can, run him down?

The appropriate reply to the question of how good is a quick poll may be like the gag reply to "How's your wife?": relative to what?; to the national audiometer that registered the collective "gasp" Schneider reports, for instance? It is also not true that one cannot do pretty good quick surveys; particularly of responses to scheduled events. Individual respondent change measures in on-going longitudinal surveys, for instance, have great utility. (Also, self-cite: "Anticipatory Research and Stand-By Research Capabilities," in R. A. Bauer, Social Indicators, MIT press, 1966.)

>From DMMerkle@aol.com Fri Aug 18 13:20:08 2000
Received: from imo-d08.mx.aol.com (imo-d08.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.40])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA21512 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 13:20:08 -0700
(PDT)
From: DMMerkle@aol.com
Message-Id: <200008182020.NAA21512@usc.edu>
Received: from DMMerkle@aol.com
by imo-d08.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.6.a617bf4 (5713)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 16:19:32 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from web28.aolmail.aol.com (web28.aolmail.aol.com
[205.188.222.4]) by air-id04.mx.aol.com (v75_b3.11) with ESMTTP; Fri, 18 Aug
2000 16:19:32 -0400
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 16:19:31 EDT
Subject: Re: NCPP's influential effort
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Unknown

Before assigning the credit to NCPP, you first need to demonstrate that the number of polls released today is less than the number released the day after the Republican convention. That's not the case. Only two national polls were released the day after the Rep. convention: an NBC one-nighter and a Voter.com/Battleground tracking poll conducted Wed. and Thurs. Both of these organizations released similar polls today.

In a message dated Fri, 18 Aug 2000 3:00:35 PM Eastern Daylight Time, "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu> writes:

<< My media exposures this (Friday) morning suggest the NCPP deserves congratulations for a successful effort at discouraging fast and loose media use of fast and loose quickie polls. I heard nor saw nothing like the usual morning-after reports of percentage ticks. As early as yesterday noon, I heard Bill Schneider on CNN refusing to give an estimate the public reaction to DNC2000's first 2 nights. He recited as reason for refusing what well might have been a succinct version of NCPP's statement on one-night polls. A broader measure of NCPP's influence might be a comparison with how media handled public reactions the morning after Bush's nomination The NY Times, for instance, featured an August 4 overnight poll results on Bush's gain from the convention.

Does anyone now have more and, especially, more systematic information than this one media junkie's impressions of the effectiveness of NCPP's cautionary effort?

Here's a different cautionary note, however: Journalists are not shy about talking about public public reactions to major events whether they have poll data or not. My reaction yesterday to Bill Schneider's scientific caution, for instance, was tempered by my having also heard him a bit earlier that day, in discussing how voter impresssions of Gore have developed [my quote is very close but may not be exactly word-for word]:

"When Al Gore flipped on Elian Gonzalez, a gasp ran through the whole nation."

My impression of the coverage of Gore's speech is that it generally managed to convey the impression that he got a positive response from voters. I think it fair to ask whether NCPP's influence merely makes it easier for media figures to say whatever they are inclined to about public reactions to events unrestrained by any systematic data whatsoever? For instance, the Sunday morning TV and op ed experts will have wrapped up their influential stuff on whether Gore proved effective or ineffective as a "leader" before "acceptable" poll data are available. Supposing good research, or a quickie poll like was used on Bush's speech, indicates that Gore bombed. Would NCPP's intervention have been an unfair disservice to Bush's campaign. Supposing Gore scored absolutely Boffo and the Sunday bloviations, some of which are already in the can, run him down?

The appropriate reply to the question of how good is a quick poll may be like the gag reply to "How's your wife?": relative to what?; to the national audiometer that registered the collective "gasp" Schneider reports, for instance? It is also not true that one cannot do pretty good quick surveys; particularly of responses to scheduled events. Individual respondent change measures in on-going longitudinal surveys, for instance, have great utility. (Also, self-cite: "Anticipatory Research and Stand-By Research Capabilities," in R. A. Bauer, Social Indicators, MIT press, 1966.)

>>

>From kneuman@intouchsurvey.com Fri Aug 18 13:28:03 2000
Received: from mail.dmz.intouchsurvey.com (host-050.nbc.netcom.ca [216.191.36.50] (may be forged))
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA26775 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 13:28:02 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from comp55 ([192.168.1.21])
by mail.dmz.intouchsurvey.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA19001
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 15:23:00 -0400
Received: by localhost with Microsoft MAPI; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 16:36:35 -0400
Message-ID: <01C00932.7913A800.kneuman@intouchsurvey.com>
From: Keith Neuman <kneuman@intouchsurvey.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A couple of survey questions
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 16:36:34 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet E-mail/MAPI - 8.0.0.4211

On your first question of how many points to use to measure satisfaction, the issue is not so much one of using an even versus odd number of response choices because satisfaction is in many cases best measured in a continuum of positive to negative (rather than positive or negative, with some type of neutral midpoint). People who are not clearly positive or negative may well have an opinion that is a mixture of positive and negative, or may be dissatisfied but too polite to say so. Using this perspective, the objective then becomes one of defining a set of responses that cover the range of potential responses, with the middle part of the scale presenting the greatest challenge.

Susan Devlin (formerly with Bellcore, now with The Artemis Group) has done some excellent work in evaluating satisfaction scales, and she identifies

some that seem to work very well. One of her contributions is introducing the concept of the "polite negative" response to capture those customers who are too polite to express dissatisfaction. Examples of polite negative responses include "Just OK" and "Somewhat satisfied" (both of which I have used successfully in my own work). Some of this is covered in a paper she published in Marketing Research (1994, Volume 6, Number 1; pp 5-13).

-----Original Message-----

From: Charissa Mettler [SMTP:charissa.mettler@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2000 10:30 AM
To: AAPOR
Subject: A couple of survey questions

I have a couple of questions pertaining to commonly asked survey questions.

1. What are the pros/cons of using a 4 point satisfaction scale (i.e., very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied) versus using a 5 point scale (i.e., very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied). We know the obvious (i.e., a 4 point forces a person to choose one side or the other, while a 5 point gives the person to stay in the middle), but is there literature supporting one way or another?

2. In the demographic question regarding income, how do researchers address earned versus unearned income? Does anyone ask a separate question for unearned income?

Thanks for your help,

Charissa Brannon
Research Associate
Center for Urban and Public Affaris
Wright State University

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Fri Aug 18 20:32:47 2000
Received: from imo-r03.mx.aol.com (imo-r03.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id UAA12179 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Aug 2000 20:32:46 -0700
(PDT)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo-r03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 1.24.96739d8 (4207);
Fri, 18 Aug 2000 23:32:05 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <24.96739d8.26cf59b5@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 23:32:05 EDT
Subject: Re: RE: A possible side effect of Lieberman's nomination
To: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Mac - Post-GM sub 147

In a message dated 8/17/00 5:26:03 PM, LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu writes:

<< The fact that Lieberman is orthodox might (I say MIGHT) have a differential impact on Jewish respondents, one that probably does not arise with non-Jewish respondents. >>

Actually, Lieberman is taking pains to describe himself as "observant" (his term) rather than possibly not being considered attractive to all branches of Judaism. If considered believable, this may pick up votes from all practicing or identifying Jews. Matt Lauer did call him "orthodox" on the Today show a few days ago when he was interviewed, and Lieberman chose to not correct him.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Aug 19 00:17:34 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id AAA00909 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 19 Aug 2000 00:17:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id AAA28598 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 19 Aug 2000 00:17:32 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sat, 19 Aug 2000 00:17:32 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: What can you tell us all about the methods of SpeakOut.com?
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008182138010.21812-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Can any of you tell us all more about the methods of SpeakOut.com, of 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC, whose recent press release (see below) boasts of having created "the largest-ever focus group"?

My interest in the company has been increasingly aroused by the Los Angeles Times, which has mentioned it in four major national party convention stories over the past two weeks, including a five-column time series chart of the continuous reactions of 1,237 "individuals" (no sampling, percentages or demographics discussed) to Al Gore's acceptance speech Thursday night, aggregated by Democrats, Republicans, and Undecided, with a running line for "Overall" also included. The same chart reports "Data lost for first 6 minutes of speech" (I am not kidding).

MSNBC, a partner in the SpeakOut venture since last December, has mentioned the company's name and research in five stories over the past 18 days. USA Today, another prominent user of SpeakOut data, has cited the company in 9 stories over the past 8 months.

One unacknowledged dispute over the SpeakOut methods has arisen between the two Times, Los Angeles and New York. The New York Times, which has mentioned SpeakOut in nine articles--including several technology reports--over the past five-and-a-half months, recently dismissed the SpeakOut sample size as only "a few hundred"--while today's Los Angeles Times, as I've already mentioned, gives extreme prominence to its statement: "A total of 1,237 individuals participated" (to rate the Gore acceptance speech).

Despite knowing all this, I still know next to nothing about the demographic characteristics of the SpeakOut sample, how it was selected, how consent was obtained, how continuous time series data are collected on each participant, and how the quality and integrity of the tabulation is assured (just to scratch the surface of my own curiosity).

I don't even know whether to worry more, on the one hand, about the imminence of a Federal Ministry of Truth, humming out continuous synthetic survey data on every imaginable policy question, each with its own homepage on the Web, in the service of nameless and faceless "focus groups" of our fellow citizens, or to worry more, on the other hand, that survey research--which only 60 years ago promised to make public opinion measurement a respectable applied science--has begun the new millennium as some rude mating of a television game show, a telethon to help the victims of the latest public policy malfeasance, and a carnival tent-act.

How long before Las Vegas and Reno begin to post book on, say, the Democrat-Republican percentage-point spread for "Agree" on the Vice President's third mention of the term "Social Security"? And how long after that before we have the first scandal involving the fixing of that spread?

Meanwhile, what can any of you tell us all about the methods of SpeakOut.com?

-- Jim

Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC 20005

<http://www.speakout.com/aboutus/releases/InstantViewerResponse.asp>

Press Release

SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History at the Political Conventions; Partnership with MSNBC creates the largest-ever focus group

WASHINGTON, D.C. - August 9, 2000 - For SpeakOut.com, the Republican National Convention represented a technological breakthrough in the field of online opinion research.

During George W. Bush's acceptance speech at the Republican convention, SpeakOut.com's patent-pending online research technology -- Ntercept™ -- captured demographically cross-tabulated response data on a second-by-second basis from the largest, live online panel ever assembled. Results from the Internet-based survey were used in reporting

by MSNBC, The Los Angeles Times, USA Today, The Washington Post and other major news organizations. Over 1,000 respondents participated in the survey during the final evening of the convention, with many providing moment-by-moment input throughout the Bush speech.

Traditional focus groups are typically limited to 20 to 40 respondents who must be brought together at the same time, in a single location, usually after office hours. In contrast, SpeakOut's new Ntercept™ technology brings the research room to the participant, allowing thousands of participants to be simultaneously interviewed, or interviewed on a delayed basis, at the participant's convenience.

As users respond and react within the focus group, the Ntercept technology aggregates user responses in real time, second-by-second, and provides live analysis of how different demographic groups are reacting, with complete summary information and analysis available as well. In Philadelphia, for example, cross-tabulated data of viewer response to George W. Bush's speech was available on MSNBC.com and SpeakOut.com online even before the Texas Governor left the stage.

"This is not your parents' focus group," said Will Feltus, Director of Polling for SpeakOut.com. "This is the dawn of a new age in interactive media research."

The Internet represents the next revolution in market research platforms. Whereas traditional in-person focus groups and telephone interview surveys are limited in their scope and reach, the Internet -- with streaming video and audio and enhanced interactivity -- provides faster turnaround and a more cost-effective solution for many types of analysis. While not suitable for all types of research, many projects can be executed successfully using Ntercept™ technology based on its ability to poll larger groups of participants faster at lower per-participant costs.

Ntercept™ software allows market research firms, polling companies, advertising agencies, corporate research departments and political campaigns to capture data from larger, more demographically diverse panels than ever before, with greater speed and statistical accuracy. The political world, news media, and sports and entertainment industries are now developing applications for Ntercept™, which is capable of supporting tens of thousands of simultaneous participants.

"Public opinion research has come a long way from those door-to-door, pen-and-clipboard interviews," said Ron Howard, Chairman and CEO of SpeakOut.com. "Telephone surveys were the next step and now the Internet represents the new frontier. Ntercept represents breakthrough opinion research technology which we plan to make the standard for all consumers of opinion research analysis."

About SpeakOut.com

Based in Washington, DC, SpeakOut.com (www.speakout.com) is the leading non-partisan Internet activism Web site and online opinion research company. Launched in February 2000, Speakout.com's primary mission is to enhance the democratic process by enabling citizens to have a direct impact on the decisions that affect their lives. Users enjoy a wide variety of news and information tailored to their interests and activism

tools allowing aggregated messaging to a vast array of public officeholders, candidates, business and news executives.

Contacts

Rekha Chalasani
rekhac@SpeakOut.com
SpeakOut.com
202-777-3173

Jennifer Rich
jennifer_rich@dc.edelman.com
Edelman Worldwide
202-326-1774

OTHER PRESS RELEASES

Gore Gets Higher Scores From Swing Voters Than Any Speaker In Either Party (8/16/00)

Lieberman Scores High With Democrats But Loses Independents On Affirmative Action (8/16/00)

Kennedys, Bradley Rate Higher Than Clinton With Swing Voters (8/15/00)

Democrats, Women Give Clinton Soaring Marks; Undecideds Hover Just Under 50% (8/15/00)

SpeakOut.com offers \$5,000 prize to a lucky at-home analyst (8/11/00)

SpeakOut.com to Acquire VoxCap.com Political Portals (8/10/00)

SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History at the Political Conventions (8/9/00)

"Soccer Mom" Picks Lieberman for VP (8/8/00)

SpeakOut.com Delivers Results of Instant Viewer Response Analysis: Independents Waver On Abortion & Anti-Clinton Remarks (8/4/00)

SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Viewers Tell the Whole Story with Instantaneous Convention Analysis (8/2/00)

MSNBC & MSNBC.com Get America to SpeakOut during Political Conventions (7/19/00)

SpeakOut.com Launches "Boys on the Buzz" (7/18/00)

SpeakOut.com & RNC Partner to Revolutionize Democracy Online (7/11/00)

SpeakOut.com's Armchair Pundits Pick the VP Candidates (7/11/00)

Local Activism Goes National with SpeakOut.com (6/28/00)

SpeakOut.com Acquires Issues2000.org (6/21/00)

SpeakOut.com Expands International News Coverage (5/25/00)

SpeakOut.com & Roll Call Keep Americans Guessing in National Veepstakes (5/25/00)

SpeakOut.com Challenges New Yorkers to Speak their Minds (5/24/00)

SpeakOut.Com Urges Federal Election Commission To Protect Free Speech on the Internet (5/22/00)

Republican Heavyweight Jumps into the Ring for SpeakOut.com (5/17/00)

Political Opposites Find Common Ground at SpeakOut.com (5/10/00)

SpeakOut.com Announces the Real "VeepStakes!" (4/19/00)

SpeakOut.com & DNC Kick Off First Interactive Party Platform in History (4/6/00)

All Three Major Political Parties Agree on One Thing (3/28/00)

SpeakOut.com to Acquire GoVote.com (2/25/00)

SpeakOut.com "Rolls Out" Ad Campaign in Nation's Capital (2/22/00)

SpeakOut.com Speaks to America Through Talk Radio (2/14/00)

McCain Matches Bush in Ad Buys in Top South Carolina TV Markets (2/10/00)

Major Political Parties Sign Partnership Enabling Citizens to Speak Out (2/3/00)

SpeakOut.com Provides Real-Time Analysis of Voters During January 26 Democratic & Republican Debates (1/26/00)

SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bill Bradley as Winner of Democratic Debate (1/26/00)

SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bush, Keyes as Clear Winners in New Hampshire Republican Debate (1/26/00)

SpeakOut.com Selects GlobalCenter For Its Internet Infrastructure (1/13/00)

SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Join Forces to Enhance GOP Debate Coverage (12/9/99)

Kerry Kennedy Cuomo, Susan Eisenhower Join SpeakOut.com (12/8/99)

All-Star Political Team (11/6/99)

Funding (11/6/99)

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Sun Aug 20 04:59:32 2000
Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id EAA20224 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 04:59:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from x.mindspring.com (user-2inic20.dialup.mindspring.com
[165.121.48.64])
by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id HAA22867
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 07:59:29 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000820074539.00b98b20@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 07:57:59 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: What can you tell us all about the methods of SpeakOut.com?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008182138010.21812-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

To answer Jim's inquiry, Speakout.com is nothing more than a self selected sample of people who chose to dial into the MSNBC.com web site and search long enough to find speakout.com. If you did this during the Republican or Democratic conventions, which I did, you could play the game of indicating your reaction, positive or negative, from 0 to 100 for what was currently being said by speakers at the conventions.

Speakout.com provided viewing for journalists. Those who were dumb enough to play as shells for this information wrote stories for their newspapers and MSNBC put it on television in the Frank Luntz segments. Luntz also had a studio group that played their own games. Both activities were referred to by Luntz as focus groups. This was the material criticized in the NCPP press release, which is available at NCPP.org under press releases.

Speakout.com clearly says its material is not scientific. However, every discussion of its results by the media speaks in generalities about the public reaction.

There is nothing to evaluate here. Speakout.com is a meaningless collection of a handful of self selected web participants. And the press that covered it is naive in the extreme.
warren mitofsky

At 12:17 AM 8/19/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Can any of you tell us all more about the methods of SpeakOut.com, of 1225
>I Street N.W., Washington, DC, whose recent press release (see below)
>boasts of having created "the largest-ever focus group"?

>
>My interest in the company has been increasingly aroused by the Los
>Angeles Times, which has mentioned it in four major national party
>convention stories over the past two weeks, including a five-column time
>series chart of the continuous reactions of 1,237 "individuals" (no
>sampling, percentages or demographics discussed) to Al Gore's acceptance
>speech Thursday night, aggregated by Democrats, Republicans, and
>Undecided, with a running line for "Overall" also included. The same
>chart reports "Data lost for first 6 minutes of speech" (I am not
>kidding).
>
>MSNBC, a partner in the SpeakOut venture since last December, has
>mentioned the company's name and research in five stories over the past 18
>days. USA Today, another prominent user of SpeakOut data, has cited
>the company in 9 stories over the past 8 months.
>
>One unacknowledged dispute over the SpeakOut methods has arisen between
>the two Times, Los Angeles and New York. The New York Times, which has
>mentioned SpeakOut in nine articles--including several technology
>reports--over the past five-and-a-half months, recently dismissed the
>SpeakOut sample size as only "a few hundred"--while today's Los Angeles
>Times, as I've already mentioned, gives extreme prominence to its
>statement: "A total of 1,237 individuals participated" (to rate the Gore
>acceptance speech).
>
>Despite knowing all this, I still know next to nothing about the
>demographic characteristics of the SpeakOut sample, how it was selected,
>how consent was obtained, how continuous time series data are collected on
>each participant, and how the quality and integrity of the tabulation is
>assured (just to scratch the surface of my own curiosity).
>
>I don't even know whether to worry more, on the one hand, about the
>imminence of a Federal Ministry of Truth, humming out continuous synthetic
>survey data on every imaginable policy question, each with its own
>homepage on the Web, in the service of nameless and faceless "focus
>groups" of our fellow citizens, or to worry more, on the other hand, that
>survey research--which only 60 years ago promised to make public opinion
>measurement a respectable applied science--has begun the new millennium as
>some rude mating of a television game show, a telethon to help the victims
>of the latest public policy malfeasance, and a carnival tent-act.
>
>How long before Las Vegas and Reno begin to post book on, say, the
>Democrat-Republican percentage-point spread for "Agree" on the Vice
>President's third mention of the term "Social Security"? And how long
>after that before we have the first scandal involving the fixing of that
>spread?
>
>Meanwhile, what can any of you tell us all about the methods of
>SpeakOut.com?
>
>-- Jim
>
>-----
>Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC 20005
>-----
> <http://www.speakout.com/aboutus/releases/InstantViewerResponse.asp>
>
>Press Release

>
>
> SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> at the Political Conventions; Partnership with MSNBC creates the
> largest-ever focus group
>
>

>WASHINGTON, D.C. - August 9, 2000 - For SpeakOut.com, the Republican
>National Convention represented a technological breakthrough in the field
>of online opinion research.
>

>During George W. Bush's acceptance speech at the Republican convention,
>SpeakOut.com's patent-pending online research technology -- NterceptTM --
>captured demographically cross-tabulated response data on a
>second-by-second basis from the largest, live online panel ever
>assembled. Results from the Internet-based survey were used in reporting
>by MSNBC, The Los Angeles Times, USA Today, The Washington Post and other
>major news organizations. Over 1,000 respondents participated in the
>survey during the final evening of the convention, with many providing
>moment-by-moment input throughout the Bush speech.
>

>Traditional focus groups are typically limited to 20 to 40 respondents
>who must be brought together at the same time, in a single location,
>usually after office hours. In contrast, SpeakOut's new NterceptTM
>technology brings the research room to the participant, allowing
>thousands of participants to be simultaneously interviewed, or
>interviewed on a delayed basis, at the participant's convenience.
>

>As users respond and react within the focus group, the Ntercept
>technology aggregates user responses in real time, second-by-second, and
>provides live analysis of how different demographic groups are reacting,
>with complete summary information and analysis available as well. In
>Philadelphia, for example, cross-tabulated data of viewer response to
>George W. Bush's speech was available on MSNBC.com and SpeakOut.com
>online even before the Texas Governor left the stage.
>

>"This is not your parents' focus group," said Will Feltus, Director of
>Polling for SpeakOut.com. "This is the dawn of a new age in interactive
>media research."
>

>The Internet represents the next revolution in market research platforms.
>Whereas traditional in-person focus groups and telephone interview
>surveys are limited in their scope and reach, the Internet -- with
>streaming video and audio and enhanced interactivity -- provides faster
>turnaround and a more cost-effective solution for many types of analysis.
>While not suitable for all types of research, many projects can be
>executed successfully using NterceptTM technology based on its ability to
>poll larger groups of participants faster at lower per-participant costs.
>

>NterceptTM software allows market research firms, polling companies,
>advertising agencies, corporate research departments and political
>campaigns to capture data from larger, more demographically diverse
>panels than ever before, with greater speed and statistical accuracy. The
>political world, news media, and sports and entertainment industries are
>now developing applications for NterceptTM, which is capable of
>supporting tens of thousands of simultaneous participants.
>

>"Public opinion research has come a long way from those door-to-door,
>pen-and-clipboard interviews," said Ron Howard, Chairman and CEO of
>SpeakOut.com. "Telephone surveys were the next step and now the Internet
>represents the new frontier. Ntercept represents breakthrough opinion
>research technology which we plan to make the standard for all consumers
>of opinion research analysis."

>
>

>About SpeakOut.com

>

>Based in Washington, DC, SpeakOut.com (www.speakout.com) is the leading
>non-partisan Internet activism Web site and online opinion research
>company. Launched in February 2000, Speakout.com's primary mission is to
>enhance the democratic process by enabling citizens to have a direct
>impact on the decisions that affect their lives. Users enjoy a wide
>variety of news and information tailored to their interests and activism
>tools allowing aggregated messaging to a vast array of public
>officeholders, candidates, business and news executives.

>

>

>Contacts

>

>Rekha Chalasani

>rekhac@SpeakOut.com

>SpeakOut.com

>202-777-3173

>

>Jennifer Rich

>jennifer_rich@dc.edelman.com

>Edelman Worldwide

>202-326-1774

>

>-----

>

>

> OTHER PRESS RELEASES

>

> Gore Gets Higher Scores From Swing Voters Than Any Speaker In Either
> Party (8/16/00)

>

> Lieberman Scores High With Democrats But Loses Independents On
> Affirmative Action (8/16/00)

>

> Kennedys, Bradley Rate Higher Than Clinton With Swing Voters (8/15/00)

>

> Democrats, Women Give Clinton Soaring Marks; Undecideds Hover Just Under
> 50% (8/15/00)

>

> SpeakOut.com offers \$5,000 prize to a lucky at-home analyst (8/11/00)

>

> SpeakOut.com to Acquire VoxCap.com Political Portals (8/10/00)

>

> SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> at the Political Conventions (8/9/00)

>

> "Soccer Mom" Picks Lieberman for VP (8/8/00)

>

> SpeakOut.com Delivers Results of Instant Viewer Response Analysis:
> Independents Waver On Abortion & Anti-Clinton Remarks (8/4/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Viewers Tell the Whole Story with Instantaneous
> Convention Analysis (8/2/00)
>
> MSNBC & MSNBC.com Get America to SpeakOut during Political Conventions
> (7/19/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Launches "Boys on the Buzz" (7/18/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & RNC Partner to Revolutionize Democracy Online (7/11/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com's Armchair Pundits Pick the VP Candidates (7/11/00)
>
> Local Activism Goes National with SpeakOut.com (6/28/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Acquires Issues2000.org (6/21/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Expands International News Coverage (5/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & Roll Call Keep Americans Guessing in National Veepstakes
> (5/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Challenges New Yorkers to Speak their Minds (5/24/00)
>
> SpeakOut.Com Urges Federal Election Commission To Protect Free Speech on
> the Internet (5/22/00)
>
> Republican Heavyweight Jumps into the Ring for SpeakOut.com (5/17/00)
>
> Political Opposites Find Common Ground at SpeakOut.com (5/10/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Announces the Real "VeepStakes!" (4/19/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & DNC Kick Off First Interactive Party Platform in History
> (4/6/00)
>
> All Three Major Political Parties Agree on One Thing (3/28/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com to Acquire GoVote.com (2/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com "Rolls Out" Ad Campaign in Nation's Capital (2/22/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Speaks to America Through Talk Radio (2/14/00)
>
> McCain Matches Bush in Ad Buys in Top South Carolina TV Markets (2/10/00)
>
> Major Political Parties Sign Partnership Enabling Citizens to Speak Out
> (2/3/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Provides Real-Time Analysis of Voters During January 26
> Democratic & Republican Debates (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bill Bradley as Winner of Democratic
> Debate (1/26/00)
>

> SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bush, Keyes as Clear Winners in New
> Hampshire Republican Debate (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Selects GlobalCenter For Its Internet Infrastructure
> (1/13/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Join Forces to Enhance GOP Debate Coverage (12/9/99)
>
> Kerry Kennedy Cuomo, Susan Eisenhower Join SpeakOut.com (12/8/99)
>
> All-Star Political Team (11/6/99)
>
> Funding (11/6/99)
>
>-----
>Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC 20005
>-----
>
>
>*****

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Aug 20 06:33:44 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA27899 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 06:33:44 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-74.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.74])
by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id JAA23928
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:33:36 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <399FDDEA.F86048E3@jwdp.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:32:26 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: What can you tell us all about the methods of SpeakOut.com?
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008182138010.21812-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't believe that SpeakOut.com makes any pretense of providing
representative surveys.

Their claimed mission is to provide a means for "activists" to make

their voice heard by the political elite. The general idea is to allow individuals to lobby politicians by making their opinions known in the form of pseudo polls, which will then be presented as "public opinion".

Their "board of advisors" reads like a who's who of the most manipulative lobbyists in Washington, including Richard Bond, Michael Deaver, Tom Downey, Carter Eskew, Ed Gillespie, Terry McAuliffe, Susan Molinari and Ralph Reed.

Jan Werner

James Beniger wrote:

>
> Can any of you tell us all more about the methods of SpeakOut.com, of 1225
> I Street N.W., Washington, DC, whose recent press release (see below)
> boasts of having created "the largest-ever focus group"?
>
> My interest in the company has been increasingly aroused by the Los
> Angeles Times, which has mentioned it in four major national party
> convention stories over the past two weeks, including a five-column time
> series chart of the continuous reactions of 1,237 "individuals" (no
> sampling, percentages or demographics discussed) to Al Gore's acceptance
> speech Thursday night, aggregated by Democrats, Republicans, and
> Undecided, with a running line for "Overall" also included. The same
> chart reports "Data lost for first 6 minutes of speech" (I am not
> kidding).
>
> MSNBC, a partner in the SpeakOut venture since last December, has
> mentioned the company's name and research in five stories over the past 18
> days. USA Today, another prominent user of SpeakOut data, has cited
> the company in 9 stories over the past 8 months.
>
> One unacknowledged dispute over the SpeakOut methods has arisen between
> the two Times, Los Angeles and New York. The New York Times, which has
> mentioned SpeakOut in nine articles--including several technology
> reports--over the past five-and-a-half months, recently dismissed the
> SpeakOut sample size as only "a few hundred"--while today's Los Angeles
> Times, as I've already mentioned, gives extreme prominence to its
> statement: "A total of 1,237 individuals participated" (to rate the Gore
> acceptance speech).
>
> Despite knowing all this, I still know next to nothing about the
> demographic characteristics of the SpeakOut sample, how it was selected,
> how consent was obtained, how continuous time series data are collected on
> each participant, and how the quality and integrity of the tabulation is
> assured (just to scratch the surface of my own curiosity).
>
> I don't even know whether to worry more, on the one hand, about the
> imminence of a Federal Ministry of Truth, humming out continuous synthetic
> survey data on every imaginable policy question, each with its own
> homepage on the Web, in the service of nameless and faceless "focus
> groups" of our fellow citizens, or to worry more, on the other hand, that
> survey research--which only 60 years ago promised to make public opinion
> measurement a respectable applied science--has begun the new millennium as
> some rude mating of a television game show, a telethon to help the victims
> of the latest public policy malfeasance, and a carnival tent-act.

>
> How long before Las Vegas and Reno begin to post book on, say, the
> Democrat-Republican percentage-point spread for "Agree" on the Vice
> President's third mention of the term "Social Security"? And how long
> after that before we have the first scandal involving the fixing of that
> spread?
>
> Meanwhile, what can any of you tell us all about the methods of
> SpeakOut.com?
>
> -- Jim
>
>

> Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC
> 20005
>

> <http://www.speakout.com/aboutus/releases/InstantViewerResponse.asp>
>

> Press Release
>

> SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> at the Political Conventions; Partnership with MSNBC creates the
> largest-ever focus group
>

> WASHINGTON, D.C. - August 9, 2000 - For SpeakOut.com, the Republican
> National Convention represented a technological breakthrough in the field
> of online opinion research.
>

> During George W. Bush's acceptance speech at the Republican convention,
> SpeakOut.com's patent-pending online research technology -- NterceptTM --
> captured demographically cross-tabulated response data on a
> second-by-second basis from the largest, live online panel ever
> assembled. Results from the Internet-based survey were used in reporting
> by MSNBC, The Los Angeles Times, USA Today, The Washington Post and other
> major news organizations. Over 1,000 respondents participated in the
> survey during the final evening of the convention, with many providing
> moment-by-moment input throughout the Bush speech.
>

> Traditional focus groups are typically limited to 20 to 40 respondents
> who must be brought together at the same time, in a single location,
> usually after office hours. In contrast, SpeakOut's new NterceptTM
> technology brings the research room to the participant, allowing
> thousands of participants to be simultaneously interviewed, or
> interviewed on a delayed basis, at the participant's convenience.
>

> As users respond and react within the focus group, the Ntercept
> technology aggregates user responses in real time, second-by-second, and
> provides live analysis of how different demographic groups are reacting,
> with complete summary information and analysis available as well. In
> Philadelphia, for example, cross-tabulated data of viewer response to
> George W. Bush's speech was available on MSNBC.com and SpeakOut.com
> online even before the Texas Governor left the stage.
>

> "This is not your parents' focus group," said Will Feltus, Director of
> Polling for SpeakOut.com. "This is the dawn of a new age in interactive
> media research."

>
> The Internet represents the next revolution in market research platforms.
> Whereas traditional in-person focus groups and telephone interview
> surveys are limited in their scope and reach, the Internet -- with
> streaming video and audio and enhanced interactivity -- provides faster
> turnaround and a more cost-effective solution for many types of analysis.
> While not suitable for all types of research, many projects can be
> executed successfully using Ntercept™ technology based on its ability to
> poll larger groups of participants faster at lower per-participant costs.
>
> Ntercept™ software allows market research firms, polling companies,
> advertising agencies, corporate research departments and political
> campaigns to capture data from larger, more demographically diverse
> panels than ever before, with greater speed and statistical accuracy. The
> political world, news media, and sports and entertainment industries are
> now developing applications for Ntercept™, which is capable of
> supporting tens of thousands of simultaneous participants.
>
> "Public opinion research has come a long way from those door-to-door,
> pen-and-clipboard interviews," said Ron Howard, Chairman and CEO of
> SpeakOut.com. "Telephone surveys were the next step and now the Internet
> represents the new frontier. Ntercept represents breakthrough opinion
> research technology which we plan to make the standard for all consumers
> of opinion research analysis."
>
> About SpeakOut.com
>
> Based in Washington, DC, SpeakOut.com (www.speakout.com) is the leading
> non-partisan Internet activism Web site and online opinion research
> company. Launched in February 2000, Speakout.com's primary mission is to
> enhance the democratic process by enabling citizens to have a direct
> impact on the decisions that affect their lives. Users enjoy a wide
> variety of news and information tailored to their interests and activism
> tools allowing aggregated messaging to a vast array of public
> officeholders, candidates, business and news executives.
>
> Contacts
>
> Rekha Chalasani
> rekhac@SpeakOut.com
> SpeakOut.com
> 202-777-3173
>
> Jennifer Rich
> jennifer_rich@dc.edelman.com
> Edelman Worldwide
> 202-326-1774
>
> -----
>
>
> OTHER PRESS RELEASES
>
> Gore Gets Higher Scores From Swing Voters Than Any Speaker In Either
> Party (8/16/00)
>
> Lieberman Scores High With Democrats But Loses Independents On

> Affirmative Action (8/16/00)
>
> Kennedys, Bradley Rate Higher Than Clinton With Swing Voters (8/15/00)
>
> Democrats, Women Give Clinton Soaring Marks; Undecideds Hover Just Under
> 50% (8/15/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com offers \$5,000 prize to a lucky at-home analyst (8/11/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com to Acquire VoxCap.com Political Portals (8/10/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> at the Political Conventions (8/9/00)
>
> "Soccer Mom" Picks Lieberman for VP (8/8/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Delivers Results of Instant Viewer Response Analysis:
> Independents Waver On Abortion & Anti-Clinton Remarks (8/4/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Viewers Tell the Whole Story with Instantaneous
> Convention Analysis (8/2/00)
>
> MSNBC & MSNBC.com Get America to SpeakOut during Political Conventions
> (7/19/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Launches "Boys on the Buzz" (7/18/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & RNC Partner to Revolutionize Democracy Online (7/11/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com's Armchair Pundits Pick the VP Candidates (7/11/00)
>
> Local Activism Goes National with SpeakOut.com (6/28/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Acquires Issues2000.org (6/21/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Expands International News Coverage (5/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & Roll Call Keep Americans Guessing in National Veepstakes
> (5/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Challenges New Yorkers to Speak their Minds (5/24/00)
>
> SpeakOut.Com Urges Federal Election Commission To Protect Free Speech on
> the Internet (5/22/00)
>
> Republican Heavyweight Jumps into the Ring for SpeakOut.com (5/17/00)
>
> Political Opposites Find Common Ground at SpeakOut.com (5/10/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Announces the Real "VeepStakes!" (4/19/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & DNC Kick Off First Interactive Party Platform in History
> (4/6/00)
>
> All Three Major Political Parties Agree on One Thing (3/28/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com to Acquire GoVote.com (2/25/00)

>
> SpeakOut.com "Rolls Out" Ad Campaign in Nation's Capital (2/22/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Speaks to America Through Talk Radio (2/14/00)
>
> McCain Matches Bush in Ad Buys in Top South Carolina TV Markets (2/10/00)
>
> Major Political Parties Sign Partnership Enabling Citizens to Speak Out
> (2/3/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Provides Real-Time Analysis of Voters During January 26
> Democratic & Republican Debates (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bill Bradley as Winner of Democratic
> Debate (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bush, Keyes as Clear Winners in New
> Hampshire Republican Debate (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Selects GlobalCenter For Its Internet Infrastructure
> (1/13/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Join Forces to Enhance GOP Debate Coverage (12/9/99)
>
> Kerry Kennedy Cuomo, Susan Eisenhower Join SpeakOut.com (12/8/99)
>
> All-Star Political Team (11/6/99)
>
> Funding (11/6/99)
>
>

> Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC
20005
>

>
> *****
>From mkshares@mcs.net Sun Aug 20 09:15:31 2000
Received: from uucphost.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA14583 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 09:15:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P43-Chi-Dial-3.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.171])
by uucphost.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id LAA89271
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 11:15:26 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <399FBDDE.9A3E6215@mcs.net>
Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 11:15:46 +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: What can you tell us all about the methods of SpeakOut.com?
References: <4.3.2.7.2.20000820074539.00b98b20@pop.mindspring.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Speakout.com clearly says its material is not scientific.

The closest they come to this in the release is: "While not suitable for all types of research".

Which they contradict elsewhere with claims which are laughable.

"Whereas traditional in-person focus groups and *telephone interview surveys* are limited in their scope and reach."

"allows.....to capture data from larger, *more demographically diverse panels* than ever before, with greater speed *and statistical accuracy*."

"represents breakthrough opinion research technology which *we plan to make the standard* for all consumers of opinion research analysis"

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> To answer Jim's inquiry, Speakout.com is nothing more than a self selected
> sample of people who chose to dial into the MSNBC.com web site and search
> long enough to find speakout.com. If you did this during the Republican or
> Democratic conventions, which I did, you could play the game of indicating
> your reaction, positive or negative, from 0 to 100 for what was currently
> being said by speakers at the conventions.

>
> Speakout.com provided viewing for journalists. Those who were dumb enough
> to play as shells for this information wrote stories for their newspapers
> and MSNBC put it on television in the Frank Luntz segments. Luntz also had
> a studio group that played their own games. Both activities were referred
> to by Luntz as focus groups. This was the material criticized in the NCPP
> press release, which is available at NCPP.org under press releases.

>
> Speakout.com clearly says its material is not scientific. However, every
> discussion of its results by the media speaks in generalities about the
> public reaction.

>
> There is nothing to evaluate here. Speakout.com is a meaningless
collection
> of a handful of self selected web participants. And the press that covered
> it is naive in the extreme.

> warren mitofsky

>
> At 12:17 AM 8/19/00 -0700, you wrote:

>
> >Can any of you tell us all more about the methods of SpeakOut.com, of
1225

> >I Street N.W., Washington, DC, whose recent press release (see below)
> >boasts of having created "the largest-ever focus group"?

> >
> >My interest in the company has been increasingly aroused by the Los
> >Angeles Times, which has mentioned it in four major national party
> >convention stories over the past two weeks, including a five-column time
> >series chart of the continuous reactions of 1,237 "individuals" (no
> >sampling, percentages or demographics discussed) to Al Gore's acceptance
> >speech Thursday night, aggregated by Democrats, Republicans, and
> >Undecided, with a running line for "Overall" also included. The same
> >chart reports "Data lost for first 6 minutes of speech" (I am not
> >kidding).
> >
> >MSNBC, a partner in the SpeakOut venture since last December, has
> >mentioned the company's name and research in five stories over the past
18
> >days. USA Today, another prominent user of SpeakOut data, has cited
> >the company in 9 stories over the past 8 months.
> >
> >One unacknowledged dispute over the SpeakOut methods has arisen between
> >the two Times, Los Angeles and New York. The New York Times, which has
> >mentioned SpeakOut in nine articles--including several technology
> >reports--over the past five-and-a-half months, recently dismissed the
> >SpeakOut sample size as only "a few hundred"--while today's Los Angeles
> >Times, as I've already mentioned, gives extreme prominence to its
> >statement: "A total of 1,237 individuals participated" (to rate the Gore
> >acceptance speech).
> >
> >Despite knowing all this, I still know next to nothing about the
> >demographic characteristics of the SpeakOut sample, how it was selected,
> >how consent was obtained, how continuous time series data are collected
on
> >each participant, and how the quality and integrity of the tabulation is
> >assured (just to scratch the surface of my own curiosity).
> >
> >I don't even know whether to worry more, on the one hand, about the
> >imminence of a Federal Ministry of Truth, humming out continuous
synthetic
> >survey data on every imaginable policy question, each with its own
> >homepage on the Web, in the service of nameless and faceless "focus
> >groups" of our fellow citizens, or to worry more, on the other hand, that
> >survey research--which only 60 years ago promised to make public opinion
> >measurement a respectable applied science--has begun the new millennium
as
> >some rude mating of a television game show, a telethon to help the
victims
> >of the latest public policy malfeasance, and a carnival tent-act.
> >
> >How long before Las Vegas and Reno begin to post book on, say, the
> >Democrat-Republican percentage-point spread for "Agree" on the Vice
> >President's third mention of the term "Social Security"? And how long
> >after that before we have the first scandal involving the fixing of that
> >spread?
> >
> >Meanwhile, what can any of you tell us all about the methods of
> >SpeakOut.com?
> >
> >
> >

-- Jim

>-----
> >Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC
20005
>
>-----
> > <http://www.speakout.com/aboutus/releases/InstantViewerResponse.asp>
> >
> >Press Release
> >
> >
> > SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research
History
> > at the Political Conventions; Partnership with MSNBC creates the
> > largest-ever focus group
> >
> >
> >WASHINGTON, D.C. - August 9, 2000 - For SpeakOut.com, the Republican
> >National Convention represented a technological breakthrough in the field
> >of online opinion research.
> >
> >During George W. Bush's acceptance speech at the Republican convention,
> >SpeakOut.com's patent-pending online research technology -- NterceptTM --
> >captured demographically cross-tabulated response data on a
> >second-by-second basis from the largest, live online panel ever
> >assembled. Results from the Internet-based survey were used in reporting
> >by MSNBC, The Los Angeles Times, USA Today, The Washington Post and other
> >major news organizations. Over 1,000 respondents participated in the
> >survey during the final evening of the convention, with many providing
> >moment-by-moment input throughout the Bush speech.
> >
> >Traditional focus groups are typically limited to 20 to 40 respondents
> >who must be brought together at the same time, in a single location,
> >usually after office hours. In contrast, SpeakOut's new NterceptTM
> >technology brings the research room to the participant, allowing
> >thousands of participants to be simultaneously interviewed, or
> >interviewed on a delayed basis, at the participant's convenience.
> >
> >As users respond and react within the focus group, the Ntercept
> >technology aggregates user responses in real time, second-by-second, and
> >provides live analysis of how different demographic groups are reacting,
> >with complete summary information and analysis available as well. In
> >Philadelphia, for example, cross-tabulated data of viewer response to
> >George W. Bush's speech was available on MSNBC.com and SpeakOut.com
> >online even before the Texas Governor left the stage.
> >
> >"This is not your parents' focus group," said Will Feltus, Director of
> >Polling for SpeakOut.com. "This is the dawn of a new age in interactive
> >media research."
> >
> >The Internet represents the next revolution in market research platforms.
> >Whereas traditional in-person focus groups and telephone interview
> >surveys are limited in their scope and reach, the Internet -- with
> >streaming video and audio and enhanced interactivity -- provides faster
> >turnaround and a more cost-effective solution for many types of analysis.
> >While not suitable for all types of research, many projects can be
> >executed successfully using NterceptTM technology based on its ability to
> >poll larger groups of participants faster at lower per-participant costs.

> >
> >NterceptTM software allows market research firms, polling companies,
> >advertising agencies, corporate research departments and political
> >campaigns to capture data from larger, more demographically diverse
> >panels than ever before, with greater speed and statistical accuracy. The
> >political world, news media, and sports and entertainment industries are
> >now developing applications for NterceptTM, which is capable of
> >supporting tens of thousands of simultaneous participants.
> >
> >"Public opinion research has come a long way from those door-to-door,
> >pen-and-clipboard interviews," said Ron Howard, Chairman and CEO of
> >SpeakOut.com. "Telephone surveys were the next step and now the Internet
> >represents the new frontier. Ntercept represents breakthrough opinion
> >research technology which we plan to make the standard for all consumers
> >of opinion research analysis."
> >
> >
> >About SpeakOut.com
> >
> >Based in Washington, DC, SpeakOut.com (www.speakout.com) is the leading
> >non-partisan Internet activism Web site and online opinion research
> >company. Launched in February 2000, Speakout.com's primary mission is to
> >enhance the democratic process by enabling citizens to have a direct
> >impact on the decisions that affect their lives. Users enjoy a wide
> >variety of news and information tailored to their interests and activism
> >tools allowing aggregated messaging to a vast array of public
> >officeholders, candidates, business and news executives.
> >
> >
> >Contacts
> >
> >Rekha Chalasani
> >rekhac@SpeakOut.com
> >SpeakOut.com
> >202-777-3173
> >
> >Jennifer Rich
> >jennifer_rich@dc.edelman.com
> >Edelman Worldwide
> >202-326-1774
> >
> >-----
> >
> >
> >
> > OTHER PRESS RELEASES
> >
> > Gore Gets Higher Scores From Swing Voters Than Any Speaker In Either
> > Party (8/16/00)
> >
> > Lieberman Scores High With Democrats But Loses Independents On
> > Affirmative Action (8/16/00)
> >
> > Kennedys, Bradley Rate Higher Than Clinton With Swing Voters (8/15/00)
> >
> > Democrats, Women Give Clinton Soaring Marks; Undecideds Hover Just Under
> > 50% (8/15/00)
> >
> >

> > SpeakOut.com offers \$5,000 prize to a lucky at-home analyst (8/11/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com to Acquire VoxCap.com Political Portals (8/10/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> > at the Political Conventions (8/9/00)
> >
> > "Soccer Mom" Picks Lieberman for VP (8/8/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Delivers Results of Instant Viewer Response Analysis:
> > Independents Waver On Abortion & Anti-Clinton Remarks (8/4/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Viewers Tell the Whole Story with Instantaneous
> > Convention Analysis (8/2/00)
> >
> > MSNBC & MSNBC.com Get America to SpeakOut during Political Conventions
> > (7/19/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Launches "Boys on the Buzz" (7/18/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com & RNC Partner to Revolutionize Democracy Online (7/11/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com's Armchair Pundits Pick the VP Candidates (7/11/00)
> >
> > Local Activism Goes National with SpeakOut.com (6/28/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Acquires Issues2000.org (6/21/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Expands International News Coverage (5/25/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com & Roll Call Keep Americans Guessing in National Veepstakes
> > (5/25/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Challenges New Yorkers to Speak their Minds (5/24/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.Com Urges Federal Election Commission To Protect Free Speech
on
> > the Internet (5/22/00)
> >
> > Republican Heavyweight Jumps into the Ring for SpeakOut.com (5/17/00)
> >
> > Political Opposites Find Common Ground at SpeakOut.com (5/10/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Announces the Real "VeepStakes!" (4/19/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com & DNC Kick Off First Interactive Party Platform in History
> > (4/6/00)
> >
> > All Three Major Political Parties Agree on One Thing (3/28/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com to Acquire GoVote.com (2/25/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com "Rolls Out" Ad Campaign in Nation's Capital (2/22/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Speaks to America Through Talk Radio (2/14/00)
> >
> > McCain Matches Bush in Ad Buys in Top South Carolina TV Markets

(2/10/00)

> >
> > Major Political Parties Sign Partnership Enabling Citizens to Speak Out
> > (2/3/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Provides Real-Time Analysis of Voters During January 26
> > Democratic & Republican Debates (1/26/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bill Bradley as Winner of Democratic
> > Debate (1/26/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bush, Keyes as Clear Winners in New
> > Hampshire Republican Debate (1/26/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com Selects GlobalCenter For Its Internet Infrastructure
> > (1/13/00)
> >
> > SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Join Forces to Enhance GOP Debate Coverage
(12/9/99)
> >
> > Kerry Kennedy Cuomo, Susan Eisenhower Join SpeakOut.com (12/8/99)
> >
> > All-Star Political Team (11/6/99)
> >
> > Funding (11/6/99)
> >
>

> > Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC
20005

>

> >
> >
> >*****

>
> Warren Mitofsky
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
>
> 212 980-3031
> 212 980-3107 FAX

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Aug 20 15:25:51 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA17819 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 15:25:51 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA17832 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 15:25:50 -0700
(PDT)

Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 15:25:50 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Newsweek Poll: Convention Bounce Makes It Gore 48%, Bush 42%

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008201518340.16922-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! All Rights Reserved.

http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/000819/ny_newswee.html

Saturday August 19, 12:44 pm Eastern Time

Press Release

SOURCE: Newsweek

NEWSWEEK POLL: CONVENTION BOUNCE PUSHES GORE AHEAD OF BUSH 48-42 PERCENT

Democrat Also Shrinks Gap On Leadership (60%-62%); Leads on Issues (54%-47%); Honesty (64%-58%), Caring (60%-47%); And Even Edges Republican on Likeability (70%-68%); Clinton Ties Still Hurt

NEW YORK, Aug. 19 /PRNewswire/ -- Vice President Al Gore has come from behind to lead his presidential Republican opponent, Texas Gov. George W. Bush, for the first time since late June, according to the latest Newsweek Poll, which shows Gore at 48 percent and Bush at 42 percent in a standard two-night average of registered voters surveyed during and after the Democratic convention. The four-way trial also shows 3 percent for Green Party leader Ralph Nader and 1 percent for Reform Party leader Pat Buchanan. (Photo: <http://www.newscom.com/cgi-bin/prnh/20000819/HSSA008>)

Even before Gore's speech to Democratic delegates at the convention on Thursday, the vice president had gained ground on Bush in the Newsweek Poll, with 45 percent supporting Gore versus 44 percent for Bush. That figure went up on Friday to 51 percent for Gore versus 39 percent for Bush among voters polled after the vice president's acceptance speech for the Democratic nomination. In a two-way trial, Gore (52%) comes from behind to pull ahead of Bush (44%), based on results that average the votes from Thursday and Friday night.

Gore's speech had an impact on a large number of voters, with 45 percent saying it gave them a more favorable opinion of him (only 20% say less favorable). Based on voters interviewed on Friday, 40 percent said it made them more likely to support the Democratic ticket (only 11% said less likely). That compares with 47 percent of voters who said they had a more favorable opinion of Bush following his speech at the Republican convention two weeks ago and 37 percent, who said they felt more likely to support the Republican ticket.

Thirty-seven percent of voters also said they were more likely to support the Democratic ticket following the speech given by vice presidential nominee, Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman. After the acceptance speech by Dick Cheney, the Republican vice presidential nominee, 32 percent said they were more likely to vote for the Republican ticket. But only 22 percent of voters said they were more likely to support the Democrats

following former Sen. Bill Bradley's speech and endorsement of Gore at the convention. After his GOP counterpart, Arizona Sen. John McCain, spoke and at the Republican convention, 32 percent of voters said they were more likely to support the Republican ticket.

Gore is also getting a bounce on the issues. More people think Gore will do a better job than Bush on the economy and jobs (52% to 35%), on abortion (48% to 30%), on social security (51% to 35%), on taxes (45% to 39%), on education and vouchers (49% to 35%), on upholding moral values (42% to 38%), on appointing new justices to the Supreme Court (43% to 36%), on health care (56% to 30%) and on helping seniors pay for prescription drugs (58% to 27%).

Voters also view Gore more favorably now. While Bush is still seen as having marginally stronger leadership qualities than Gore (62% to 60%), the figure marks Gore's highest rating in this area, according to the last six Newsweek Polls. In a reversal from last week's poll, Gore is now seen as being more honest and ethical than Bush (64% to 58%). (Bush led last week on this front 66% to 52%). The vice president has also moved marginally ahead in being personally likeable (70% to 68%), and in saying what he believes, not just what people want to hear (54% to 49%). But 39 percent of voters still think the vice president's ties to President Bill Clinton and his record will hurt Gore's chances of being elected. And even though the majority of voters (52%) say they and their families are financially better off today than they were eight years ago, under President George Bush, 46 percent of people polled say it makes no difference who is elected because the prosperity will continue either way (35% said it was more likely to continue under Gore; 14% under Bush).

The Democratic Party as a whole gained a bounce from the convention. The majority of voters (51%) said they would vote for a Democratic candidate for Congress if the elections were held now, while 40 percent said they would vote Republican. That marks a huge jump for the Democrats from last week's poll when Republicans had a marginal 45 to 44 percent edge.

For this Newsweek Poll, Princeton Survey Research Associates interviewed 806 adults, age 18 and older, from Aug. 17-18, 2000. The margin of error is plus or minus 4 percentage points.

SOURCE: Newsweek

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! All Rights Reserved.

```
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Aug 20 16:57:34 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id QAA02818 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 16:57:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id QAA21817 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Aug 2000 16:57:33 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 16:57:33 -0700 (PDT)
```

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CNN/USAToday/Gallup Poll: Gore 47%, Bush 46%, Nader 3%, Buchanan
2%
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008201630360.20554-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000820/ts/poll_cnn_dc_1.html

Sunday August 20 4:26 PM ET

Gore And Bush Teams Neck-And-Neck in New Poll

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - A new poll on Sunday showed Democratic presidential candidate Al Gore and vice-presidential nominee in a neck-and-neck race with the Republican team of George W. Bush and Dick Cheney among Americans most likely to go to the polls in November.

The CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll conducted on Friday and Saturday showed that, in two-way race, 49 percent of likely voters would vote for each contending team in November's general elections.

The poll had a margin of error of 4 percent.

That represented a major move upward for Gore and Lieberman, who gained momentum from last week's Democratic convention. A poll by the same group conducted on Aug. 11-12 had shown the Gore team trailing by 40 percent to 56 percent for Bush and Cheney.

The new CNN poll also measured likely voters' response to a four-way race, including Reform Party candidate Patrick Buchanan and the Green Party's Ralph Nader, even though the two secondary candidates barely showed up in voter's plans.

In a four-way race, Gore would lead Bush by 47 percent to 46 percent among likely voters, with two percent supporting a ticket led by Buchanan and three percent for Nader.

A total of 1,043 adult Americans were interviewed for the poll, with 697 of them considered likely voters.

In broader terms that include all those interviewed, 50 percent said they backed the Gore team against 47 percent for Bush and Cheney in a two-way race. In a four-way race, 48 percent were for Gore, 44 percent for Bush, 1 percent for Buchanan and 3 percent for Nader.

The margin of error for all Americans interviewed was three percent.

The new poll was in line with an earlier one issued on Saturday by Newsweek magazine among likely voters that showed Gore pulling ahead of Bush.

Newsweek's poll of 806 registered voters conducted before and after Gore's nomination acceptance speech on Thursday night at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles had 48 percent favoring Gore and 42 percent for Bush. Green Party nominee Ralph Nader took 3 percent and Reform Party leader Pat Buchanan (news - web sites) 1 percent.

In a two-way race between the vice president and the Texas governor, Gore led with 52 percent, compared with 44 percent for Bush, according to the survey conducted last Thursday and Friday night.

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

Copyright (C) 2000 The Associated Press. All rights reserved.

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/ap/20000820/el/presidential_race_1.html

Sunday August 20 4:49 PM ET
Politics News - updated 6:05 PM ET Aug 20

Poll: Gore, Bush Tied

By WILL LESTER, Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - Al Gore and George W. Bush were tied in a poll of likely voters Sunday as aides for both candidates heated up the dialogue on the air waves over presidential debates.

``We are going to participate in a record number of five presidential and vice presidential debates,'' Bush communications director Karen Hughes said on ``Fox News Sunday.'' She was referring to a recent campaign proposal that the presidential candidates debate three times and the vice presidential candidates debate twice.

``We're game. We'll start this week. In fact, we'll do five times five if they'll give us the opportunity,'' said Donna Brazile, Gore's campaign manager. ``We'll start negotiations tomorrow.''

The Commission on Presidential Debates has proposed three between the presidential candidates, on Oct. 3 in Boston, Oct. 11 in Winston-Salem, N.C., and Oct. 17 in St. Louis. The commission plan is for a vice presidential debate in Danville, Ky., on Oct. 5. The commission proposals are always subject to negotiations by the candidates.

Bush aides cautioned the surge Gore has gotten in the polls after his party's national convention could be short-lived. Bush got a bounce after his convention that quickly evaporated.

``We said all along that it's going to be a close election,'' Hughes said on CNN's ``Late Edition.'' ``We expect it to be a close, hard-fought election all the way to November.''

The CNN-USA Today-Gallup poll had Democrat Gore at 47 percent, Republican Bush at 46 percent, Green Party candidate Ralph Nader at 3 percent and Reform Party candidate Pat Buchanan at 2 percent.

The poll of 697 likely voters taken Friday and Saturday had an error margin of 4 percentage points. That same poll right before the convention showed Bush 16 points ahead of Gore, 55 percent to 39 percent.

``I don't think you can put too much stock in the instant polls taken in the immediate aftermath of a convention,'' Hughes said, noting that Walter Mondale surged ahead of Ronald Reagan in 1984 in some polls but eventually lost the race.

Gore's campaign press secretary Chris Lehane said the campaign was determined to appear nonchalant about the progress, but added: ``Clearly, there's some movement going on in this race.''

Gore's campaign manager William Daley said on NBC's ``Meet The Press: ``We are encouraged that people obviously listened to the vice president on Thursday evening. ... There are issues that we've got to address and he was specific about them. And I think that's what people reacted to.''

Bush aide Karl Rove countered that Gore's convention speech could cost him support in the long run. ``Al Gore launched out talking about populism, about class warfare, about powerful forces that were supposedly keeping us from making progress,'' Rove said.

The Gallup poll is one of several that have indicated Gore made significant gains in public opinion after his convention. A Newsweek poll out Saturday showed Gore slightly ahead at 48 percent to 42 percent, but that measured all registered voters, which tends to give stronger results to the Democrats.

Gore pulled even in the CNN-USA Today-Gallup poll by building about a 20-point lead among women, while Bush has about the same size lead among men.

The poll suggested that Gore helped himself on the issues of health care, Medicare and Social Security during the convention.

Both campaigns are launching TV ad campaigns in key states to kick off the fall campaign. While Bush aides said they planned a positive focus, they would quickly respond if attacked.

Gore had about \$6.4 million in the bank at the end of July before setting out for the Democratic National Convention and he had spent \$44 million for his campaign, according to records filed Sunday with the Federal Election Commission.

The debate picture has unanswered questions, the participation of third-party candidates among them. Hughes said on CNN ``that's not something we've really'' had ``a specific discussion with the governor

about at this point.''

Former Democratic candidate Bill Bradley told Newsweek that Bush is unlikely to get clobbered by Gore in the debates because he hasn't provided specifics on plans like Social Security that Gore can pick apart.

``I'd rather be the guy who can't add two and two,''' Bradley told Newsweek. ``All Bush has to do is have one or two moments where people go, `Phew! I guess it's going to be OK!'''

Bush was to campaign in Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Louisiana and Florida in the coming week, while Cheney heads to California. Gore and running mate Joe Lieberman were getting back aboard their riverboat Monday to head to Hannibal, Mo., the boyhood hometown of Mark Twain.

Copyright (C) 2000 The Associated Press. All rights reserved.

>From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Mon Aug 21 08:42:51 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 ESMTTP
id IAA16315 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 08:42:50 -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 KAA11165
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 10:42:49 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 10:42:38 -0500
Message-Id: <s9a1079e.067@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 10:36:19 -0500
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: shavitt@uiuc.edu
Subject: position opening

Position Announcement

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Department of Advertising is searching to fill two full-time faculty positions, starting August, 2001.

Levels for both positions are open, and both junior and senior candidates are encouraged to apply. Qualified applicants will have completed a Ph.D. by the time they begin.

The Department of Advertising is comprised of research-oriented faculty with strengths in consumer behavior and other advertising-related areas.

The department is interdisciplinary in approach and composition. We seek to hire an individual who is committed to research in consumer behavior and/or commercial communication. Salary is competitive; research support and environment are excellent.

The successful applicant will be expected to teach in the department's undergraduate advertising sequence as well as at the graduate level. S/he will also be expected to serve on departmental committees and to participate in the recruitment of future faculty.

Letter of application, vita, and three letters of recommendation should be sent to Search Committee, Department of Advertising, University of Illinois, 810 S. Wright Street, Urbana, IL 61801, (217) 333-1603. In order to ensure full consideration, applications should be received by October 15, 2000. Women and minority candidates are strongly encouraged to apply. The University of Illinois is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer.

```
>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Mon Aug 21 09:47:37 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
      by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
      id JAA22688 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 09:47:37 -0700
(PDT)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscntl.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
      by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA29428
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 09:47:35 -0700
Message-Id: <200008211647.JAA29428@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 09:49:59 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: What can you tell us all about the methods of SpeakOut.com?
In-reply-to: <4.3.2.7.2.20000820074539.00b98b20@pop.mindspring.com>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008182138010.21812-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
```

Nobody I know would ever do this, but it occurs to me that it would be relatively easy to demonstrate the perils of self-selected samples to the press. We could, for example, point the considerable computer resources of aapornet members at this site during the next big event with a specific agreed upon response pattern. I suspect a few hundred terminals responding in an agreed upon manner could be made to move the lines on the screen in ways that would give the flacks some interesting trends to talk about.

Now, I for one would never even consider doing this. Anybody who would consider doing this should not contact me under any circumstances.

```
Date sent: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 07:57:59 -0400
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: What can you tell us all about the methods of
SpeakOut.com?
```

To answer Jim's inquiry, Speakout.com is nothing more than a self selected

sample of people who chose to dial into the MSNBC.com web site and search long enough to find speakout.com. If you did this during the Republican or Democratic conventions, which I did, you could play the game of indicating your reaction, positive or negative, from 0 to 100 for what was currently being said by speakers at the conventions.

Speakout.com provided viewing for journalists. Those who were dumb enough to play as shells for this information wrote stories for their newspapers and MSNBC put it on television in the Frank Luntz segments. Luntz also had a studio group that played their own games. Both activities were referred to by Luntz as focus groups. This was the material criticized in the NCPP press release, which is available at NCPP.org under press releases.

Speakout.com clearly says its material is not scientific. However, every discussion of its results by the media speaks in generalities about the public reaction.

There is nothing to evaluate here. Speakout.com is a meaningless collection of a handful of self selected web participants. And the press that covered it is naive in the extreme.

warren mitofsky

At 12:17 AM 8/19/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Can any of you tell us all more about the methods of SpeakOut.com, of 1225
>I Street N.W., Washington, DC, whose recent press release (see below)
>boasts of having created "the largest-ever focus group"?

>

>My interest in the company has been increasingly aroused by the Los
>Angeles Times, which has mentioned it in four major national party
>convention stories over the past two weeks, including a five-column time
>series chart of the continuous reactions of 1,237 "individuals" (no
>sampling, percentages or demographics discussed) to Al Gore's acceptance
>speech Thursday night, aggregated by Democrats, Republicans, and
>Undecided, with a running line for "Overall" also included. The same
>chart reports "Data lost for first 6 minutes of speech" (I am not
>kidding).

>

>MSNBC, a partner in the SpeakOut venture since last December, has
>mentioned the company's name and research in five stories over the past 18
>days. USA Today, another prominent user of SpeakOut data, has cited
>the company in 9 stories over the past 8 months.

>

>One unacknowledged dispute over the SpeakOut methods has arisen between
>the two Times, Los Angeles and New York. The New York Times, which has
>mentioned SpeakOut in nine articles--including several technology
>reports--over the past five-and-a-half months, recently dismissed the
>SpeakOut sample size as only "a few hundred"--while today's Los Angeles
>Times, as I've already mentioned, gives extreme prominence to its
>statement: "A total of 1,237 individuals participated" (to rate the Gore
>acceptance speech).

>

>Despite knowing all this, I still know next to nothing about the

>demographic characteristics of the SpeakOut sample, how it was selected,
>how consent was obtained, how continuous time series data are collected on
>each participant, and how the quality and integrity of the tabulation is
>assured (just to scratch the surface of my own curiosity).

>

>I don't even know whether to worry more, on the one hand, about the
>imminence of a Federal Ministry of Truth, humming out continuous synthetic
>survey data on every imaginable policy question, each with its own
>homepage on the Web, in the service of nameless and faceless "focus
>groups" of our fellow citizens, or to worry more, on the other hand, that
>survey research--which only 60 years ago promised to make public opinion
>measurement a respectable applied science--has begun the new millennium as
>some rude mating of a television game show, a telethon to help the victims
>of the latest public policy malfeasance, and a carnival tent-act.

>

>How long before Las Vegas and Reno begin to post book on, say, the
>Democrat-Republican percentage-point spread for "Agree" on the Vice
>President's third mention of the term "Social Security"? And how long
>after that before we have the first scandal involving the fixing of that
>spread?

>

>Meanwhile, what can any of you tell us all about the methods of
>SpeakOut.com?

>

-- Jim

>

>

>Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC 20005

>

<http://www.speakout.com/aboutus/releases/InstantViewerResponse.asp>

>

>Press Release

>

>

> SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> at the Political Conventions; Partnership with MSNBC creates the
> largest-ever focus group

>

>

>WASHINGTON, D.C. - August 9, 2000 - For SpeakOut.com, the Republican
>National Convention represented a technological breakthrough in the field
>of online opinion research.

>

>During George W. Bush's acceptance speech at the Republican convention,
>SpeakOut.com's patent-pending online research technology -- NterceptTM --
>captured demographically cross-tabulated response data on a
>second-by-second basis from the largest, live online panel ever
>assembled. Results from the Internet-based survey were used in reporting
>by MSNBC, The Los Angeles Times, USA Today, The Washington Post and other
>major news organizations. Over 1,000 respondents participated in the
>survey during the final evening of the convention, with many providing
>moment-by-moment input throughout the Bush speech.

>

>Traditional focus groups are typically limited to 20 to 40 respondents
>who must be brought together at the same time, in a single location,
>usually after office hours. In contrast, SpeakOut's new NterceptTM
>technology brings the research room to the participant, allowing
>thousands of participants to be simultaneously interviewed, or

>interviewed on a delayed basis, at the participant's convenience.
>
>As users respond and react within the focus group, the Ntercept
>technology aggregates user responses in real time, second-by-second, and
>provides live analysis of how different demographic groups are reacting,
>with complete summary information and analysis available as well. In
>Philadelphia, for example, cross-tabulated data of viewer response to
>George W. Bush's speech was available on MSNBC.com and SpeakOut.com
>online even before the Texas Governor left the stage.
>
>"This is not your parents' focus group," said Will Feltus, Director of
>Polling for SpeakOut.com. "This is the dawn of a new age in interactive
>media research."
>
>The Internet represents the next revolution in market research platforms.
>Whereas traditional in-person focus groups and telephone interview
>surveys are limited in their scope and reach, the Internet -- with
>streaming video and audio and enhanced interactivity -- provides faster
>turnaround and a more cost-effective solution for many types of analysis.
>While not suitable for all types of research, many projects can be
>executed successfully using NterceptTM technology based on its ability to
>poll larger groups of participants faster at lower per-participant costs.
>
>NterceptTM software allows market research firms, polling companies,
>advertising agencies, corporate research departments and political
>campaigns to capture data from larger, more demographically diverse
>panels than ever before, with greater speed and statistical accuracy. The
>political world, news media, and sports and entertainment industries are
>now developing applications for NterceptTM, which is capable of
>supporting tens of thousands of simultaneous participants.
>
>"Public opinion research has come a long way from those door-to-door,
>pen-and-clipboard interviews," said Ron Howard, Chairman and CEO of
>SpeakOut.com. "Telephone surveys were the next step and now the Internet
>represents the new frontier. Ntercept represents breakthrough opinion
>research technology which we plan to make the standard for all consumers
>of opinion research analysis."
>
>
>About SpeakOut.com
>
>Based in Washington, DC, SpeakOut.com (www.speakout.com) is the leading
>non-partisan Internet activism Web site and online opinion research
>company. Launched in February 2000, Speakout.com's primary mission is to
>enhance the democratic process by enabling citizens to have a direct
>impact on the decisions that affect their lives. Users enjoy a wide
>variety of news and information tailored to their interests and activism
>tools allowing aggregated messaging to a vast array of public
>officeholders, candidates, business and news executives.
>
>
>Contacts
>
>Rekha Chalasani
>rekha@SpeakOut.com
>SpeakOut.com
>202-777-3173

>
>Jennifer Rich
>jennifer_rich@dc.edelman.com
>Edelman Worldwide
>202-326-1774
>
>-----
>
>
> OTHER PRESS RELEASES
>
> Gore Gets Higher Scores From Swing Voters Than Any Speaker In Either
> Party (8/16/00)
>
> Lieberman Scores High With Democrats But Loses Independents On
> Affirmative Action (8/16/00)
>
> Kennedys, Bradley Rate Higher Than Clinton With Swing Voters (8/15/00)
>
> Democrats, Women Give Clinton Soaring Marks; Undecideds Hover Just Under
> 50% (8/15/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com offers \$5,000 prize to a lucky at-home analyst (8/11/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com to Acquire VoxCap.com Political Portals (8/10/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com's "Instant Viewer Response" Makes Opinion Research History
> at the Political Conventions (8/9/00)
>
> "Soccer Mom" Picks Lieberman for VP (8/8/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Delivers Results of Instant Viewer Response Analysis:
> Independents Waver On Abortion & Anti-Clinton Remarks (8/4/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Viewers Tell the Whole Story with Instantaneous
> Convention Analysis (8/2/00)
>
> MSNBC & MSNBC.com Get America to SpeakOut during Political Conventions
> (7/19/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Launches "Boys on the Buzz" (7/18/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & RNC Partner to Revolutionize Democracy Online (7/11/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com's Armchair Pundits Pick the VP Candidates (7/11/00)
>
> Local Activism Goes National with SpeakOut.com (6/28/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Acquires Issues2000.org (6/21/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Expands International News Coverage (5/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & Roll Call Keep Americans Guessing in National Veepstakes
> (5/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Challenges New Yorkers to Speak their Minds (5/24/00)
>

> SpeakOut.Com Urges Federal Election Commission To Protect Free Speech on
> the Internet (5/22/00)
>
> Republican Heavyweight Jumps into the Ring for SpeakOut.com (5/17/00)
>
> Political Opposites Find Common Ground at SpeakOut.com (5/10/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Announces the Real "VeepStakes!" (4/19/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & DNC Kick Off First Interactive Party Platform in History
> (4/6/00)
>
> All Three Major Political Parties Agree on One Thing (3/28/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com to Acquire GoVote.com (2/25/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com "Rolls Out" Ad Campaign in Nation's Capital (2/22/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Speaks to America Through Talk Radio (2/14/00)
>
> McCain Matches Bush in Ad Buys in Top South Carolina TV Markets (2/10/00)
>
> Major Political Parties Sign Partnership Enabling Citizens to Speak Out
> (2/3/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Provides Real-Time Analysis of Voters During January 26
> Democratic & Republican Debates (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bill Bradley as Winner of Democratic
> Debate (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Dial Group Projects Bush, Keyes as Clear Winners in New
> Hampshire Republican Debate (1/26/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com Selects GlobalCenter For Its Internet Infrastructure
> (1/13/00)
>
> SpeakOut.com & MSNBC Join Forces to Enhance GOP Debate Coverage (12/9/99)
>
> Kerry Kennedy Cuomo, Susan Eisenhower Join SpeakOut.com (12/8/99)
>
> All-Star Political Team (11/6/99)
>
> Funding (11/6/99)
>
>-----
>Copyright (C) 2000 SpeakOut.com -- 1225 I Street N.W., Washington, DC 20005
>-----
>
>
>*****

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From hfienberg@stats.org Mon Aug 21 12:20:48 2000
Received: from smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net [207.172.4.62])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA28083 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 12:20:43 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from 207-172-113-103.s103.tnt5.ann.va.dialup.rcn.com ([207.172.113.103] helo=howard)
by smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net with smtp (Exim 3.15 #2)
id 13Qx7a-0001Nd-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 15:20:34 -0400

Reply-To: <hfienberg@stats.org>
From: "Howard Fienberg" <hfienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: What is a daily rolling sample?
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 15:11:38 -0400
Message-ID: <000e01c00ba4\$ea2354e0\$6771accf@howard>
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
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

from the Frontrunner: "Battleground Poll Shows Bush Leading By 5. A Battleground Poll of 1000 likely voters, with a daily rolling sample of 500, taken August 16-17 and released August 18 showed Bush ahead of Gore 45-40."

Could someone please explain what might be meant by "daily rolling sample"? Does this mean that half of each day's sample gets to stay on the island the next day?

++++
Howard Fienberg hfienberg@stats.org
Research Analyst http://www.stats.org
The Statistical Assessment Service
2100 L. St., NW (202) 223-3193
Suite 300 FAX: 872-4014
Washington, DC 20037 ICQ#: 38550600

The Statistical Assessment Service is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to improving public understanding of scientific and social research.

+++++

>From stuartsobel@visto.com Mon Aug 21 12:41:54 2000
Received: from qmail1.visto.com ([209.185.20.131])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id MAA10865 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 12:41:47 -0700
(PDT)

Message-Id: <200008211941.MAA10865@usc.edu>
Received: (qmail 4702 invoked by alias); Received: from unknown (HELO mp7)
(206.79.140.187) by qmail1.visto.com with SMTP; 21 Aug 2000 12:36:18 -0700
Sender: stuartsobel@visto.com
Reply-To: stuartsobel@visto.com
From: "Stuart Sobel" <stuartsobel@visto.com>
Subject: Employment Opportunity - Field Interview Manager
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 12:36:29 -0700
X-Mailer: Visto
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Visto Server
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id MAA10875

The March of Dimes' California Birth Defects Monitoring Program is a nationally recognized program devoted to finding the causes of birth defects. To this end the Program:

- * Maintains a birth defects registry of babies born with a medically-significant, structural birth defect
- * Conducts large interview studies to gather information about factors which may be associated with birth defects
- * Monitors rates and trends
- * Responds to community concerns about birth defects and the environment

We are looking for an experienced Field Interview Manager to direct our surveys of mothers of children born with birth defects. You will implement data collection procedures and protocols to ensure study goals are effectively met, including:

-  Work with research scientists to help develop and test survey questionnaires
-  Monitor and analyze survey progress and propose strategies to improve progress and increase response rates
-  Supervise day-to-day activities of home-based interviewers, including assignment of cases, monitoring telephone or in-person interviews in progress
-  Perform quality control of interviews and the overall survey process
-  Hire and train new interviewers
-  Direct tracking and tracing activities
-  Meet with interviewers on individual and group basis to discuss ways to improve quality and efficiency

 Meet with research scientists to discuss ways to improve survey methods

 Identify and possibly implement alternative methods of data gathering

We offer a collegial, team oriented work environment with sane schedules and flexible hours. Highly competitive salary and 18% additional for selection of benefits or cash, plus generous paid time off.

The position requires a minimum of 3 years experience managing research survey staff as described above. Previous experience with interviewing or interviewer supervision is desirable. Experience with computer assisted interviewing (CATI/CAPI) is preferred (or at least computer literacy and willingness to learn this technology). Knowledge of alternative methods of data gathering such as focus groups, etc. Experience in a scientific environment is a plus. Periodic travel throughout California is also required

Email resume to careers@cbdmp.org. Fax to Careers@CBDMP (510) 434-5393, or mail to California Birth Defects Monitoring Program, Attn: Careers, 1830 Embarcadero, Suite 100, Oakland, CA 94606. EOE/AA

Visit <http://www.visto.com/info>, your free web-based communications center. Visto.com. Life on the Dot.

>From binddav@statcan.ca Mon Aug 21 13:04:31 2000
Received: from smtpshb2.statcan.ca (smtpshb2.statcan.ca [142.206.3.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA24990 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 13:04:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from stcnet.statcan.ca (stcnet.statcan.ca [142.206.128.146])
by smtpshb2.statcan.ca (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id QAA11678;
Mon, 21 Aug 2000 16:07:01 -0400
Received: from cr981443-a (dhcp11-154.statcan.ca [142.206.11.154])
by stcnet.statcan.ca (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA27161;
Mon, 21 Aug 2000 15:59:48 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.20000821160338.007b8440@stcpop.statcan.ca>
X-Sender: binddav@stcpop.statcan.ca
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 16:03:38 -0400
To: "AAPORNET" <AAPORNET@usc.edu>, "allstat" <allstat@mailbase.ac.uk>
From: "David A. Binder" <binddav@statcan.ca>
Subject: Statistics Canada Symposium 2001 Call for Papers
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 NAA25036

Note: For the following, please send replies to: symposium2001@statcan.ca

CALL FOR PAPERS

Achieving Data Quality in a Statistical Agency: A Methodological Perspective

October 17 to 19, 2001

XVIIIth International Symposium on Methodological Issues Statistics Canada

With its eighteenth annual symposium, Statistics Canada continues its successful series of conferences on methodological issues, attracting renowned statisticians, researchers, academics, and data analysts and others interested in meeting the challenges of a statistical agency. Symposium 2001 will feature both invited and contributed sessions, and will provide an ideal forum for exchanging your experiences and knowledge of methods to achieve data quality. Papers of this conference will be published in the proceedings of the Symposium.

We invite abstracts of 200 to 300 words for contributed papers. We are especially interested in papers that present innovative methods to meet the challenges of data quality, especially from the perspective of data accuracy. Your abstract (English or French) should include the presenter's name, affiliation, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address. The deadline is December 1, 2000. Send yours to:

Simon Cheung, Symposium 2001 Co-ordinator
16th Floor, R.H. Coats Building, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0T6
E-mail: symposium2001@statcan.ca Telephone: (613) 951-1482 Fax: (613) 951-3100

The symposium will be held at the Palais des congrès in Hull, Quebec, just minutes away from downtown Ottawa. Examples of possible topics for the Symposium are listed below.

Registers and Frames: construction and maintenance, coverage and quality evaluation, dealing with imperfect frames

Sample Design: complex survey redesign, multi-phase sampling, area sampling, sample rotation, robustness over time, respondent burden, longitudinal surveys, co-ordinating samples between surveys, sampling rare or elusive population, RDD sampling, sampling for non-response

Data Collection and Capture: new technologies for quality control of collection and capture, mixed-mode collection, interviewer effects, re-interview and response evaluation, measurement errors, cognitive aspects, questionnaire design, reducing non-response, controlling response error, selective follow-up, remote sensing, data scanning and recognition, internet survey

Data Processing: selective editing, graphical editing, macro editing, new coding and editing technologies, new imputation methods

Estimation: estimation of level, change, trend or complex indices, use of auxiliary information, weighting, small area methods, model-assisted methods, combining data across time and space, calibration methods, mass imputation, variance estimation and in the presence of imputed data, outliers, use of measurement scales, coherence and integration with external information, data calendarization and benchmarking, projection and advance statistics

Data Analysis and Dissemination: analysis of data from complex surveys, modelling with survey data, quality evaluation, accuracy measurement,

effects of survey errors, impact of disclosure control, communicating data quality

Sector-specific: censuses, surveys of households, individuals, institutions, businesses, agriculture, and the environment, price indexes, system of national accounts

Cross-cutting Issues: survey integration and harmonisation, international comparisons, derived products, meta-analysis, use of administrative data, record linkage, statistical matching, time series methods, tools for survey design and data processing

Visit our Web site: www.statcan.ca/english/services/smnrs.htm (up shortly)

David A. Binder | binddav@statcan.ca
Director General | davidbinder@home.com
Methodology Branch | az004@ncf.ca
120 Parkdale Avenue | TEL: 1-613-951-0980 (Office)
R.H. Coats Building 3-0 | 1-613-226-7292 (Home)
Statistics Canada | FAX: 1-613-951-5711
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6 |

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Aug 21 15:49:26 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA13133 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 15:49:26 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA23072 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 15:49:25 -0700
(PDT)

Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 15:49:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Gore Leads for First Time in Reuters/Zogby Poll
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008211530360.20510-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000821/p1/campaign_poll_dc_11.html

Monday August 21 12:44 PM ET

Gore Leads for First Time in Reuters/Zogby Poll

By Alan Elsner, Political Correspondent

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Vice President Al Gore (news - web sites), helped by a bounce from the Democratic convention, sprung into a narrow lead over Republican rival George W. Bush (news - web sites) on Monday, the first time he has led the presidential race in the Reuters/Zogby poll.

The poll of 1,004 likely voters conducted for Reuters Friday through Sunday by pollster John Zogby found Gore leading Bush, the governor of Texas, 44-41 percent. With a three percentage point margin of error, the race was technically a statistical dead heat.

Green Party candidate Ralph Nader (news - web sites) polled 5 percent and Reform Party candidate Pat Buchanan (news - web sites) had 2 percent with 7 percent still unsure. In a two-man matchup, the results were similar: Gore led 47-43 percent.

One week ago, before the Democratic convention, Bush had led Gore 43-40 percent. That put Gore's convention bounce at a fairly modest six percentage points.

But it was the first time the vice president had ever led Bush in any Reuters/Zogby poll of likely voters.

``As expected Gore, received a boost, especially among women voters, and he brought the Democratic base back to him. What remains to be seen is whether it lasts or whether the good feelings Gore engendered with his speech melt away in the next week or two,' ' Zogby said.

Three other polls taken since the convention ended last Thursday have shown Gore taking a narrow lead. A Gallup poll of likely voters and a CBS poll of registered voters both had the vice president a single point ahead. A Newsweek poll taken last Thursday and Friday showed Gore six points ahead.

Most experts and the candidates themselves, expect the race to stay close all the way to Election Day on Nov. 7.

Bush Predicts Close Race

``It's going to be a close race,' ' Bush said on Monday before boarding a plane for a campaign event in Milwaukee.

If it is close, individual state polls may become more crucial than national surveys since the election is decided on a state-by-state basis.

Gore took a wide lead of 19 points in the eastern part of the country and led by nine points in the west. But Bush stayed seven points ahead in the south and led by four points in the crucial Midwest region, where most experts believe the election will be decided.

For the first time, Gore was winning 80 percent support from Democrats -- around the same as Bush was gaining from Republicans. Gore was three points ahead among independent voters.

Bush led by nine points among men but Gore was 14 points ahead among women. The vice president also led by nine points among Hispanic voters

and took three quarters of the black vote but Bush led by six points among whites.

Looking at the weekly surveys Reuters has conducted for each of the past four weeks, apart from a rise in support for Bush after the Republican convention, voter sentiment has remained fairly stable. Bush was at 42 percent on July 31, 43 percent on Aug. 14 and 41 percent now. Gore was at 38 percent on July 31, 40 percent on Aug. 14 and 44 percent now.

Gore received high marks for his speech on Thursday accepting the Democratic presidential nomination. Of the 57 percent of respondents who watched, 36 percent said it was excellent, 40 percent thought it was good, 16 percent said it was fair and only 7 percent said it was poor.

But Bush won slightly higher marks after his speech, which 47 percent had judged excellent.

Lieberman Gets High Marks

Gore's vice presidential running mate Joseph Lieberman also won high marks for his speech: 31 percent said it was excellent, 47 percent said good, 17 percent fair and only 4 percent poor.

Seventy percent of respondents said they had definitely made up their minds whom to support in the election but 29 percent said they would wait until the presidential debates before finally deciding.

However, there did not appear to be room for radical change in the race. Of those not supporting him, 80 percent said they had ruled out backing Gore. The numbers for Bush were similar: of those not supporting him, 79 percent said they had definitely ruled him out.

Respondents were given a choice of two statements with which to agree or disagree: 41 percent agreed that Gore had been a loyal vice president but did not have what it took to be president but 53 percent said that Gore was ready to be a strong leader.

Asked which candidate best understood the problems of married people with children, 41 percent said Gore and 29 percent said Bush. Asked which understood the problems of single people, 39 percent said Gore and 27 percent said Bush.

Table: If the presidential election were held today, who would you vote for?

	Aug. 21	Aug. 14	Aug. 7	July 31
George W. Bush (Republican) ...	41	43	49	42
Al Gore (Democrat)	44	40	32	38
Ralph Nader (Green)	5	7	6	7
Patrick Buchanan (Reform)	2	2	1	3
Harry Browne (Libertarian)	1	1	1	0.5
Not sure/don't know	7	7	11.5	9

Earlier Stories

POLL-Gore Edges Ahead in New Reuters/Zogby Poll (August 21)
Gore Pulls Ahead of Bush in Latest Poll (August 19)
Bush Lead Slips to Three in New Reuters/Zogby Poll (August 14)

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000821/zo/wages_2.html

Public Opinion News - updated 4:45 PM ET Aug 21
Monday August 21 4:44 PM ET

Most Want the Minimum Wage Increased

UTICA, N.Y. (Reuters/Zogby) - More Americans say they believe raising the minimum wage would benefit society rather than hurt small business, according to a recent Zogby American Values poll.

A recent survey of 1,028 likely voters nationwide showed that 51.5% supported increasing the minimum wage by \$1 an hour over three years, saying it would help reduce welfare rolls and improve standards of living.

Nearly four in 10 respondents, or 38%, opposed a minimum wage increase and said that it would hurt small businesses and decrease the number of entry-level jobs.

Democrats and Republicans responded along party lines, with 68.6% of Democrats favoring an increase while 54.8% of Republicans said it would be detrimental.

What we asked:

``Statement A: If the minimum wage is increased gradually by \$1 an hour over three years, it will benefit low-income families, help others get off welfare rolls, and improve the standard of living for millions of people.

Statement B: The bill to increase the minimum wage will be detrimental to small businesses that are not able to handle such increases and will cause businesses to decrease the number of people hired for entry-level jobs.''

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

>From ToniGenalo@asu.edu Mon Aug 21 17:39:51 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 RAA29917 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 17:39:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from conversion.post1.inre.asu.edu by asu.edu (PMDF V5.2-31
#33824)
id <0FZO00G014HVSU@asu.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon,
21 Aug 2000 17:39:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mainex1.asu.edu (mainex1.asu.edu [129.219.10.200])
by asu.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #33824) with ESMTP id <0FZO00IQ04HV3V@asu.edu> for
aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 17:39:31 -0700 (MST)
Received: by mainex1.asu.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <R20M7WBN>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 17:39:28 -0700
Content-return: allowed
Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 17:39:28 -0700
From: Toni Genalo <ToniGenalo@asu.edu>
Subject: Studies that have provided home computers
To: "AAPOR (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <23C4FF6DECA4D21182C400A0C9D17B740427F5BF@mainex4.asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-type: MULTIPART/ALTERNATIVE;
BOUNDARY="Boundary_(ID_1jSL1qyE9UTK2ONnecfniw)"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--Boundary_(ID_1jSL1qyE9UTK2ONnecfniw)
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home computers to
families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance
rates etc would be appreciated.

--Boundary_(ID_1jSL1qyE9UTK2ONnecfniw)
Content-type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!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">
<META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server version =
5.5.2652.35">
<TITLE>Studies that have provided home computers</TITLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Is anyone aware of the success of =
providing inexpensive in-home computers to families of varying SES to =
respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance rates etc would be =
```

appreciated. </P>

</BODY>

</HTML>

--Boundary_(ID_1jSL1qyE9UTK2ONnecfniw)--

>From arobbin@indiana.edu Mon Aug 21 19:01:33 2000

Received: from mask.uits.indiana.edu (mask.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.6.184])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id TAA09599 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 19:01:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ariel.uics.indiana.edu (aroBBin@ariel.uics.indiana.edu

[129.79.5.209])

by mask.uits.indiana.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/IUPO) with ESMTP id

e7M203622911

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 21:00:03 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (aroBBin@localhost)

by ariel.uics.indiana.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/1.2ariel-imap4) with SMTP id

VAA27070

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 21:00:02 -0500 (EST)

Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 21:00:02 -0500 (EST)

From: Alice Robbin <aroBBin@indiana.edu>

X-Sender: aroBBin@ariel.uics.indiana.edu

To: "AAPOR (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Studies that have provided home computers

In-Reply-To: <23C4FF6DECA4D21182C400A0C9D17B740427F5BF@mainex4.asu.edu>

Message-ID:

<Pine.GSO.3.96.1000821205108.24855B-100000@ariel.uics.indiana.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Check with InterSurvey, Inc: www.intersurvey.com

If I'm not mistaken, this is what they have done for their panel.

Alice Robbin

On Mon, 21 Aug 2000, Toni Genalo wrote:

> Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home computers
> to

> families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance

> rates etc would be appreciated.

>

School of Library and Information Science

Indiana University

005A Main Library

1320 East 10th Street

Bloomington, IN 47405-3907

Office: (812) 855-2018 Fax: (812) 855-6166

Email: aroBBin@indiana.edu

>From rusciano@rider.edu Mon Aug 21 19:33:32 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 TAA20972 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 19:33:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
id <01JT8Y3G8RF4000ZME@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon,
21 Aug 2000 22:34:10 EDT

Received: from rider.edu (access10.rider.edu [204.142.218.110])
by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
with ESMTTP id <01JT8Y3F54JC000XGN@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Mon,

21 Aug 2000 22:34:10 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 22:35:34 -0400

From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>

Subject: Digital recording/transcription of interviews

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win98; U)

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Accept-Language: en

References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>

Fellow AAPORneters:

Has anyone had any experience with using digital recorders and the
accompanying
transcription software for interviews? I was wondering if there is a
reliable
recorder and software setup that one can use to record an interview, and
then
have the results automatically transcribed on the computer in a Word file
(or
some other easy to edit format). Since I don't know if all AAPORneters
would be
interested in this (or probably know about it already), you can reply
directly to
me.

Thanks,

Frank Rusciano
email at rusciano@rider.edu

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Mon Aug 21 20:01:59 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 ESMTTP
id UAA00082 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 20:01:38 -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 ESMTTP id XAA59736
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 23:00:11 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial095.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.95])
by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id XAA21480

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Aug 2000 23:00:09 -0400

Date: Mon, 21 Aug 2000 23:00:09 -0400

Message-Id: <200008220300.XAA21480@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: Studies that have provided home computers

If Intersurvey is Norman Nie's group that did the late 1999 internet usage etc. survey, they provided everyone in their sample who did not already have internet usage with Web-TV.

But that's not the sample as an "in-home computer."

Susan

At 05:39 PM 8/21/2000 -0700, you wrote:

>Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home computers to

>families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance rates etc would be appreciated.

><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

><HTML>

><HEAD>

><META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

><META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2652.35">

><TITLE>Studies that have provided home computers</TITLE>

></HEAD>

><BODY>

>

><P>Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home computers to families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance rates etc would be appreciated. </P>

>

></BODY>

></HTML>

>

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.

slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

visit the site at:

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

850-644-8778 and

850-385-4266

Educational Research Office 850-644-4592

FAX 850-644-8776

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I HAVE JUST JOINED THE FACULTY AT:

The Department of Educational Research

307L Stone Building

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

>From edithl@xs4all.nl Tue Aug 22 02:55:35 2000
Received: from smtp1.xs4all.nl (smtp1.xs4all.nl [194.109.127.131])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id CAA18540 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 02:55:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hera (s340-isdn985.dial.xs4all.nl [194.109.183.217])
by smtp1.xs4all.nl (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id LAA22276;
Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:55:31 +0200 (CEST)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.20000822114336.00a5cdd0@pop.xs4all.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@pop.xs4all.nl
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:51:39 +0200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>
Subject: Re: Studies that have provided home computers
Cc: dirks@pi.net
In-Reply-To: <23C4FF6DECA4D21182C400A0C9D17B740427F5BF@mainex4.asu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_4142268==_ .ALT"

-----_4142268==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

This has been done in the Netherlands for some time with success.
for a theoretical description see the article by Saris in the book edited
by Mick Couper on CASIC. (Wiley in the ASA-conference monograph series).

For more practical information contact CENTERDATA in The Netherlands. They
have run a panels they provided with home computers (thoroughly stratified
according to age, gender and SES) for years. They are now switching to
Internet, pioneering how to do Internet panel surveys with members of
varying SES, age, gender (By the way I am not connected in any way with
Centerdata, but I think what they do is interesting).

You can contact centerdata at centerdata@kub.nl
Best regards, Edith

At 05:39 PM 8/21/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home computers
>to families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls,
>compliance rates etc would be appreciated.

Edith de Leeuw
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam

tel/fax +31.20.6223438 e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

A man said to the universe, "Madam I exist"
"Excellent", replied the universe,
"I need someone to take care of my cats"

(with thanks to Stephen Crane's cat)

-----_4142268==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

This has been done in the Netherlands for some time with success.

for a theoretical description see the article by Saris in the book edited
by Mick Couper on CASIC. (Wiley in the ASA-conference monograph
series).

For more practical information contact CENTERDATA in The Netherlands.
They have run a panels they provided with home computers (thoroughly
stratified according to age, gender and SES) for years. They are now
switching to Internet, pioneering how to do Internet panel surveys with
members of varying SES, age, gender (By the way I am not connected
in any way with Centerdata, but I think what they do is
interesting).

You can contact centerdata at centerdata@kub.nl

Best regards, Edith

At 05:39 PM 8/21/00 -0700, you wrote:

<blockquote type=cite cite>Is anyone aware of the success of
providing inexpensive in-home computers to families of varying SES to
respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance rates etc would be
appreciated. </blockquote>

<div>Edith de Leeuw</div>

<div>Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam</div>

<div>tel/fax +31.20.6223438 e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl</div>

<div>-----</div>

<div>A man said to the universe, "Madam I exist"</div>

<div>"Excellent", replied the universe,</div>

<div> "I need someone to take care of my cats"</div>

(with thanks to Stephen Crane's cat)

</html>

-----_4142268==_ .ALT--

>From arobbin@indiana.edu Tue Aug 22 05:08:21 2000

Received: from mask.uits.indiana.edu (mask.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.6.184])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id FAA15531 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 05:08:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ariel.uics.indiana.edu (arobbin@ariel.uics.indiana.edu

[129.79.5.209])

by mask.uits.indiana.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/IUPO) with ESMTP id
e7MC8I504787
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 07:08:18 -0500 (EST)
Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)
by ariel.ucs.indiana.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/1.2ariel-imap4) with SMTP id
HAA27601
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 07:08:17 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 07:08:17 -0500 (EST)
From: Alice Robbin <arobbin@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: arobbin@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Studies that have provided home computers
In-Reply-To: <200008220300.XAA21480@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.GSO.3.96.1000822070721.27419A-100000@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Thank you for correcting my misinformation. Hmmn. That's why we need
experts to filter massvie amount of information that flows across the
screen/monitors. Thank you.

On Mon, 21 Aug 2000, Susan Losh wrote:

```
> If Intersurvey is Norman Nie's group that did the late 1999 internet usage
> etc. survey, they provided everyone in their sample who did not already
have
> internet usage with Web-TV.
>
> But that's not the sample as an "in-home computer."
>
> Susan
>
> At 05:39 PM 8/21/2000 -0700, you wrote:
> >Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home computers
to
> >families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys? Pitfalls, compliance
> >rates etc would be appreciated.
> ><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
> ><HTML>
> ><HEAD>
> ><META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
> ><META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2652.35">
> ><TITLE>Studies that have provided home computers</TITLE>
> ></HEAD>
> ><BODY>
> >
> ><P><FONT SIZE=2 FACE="Arial">Is anyone aware of the success of providing
> >inexpensive in-home computers to families of varying SES to respond to
panel
> >surveys? Pitfalls, compliance rates etc would be appreciated. </FONT></P>
> >
> ></BODY>
> ></HTML>
> >
> Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
> slosh@garnet.fsu.edu
```


>
> visit the site at:
> <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>
>
> 850-644-8778 and
> 850-385-4266
> Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
> FAX 850-644-8776
>
> PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!
>
> I HAVE JUST JOINED THE FACULTY AT:
>
> The Department of Educational Research
> 307L Stone Building
> Florida State University
> Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

School of Library and Information Science
Indiana University
005A Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-2018 Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.edu

>From jkoch@tiac.net Tue Aug 22 07:31:15 2000
Received: from relay20.smtp.psi.net (relay20.smtp.psi.net [38.8.20.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA25603 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 07:31:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ip89.bedford8.ma.pub-ip.psi.net ([38.32.78.89] helo=tiac.net)
by relay20.smtp.psi.net with esmtp (Exim 3.13 #3)
id 13RF4W-0007hf-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 10:30:37 -0400
Message-ID: <39A2919E.B41C9A2B@tiac.net>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 10:43:42 -0400
From: John Kochevar <jkoch@tiac.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Studies that have provided home computers
References: <23C4FF6DECA4D21182C400A0C9D17B740427F5BF@mainex4.asu.edu>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----A1339DD9701F5C88AB706192"

-----A1339DD9701F5C88AB706192
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Marketing Service LTD., a Japanese research company, established a large consumer panel in the greater Tokyo/Osaka regions more than five years ago. They use several different types of computers, including a touch screen monitor which greatly simplifies administration for non computer literate respondents.

They start with a simple random sample and make repeated visits to respondent's homes, begging them to join their panel.

The placement cooperation rate is equal or better than in home/personal survey. (I believe this means better than 65 percent.) Demographics match the Japanese census stats for the Tokyo Osaka region. They take care to only survey the panel two times a month with a short survey (about 20 minutes) and get a 70 to 80 percent cooperation rate.

It is difficult to report the placement cooperation rate because of the complexity of the panel sample design and the fact that they replace 100 respondents every month. The whole panel is refreshed over the course of a year.

This panel, called Hyper Research, was in development for several years, and there were numerous detailed reports on reliability and validity. Unfortunately, all are in Japanese. Some may also be proprietary, because the system was partially supported by Asahi Shinbun.

Hyper Research is described in the Marketing Service web site:
MarketingService-jp.com.

Best Regards,

John Kochevar

Toni Genalo wrote:

>
>
> Is anyone aware of the success of providing inexpensive in-home
> computers to families of varying SES to respond to panel surveys?
> Pitfalls, compliance rates etc would be appreciated.

-----A1339DD9701F5C88AB706192
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en">
<html>

Marketing Service LTD., a Japanese research company, established a large consumer panel in the greater Tokyo/Osaka regions more than five years ago. They use several different types of computers, including a touch

POSITION: Field Director; 12-month research position with negotiable starting date. Start may be immediate, but no later than September 22, 2000.

RESPONSIBILITIES: Manage day-to-day activities of ongoing surveys conducted via a variety of methods; work with Center director to develop, plan, implement & monitor research designs including questionnaire designs; supervise all aspects of field projects including personnel; consult on stages of research design including sampling, data collection, and analysis; draft some proposals and reports. Responsible for interfacing with Computing Services; managing personnel who oversee routine maintenance of PCs; assisting with other technical details, including CATI system management and some client interaction.

QUALIFICATIONS: This position requires a record of successfully implementing surveys or managing complex research projects. A masters degree completed or in process in a social science or business is required; a Ph.D. is preferable.

Required are: an ability to assume multiple assignments, often under tight timeframes; very good oral and written communications and an ability to write clear research reports for professional and public audiences; very good interpersonal skills; supervisory experience; experience with computers in a networked environment; some evening and weekend work. Desirable qualities include: Experience using a CATI system, e-mail and/or other web-based surveys, mail and/or in-person surveys, and/or focus groups; knowledge of sampling methods; strong background in social science research in general & survey methodology in particular or evaluation; knowledge/experience with SAS or SPSS or other statistical packages and data analysis; computer programming; experience with client interactions and/or client development.

THE PROGRAM: The Survey Research Center, serves the entire university community and is part of the Graduate School. The center is a vital element in a strong commitment to research at a nationally recognized institution. The Center will use a variety of technologies.

SALARY: Salary depends on academic preparation and professional experience.

FRINGE BENEFITS: Major medical insurance, group life insurance, loss of income insurance, TIAA/CREF and/or Fidelity, Social Security, matching retirement contribution by the University and educational benefits.

LOCATION: The University of Arkansas, a Land Grant university, enrolls over 14,000 students. It is located in Northwest Arkansas, a dynamic and

fast-growing region, in the scenic Ozark Mountains close to lakes, rivers and national forests. The Fayetteville campus is the primary doctoral degree granting institution in the state and the major source of liberal and professional education. As Arkansas' major source of theoretical and applied research, it provides a wide range of public services throughout the state and nation. Direct air service to Chicago, Dallas-Ft. Worth, and other major cities is available.

CLOSING DATE: Review of applications begins September 4, 2000 and continues until position is filled.

APPLICATION: Interested persons should send or e-mail a resume, official college transcripts, & three letters of recommendation to: Molly Longstreth, Ph.D., Director, Survey Research Center, University of Arkansas, ADSB 100A, Fayetteville, AR 72701.

The University of Arkansas is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and applications will be accepted without regard to age, race, color, sex or national origin. Persons hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.

```
>From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Tue Aug 22 09:11:39 2000
Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id JAA12719 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 09:11:38 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [24.10.212.149] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu
    id LAA39052 (8.9.1/50); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:11:37 -0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu
Message-Id: <p04320400b5c855fe6a18@[24.10.212.149]>
In-Reply-To: <39A2A470@WebMail.uark.edu>
References: <39A2A470@WebMail.uark.edu>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:11:34 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject: TALK OF THE NATION on pollsters
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"
```

In the first hour of today's NPR's "Talk of the Nation" program (2 p.m. EST, 1 p.m. CST):

TALK OF THE NATION takes a look at how pollsters get their numbers.

```
>From jcf3c@erols.com Tue Aug 22 09:17:25 2000
Received: from hestia.host4u.net (hestia.host4u.net [216.71.64.32])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id JAA16290 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 09:17:25 -0700
(PDT)
```

Received: from erols.com ([209.3.2.162])
by hestia.host4u.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id LAA13891;
Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:17:21 -0500
Message-ID: <39A2A804.4C2D7A6A@erols.com>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 12:19:16 -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
CC: "John C. Fries" <JCF@SIRresearch.com>
Subject: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
References: <23C4FF6DECA4D21182C400A0C9D17B740427F5BF@mainex4.asu.edu>
<39A2919E.B41C9A2B@tiac.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

AAPORnetters,

Here's the latest debate raging in my corner of marketing research. On a handful of studies we have recently had to order sample at more than a 10:1 ratio of numbers to completes. And this is with numbers being called on several different days at different times up to a total of ten times over the life of the number. The concerns are probably obvious.

First, we realize that for those numbers that do get 10 calls over a relatively short period of time (say a three days), the potential respondent could rightfully claim that 10 calls are a bit excessive (bordering harassment).

Second, the impact this ratio has on our response rate is obviously significant. Certainly many numbers prove to be inelligable. But adding more and more sample over the course of a particular project might seriously distort the representativeness of the final sample of respondents. The piece I haven't mentioned here, although again it is probably a given, is that we are often pushed in terms of the amount of time allotted to complete a project. Frequently our clients give us only about a week to field a particular survey. Hence, the luxury of simply letting the last 15 or 20 completes trickle in over "the next few days" is generally not possible. And so we order more sample.

I'm wondering what the situation is at other places. At what ratio (numbers to desired completes) do other shops order sample? And what is the maximum (as well as the average) number of call attempts per number? Also, I recall hearing at this past conference several reports about the incidence of call-screening technology. My recollection is that we were talking about a relatively small, though growing, chunk of the population typically younger and with higher incomes. However, I don't have any good numbers on this. Does anyone else?

We have a fairly large calling facility (75 stations) but segment the interviewing staff into teams and then assign teams to projects. However one of the underlying factors is that with 25+ IVers calling on a job for a 4-hour shift, a whole lot of numbers can be dialed....and redialed. And before you know it, they are through the sample and the shift is barely half over. (We can of course switch them to other jobs,

but that doesn't get the current job done any faster.)

Anyway, that's what I'm dealing with at the moment. Theory is always good, but this is one of those places where the rubber hits the road. And so any "real-life" thoughts, comments, or experiences you want to share would be very much appreciated. Please feel free to email me directly if you prefer to keep the exchange off-list.

As always, thanks in advance for any and all help, advice, etc.

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
>From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Tue Aug 22 09:39:49 2000
Received: from maill.doit.wisc.edu (maill.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA01480 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 09:39:49 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [24.10.212.149] by maill.doit.wisc.edu
id LAA166544 (8.9.1/50); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:39:47 -0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu
Message-Id: <p04320401b5c85c5de95d@[24.10.212.149]>
In-Reply-To: <p04320402b576a4a7ee30@[24.10.212.149]>
References: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90EEEFCEB@EXCHNG3>
<p04320402b576a4a7ee30@[24.10.212.149]>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:39:41 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject: TALK OF THE NATION on pollsters (more details)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Here is a little more information on today's NPR's "Talk of the Nation" program (First Hour).

TALK OF THE NATION

HOST: JUAN WILLIAMS

HOOR ONE: Understanding Polls

Guests:

Richard Morin

Staff writer and director of Polling at the Washington Post

Andrew Kohut

Director for the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

Justin Lewis

Professor of Communications at University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Author, Constructing Public Opinion: How elites do what they like and
why we seem to go along with it. (Columbia University Press,

forthcoming)

During the presidential election season, new polls revealing voter's leanings and attitudes appear almost daily- and approval ratings can move 10 or 12 points within days. Is the public really that fickle, or are the polls unreliable? Are polls really useful for gauging public sentiment? Join Juan Williams for a close look at how pollsters get their numbers.

>From: jblair@srcmail.umd.edu Tue Aug 22 15:08:26 2000

Received: from srcmail.umd.edu (srcnotes2.umd.edu [128.8.179.41])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP

id PAA07222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 15:08:25 -0700

(PDT)

From: jblair@srcmail.umd.edu

Received: by srcmail.umd.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v1.2 (600.1 3-26-1998)) id

85256943.0079AF48 ; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 18:09:07 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: SRC

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <85256942.007ABB69.00@srcmail.umd.edu>

Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 18:09:06 -0400

Subject: Re: NATIONAL OMNIBUS SURVEY

National Omnibus Survey

2000

The University of Maryland Survey Research Center (SRC) will be beginning its next National Omnibus survey in September

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: September 15

Pretesting: September-October

Data collection: October-December

Data delivered: December

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

>From surveys@wco.com Tue Aug 22 16:23:46 2000
Received: from e4500a.callatg.com (qmailr@e4500a.atgi.net [216.174.194.60])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id QAA28369 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 16:23:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (qmail 12024 invoked from network); 22 Aug 2000 23:23:45 -0000
Received: from unknown (HELO Default) (216.174.247.215)
by e4500a.callatg.com with SMTP; 22 Aug 2000 23:23:45 -0000
Message-ID: <011c01c00c77\$25652100\$05c8a8c0@dummy.net>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>
<39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: Digital recording/transcription of interviews
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 16:25:29 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

I believe many AAPORneters would find a practical open ended voice capture/automatic transcription combination very valuable indeed. Our software is half there - it can digitally record and play back survey answers. We would very much like to add a transcription ability.

Our understanding is that computer science is not quite there yet. Voice recognition can currently work with a very limited set of words, such as numbers, with the general population or it can work with a large set of words after training by a specific individual, but it cannot do both. It cannot transcribe general conversations of the general population. If anyone knows of any PC software that can do this, please let me know.

Thank you.

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
<http://www.surveysystem.com>

----- Original Message -----

From: "Frank Rusciano" <rusciano@rider.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2000 10:35 PM
Subject: Digital recording/transcription of interviews

> Fellow AAPORneters:
>

> Has anyone had any experience with using digital recorders and the
> accompanying
> transcription software for interviews? I was wondering if there is a
> reliable
> recorder and software setup that one can use to record an interview, and
> then
> have the results automatically transcribed on the computer in a Word file
> (or
> some other easy to edit format). Since I don't know if all AAPORneters
> would be
> interested in this (or probably know about it already), you can reply
> directly to
> me.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Frank Rusciano
> email at rusciano@rider.edu
>
>
>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Aug 22 19:27:56 2000
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.156])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA22831 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 19:27:55 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-74.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.74])
by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id WAA15147
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 22:25:54 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39A335E7.4BA0623D@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 22:24:39 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: TALK OF THE NATION on pollsters (more details)
References: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90EEEFCEB@EXCHNG3>
<p04320402b576a4a7ee30@[24.10.212.149]>
<p04320401b5c85c5de95d@[24.10.212.149]>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I did not hear this program, which is not carried by NPR stations in
this area, but I am surprised to see the name of Justin Lewis. This is
not someone whose opinions I would have a lot of confidence in.

A couple of years ago, Professor Lewis was the lead author of a study
published by several members of the UMASS Communications Department
which held that the general voting public did not know what Clinton's
positions on issues were.

The report stated, among other things:

When asked about President Clinton's position on health care reform, for example, respondents were given two options:

a) That he promoted a universal system of national health insurance;
or

b) That he favored adjustments to the existing system of private insurance in order to give more people access to the system.

Although President Clinton has never advocated the first option and has consistently proposed the second, 26% chose the correct answer while a much higher percentage (59%) chose the incorrect one. Thus, given a one in two chance, most people opted for the wrong answer.

I wrote to Professor Lewis pointing out that Clinton had run for office in 1992 promoting "Universal Coverage", using that very phrase in a published position paper as well as in stump speeches. Mr. Lewis wrote back, in full, as follows:

Dear Jan Werner,

Thank you for your comments.

You imply in your message that the people are so well informed about Clinton that they are using a statement he made before he became President to evaluate his position on healthcare - NOT a position articulated either as President or while campaigning for the presidency. In the context of our survey - and all the other surveys on public knowledge - this seems I'm sure you will agree, decidedly implausible.

I wrote back to him listing about a dozen different public statements (many obtained from the White House web site) describing Clinton's commitment to universal coverage and suggested that perhaps the survey authors had confused "Universal Coverage" with a "Single Payer Plan." I also pointed out that, while the authors published their questionnaire, results and report in full on the web, they had provided no information whatsoever as to how they obtained their sample.

I never heard from Professor Lewis again, but I have heard that very report cited as "scientific" evidence of how misinformed the voting public is.

Thus are urban legends born!

Jan Werner

Robert Godfrey wrote:

>
> Here is a little more information on today's NPR's "Talk of the
> Nation" program (First Hour).
>
> TALK OF THE NATION

>
> HOST: JUAN WILLIAMS
>
> HOUR ONE: Understanding Polls
>
> Guests:
> Richard Morin
> Staff writer and director of Polling at the Washington Post
>
> Andrew Kohut
> Director for the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>
> Justin Lewis
> Professor of Communications at University of Massachusetts at Amherst
> Author, Constructing Public Opinion: How elites do what they like and
> why we seem to go along with it. (Columbia University Press,
> forthcoming)
>
> During the presidential election season, new polls revealing voter's
> leanings and attitudes appear almost daily- and approval ratings can
> move 10 or 12 points within days. Is the public really that fickle,
> or are the polls unreliable? Are polls really useful for gauging
> public sentiment? Join Juan Williams for a close look at how
> pollsters get their numbers.
>From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Tue Aug 22 21:15:25 2000
Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id VAA27360 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Aug 2000 21:15:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [24.10.212.149] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu
id XAA26984 (8.9.1/50); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 23:15:23 -0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu
Message-Id: <p04320400b5c8fdf9e33c@[24.10.212.149]>
In-Reply-To: <39A335E7.4BA0623D@jwdp.com>
References: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90EEFCB@EXCHNG3>
<p04320402b576a4a7ee30@[24.10.212.149]>
Date: Tue, 22 Aug 2000 23:15:16 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: TALK OF THE NATION on pollsters (more details)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

At 10:24 PM -0400 8/22/00, Jan Werner wrote:

>I did not hear this program, which is not carried by NPR stations in
>this area, but I am surprised to see the name of Justin Lewis. This is
>not someone whose opinions I would have a lot of confidence in.

You can, I think, access it directly with this address
<http://www.npr.org/ramfiles/totn/20000822.totn.01.rmm>

Otherwise, go to <http://www.npr.org/programs/totn/> and click on archive.

There was a couple of testy exchanges between Andy Kohut and Prof.
Lewis on some of the conclusions Prof. Lewis drew from his research,
as well as an answer he gave suggesting elites influence public
opinion.

I thought some of the questions that were called in by the public were interesting in themselves and perhaps offer an insight into many people's thinking about polling in general.

Robert Godfrey

UW-Madison

>From mohler@zuma-mannheim.de Wed Aug 23 01:29:57 2000

Received: from mail.zuma-mannheim.de (mail.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id BAA22589 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 01:29:56 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from zuma-mannheim.de (nb-mohler.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.87])
by mail.zuma-mannheim.de (8.11.0/8.11.0) with ESMTTP id e7N8TOu04316
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:29:24 +0200

Message-ID: <39A38B61.266BE6F6@zuma-mannheim.de>

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:29:22 +0200

From: pphmohler <mohler@zuma-mannheim.de>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.74 [en] (WinNT; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Digital recording/transcription of interviews

References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>

<39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu> <011c01c00c77\$25652100\$05c8a8c0@dummy.net>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Perhaps someone knows about the devices used by intelligence services. They are reported to have software, which recognizes 'keywords' in tapped telephone conversation.

Moreover, full transcription seems to be unlikely (if you consider the million

ways of how to 'fully' transcribe spoken language). But if you are interested

in key-words as a first step to funnel down the masses of information, you might give some standard software a try.

P. Mohler

Hank Zucker wrote:

> I believe many AAPORneters would find a practical open ended voice
> capture/automatic transcription combination very valuable indeed. Our
> software is half there - it can digitally record and play back survey
> answers. We would very much like to add a transcription ability.

>

> Our understanding is that computer science is not quite there yet. Voice
> recognition can currently work with a very limited set of words, such as
> numbers, with the general population or it can work with a large set of
> words after training by a specific individual, but it cannot do both. It
> cannot transcribe general conversations of the general population. If
> anyone knows of any PC software that can do this, please let me know.

>

> Thank you.

>

> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.

> Creative Research Systems
> <http://www.surveysystem.com>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Frank Rusciano" <rusciano@rider.edu>
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Monday, August 21, 2000 10:35 PM
> Subject: Digital recording/transcription of interviews
>
> > Fellow AAPORneters:
> >
> > Has anyone had any experience with using digital recorders and the
> > accompanying
> > transcription software for interviews? I was wondering if there is a
> > reliable
> > recorder and software setup that one can use to record an interview, and
> > then
> > have the results automatically transcribed on the computer in a Word
> > file
> > (or
> > some other easy to edit format). Since I don't know if all AAPORneters
> > would be
> > interested in this (or probably know about it already), you can reply
> > directly to
> > me.
> >
> > Thanks,
> >
> > Frank Rusciano
> > email at rusciano@rider.edu
> >
> >
> >

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Wed Aug 23 08:18:34 2000
Received: from imo-r10.mx.aol.com (imo-r10.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.10])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA02738 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 08:18:33 -0700
(PDT)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
by imo-r10.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.68.6b2c4b9 (4200)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:17:53 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <68.6b2c4b9.26d5451f@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:17:51 EDT
Subject: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
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 118

John....

Let me ask a question so simple-minded and so apt to have been repeatedly asked before that I blush (something that doesn't come to me easily) to put it to you and by extension other AAPORnetters. This is in no way an answer

to your question but is certainly implicit in what you've written.

You note that "Theory is always good, but this is one of those places where the rubber hits the road." And, should you find yourself in one of those places, otherwise known as REALITY (inappropriate deadlines, demanding clients, etc.), you go with pragmatism over theory every time. I understand;
here's my question:

At what point does the resultant departure from probability -- for the reasons you're talking about plus some others -- match that of Internet surveys? Where does a position taken against such surveys on the basis of their biased samples become untenable? I'm not persuaded that going the Intersurvey route and bringing computers to predesignees who happen not to possess them gets around the issue. There's a reason they don't possess them, and that in itself introduces one of several possible confounding variables that flow from giving the computer-innocent temporary access for the purposes of a survey.

If we cut through the questionable stuff about weighting to correct for bias

in an Internet-only sample, proponents of Internet surveys can still come back at you with the unproductive counterargument that those opposed to electronic data-gathering are still dealing with biased samples because of the kinds of things your e-mail cites.

Which then deteriorates into a question of which bias is more tolerable: a sample that excludes the gradually shrinking segment of households without Internet access...or a sample that excludes persons who, for one reason or another, were unreachable, unwilling to cooperate, or, for any number of other reasons when first contacted, were in no mood to answer your questions.

I regret I have no numbers to share with you that would be directly responsive to your question; CASRO, maybe even one of ARF's councils could be better sources in any case. But your e-mail became the causal agent to the raising of my question -- admittedly an obvious one and therefore already addressed to the point of nausea (could have used the Latin but can't remember whether it's nauseum or nauseum). Has the question been answered, though, with any degree of consensus?

Regards,

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

>From drivers@intersurvey.com Wed Aug 23 09:09:02 2000

Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.12])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id JAA07575 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:09:01 -0700

(PDT)

Message-ID: <b3078b182c04f09a6ec1e41e094a86b439a3f771@inter-survey.com>

From: Doug Rivers <drivers@intersurvey.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:08:46 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote:

>
> At what point does the resultant departure from probability -- for the
> reasons you're talking about plus some others -- match that of Internet
> surveys? Where does a position taken against such surveys on the basis of

> their biased samples become untenable? I'm not persuaded that going the
> Intersurvey route and bringing computers to predesignees who happen not to

> possess them gets around the issue. There's a reason they don't possess
> them, and that in itself introduces one of several possible confounding
> variables that flow from giving the computer-innocent temporary access for

> the purposes of a survey.
>

The whole point is that the people who don't currently own PCs are systematically different from those who do. That's why it's necessary to provide them with Internet access. By including them in the sampling frame, we have eliminated the effects of ANY confounding variable that might differentiate computer users from non-users. This is precisely what differentiates our approach from other Web surveys.

Now, you might argue that giving someone a WebTV unit changes their attitudes or behavior somehow, but we have accumulated quite a bit of evidence that these effects are minimal or non-existent.

Doug Rivers

InterSurvey

>From crcsf@ix.netcom.com Wed Aug 23 09:29:32 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 ESMTP

id JAA25847 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:29:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from julie (ali-ca10-54.ix.netcom.com [209.110.226.118])

by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA03095

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:27:15 -0400 (EDT)

Reply-To: "#crcsf" <crcsf@ix.netcom.com>

From: "#crcsf" <crcsf@ix.netcom.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Upcoming PAAPOR Conference

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:26:31 -0700

Message-ID: <01c00dle\$e59fa9c0\$76e26ed1@julie>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0050_01C00CE4.3940D1C0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

AAAAAKA4AQB4gBgAhH9446Z8eCvHf3jz50vtFABgAABgfdUHgkEIABoAAgEFAAAA//////////94
88N/odgCAUggmm2AQQAU/gD+kgAAHqABAIA8LkRAUwAAHrAxAAAAhQAQKBQPjAFAFMAdQBtAG0A
YQByAHkASQBUAGYAbwByAG0AYQB0AGkAbwBuAAAAyGPAKBQ9iYemAEAv6AMCQA4//++sAQAKAAC
AQIAAAAEAAAA////////wQA24D+kAYAkN4ACofCigOAN6YKQrfia8A3pgqCt+oEADesEEAAAC0AQAA
36gKlv////////AwAAAAQAAAAFAAAABgAAAAcAAAAIAAAACQAAAAoAAAD+////DAAAA0AAAAO
AAADwAAABAAAAARAAAAEgAAP7/////////
/////////
/////////8yAAAAgAAADUAAAD9////v////7////84AAAA
OQAAADoAAAA7AAAAPAAAAAD0AAAA/AAAAANwAAAP7/////////
/////////
/////////
/////////
/////////BQBEAG8AYwB1AG0AZQBwAHQAUwB1AG0AbQBhAHIAeQBJAG4AZgBvAHIAbQBhAHQAaQBvAG4A
AAcEfc4YiXymAzgAAgH//////////8BAGA8HpAkADi1//+wvgAs//+EOC4AnrA4AB6Q//9j
ODYAFrA5AAAA5AEAAKA8AAEBAEMAbwBtAHAATwBiAGoAAAAFCWA8AQDemCEA34gKCaU4//emCYA
34jNCoQ4//GVP4H3rAqAN+gDA5jOP//EgACAAEAAAAGAAAA////////7oAnrAekLwAkB4AzrB+AMbI
AB6QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABYAAAAH4gJBU8AYgBqAGUAYwB0AFAAbwBvAGwAAADVAgBg
AAAASAACH4gECYA8AQaemCAAH4AGCWA8AQaekCIAv4gFCQA4//8WAAEB/////////AAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOipt4gAAQA6Km3iDMABugAekLIAfrAekAC0MABUAGEAYgBsAGUA
AAAwAEBXPgRemzIAYDj//36QNABAOWAAxps/AAAsCgB+kEwAgkHMAIBAHAAALAIAGkEgAA4AAgD/
//////////8PAAAsgkFoAEgAAUR/A8N4eNNfwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAaug0AAIGw
AEwBAAAA/v//wMAAAAEAAAABQAAAAyAAAAHAAAAcAAAAkAAAAKAAAAcWAAAAwAAAAANAAAAADgAA
AA8AAAAQAAAAEQAAAABIAAAATAAAAFAAAAABUAAAAWAAAAFwAAABgAAAAZAAAAgGAAABsAAAAcAAAA
HQAAAAB4AAAAfAAAAIAAAACEAAAAiAAAAIwAAACQAAAAIAAAAJgAAACcAAAAoAAAAKQAAACoAAAAr
AAAALAAAAC0AAAAuAAAAALwAADAAAAAAxAAAAmGAAADMAAAA0AAAAANQAAADYAAAA3AAAAOAAAAp7/
//86AAAAowAADwAAAA9AAAApGAAAD8AAABAAAA/v//0IAAABDAAAAARAAAAEUAAABGAAAAARwAA
AP7/////////
/////////
/////////
/////////
/wAAAAQAAG0GAAAIbWAAABwAAAAkAAAAABAAACAcAAAgAAAApAADwOAAAAAAABvAYAAAAAggAAAIa
AAACAAAAQAAAAEAAAADAAAAQAae8RAAAD//wAAAD/AICAgAD3AAAQAA8AAvCcQAEEAAI8AgA
AAACAAAAAgQAAA8AA/A6QAADwAE8CgAAAABAAAnwEAAAFVvvVwqq1VvqqqqqqqqqqoCAArwCAAA
AAAEAAAFAAAADwAE8AIBAAASCgrwCAAAAIEAAAACgAAkwEL8NIAAADAwBYAAADDAAAAQgDEADoz
AQDFwCYAAD/ABBX//+BAZnM/wC/ARAAEAD/AQgACAABAoaGhgA/AgAAAwB/AgAAAQCFAvh8AwCH
AgBmzAC/AgkADwDLAjdT7P/OAgCA//QAgAA0//SahAnAADTAgAAAADUArA8//WAuCrAADXAgAA
AADYA1DDAADaAsBdAAD/AhYAHwBDAE8ATgBGAEUAUgBFAE4AQwBFAAAARgBvAG8AdABsAGkAZwBo
AHQAIABNFQAIABMAGkAZwBoAHQAAAAAABDwBAAAAAAAAAAAAABHwBAAAAAEAAAgaPAATwQgAAABIA
CvAIAAAAAQAAAAOABTAAvwHgAAAL8BAAAQAMsBAAAAAP8BAAIAAQDCQAAAD8DAQABAAAAEFAE
AAAAAAAAAAUAAAAIAwAAAgQAAIgcAABRAAAA/B8AAKsGAAB0AAAAAAAAAAAAACgMAAAcAAAAACUA
AAAnAAAAsgAAALwAAABvQAacwEAAIocAACNAGAACgMAAAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHAP//FAAA
AAwAVABYAGEAYwB1AHkAIABTAG8AZQB0AGgAMgBMAGkAcwBhACcAcwAgAE0AYQBjAdoARAB1AHMA
awB0AG8AcAAgAEYAbwBsAGQAZQBjAdoAUABBAEEAUABPAFIATIAAyADAAMAAwAdoAQQBnAGUAbgBk
AGEAIAbjAG8AdgB1AHIAADABUAHIAYQBjAGUAeQAQgAFMABwB1AHQAaAAyAEwAaQBzAGEAJwBzACAA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A
MAAwAdoAQQBnAGUAbgBkAGEAIAbjAG8AdgB1AHIAADABUAHIAYQBjAGUAeQAQgAFMABwB1AHQAaABa
AEwAaQBzAGEAJwBzACAATQBhAGMAOgBBAEQATQBjAE4ASQBTAfQAUgBBAFQASQBWAEUAOgBBAGQA
bQBpAG4ALgAgAFQAZQBtAHAAbABhAHQAZQBzAdoAVwBFAEUASwBMAFkAIABXAE8AUgBLAEkATgBH
ACAATABFAFQAVABFAFIAUwA6AFAAQQBBFAATwBSACAAMgAwADAAMAA6AEEAZwB1AG4AZABhACA

egABAAADAAABLAESAAAAAAvZCPz/f/+DDGIJeQNnBSgD/AACAAABLAESAAAAAALYAigAAQAAAGQA
AAABAAMDawAAAAEnDwABAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABgCAAZAZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKEAIgABAGQAAQABAAEAAgAsASwBzcZmZmM5D9xPQrXo3DdPwEAVQACAAoAfQAM
AAAAAAAAqBxYAAgAAAn0ADAABAAEA1Q0WAAIAAgB9AAwAAgACAFUQFgACAAACfQAMAAMAaAAHhYA
AgACAH0ADAEEAAQAVQAWAAMAAA9AAwABQAGACoJFgADAAIAfQAMAAcABwDVBxYAAwAAAn0ADAAI
AAkAkGkWAAAAgB9AAwACgAAASoJFgACAAACAAIOAAMAAABSAAAAAAAAKAAACAIQAAMAAAAEAEAB
AAAAIABIgAIAhAABAAAAQAQAEAAgBpGAE1gAgCEAAFAAAABABAAQAAxOCAASUACAIQAAYAAAAE
AEABAAHAIABJQAIhAABwAAAAQAQAEAAACQAgAE1AAgCEAAIAAAABABAAQAAqEKAASIAACAIQAakA
AAAEACwBAAAsb4ABIgAIAhAACgAAAAQALAEAAAAAgAEiAAgCEAALAAAABAAAsAQAAeEOAASIAACAIQ
AAwAAAAEACwBAAAAIABJcAIAhAADQAAAAQALAEAAABCFgAEiAAgCEAAOAAAABAAAsAQAAAACAASVA
CAIQAA8AAAAEACwBAAA4k4ABJQAIhAAEAAAAAAAAALAEAAANiKgAE1QAgCEAARAAAAAAAAAsAQAA8MOA
ASUACAIQABIAAAAAACwBAAAoNYABJQAIhAAEAAAAAAAAALAEAAAGQ6gAE1AAgCEAAUAAAAAAAAAsAQAA
6F+AAASWACAIQABUAAAAAAAAACwBAADQNIABJQAIhAAAFgAAAAAAAAALAEAAOCCgAE1AAgCEAAAXAAAAAAs
AQAAADHOASWACAIQABgAAAAAACwBAAB8L4ABJYAIhAAAGQAAAAAALAEAAAAAgAE1AAgCEAAaAAAA
AAAsAQABwCAASUACAIQABsAAAAACwBAACA14ABJQAIhAAHAAAAAAAAALAEAAAEAgAE1AAgCEAAAd
AAAAAAAsAQAAZDqAASUACAIQAB4AAAAACwBAAAg1IABJQAIhAAHwAAAAAAAAALAEAAABjGgAE1gAgC
EAAgAAAABAAAsAQAAgD2AASXACAIQACEAAAAEAEABAAABAMABIgAIAhAAIgAAAAQALAEAAABCFAAEA
AP0ACgADAAAAJgArAAAVgAMAAMAAQAmACYAJgADAP0ACgAEAAAAJwAXAAAVgAMAAQAAQAnACcA
JwADAL4ACgAFAAAAHgAeAAEA/QAKAAUAAGeABoAAAABAgYABQADAB4A/QAKAAYAAAAAnABgAAAC+
AAwABgABACcAJwAnAAMAVgAOAAcAAAAeAB4AHgAeAAMAVgAOAAgAAAAhACEAIQAhAAMA/QAKAAkA
AAAJAAAAAABAgYACgAAACMAAQIGAAAsAAAAjAP0ACgALAAEAIGAOAAAA/QAKAAAsAAgAkAA8AAAD9
AAoACwADACQAFgAAAP0ACgAiAAEAFgAcAAAA/QAKACIAAgAWAB0AAADXAQAJAMAAGwChgAeACYA
HgASABIADgAKADQAAAI
hAAJAAAAQALAEAAAAAAAEiAAgCEAALAAAABAAAsAQAAAYGkAASWACAIQACYAAAAEACwBAAD4AAB
JQAIhAAJwAAAAQALAEAAAcAAAE1AAgCEAAoAAAABAAAsAQAAJAAASUACAIQACkAAAAEACwBAACo
QgABIgAIAhAAKgAAAAQALAEAAcXvAAEiAAgCEAArAAAABAAAsAQAAAAAASIAACAIQACwAAAAEACwB
AAB4QwABIgAIAhAALQAAAAQALAEAAAAAAAE1wAgCEAAvAAAABAAAsAQAAE1UAASIAACAIQADAAAQAF
ACwBAAAAAABJUAIAhAAMQABAAUALAEAADiTAELAAgCEAAyAAEABQAsAQAA2IoAASVACAIQADMA
AQAFQwBAADwWwABJQAIhAANAABAAUALAEAAACg1AAE1AAgCEAA1AAEABQAsAQAAZDoAASUACAIQ
ADYAAQAFACwBAADoXwABJYAIhAANAABAAUALAEAAANA0AAE1AAgCEAA5AAEABQAsAQAA4IIAASUA
CAIQADsAAQAFACwBAAB0cwABJYAIhAAPAABAAUALAEAAHwvAAE1gAgCEAA9AAEABQAsAQAAAAA
ASUACAIQAD4AAQAFACwBAAAHAAABJQAIhAAPwABAAUALAEAAICXAAE1AAgCEABAAAEEABAAAsAQAA
AQAAASUACAIQAEAAQAEACwBAABkOgABJQAIhAAQgABAAQALAEAAACCUAELAH4CCgAkAAEFwAA
AOg//QAKACQAAgAWAAUAAAABAgYAJQABABCAAwIOACYAAQAXAFVvvvvvvVek//QAKACYAAgAWAAYA
AAABAgYAJwABABCAAwIOACgAAQAYAKuqqqqqqquo//QAKACgAAgAVAACAAAD9AAoAKAADABsALQAA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A
AwAcACYAAADXDADwAtgQAABwCHAAKACAACgAuAA4AHAAcAAoADgAgAAoAKgAOACIADgAOAA4ADgAg
AC4ADgAOAA4AHAAQAC4ACAIQAEMAAQAEACwBAAAAAABIGAIhAARAABAAQALAEAAgBpAAE1gAgC
EABFAAEABAAAsAQAAxOAAASUACAIQAEYAAQAEACwBAAAHAAABJQAIhAARwABAAQALAEAAcQAAE1
AAgCEABIAAEABAAAsAQAAqEIAASIAACAIQAEkAAQAEACwBAAAsbwABIgAIAhAASgABAAQALAEAAAA
AAEiAAgCEABLAEEABAAAsAQAAeEMAASIAACAIQAEwAAQAEACwBAAAAAABJcAIAhAATQABAAQALAEAA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////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////7/AAADCgEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEA
AADghZ/y+U9oEKuRCAArJ7PZMAAAALgAAAAIAAAAAQAAAEgAAAAEAAAAUAAAAgAAABcAAAAEgAA
AHQAAAAIAAAjAAAAAwAAACYAAADQAAAKQAAATAAAAsAAAAIAAAAQJwAAHgAAAAIAAAB4AABz
HgAAAA0AAABUcmFjZXkgU29ldGgARQB4HgAAABAAAABNaWNyb3NvZnQgRXhjZWwAQAAAAIC02f/O
C8ABQAAAAIAa+way778BQAAAAIAoqaG1778BAwAAAAAAABWACus/QAAgfQABCusVoFW9gAAgfoA
BCv+/wAAAwoBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAtXN1ZwuGxCTlwgAKyz5rkQAAAAF1c3VnC4b
EJOXCAArLPmuHAEAAngAAAAJAAAAQAAAFAAAAAFAAAAWAAAAABcAAABkAAAAACwAAAGwAAAAQAAAA
dAAAABMAAAAB8AAAAFgAAAIQAAAAANAAAAjAAAAwAAAC1AAAAAgAAABAnAAAEAAAAAgAAAHgAADMD
AAAAOhMIAAsAAAAAAAAAAACwAAAAAAAAAALAAAAAAAAAAAsAAAAAAAAAAHhAAAAAAAAAAAU2h1ZXQx
AAcAAABTaGVldDIABwAAAFNoZWV0MwAMEAAAAGAAAB4AAAAIAAAAV29ya3NoZWV0cwADAAAAAAwAA
AJgAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAACAAAAABAAAANgAAAAIAAAA+AAAAAQAAAAIAAAAKAAAAAX1BJRF9HVU1EAAIA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A
AAAEgACAP//////////wAAAAAA
AAAsAAABYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA///
//////////AA
AA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAD//////////8AA
AA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP//////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA==

-----=_NextPart_000_0050_01C00CE4.3940D1C0--

>From sflexo@deltanet.com Wed Aug 23 09:53:22 2000
Received: from server.suremail.com (root@server.suremail.com [207.48.17.1])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA15223 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:53:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from sflexo (dsl-35-249-186-216.cust.dslnetworks.net
[216.186.249.35]) by server.suremail.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id JAA02535
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:53:19 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Scott W. Flexo, Ph.D." <sflexo@deltanet.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 09:45:05 -0700
Message-ID: <LPBBIGOHOFLLCAECJFJFLGENPCAA.sflexo@deltanet.com>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <68.6b2c4b9.26d5451f@aol.com>

Paul:

The problem is not Internet surveys per se... It is the nature of the sampling frame. Random digit dial surveys use a sampling frame produced from a random procedure. This makes it a probability sample. Unfortunately, many Internet surveys rely on unsolicited email, banner ads and direct mail to build sampling frames or panels of people with access to the Internet. These are textbook examples of non-probability samples. It's exactly the same as going outside my office and talking with the first 100 or so people that walk by (and agree to be interviewed).

Probability and non-probability sampling should not be confused with non-response error. Non-response are people who refuse to do interviews, or not home, etc. There is a large body of work in the area of non-response that offers specific instructions on how to minimize it and deal with it. It's a mistake to equate non-response error arising from a random probability sample with people who do not respond to unsolicited emails, banner ads or direct mail. The latter is not non-response error, but error arising from the non-probability design.

Finally, one cannot equate non-response error and people without computers and Internet access. It would be like going back to the early thirties and forties (or maybe even later - I'm not old enough to really know a time without telephones) talking a sample of people with telephones and defining as non-response error those people without telephones. Lacking a telephone (or in the current case access to the Internet) these people simply could not be included in the population when the sample was drawn. This is not non-response error, but rather error arising from the sampling design.

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of PAHARDING7@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2000 8:18 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?

John....

Let me ask a question so simple-minded and so apt to have been repeatedly asked before that I blush (something that doesn't come to me easily) to put it to you and by extension other AAPORnetters. This is in no way an answer to your question but is certainly implicit in what you've written.

You note that "Theory is always good, but this is one of those places where the rubber hits the road." And, should you find yourself in one of those places, otherwise known as REALITY (inappropriate deadlines, demanding clients, etc.), you go with pragmatism over theory every time. I understand;
here's my question:

At what point does the resultant departure from probability -- for the reasons you're talking about plus some others -- match that of Internet surveys? Where does a position taken against such surveys on the basis of their biased samples become untenable? I'm not persuaded that going the Intersurvey route and bringing computers to predesignees who happen not to

possess them gets around the issue. There's a reason they don't possess them, and that in itself introduces one of several possible confounding variables that flow from giving the computer-innocent temporary access for the purposes of a survey.

If we cut through the questionable stuff about weighting to correct for bias in an Internet-only sample, proponents of Internet surveys can still come back at you with the unproductive counterargument that those opposed to electronic data-gathering are still dealing with biased samples because of the kinds of things your e-mail cites.

Which then deteriorates into a question of which bias is more tolerable: a sample that excludes the gradually shrinking segment of households without Internet access...or a sample that excludes persons who, for one reason or another, were unreachable, unwilling to cooperate, or, for any number of other reasons when first contacted, were in no mood to answer your questions.

I regret I have no numbers to share with you that would be directly responsive to your question; CASRO, maybe even one of ARF's councils could be better sources in any case. But your e-mail became the causal agent to the raising of my question -- admittedly an obvious one and therefore already addressed to the point of nausea (could have used the Latin but can't remember whether it's nauseum or nauseam). Has the question been answered, though, with any degree of consensus?

Regards,

Phil Harding
paharding7@aol.com

```
>From rstuefen@usd.edu Wed Aug 23 10:05:06 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 ESMTTP
    id KAA26289 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:05:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by exchange.usd.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <R11FW87F>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:59:42 -0500
Message-ID: <C3AC1B98FED7D21190E700C00D003E8C03E37B54@exchange.usd.edu>
From: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@usd.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: WEB & E-mail Survey Software
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:59:41 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
```

All,

I am interested in acquiring software that will allow me to do WEB based and E-mail surveys. From AAPOR member experience, which products work?

Randy Stuefen

```
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Aug 23 10:16:00 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
```

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA06337 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:16:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA12288 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:15:59 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:15:59 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Latest Data on Lower-Income Population of the Web
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008230955440.9955-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Considering the direction of current discussion on AAPORNET, this seems the perfect time to post this report from Reuters, based on Media Metrix data.

Although the headline is certainly good news for the future of survey and market research, not to mention American society and culture, the data reported in the body of the article is hardly likely to instill confidence in any so-called Internet "surveys" of the general population taken so far.

A question for anyone who might know (obviously I don't): At what penetration of the telephone into American households did the first serious (i.e., scientific) survey researcher decide it was appropriate to conduct surveys via telephone? My guess (largely from ignorance): 85 to 90 percent.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/tech/00/08/biztech/articles/23net-incomes.html>

August 23, 2000

LOWER-INCOME INTERNET USERS
FASTEST-GROWING ON THE WEB

By REUTERS

NEW YORK - Low-income Web users drawn to sites like ValuePay.com and GetPaid4.com are going online at three to four times the rates of wealthier groups that favor upscale financial or travel sites, a U.S. study published Monday

found.

Market research firm Media Metrix of New York said a survey of 55,000 Internet users found low-income groups, especially those from households earning less than \$25,000 a year, grew nearly 50 percent in the 12 months ended in June.

At the other extreme, Internet users from households with incomes greater than \$75,000 grew just 13 percent.

While the lower-income Internet users grew more than 49 percent to 7.5 million users, they still represent only 10 percent of the total online population, the smallest group in terms of income. Web surfers earning more than \$75,000 make up nearly one-third of the total audience.

At first glance the study appears to reflect the dull statistical fact that low-income groups have more room to grow compared to higher income groups. But it also highlights the changing demographics of the Web as it becomes a mass medium.

"The Internet ... clearly looks more like the mainstream population than ever before," said Media Metrix analyst Anne Rickert, the author of the study entitled "Web Usage Patterns by Household Income."

The U.S. market survey found lower-income Web users, typically newer to the Internet, tend to be less experienced surfers and yet spend more time online -- about 13 hours per month. They viewed 700 Web pages on average during June.

By contrast, higher-income users, who tend to be more experienced Web surfers, spent less time -- just over nine hours -- and viewed an average of only 550 pages during the month of June, the report found.

Household income also appears to influence Internet viewing preferences with lower-income groups visiting Internet career and auction sites, while higher-income audiences flock to hobby, leisure, auto, sports and travel sites. For example, ValuePay.com, which offers visitors a nominal fee of a dollar for each hour spent on the site, was the second most-visited online destination in June among lower-income Web users.

Internet users with mid-level household incomes, defined as between \$40,000 and \$60,000 a year, the largest group of Web users, showed a wide

range of Web site preferences that were more difficult to categorize, a summary of the study said.

"Because Internet users with higher household incomes were among the earliest adopters of the net, they are more likely to have already established their online preferences, thereby streamlining their sessions," Rickert said.

"Because many lower-income users are new to the Internet, and therefore less experienced, they are likely to spend more time and view more content online as they get acquainted with the medium," she said.

With growth slowing among the wealthy and middle-income groups, lower income Americans have partly compensated for the increasing maturation of U.S. Internet market.

The survey found that overall U.S. Internet use grew 23 percent annually, down from explosive rates of prior years, but still faster than some analysts had previously forecast.

This faster growth reflects an unforeseen plunge in the price of personal computers in 1999 and a growing move to new low-cost Web access devices such as handheld PCs, Web TVs and other Internet devices that can retail for as little as \$99.

"Income is always the main driver that influences adoption of any new technology, be it digital TV, PCs, cell phones or MP3 (Internet music) players," said Forrester Research's Ekaterina Walsh, another Internet analyst who tracks social trends.

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

>From daves@startribune.com Wed Aug 23 10:21:13 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 ESMTTP
id KAA10465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:21:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id MAA02597; Wed, 23 Aug 2000
12:23:30 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from unknown(132.148.25.25) by firewall12.startribune.com via smap (V5.5)

id xma000992; Wed, 23 Aug 00 12:20:17 -0500

Received: from SMTP (stnave.startribune.com [132.148.90.39])
by mailserv1.startribune.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id MAA14260
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:14:14 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from mail.startribune.com ([132.148.90.226]) by 132.148.90.39
(Norton AntiVirus for Internet Email Gateways 1.0) ;
Wed, 23 Aug 2000 17:11:32 0000 (GMT)

Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:17:06 -0600

Message-Id: <s9a3c0c2.053@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:16:23 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Minnesota politics

For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you might be interested in a story in this morning's paper that suggests that campaign weasels have popped out of their holes in the Democratic Senate primary race. I'm happy that the reporters waited until lower in the story to refer to it as "push polling" and called it "anonymous telemarketing attacks" in the lead paragraph.

Check out <http://www.startribune.com> and click on the story titled "Is Dayton ahead in DFL ..."

Rob

Robert P. Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

v: 612.673-7278
f: 612.673-4359
e:

>From hochschi@Princeton.EDU Wed Aug 23 11:23:15 2000
Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA28439 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:23:14 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mailserver.Princeton.EDU (mailserver.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.65])

by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id OAA26918
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:23:08 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from princeton.edu (wws-080299c.Princeton.EDU [128.112.149.44])
by mailserver.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id OAA23296;
Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:23:07 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <39A4168B.19BE7AB2@princeton.edu>

Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:23:07 -0400

From: Jennifer Hochschild <hochschi@Princeton.EDU>

Reply-To: hochschi@Princeton.EDU

X-Sender: "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@smtp.princeton.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD Princeton University 05-99 (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
CC: "Elaine T Bonner Tompkins (elaine@Princeton.EDU)"
<elaine@Princeton.EDU>,
Subject: request re survey responses to questions of disability
References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>
<39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu> <011c01c00c77\$25652100\$05c8a8c0@dummy.net>
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----7CBA5F59046F9F208BD76B2C"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----7CBA5F59046F9F208BD76B2C
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm writing on behalf of a student of mine who is writing a terrific dissertation on the issue of possible racial and class bias in special education placement and services. She has a question which I could not begin to answer: is there any evidence on whether parents answer surveyors honestly, to the best of their ability, when queried about possible disabilities of their children? That is, are they defensive and underreport disabilities? or do they report mild disabilities more than/instead of more severe ones? Is the answer to this question affected by the race (or gender or class...?) of the respondent and/or the race etc. of the interviewer. And so on.

Along the same lines, if parents and teachers report differently on a child's disability, is there any evidence on which response is more "accurate" -- or is there a better way to frame an understanding of disparate results?

thanks much; please respond privately unless others on the list are interested in the responses. best, Jennifer Hochschild

-----7CBA5F59046F9F208BD76B2C
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;
name="hochschi.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Jennifer Hochschild
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="hochschi.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Hochschild;Jennifer
tel;fax:609-258-2809
tel;work:609-258-5634
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Princeton University;Woodrow Wilson School OR Dept. of Politics
adr;;;Princeton ;NJ;08544;
version:2.1

email;internet:hochschi@Princeton.EDU
title:W. S. Tod Prof. of Public and International Affairs
fn:Jennifer L. Hochschild
end:vcard

-----7CBA5F59046F9F208BD76B2C--

>From caplanjr@bellsouth.net Wed Aug 23 11:33:33 2000
Received: from maill.mia.bellsouth.net (maill.mia.bellsouth.net
[205.152.144.13])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA05238 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:33:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jrc (host-208-60-253-97.mia.bellsouth.net [208.60.253.97])
by maill.mia.bellsouth.net (3.3.5alt/0.75.2) with SMTP id OAA20734;
Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:32:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <004901c00d30\$902af6e0\$5393fea9@jrc>
Reply-To: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@iname.com>
From: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@bellsouth.net>
To: <hochschi@Princeton.EDU>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: <elaine@Princeton.EDU>
References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>
<39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu> <011c01c00c77\$25652100\$05c8a8c0@dummy.net>
<39A4168B.19BE7AB2@princeton.edu>
Subject: Re: request re survey responses to questions of disability
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:32:27 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This IS a fascinating question but the confidentiality, privacy, and ethical barriers alone raise the hair on the back of my neck. How would you verify the "actual" severity of the disability?

Jim Caplan
Miami

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@Princeton.EDU>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: <elaine@Princeton.EDU>
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2000 2:23 PM
Subject: request re survey responses to questions of disability

> I'm writing on behalf of a student of mine who is writing a terrific
> dissertation on the issue of possible racial and class bias in special
> education placement and services. She has a question which I could not
> begin to
> answer: is there any evidence on whether parents answer surveyors
honestly, to
> the best of their ability, when queried about possible disabilities of
their

> children? That is, are they defensive and underreport disabilities? or do they
> report mild disabilities more than/instead of more severe ones? Is the answer
> to this question affected by the race (or gender or class...?) of the respondent and/or the race etc. of the interviewer. And so on.
>
> Along the same lines, if parents and teachers report differently on a child's
> disability, is there any evidence on which response is more "accurate" -- or is
> there a better way to frame an understanding of disparate results?
>
> thanks much; please respond privately unless others on the list are interested
> in the responses. best, Jennifer Hochschild
>
>
>

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Aug 23 11:51:28 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA18096 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 11:51:26 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mitofsky.mindspring.com (adsl-151-202-52-63.bellatlantic.net [151.202.52.63])
by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id OAA13978
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:51:14 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000823140425.00d208c0@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 14:50:34 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Reply- Latest Data on Lower-Income Population of the Web
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0008230955440.9955-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_5435473==_ .ALT"

-----_5435473==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The Reuters internet survey article that Jim posted from the New York Times does not answer the very question it proposes as its main theme. That is, enlightenment about low income users of the web. The reporter did not do his/her job. The article has the following omissions:

1. We know nothing about the proportion of low income households that currently use the web. We know the rate of change of this group and we know what share of the internet they comprise, but that is not nearly as useful for researchers as knowing if the group is adequately represented among web users. If they are now 10% of the total web users is that larger or smaller than their share of the population, and by how much?

2. The article also says: "But it also highlights the changing demographics of the Web as it becomes a mass medium." The article does no such thing. A 50% increase from a base of nothing may be meaningless. A 13% increase from a large base may be gigantic. A reader has no way to fill in the gaps about the size of the base.

3. The results lead us to assume that this web survey is a fair reflection of web users. There is no way to know this. There is no methodology statement or hints about who the respondents are. If this is just another self selected sample of web users who cared enough to respond the data are likely to be meaningless.

I have no idea why Reuters would release such a bad article or the New York Times would carry it.

As for Jim's question about the start of telephone surveys, I know they were being done in the 1950's by Sindlinger. He used telephone books to draw samples. No one ever called them probability samples with a straight face. CBS started doing telephone surveys in 1969 using probability samples. There were other earlier probability samples of telephone households at Chilton and maybe other places too. Most of the phone book frame samples were biased selections. I know the CBS and Chilton efforts were not biased selections. Also, the 1960 Census showed that about 94 percent of the households could be reached by telephone, if my memory is correct. It was certainly over 90 percent. This does not mean that percentage had telephones in their homes. It just means that there was a telephone number that could be called that would reach the household.

warren mitofsky

At 10:15 AM 8/23/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Considering the direction of current discussion on AAPORNET, this seems
>the perfect time to post this report from Reuters, based on Media Metrix
>data.

>

>Although the headline is certainly good news for the future of survey and
>market research, not to mention American society and culture, the data
>reported in the body of the article is hardly likely to instill confidence
>in any so-called Internet "surveys" of the general population taken so
>far.

>

>A question for anyone who might know (obviously I don't): At what
>penetration of the telephone into American households did the first
>serious (i.e., scientific) survey researcher decide it was appropriate to
>conduct surveys via telephone? My guess (largely from ignorance): 85 to
>90 percent.

>

-- Jim

>*****

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/tech/00/08/>

biztech/articles/23net-incomes.html

August 23, 2000

LOWER-INCOME INTERNET USERS
FASTEST-GROWING ON THE WEB

By REUTERS

NEW YORK - Low-income Web users drawn to sites like ValuePay.com and GetPaid4.com are going online at three to four times the rates of wealthier groups that favor upscale financial or travel sites, a U.S. study published Monday found.

Market research firm Media Metrix of New York said a survey of 55,000 Internet users found low-income groups, especially those from households earning less than \$25,000 a year, grew nearly 50 percent in the 12 months ended in June.

At the other extreme, Internet users from households with incomes greater than \$75,000 grew just 13 percent.

While the lower-income Internet users grew more than 49 percent to 7.5 million users, they still represent only 10 percent of the total online population, the smallest group in terms of income. Web surfers earning more than \$75,000 make up nearly one-third of the total audience.

At first glance the study appears to reflect the dull statistical fact that low-income groups have more room to grow compared to higher income groups. But it also highlights the changing demographics of the Web as it becomes a mass medium.

"The Internet ... clearly looks more like the mainstream population than ever before," said Media Metrix analyst Anne Rickert, the author of the study entitled "Web Usage Patterns by Household Income."

The U.S. market survey found lower-income Web users, typically newer to the Internet, tend to be less experienced surfers and yet spend more time online -- about 13 hours per month. They viewed 700 Web pages on average during June.

By contrast, higher-income users, who tend to be more experienced Web surfers, spent less time -- just over nine hours -- and viewed an average of

> only 550 pages during the month of June, the
> report found.

> Household income also appears to influence
> Internet viewing preferences with lower-income
> groups visiting Internet career and auction
> sites, while higher-income audiences flock to
> hobby, leisure, auto, sports and travel sites.
> For example, ValuePay.com, which offers visitors
> a nominal fee of a dollar for each hour spent on
> the site, was the second most-visited online
> destination in June among lower-income Web users.

> Internet users with mid-level household incomes,
> defined as between \$40,000 and \$60,000 a year,
> the largest group of Web users, showed a wide
> range of Web site preferences that were more
> difficult to categorize, a summary of the study
> said.

> "Because Internet users with higher household
> incomes were among the earliest adopters of the
> net, they are more likely to have already
> established their online preferences, thereby
> streamlining their sessions," Rickert said.

> "Because many lower-income users are new to the
> Internet, and therefore less experienced, they
> are likely to spend more time and view more
> content online as they get acquainted with the
> medium," she said.

> With growth slowing among the wealthy and
> middle-income groups, lower income Americans have
> partly compensated for the increasing maturation
> of U.S. Internet market.

> The survey found that overall U.S. Internet use
> grew 23 percent annually, down from explosive
> rates of prior years, but still faster than some
> analysts had previously forecast.

> This faster growth reflects an unforeseen plunge
> in the price of personal computers in 1999 and a
> growing move to new low-cost Web access devices
> such as handheld PCs, Web TVs and other Internet
> devices that can retail for as little as \$99.

> "Income is always the main driver that influences
> adoption of any new technology, be it digital TV,
> PCs, cell phones or MP3 (Internet music)
> players," said Forrester Research's Ekaterina
> Walsh, another Internet analyst who tracks social
> trends.

> _____
>

>From crcsf@ix.netcom.com Wed Aug 23 12:03:16 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 ESMTTP
id MAA27246 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:03:15 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from julie (ali-ca10-54.ix.netcom.com [209.110.226.118])
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA23530
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 15:03:13 -0400 (EDT)
Reply-To: "#crcsf" <crcsf@ix.netcom.com>
From: "#crcsf" <crcsf@ix.netcom.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Upcoming PAAPOR Conference Announcement w/o Attachments
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:02:30 -0700
Message-ID: <01c00d34\$afbe03e0\$76e26ed1@julie>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_00D0_01C00CFA.035F2BE0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_00D0_01C00CFA.035F2BE0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Pacific Chapter of the=20

American Association

of Public Opinion Research

Conference

November 30-December 1, 2000

Asilomar Conference Grounds

Pacific Grove, California

Sponsored by a group of West Coast PAAPOR people, this conference will =
be the highlight of the year for all that attend. The first night =
session has both Al Gore and George W. Bush pollsters!

Make Reservations NOW!

\$50 - Conference Fee

Includes: PAAPOR Membership

Rooms Available at Asilomar Conference Grounds

See enclosed letter for reservation information

Includes: Cocktails and Dinner on 11/30 and

Breakfast and Lunch on 12/1

Sign-up for Short-Course

\$75

Excellent accommodations at

the Asilomar Conference Grounds in Pacific Grove, California.

MARK YOUR CALENDAR NOW

DON'T MISS THIS EXCITING CONFERENCE

-----= NextPart_000_00D0_01C00CFA.035F2BE0

Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1 =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.71.1712.3"' name=3DGENERATOR>
</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV>

<DIV>
<P align=3Dcenter>Pacific =
Chapter of=20
the<FONT face=3D"Wide =
Latin"> </P>
<P align=3Dcenter>American=20
Association<FONT face=3D"Wide =
Latin"></P>
<P align=3Dcenter>of Public =
Opinion=20
Research</P><I>
<P align=3Dcenter><FONT =
face=3DTimes></P><FONT=20
face=3DTimes size=3D2></I>
<P align=3Dcenter></P>
<P align=3Dcenter><FONT=20
face=3D"Wide Latin">Conference</P><FONT =

face=3DTimes=20
size=3D5>
<P align=3Dcenter>November 30-December 1, =
2000</P><FONT=20
size=3D3>
<P align=3Dcenter>Asilomar Conference Grounds</P>
<P align=3Dcenter>Pacific Grove, =
California</P></DIV>
<P align=3Dcenter>Sponsored by a group of =
West Coast=20
PAAPOR people, this conference will be the highlight of the year for all =
that=20
attend. The first night session has both Al Gore and George W. Bush=20
pollsters!</P>
<DIV><I>
<P align=3Dcenter>Make Reservations =
NOW!</P><FONT=20
size=3D3></I>
<P align=3Dcenter></P><FONT face=3DTimes =
size=3D5>
<P align=3Dcenter>\$50 - Conference Fee</P>
<P align=3Dcenter>Includes: PAAPOR =
Membership<I></I></P>
<P align=3Dcenter>Rooms Available at Asilomar Conference=20
Grounds</P>
<P align=3Dcenter></P>
<P align=3Dcenter>See enclosed letter for reservation=20
information</P>
<P align=3Dcenter></P>
<P align=3Dcenter>Includes: Cocktails and Dinner on 11/30 =
and</P>
<P align=3Dcenter>Breakfast and Lunch on=20
12/1<I></I></P>
<P align=3Dcenter></P><FONT face=3DTimes =
size=3D5>
<P align=3Dcenter>Sign-up for Short-Course</P>
<P align=3Dcenter>\$75</P><FONT face=3D""=20
size=3D3>
<P align=3Dcenter>Excellent accommodations at</P>
<P align=3Dcenter>the Asilomar Conference Grounds in =
Pacific Grove,=20
California.</P><FONT=20
face=3D"B VAG Rounded Bold,Courier New" size=3D6>
<P align=3Dcenter>MARK YOUR =
CALENDAR=20
NOW<FONT face=3D"Wide =
Latin"></P>
<P align=3Dcenter>DON'T MISS THIS =
EXCITING=20
CONFERENCE</P></DIV></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----_NextPart_000_00D0_01C00CFA.035F2BE0--

>From lbourque@ucla.edu Wed Aug 23 12:17:23 2000
Received: from serval.noc.ucla.edu (serval.noc.ucla.edu [169.232.10.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id MAA07022 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:17:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from bourque ([128.97.116.200])
by serval.noc.ucla.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id MAA10409;
Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:17:21 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <4.1.20000823102032.0091d500@pop.bol.ucla.edu>
X-Sender: lbourque@pop.bol.ucla.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 10:23:32 -0700
To: hochschi@Princeton.EDU, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@ucla.edu>
Subject: Re: request re survey responses to questions of disability
Cc: "Elaine T Bonner Tompkins (elaine@Princeton.EDU)" <elaine@Princeton.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <39A4168B.19BE7AB2@princeton.edu>
References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>
<39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Jennifer:

I suggest that you contact Corinne Kirchner and Alexander Todorov at the American Foundation for the Blind. They published a recent paper in the American Journal of Public Health on using proxies to report disabilities and have been working with the NHIS Supplement on Disability, 1994 and 1995.

Linda Bourque

At 02:23 PM 8/23/00 -0400, Jennifer Hochschild wrote:

>I'm writing on behalf of a student of mine who is writing a terrific
>dissertation on the issue of possible racial and class bias in special
>education placement and services. She has a question which I could not
>begin to
>answer: is there any evidence on whether parents answer surveyors honestly,
>to
>the best of their ability, when queried about possible disabilities of
>their
>children? That is, are they defensive and underreport disabilities? or do
>they
>report mild disabilities more than/instead of more severe ones? Is the
>answer
>to this question affected by the race (or gender or class...?) of the
>respondent and/or the race etc. of the interviewer. And so on.
>
>Along the same lines, if parents and teachers report differently on a
>child's
>disability, is there any evidence on which response is more "accurate" --
>or is
>there a better way to frame an understanding of disparate results?
>
>thanks much; please respond privately unless others on the list are
>interested
>in the responses. best, Jennifer Hochschild
>

>
>

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Wed Aug 23 13:08:40 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 ESMTTP
id NAA08816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 13:08:40 -0700
(PDT)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
by imo-d04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.ae.9adfb95 (17230)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 16:07:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <ae.9adfb95.26d588f9@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 16:07:21 EDT
Subject: Fwd: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1_ae.9adfb95.26d588f9_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 118

--part1_ae.9adfb95.26d588f9_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

--part1_ae.9adfb95.26d588f9_boundary
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Disposition: inline

Return-Path: <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Received: from rly-zd01.mx.aol.com (rly-zd01.mail.aol.com [172.31.33.225])
by air-zd03.mail.aol.com (v75_b3.11) with ESMTTP; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:22:23
-0400
Received: from maynard.mail.mindspring.net (maynard.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.243]) by rly-zd01.mx.aol.com (v75_b3.9) with ESMTTP; Wed, 23 Aug
2000 12:21:57 -0400
Received: from x.mindspring.com (user-2inig34.dialup.mindspring.com
[165.121.64.100])
by maynard.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id MAA07931
for <paharding7@aol.com>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:20:54 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000823120833.00ba6190@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 12:19:13 -0400
To: paharding7@aol.com
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Fwd: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Phil,

I like the comment you made below. It is a good addition to the dialogue. I
also think the original note you responded to deserves good replies. It
does, however, require a lot more in the way of response information. For
example, how many of the discarded phone numbers were nonworking? We would

expect about 8 in 10 to be either nonworking or business.

The comment I want to make to you concerns your statement about weighting, "If we cut through the questionable stuff about weighting to correct for bias." Weighting is for two purposes. First, one weights to reflect the correct probabilities of selection. Second, one weights, most commonly using demographic variables, to reduce sampling error. This is not for the purpose of correcting for bias. There is no theory that assumes that this second type of weighting reduces bias. There is plenty of good theory that it may reduce sampling error if the variables used in the weighting are correlated with the characteristics being measured. If the correlation is less than +0.5 it will increase the sampling error. The first kind of weighting, to reflect the probabilities of selection, is done to avoid introducing bias, which will happen if one does not correctly reflect the varying probabilities of selection.

You can post this if you think it worthwhile, but I wanted to comment directly to you. This is off the main discussion and I did not want to divert interest from the topic at hand.
warren

>Subject: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?

>X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 118

>

>John....

>

>Let me ask a question so simple-minded and so apt to have been repeatedly asked before that I blush (something that doesn't come to me easily) to put it to you and by extension other AAPORnetters. This is in no way an answer to your question but is certainly implicit in what you've written.

>

>You note that "Theory is always good, but this is one of those places where the rubber hits the road." And, should you find yourself in one of those places, otherwise known as REALITY (inappropriate deadlines, demanding clients, etc.), you go with pragmatism over theory every time. I understand;

>here's my question:

>

>At what point does the resultant departure from probability -- for the reasons you're talking about plus some others -- match that of Internet surveys? Where does a position taken against such surveys on the basis of their biased samples become untenable? I'm not persuaded that going the Intersurvey route and bringing computers to predesignees who happen not to possess them gets around the issue. There's a reason they don't possess them, and that in itself introduces one of several possible confounding variables that flow from giving the computer-innocent temporary access for the purposes of a survey.

>

>If we cut through the questionable stuff about weighting to correct for bias

>in an Internet-only sample, proponents of Internet surveys can still come back at you with the unproductive counterargument that those opposed to electronic data-gathering are still dealing with biased samples because of the kinds of things your e-mail cites.

>Which then deteriorates into a question of which bias is more tolerable: a sample that excludes the gradually shrinking segment of households without

>Internet access...or a sample that excludes persons who, for one reason or
>another, were unreachable, unwilling to cooperate, or, for any number of
>other reasons when first contacted, were in no mood to answer your
questions.
>
>I regret I have no numbers to share with you that would be directly
>responsive to your question; CASRO, maybe even one of ARF's councils could
be
>better sources in any case. But your e-mail became the causal agent to the
>raising of my question -- admittedly an obvious one and therefore already
>addressed to the point of nausea (could have used the Latin but can't
>remember whether it's nauseum or nauseam). Has the question been answered,
>though, with any degree of consensus?
>
>Regards,
>
>Phil Harding
>paharding7@aol.com

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

--part1_ae.9adfb95.26d588f9_boundary--
>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Aug 23 15:20:09 2000
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.156])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA29191 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 15:20:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-74.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.192.74])
by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA15808
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 18:19:57 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <39A44DBE.7B9C7576@jwdp.com>
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 18:18:38 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
References: <68.6b2c4b9.26d5451f@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote:

> At what point does the resultant departure from probability -- for the
> reasons you're talking about plus some others -- match that of Internet
> surveys? Where does a position taken against such surveys on the basis of

> their biased samples become untenable? I'm not persuaded that going the
> Intersurvey route and bringing computers to predesignees who happen not to
> possess them gets around the issue. There's a reason they don't possess
> them, and that in itself introduces one of several possible confounding
> variables that flow from giving the computer-innocent temporary access for
> the purposes of a survey.
>
> If we cut through the questionable stuff about weighting to correct for
bias
> in an Internet-only sample, proponents of Internet surveys can still come
> back at you with the unproductive counterargument that those opposed to
> electronic data-gathering are still dealing with biased samples because of
> the kinds of things your e-mail cites.
> Which then deteriorates into a question of which bias is more tolerable:
a
> sample that excludes the gradually shrinking segment of households without
> Internet access...or a sample that excludes persons who, for one reason or
> another, were unreachable, unwilling to cooperate, or, for any number of
> other reasons when first contacted, were in no mood to answer your
questions.

Speaking at the NEAAPOR mini-conference this spring, Doug Rivers of Intersurvey addressed this very question, telling us that they provided ALL respondents with WebTV units, regardless of whether or not they had a computer or Internet access. This was necessary not just to eliminate sample bias, but also to make sure that all respondents see the same survey under the same conditions, which would not be possible otherwise given the huge variety that exists in computers and software.

To my way of thinking, this may reduce one kind of bias, but it introduces other kinds. In particular, it skews the sample towards a TV-oriented audience and away from the more computer literate and perhaps even the better educated segments of society in general.

There are a lot of other issues involved in the Intersurvey process, including the measures they take to keep their panel "fresh" by making sure they participate regularly in surveys and dropping those who do not. IMO this tends to produce "professional" respondents likely to tailor their answers to what they think the survey sponsors want to hear. But then, that may well soon be the only kind that will answer surveys anyway.

Jan Werner

>From drivers@intersurvey.com Wed Aug 23 16:09:47 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id QAA01414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 16:09:47 -0700
(PDT)

Message-ID: <c82244dac2387498e2e4fcb0aa45a62a39a45ald@inter-survey.com>
From: Doug Rivers <drivers@intersurvey.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 16:09:44 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

These are interesting hypotheses, but it turns out that they aren't true. For example, we slightly overrepresent, not underrepresent, computer users and persons with college or higher degrees. I've heard the "professional respondents" hypothesis countless times, but we find no evidence of it. Josh Clinton has done a study comparing new panel members with those on the panel 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 months, and he finds no evidence of panel effects. The only noticeable difference is that persons report higher Internet usage rates in their first month on the panel, but even this is back to normal after 2 months.

Doug Rivers
InterSurvey

>
> Speaking at the NEAAPOR mini-conference this spring, Doug Rivers of
> Intersurvey addressed this very question, telling us that
> they provided
> ALL respondents with WebTV units, regardless of whether or
> not they had
> a computer or Internet access.
> This was necessary not just to eliminate sample bias, but also to make
> sure that all respondents see the same survey under the same
> conditions,
> which would not be possible otherwise given the huge variety
> that exists
> in computers and software.
>
> To my way of thinking, this may reduce one kind of bias, but it
> introduces other kinds. In particular, it skews the sample towards a
> TV-oriented audience and away from the more computer literate and
> perhaps even the better educated segments of society in general.
>
> There are a lot of other issues involved in the Intersurvey process,
> including the measures they take to keep their panel "fresh" by making
> sure they participate regularly in surveys and dropping those who do
> not. IMO this tends to produce "professional" respondents likely to
> tailor their answers to what they think the survey sponsors want to
> hear. But then, that may well soon be the only kind that will answer
> surveys anyway.
>
> Jan Werner

>
>From mkshares@mcs.net Wed Aug 23 18:23:04 2000
Received: from uucphost.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA20544 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 18:23:03 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P29-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.93])
by uucphost.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id UAA57566
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Aug 2000 20:23:00 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)

Message-ID: <39A432B6.B43BBA8C@mcs.net>
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 20:23:48 +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: [Fwd: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?]
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: Ordering Sample: What's The Going Ratio?
Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2000 19:47:04 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
To: jcf3c@erols.com
References: <23C4FF6DECA4D21182C400A0C9D17B740427F5BF@mainex4.asu.edu>
<39A2919E.B41C9A2B@tiac.net> <39A2A804.4C2D7A6A@erols.com>

John-

AAPORlist response to your question appears to have drifted off into other issues.

As the saying goes: let me be clear: Yes. We are all having a problem with "completion rates" with RDD samples. (Any arguments?)

Your statement: "Certainly many numbers prove to be ineligible" raises the question: How do we really know which numbers *are ineligible*?

The explosion of new area code as well as exchanges dedicated to business is clearly a problem.

Another is dedicated phone lines. In our July, Illinois poll we found that 20% of likely voters have phone lines in their homes which *do not receive incoming phone calls*. Yes, these were likely voters, upscale, etc., etc.

Add to this the number of unrecognizable small business phone lines, unrecognizable business outgoing phone lines, etc.

Perhaps we should all of you should be asking, rough wording: 1) how many phone lines in household, and 2) how many do you not ever/sometimes not use for voice conversation. In other words, how many random numbers have no chance of ever reaching a live respondent?

The AAPOR committee addressing (struggling with) the question of how to calculate response rate clearly has their work cut out for them.

But to answer your question, yes we are all having the same problem.

Nick

"John C. Fries" wrote:

> AAPORnetters,
>
> Here's the latest debate raging in my corner of marketing research. On

> a handful of studies we have recently had to order sample at more than a
> 10:1 ratio of numbers to completes. And this is with numbers being
> called on several different days at different times up to a total of ten
> times over the life of the number. The concerns are probably obvious.
>
> First, we realize that for those numbers that do get 10 calls over a
> relatively short period of time (say a three days), the potential
> respondent could rightfully claim that 10 calls are a bit excessive
> (bordering harassment).
>
> Second, the impact this ratio has on our response rate is obviously
> significant. Certainly many numbers prove to be inelligible. But
> adding more and more sample over the course of a particular project
> might seriously distort the representativeness of the final sample of
> respondents. The piece I haven't mentioned here, although again it is
> probably a given, is that we are often pushed in terms of the amount of
> time allotted to complete a project. Frequently our clients give us
> only about a week to field a particular survey. Hence, the luxury of
> simply letting the last 15 or 20 completes trickle in over "the next few
> days" is generally not possible. And so we order more sample.
>
> I'm wondering what the situation is at other places. At what ratio
> (numbers to desired completes) do other shops order sample? And what
> is the maximum (as well as the average) number of call attempts per
> number? Also, I recall hearing at this past conference several reports
> about the incidence of call-screening technology. My recollection is
> that we were talking about a relatively small, though growing, chunk of
> the population typically younger and with higher incomes. However, I
> don't have any good numbers on this. Does anyone else?
>
> We have a fairly large calling facility (75 stations) but segment the
> interviewing staff into teams and then assign teams to projects.
> However one of the underlying factors is that with 25+ IVers calling on
> a job for a 4-hour shift, a whole lot of numbers can be dialed...and
> redialed. And before you know it, they are through the sample and the
> shift is barely half over. (We can of course switch them to other jobs,
> but that doesn't get the current job done any faster.)
>
> Anyway, that's what I'm dealing with at the moment. Theory is always
> good, but this is one of those places where the rubber hits the road.
> And so any "real-life" thoughts, comments, or experiences you want to
> share would be very much appreciated. Please feel free to email me
> directly if you prefer to keep the exchange off-list.
>
> As always, thanks in advance for any and all help, advice, etc.
>
> 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
>From tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu Thu Aug 24 06:47:47 2000
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id GAA11808 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Aug 2000 06:47:46 -0700

From: "Schwartz, Jim" <Jim.Schwartz@ujc.org>
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Quality of Palestinian polling data
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 13:10:21 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-8"

I asked Professor Sergio DellaPergola, the Chair of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University, if he would care to reply to Jim Beniger's query regarding quality of polls produced by the Palestinian Authority-owned State Information Service. Here is Sergio's response, which I thought might be of interest to AAPOR members.

Jim Schwartz

-----Original Message-----

From: Prof. Sergio DellaPergola [mailto:Sergioa@h2.hum.huji.ac.il]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2000 8:37 AM
To: Schwartz, Jim
Subject: Re: Polls Say Palestinians Favor Declaring State in September?

I am back at my desk clearing some mail backlog.

Regarding your current request, the only sure thing is that I am acquainted with Dr. Hassan Abu-Libdeh, the President of the Palestinian Statistical Office. Abu-Libdeh has a Ph.D. from Cornell in bio-statistics. He is therefore a person of certified professional competence. At the same time he has been active for a while on the local political scene.

I had lengthy conversations with him on the procedures and quality of the Palestinian population census of 1997 and about the other surveys periodically conducted by his organization. He was very keen on recognizing the weaknesses and limitations of the Palestinian administration but at the same time he emphatically stressed his commitment to scientifically rigorous methods of data collection and analysis. The interesting point is that he conceded the Palestinians have much to learn from the Israelis, namely in the area of Public Statistics, and as proof he mentioned the uncompromising approach of Prof. Roberto Bachi, Israel's first and famous Government Statistician, when the latter had to set up the Israeli statistical system with Israel's independence in 1948. Prof. Bachi later was my mentor and the director of my own Ph.D. dissertation, and I have known him as a man of adamant public integrity. Bachi developed the high standards of Israel Central Bureau of Statistics and its image of total independence from the Israeli political system. Bachi was also deeply interested in the fate of the Jewish diaspora. Abu-Libdeh seems to cultivate a similar interest in the study of the Palestinian diaspora.

All in all, the Palestinian data seem to me reasonable and sufficiently within the range of polls of acceptable quality - in the context of a highly charged and volatile political environment.

You may forward these comments if you so wish.

Best regards,
Sergio

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu]
>Sent: Monday, August 07, 2000 2:38 AM
>To: AAPORNET
>Subject: Polls Say Palestinians Favor Declaring State in September?
>
>
>
>
>
> Anyone know anything about the survey operations of the Palestinian
> Authority-owned State Information Service?
>
> And what does the word "independent" mean, in the closing paragraph, in
> its opening phrase "Another independent Palestinian poll Wednesday..."?
>
> I have no good reason--other than the ones which would be on any
> journalist's mind--to question the quality of these polls, I am simply
> ignorant of the polling operations involved.
> -- Jim
>
>

> Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited

>http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000806/wl/mideast_palestinians_dc_1.html

>
>Sunday August 6 8:42 AM ET
>
>
>Poll: Palestinians Favor Declaring State in Sept.
>
>
>GAZA (Reuters) - An overwhelming majority of Palestinians support the
>declaration of an independent Palestinian state in September, the
>deadline for a peace treaty with Israel, according to a Palestinian poll
>issued Sunday.
>
>The survey by the Palestinian Authority-owned State Information Service
>found 71.5 percent of 1,470 Palestinians polled in the West Bank and Gaza
>Strip, including Arab East Jerusalem, favored declaring a state on
>September 13.
>
>Six percent wanted the Palestinian leadership to keep negotiating with
>Israel to achieve progress, and then declare a state after September.
>
>Palestinian President Yasser Arafat has said he will declare a
>Palestinian state this year on lands that Israel occupied in the 1967
>Middle East war, with or without a peace deal.
>
>President Clinton, a key broker in Middle East peace moves, has said he
>will review relations with Palestinians if Arafat declares a state
>unilaterally. Israel has threatened to retaliate by annexing lands still
>under its control.
>
>Eighty-eight percent of those surveyed backed Arafat following his
>U.S.-sponsored summit at Camp David with Israeli Prime Minister Ehud
>Barak. The summit ended in disagreement.
>

>Another independent Palestinian poll Wednesday indicated that a majority
>of Palestinians would opt for violent confrontation with Israel should
>the sides fail to nail down a deal by mid-September.

>

>-----
> Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited
>-----

>

>*****

>

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Aug 24 20:21:45 2000
Received: from smtp.ufl.edu (sp28fe.nerdc.ufl.edu [128.227.128.108])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA03549 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Aug 2000 20:21:44 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp.ufl.edu (ppp-s161-n89-as1.nerdc.ufl.edu [128.227.161.89])
by smtp.ufl.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/2.2.1) with ESMTP id XAA138544
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Aug 2000 23:21:42 -0400
Message-ID: <39A5E55E.FEDB7CC0@hp.ufl.edu>
Date: Thu, 24 Aug 2000 23:17:50 -0400
From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Push polling: specific examples?
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

When I am not coordinating health insurance studies, I am also an editorial writer and columnist for my local newspaper. I'm doing a somewhat light but really quite serious column about "rules of conduct" for fair play among candidates. Stuff like staying out of bicyclists' way if they are going to stand on a street corner waving, and taking down yard signs promptly after election day.

Unfortunately, push polling reared its ugly head in the '98 local election, even in our little town. So I'm adding that to the list of no-no's. I can't remember any of the exact questions from that race, as I was so livid that I hung up on the interviewer. And to write about it, I thought it might be less threatening to use a clear example from a national election or at least another locality.

Of course I read the statements on the AAPOR website, but I don't think that would be quite enough to explain it to the mom next door. What would help is an actual question wording example.

Does anyone have a "good" example that could be used?

Thanks bunches,

Colleen K. Porter

>From mark@bisconti.com Fri Aug 25 12:08:27 2000
Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA23386 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Aug 2000 12:08:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mark (adsl-138-88-47-73.bellatlantic.net [138.88.47.73]) by
pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service
Version 5.5.2650.21)
id Q8FQS4GX; Fri, 25 Aug 2000 15:08:22 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: 21st Century Faxes Ltd is back
Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 15:06:24 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBEELNCKAA.mark@bisconti.com>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

We received a FAX today headed "Bush vs. Gore." It reads:

"Recent opinion polls suggest that the presidential race between Bush & Gore is very close. Al Gore's vigorous campaigning has brought him within touching distance of Bush's lead. Is the contest as close as the opinion polls suggest? To vote, simply check one of the boxes below and fax your vote back to us. Alternatively you can mail your vote to us at the address below. Who will get your vote? Bush (900) 370-3200 or Gore (900) 680-3200? Your votes will be presented to the Presidential candidates and the major political parties. The total votes received will be available at the end of the poll at www.pollresults.co.uk. Calls to these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price to pay for greater democracy. Calls take approx. 1 or 2 minutes. Your views are important. We make sure that decision makers are hearing them! Poll commissioned by 21st Century Faxes Ltd, PMB 504, 331 West 57th St., NY, NY 100019. To be removed from our mailing list please call 1-646-602-0372 or toll free 1-800-606-5720."

I asked to be removed long ago. Mark Richards

>From lamatsch@nevada.edu Fri Aug 25 12:35:43 2000
Received: from am-dew.nevada.edu (am-dew2.nevada.edu [131.216.1.247])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA12016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Aug 2000 12:35:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from cbc138 (b138c.lv-cbc.nevada.edu [131.216.79.86])
by am-dew.nevada.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA25846
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Aug 2000 12:33:47 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@nevada.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: 21st Century Faxes Ltd is back
Date: Fri, 25 Aug 2000 12:33:47 -0700
Message-ID: <NEBBLOJLGLBGLGECJGANKEIHCAAA.lamatsch@nevada.edu>
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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBEELNCKAA.mark@bisconti.com>

They are not the only ones. My center received a fax from Digital Recall. For "only" \$2.95/min you can register your opinion on student lead prayer before football games.

When I tried to call their 1-800 number to complain a voice mail system (that does not takes messages) "answers" the phone.

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.
Director
The Howard W. Cannon Center for Survey Research
University of Nevada - Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway - Box 455008
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-5008
Phone (702) 895-0167
Fax (702) 895-0165
Cellular (702) 561-8768

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Mark David Richards
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2000 12:06 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: 21st Century Faxes Ltd is back

We received a FAX today headed "Bush vs. Gore." It reads:

"Recent opinion polls suggest that the presidential race between Bush & Gore is very close. Al Gore's vigorous campaigning has brought him within touching distance of Bush's lead. Is the contest as close as the opinion polls suggest? To vote, simply check one of the boxes below and fax your vote back to us. Alternatively you can mail your vote to us at the address below. Who will get your vote? Bush (900) 370-3200 or Gore (900) 680-3200? Your votes will be presented to the Presidential candidates and the major political parties. The total votes received will be available at the end of the poll at www.pollresults.co.uk. Calls to these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price to pay for greater democracy. Calls take approx. 1 or 2 minutes. Your views are important. We make sure that decision makers are hearing them! Poll commissioned by 21st Century Faxes Ltd, PMB 504, 331 West 57th St., NY, NY 10019. To be removed from our mailing list please call 1-646-602-0372 or toll free 1-800-606-5720."

I asked to be removed long ago. Mark Richards

>From daves@startribune.com Sat Aug 26 12:55:25 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 ESMTTP

id MAA11638 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 26 Aug 2000 12:55:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id OAA25317; Sat, 26 Aug 2000
14:57:53 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from unknown(132.148.25.25) by firewall2.startribune.com via smap
(V5.5)
id xma025284; Sat, 26 Aug 00 14:57:07 -0500
Received: from SMTP (stnave.startribune.com [132.148.90.39])
by mailserv1.startribune.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id OAA01661
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 26 Aug 2000 14:51:00 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from mail.startribune.com ([132.148.90.226]) by 132.148.90.39
(Norton AntiVirus for Internet Email Gateways 1.0) ;
Sat, 26 Aug 2000 19:48:19 0000 (GMT)
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Sat, 26 Aug 2000 14:53:48 -0600
Message-Id: <s9a7d9fc.088@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Sat, 26 Aug 2000 14:53:21 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: tsilver@capaccess.org, sschier@carleton.edu, 75227.173@compuserve.com,
djleary@iname.com, dskipper@marketsolutionsgroup.com,
Subject: Minnesota Poll news

Colleagues...

For those of you with an appetite for Minnesota politics, you may
find the results of the most recent Minnesota Poll on the presidential
race, and the DFL Senate primary election of interest. Point your
browser to
<http://www.startribune.com>

Best ...

Rob

Robert P. Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

v: 612.673-7278
f: 612.673-4359
e:

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Sun Aug 27 05:19:34 2000
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.32])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA07975 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Aug 2000 05:19:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from lavrakaslaptop (ts29-16.homenet.ohio-state.edu
[140.254.114.103])
by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA02263
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Aug 2000 08:19:32 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Sun, 27 Aug 2000 08:19:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200008271219.IAA02263@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Registered vs. Likely Voter Polls and CNN

In watching CNN Headline News this morning, I learned that "polls of registered voters are less accurate than those of likely voters." This was stated at the end of a news story which first reported the Bush/Gore horserace and then cited various findings from the poll about which politician was perceived as doing a better job handling certain issues.

I presume they meant to say "polls of likely voters are less accurate in predicting election outcomes than are polls of registered voters."

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Sun Aug 27 09:01:50 2000
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA00517 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Aug 2000 09:01:50 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from lavrakaslaptop (ts19-11.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.113.130])
by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA29093;
Sun, 27 Aug 2000 12:01:35 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Sun, 27 Aug 2000 12:01:35 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200008271601.MAA29093@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu, mkshares@mcs.net
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: Registered vs. Likely Voter Polls and CNN

Nick is completely correct that I reversed what I meant to say -- that "polls of likely voters are *more* accurate than are polls of registered voters." (Sorry for not getting it right in my original message.)

However, the point I was trying to make was that this is the case for the horserace numbers, but not necessarily for all the other opinions (e.g., who will deal with health care better) that were cited in the news report.

At 09:15 AM 8/27/00 +0000, you wrote:
>I think they said what they meant to say.
>
>The conventional wisdom is that polls of likely voters [in predicting election
>outcomes] are more accurate than polls of registered voters.
>
>Although I have never seen any research on this, companies such as Gallup
>which interview all voting age and then determine which are the likelies
>have
>a chance to compare results with the outcome..
>
>"Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." wrote:

>
>> In watching CNN Headline News this morning, I learned that "polls of
>> registered voters are less accurate than those of likely voters." This
was
>> stated at the end of a news story which first reported the Bush/Gore
>> horserace and then cited various findings from the poll about which
>> politician was perceived as doing a better job handling certain issues.
>>
>> I presume they meant to say "polls of likely voters are less accurate in
>> predicting election outcomes than are polls of registered voters."
>
>
>
>
>

>From corinne@afb.net Sun Aug 27 20:56:47 2000
Received: from nycafbgate.afb.net (afb.net [208.36.95.170])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id UAA05316 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Aug 2000 20:56:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp-customer (nyc-dyn-07a.cosmoweb.net [208.223.113.124])
by nycafbgate.afb.net (Switch-2.0.1/Switch-2.0.1) with ESMTTP id
e7S3vKa06625;
Sun, 27 Aug 2000 23:57:20 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.20000827233032.00967500@pophub.afb.net>
X-Sender: corinne@pophub.afb.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Sun, 27 Aug 2000 23:49:48 -0400
To: hochschi@Princeton.EDU, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@afb.net>
Subject: Re: request re survey responses to questions of disability
Cc: "Elaine T Bonner Tompkins (elaine@Princeton.EDU)"
<elaine@Princeton.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <39A4168B.19BE7AB2@princeton.edu>
References: <3985C760.27DF7BF4@rci.rutgers.edu>
<39A1E6F6.98132298@rider.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I'm sorry I did not respond to this earlier; hope it's still useful. I will
restrain myself from the lengthy response it deserves -- and I'll be glad
to do that off-list to anyone who wants to hear. But the issue is of
growing importance for all survey researchers, so I'll just sketch some
points. A. Todorov and I have an article in the current issue of the
American Journal of Public Health on proxy responses regarding disability
in the 1994-95 National Health Interview Survey-Disability Supplement
(NHIS-D). However, that deals only with the adult sample (18 yrs +).
Contact the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) for contacts who
are working on the children's data from NHIS-D.

The big points to make here are (1) disability is a complex concept and the
issues of measurement have more to do with conceptual clarity and
appropriateness for the purpose (e.g., whether determining placement in
special ed versus understanding the prevalence of impairments relevant to
accessibility to community resources, or employment discrimination, etc.

etc.) than they do with "honesty."

(2) Disability issues are being raised in an array of federal and private surveys (e.g., not just the traditional issues of health and employment, but also voting preferences and behavior, crime victimization, recreational and transportation uses, consumer behavior, etc.). Some heavy-duty methodological work is underway (notably, by Nancy Mathiewitz and colleagues at U. of Maryland Joint Survey Methodology Program), so that interested researchers have growing resources to turn to.

Best, Corinne

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.

Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation
American Foundation for the Blind - 212-502-7640

At 02:23 PM 8/23/00 -0400, Jennifer Hochschild wrote:

>I'm writing on behalf of a student of mine who is writing a terrific
>dissertation on the issue of possible racial and class bias in special
>education placement and services. She has a question which I could not
>begin to
>answer: is there any evidence on whether parents answer surveyors honestly,
to
>the best of their ability, when queried about possible disabilities of
their
>children? That is, are they defensive and underreport disabilities? or do
>they
>report mild disabilities more than/instead of more severe ones? Is the
>answer
>to this question affected by the race (or gender or class...?) of the
>respondent and/or the race etc. of the interviewer. And so on.
>
>Along the same lines, if parents and teachers report differently on a
child's
>disability, is there any evidence on which response is more "accurate" --
>or is
>there a better way to frame an understanding of disparate results?
>
>thanks much; please respond privately unless others on the list are
interested
>in the responses. best, Jennifer Hochschild
>
>

>From RSantos@ui.urban.org Mon Aug 28 06:24:51 2000

Received: from uint3.urban.org (uint3.urban.org [4.22.172.70])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id GAA07028 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Aug 2000 06:24:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by webmail.urban.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

id <QQKPSLMA>; Mon, 28 Aug 2000 09:17:53 -0400

Message-ID: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B012F13A@uint4.urban.org>

From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Predicting Nonresponse -- 9/12 Event -- Wash.-Balt. Chapter

Date: Mon, 28 Aug 2000 09:19:43 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Please join us!

Rob Santos
Chapter President

***** BEGIN ANNOUNCEMENT *****

Topic: Predicting Nonresponse from Household and Regional
Characteristics

Date & Time: Tuesday, September 12th, 2000, 12:30-1:30 p.m.

Speaker: John Dixon, Bureau of Labor Statistics

Location: BLS Cognitive Lab
Postal Square Building
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC
(Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitors' list, send an email to
audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Thursday, September 7.

Abstract:

This paper investigates predictors of nonresponse rates for a panel survey (i.e.: The Current Population Survey) using logistic models. The types of predictors include interviewer work characteristics (e.g., workload, number of attempted contacts), and household characteristics (e.g., age, gender of respondent). Much previous research has examined simple effects to predict interviewer or household nonresponse rates. A recent review can be found in Groves and Couper (1998). In contrast, the present study examines confounding and interaction effects between the predictors. Confounding effects occur when two predictors share the same relationship with the interviewer nonresponse rate. Interaction effects occur when the relationship between a predictor and the interviewer nonresponse rate depends on another variable.

A joint presentation of American Association for Public Opinion Research Washington/Baltimore Chapter and the WSS Data Collection Methods Section.

Note: If you have any difficulty receiving this message or prefer not to get future email notices, please reply to: dc-aapor.admin@erols.com.

***** END ANNOUNCEMENT *****

>From mkshares@mcs.net Mon Aug 28 13:22:15 2000

Received: from uucphost.mcs.net (Kitten2.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id NAA12971 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Aug 2000 13:22:10 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P43-Chi-Dial-1.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.43])
by uucphost.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id PAA92550
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Aug 2000 15:20:43 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)

Message-ID: <39AA835A.3C214B36@mcs.net>
Date: Mon, 28 Aug 2000 15:21:02 +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: Internet Shopping
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has anyone seen any recent survey findings on this subject?

One thing I am interested in is on-line purchase frequency.

More importantly, I have seen surveys showing XX% who have bought something on-line. But that could include stocks, mutual funds, on-line software/upgrades, airline tickets, purchases at auction sites such as e-bay, etc.

I am looking for the incidence/purchase frequency of goods which are available in retail outlets; i.e., goods that could be subject to sales tax.

I would appreciate your help. Answer me directly.

Nick

>From crcsf@ix.netcom.com Tue Aug 29 13:02:26 2000
Received: from blount.mail.mindspring.net (blount.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.226])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA13950 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Aug 2000 13:02:25 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from julie (ali-ca4-26.ix.netcom.com [207.93.32.26])
by blount.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA10719
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Aug 2000 16:02:22 -0400 (EDT)

Reply-To: "#crcsf" <crcsf@ix.netcom.com>
From: "#crcsf" <crcsf@ix.netcom.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: PAAPOR MAILING LIST
Date: Tue, 29 Aug 2000 13:01:14 -0700
Message-ID: <01c011f3\$e2f66ea0\$1a205dcf@julie>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0010_01C011B9.369796A0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0010_01C011B9.369796A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

DEAR AAPOR MEMBERS,

IF YOU HAVE NOT YET RECEIVED PRINTED INFORMATION IN THE MAIL REGARDING =
THE PAAPOR CONFERENCE SEPT 30-DEC 1, YOU MAY NOT BE ON THE CURRANT =
PAAPOR MAILING LIST. WE ARE GETTING READY TO BEGIN A SECOND MAILING, =
AND IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEMS, PLEASE FAX =
YOUR MAILING ADDRESS TO US @ 925-937-9895 ATTENTION: PAULA WALLACE, AND =
WE WILL BE SURE TO SEND YOU INFORMATION.

THANK YOU.

-----=_NextPart_000_0010_01C011B9.369796A0
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.71.1712.3"' name=3DGENERATOR>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV>DEAR AAPOR MEMBERS,</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>IF YOU HAVE NOT YET RECEIVED PRINTED =
INFORMATION IN=20
THE MAIL REGARDING THE PAAPOR CONFERENCE SEPT 30-DEC 1, YOU MAY NOT BE =
ON THE=20
CURRANT PAAPOR MAILING LIST. <nbsp;> WE ARE GETTING READY TO BEGIN A =
SECOND=20
MAILING, AND IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEMS, =
PLEASE FAX=20
YOUR MAILING ADDRESS TO US @ 925-937-9895 ATTENTION: PAULA WALLACE, AND =
WE WILL=20
BE SURE TO SEND YOU <nbsp;> INFORMATION.

THANK=20
YOU. <nbsp;></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0010_01C011B9.369796A0--

>From lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Aug 30 08:39:01 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 IAA06690 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 08:39:01 -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 KAA13812

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 10:37:45 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 10:38:45 -0500
Message-Id: <s9ace435.067@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 10:31:11 -0500
From: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Questions about voter registration data

I'm teaching a survey research course, and for our survey we are calling registered voters to ask some questions about voting intentions, etc. In trying to construct the sampling frame, I've discovered that the voter registration records have only addresses, not phone numbers. My contact at SSI told me that their voter registration sample files are updated by appending phone numbers to the address records. However, this means that only those people with listed numbers (or who are unlisted because they just moved) end up with complete records. In Champaign County, Illinois, there are a total of 73,350 voter records, but only 33,910 with phone numbers. Obviously, this is a poor sampling frame for this survey. Thus my two questions:

1. Is there any way to get better data? (I have no reason to think other sampling vendors have better methods for updating records than SSI)
2. Do voter registration records in other counties have the same limitation of no phone number? If so, what does this say about the accuracy of polls of registered voters? Are they really polls of registered voters with listed phone numbers?

>From tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu Wed Aug 30 09:11:14 2000
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id JAA26572 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 09:11:13 -0700
(PDT)
From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa24427;
30 Aug 2000 12:11 EDT
Received: from gj9k20b.Virginia.EDU (bootp-178-196.bootp.Virginia.EDU
[128.143.178.196])
by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA14992
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 12:11:13 -0400 (EDT)
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Questions about voter registration data
In-Reply-To: <s9ace435.067@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10008301226.L@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 12:12:26 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Our polls of registered voters are not based on registered voter lists. We screen randomly dialed households (sampled through RDD) for registered

To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Project Manager Opening in Survey Research Division, Communication
Research Center, Boston University
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Project Manager, Survey Research Division, Communication Research
Center,
Boston University.

The Survey Research Division of the CRC at Boston University seeks
candidates for the position of Project Manager. Primary responsibilities

include management of telephone interviewing operation. Secondary
responsibilities include management of project teams.

Candidate should be able to train and supervise telephone interviewers,
design questionnaires, interpret data analyses, develop conclusions and
implications for clients, communicate these conclusions and implications
in
the form of reports and presentations.

The ideal candidate has superior academic credentials, including
demonstrated analytic and quantitative skills, detail-orientation and
organizational skills, strong oral and written communication skills,
experience with CATI operation and software, knowledge of SPSS software,
and
experience as a dedicated team player.

Requires: B.A./B.S. or equivalent (M.A./M.S. or equivalent a plus), and
a
minimum of two years of related experience. Very competitive salary.

Send resume and cover letter electronically saved as Word for Windows
files
to:

crc@bu.edu

Director
Boston University
Communication Research Center
704 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215

>From BLUMWEP@aol.com Wed Aug 30 12:47:23 2000
Received: from imo-r05.mx.aol.com (imo-r05.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.5])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA06715 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 12:47:23 -0700
(PDT)
From: BLUMWEP@aol.com
Received: from BLUMWEP@aol.com
by imo-r05.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.15.) id 5.7e.9b2725e (2615)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 15:46:39 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <7e.9b2725e.26debe9f@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 15:46:39 EDT
Subject: Re: Questions about voter registration data
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 119

Our registered voter polls (and most media polls of registered voters) are based on RDD samples, not lists of registered voters.

We screen for a respondent in the household--using the birthday method--and then ask the correct respondent if he/she is a registered voter. While we get a slight overstatement of registration this way, it is not large--and it is definitely preferable to eliminating the unlisted voters.

We try to minimize the overstatement of registration by asking if they are registered "in the precinct where you now live, or haven't you had a chance to register yet?" We find that makes it easier for some respondents to admit to not being registered.

We also prefer asking the respondent about his/her own registration over asking one household member about the registration of other members.

Mickey Blum

>From brendan.cooney@strategyone.net Wed Aug 30 12:59:00 2000
Received: from chixims1.edelman.com (chixims1.edelman.com [63.104.92.15])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA16216 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 12:59:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by chixims1.edelman.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <R4DJKGAK>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 14:58:28 -0500
Message-ID: <37A880465575D4118E1D00D0B79D835E0BAFF0@NYCXMB3>
From: "Cooney, Brendan" <brendan.cooney@strategyone.net>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Questions about voter registration data
Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 14:58:27 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Tom and Mickey I think make excellent points, so I couldn't resist adding one myself: By screening registered voters in RDD samples, you also have the opportunity to survey non-registered households for comparison purposes (if budget and time allow).

-----Original Message-----

From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2000 11:31 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Questions about voter registration data

I'm teaching a survey research course, and for our survey we are calling registered voters to ask some questions about voting intentions, etc. In trying to construct the sampling frame, I've discovered that the voter registration records have only addresses, not phone numbers. My contact at SSI told me that their voter registration sample files are updated by appending phone numbers to the address records. However, this means that only those people with listed numbers (or who are unlisted because they just moved) end up with complete records. In Champaign County, Illinois, there are a total of 73,350 voter records, but only 33,910 with phone numbers. Obviously, this is a poor sampling frame for this survey. Thus my two questions:

1. Is there any way to get better data? (I have no reason to think other sampling vendors have better methods for updating records than SSI)
2. Do voter registration records in other counties have the same limitation of no phone number? If so, what does this say about the accuracy of polls of registered voters? Are they really polls of registered voters with listed phone numbers?

>From BLUMWEP@aol.com Wed Aug 30 13:14:27 2000
Received: from imo-r03.mx.aol.com (imo-r03.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.3])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA27494 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 13:14:26 -0700
(PDT)
From: BLUMWEP@aol.com
Received: from BLUMWEP@aol.com
by imo-r03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.15.) id 5.cb.8f978e8 (2615)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 16:13:46 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <cb.8f978e8.26dec4fa@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 16:13:46 EDT
Subject: Re: Questions about voter registration data
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 119

Brendan is right about the non-registered voters, who are often just asked demographic purposes and kept in for sampling purposes. When time, money, and the clients allow, we ask issue questions of the non-registered as well as for comparison.

Mickey

>From daves@startribune.com Wed Aug 30 13:48:33 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 ESMTTP
id NAA26727 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 13:48:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id PAA15168; Wed, 30 Aug 2000
15:50:57 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from unknown(132.148.25.25) by firewall2.startribune.com via smap
(V5.5)
id xma015073; Wed, 30 Aug 00 15:50:30 -0500

Received: from SMTP (stnave.startribune.com [132.148.90.39])
by mailserv1.startribune.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id PAA12196
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 15:44:21 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from mail.startribune.com ([132.148.90.226]) by 132.148.90.39
(Norton AntiVirus for Internet Email Gateways 1.0) ;
Wed, 30 Aug 2000 20:41:37 0000 (GMT)
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 30 Aug 2000 15:47:14 -0600
Message-Id: <s9ad2c82.078@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 30 Aug 2000 15:46:41 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Questions about voter registration data
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 NAA26782

There's another thing to keep in mind about polling registered voters, no matter whether you get names from a list or use an RDD screen. Some states have Election Day registration, which means that you don't really have to be registered prior to Election Day to vote. Consequently, if you're using registration status as a key screen, you might be screening out some likely voters in these states. Some of the New Hampshire primary polls found this out earlier this year.

Rob

Robert P. Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

v: 612.673-7278
f: 612.673-4359
e:

>>> <BLUMWEP@aol.com> 08/30 1:46 PM >>>

Our registered voter polls (and most media polls of registered voters) are based on RDD samples, not lists of registered voters.

We screen for a respondent in the household--using the birthday method--and then

ask the correct respondent if he/she is a registered voter. While we get

a slight overstatement of registration this way, it is not large--and it is definitely preferable to eliminating the unlisted voters.

We try to minimize the overstatement of registration by asking if they are registered "in the precinct where you now live, or haven't you had a chance to register yet?" We find that makes it easier for some respondents to admit to not being registered.

We also prefer asking the respondent about his/her own registration over asking one household member about the registration of other members.

Mickey Blum

>From RSantos@ui.urban.org Thu Aug 31 13:31:02 2000
Received: from uint3.urban.org (uint3.urban.org [4.22.172.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA27203 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 31 Aug 2000 13:31:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by webmail.urban.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <R8S6BWXR>; Thu, 31 Aug 2000 16:24:09 -0400
Message-ID: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B012F17A@uint4.urban.org>
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wash.- Balt. Chapter Announcement: Call for Nominations
Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2000 16:25:57 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings, fellow Chapter members!

The Washington/Baltimore Chapter of AAPOR is pleased to announce a call for nominees for election to the following Chapter Council positions:

Vice President (President Elect)
Associate Chapter Secretary (Secretary-Elect)
Associate Treasurer (Treasurer Elect)
Associate Online Administrator (Administrator-Elect).

An election of Chapter officers will be held this fall. In this transition year, elected officers will serve as an "associate" member from November 2000 to March 2001, then take their "full" position from March 2001 through December 2002.

CONTACT: To communicate your nominations, please contact Rob Simmons, Chair of the Nominations Committee, at SIMMONRO@osd.pentagon.mil or call him at 703 696-8961.

DUE DATE: Please submit your nominations by September 30, 2000.

NOMINATIONS WANTED

This transition year is critical for the growth and prosperity of our local chapter. The election provides an opportunity for you to get involved with the Chapter in a tangible way. The Chapter needs your participation to make the election process a success! Serving as an officer can be both fun and professionally rewarding. So, please consider yourself, your colleagues, and other Chapter members for nomination to one or more of the Chapter Council offices.

Qualifications. The current Chapter by-laws require that officers be members of national AAPOR, as well as members of our local Chapter. Please keep this in mind when considering your nominations.

If you or a colleague would like to become a member of national AAPOR,

the application can be found at www.aapor.org, the national AAPOR website. And if you wish to renew your membership with the local chapter, please contact Jennifer Reed via email at: dc-aapor.admin@erols.com.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Aug 31 15:52:27 2000

Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id PAA19409 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 31 Aug 2000 15:52:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (adsl-151-203-192-118.bellatlantic.net [151.203.192.118])

by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA09340

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 31 Aug 2000 18:52:10 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <39AEE140.50BB26C8@jwdp.com>

Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2000 18:50:40 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Presidential election results forecast

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The following article appears in today's Washington Post.

Those interested in examining the models used are referred to "Before the Vote: Forecasting Americian National Elections" edited by James E. Campbell and James C. Garand (Sage, 2000).

Those who inclined to dismiss the results may be cheered by "The Fortune Sellers: The Big Business of Buying and Selling Predictions" by William A. Sherden (Wiley, 1998).

Academics Say It's Elementary: Gore Wins

By Robert G. Kaiser

Washington Post Staff Writer

Thursday, August 31, 2000

For one group of political scientists who study U.S. elections, Campaign 2000 is effectively over. And the winner is . . . Vice President Gore, narrowly but clearly. Or so their mathematical formulas conclude.

Seven forecasts by academic analysts will be presented this morning to the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association here. Six of the seven foresee Gore winning between 52.3 and 55.4 percent of the votes cast for the two major-party candidates--Gore and George W. Bush. The seventh says Gore will win 60.3 percent of the major-party vote. All agree that other candidates won't affect the final result.

These models have proven highly accurate in the past. Their authors have applied them retrospectively to every election since 1948 or 1952

and found that most of them foresaw the final result of all but the closest elections. Several of the formulas have repeatedly been more accurate than even election-eve public opinion polls.

Preliminary projections by the same scholars were reported in The Washington Post in May, when they were substantially at variance with public opinion polls that put Bush ahead of Gore. The latest projections, based on more recent statistics, have slightly narrowed the predicted margin of a Gore victory, but not by much. Though each model is based on different factors, all combine a measurement of public opinion this summer with a measurement of the strength of the economy or the public's assessment of its economic well-being. The forecasters all agree that these fundamentals are the most powerful forces shaping election results.

Larry Bartels, a Princeton University political scientist who is not one of the forecasters, said the prognosticators "serve a very useful purpose by focusing attention on the most crucial factors influencing the outcome of presidential elections: the state of the country and the state of the economy." Emphasizing these, Bartels added, "strikes me as a valuable antidote to the press's overwhelming focus on candidates' personalities, campaign tactics and other 'unique,' campaign-specific factors which are more interesting to write about but much less important to the outcome of the election."

Bartels's comment summarizes the difference between the scholars who rely on mathematics and the political reporters and politicians who focus on the details of an electoral campaign and believe they are crucial to the final result.

"The outcome of a presidential election can be accurately predicted based on factors that are known well before the official campaign gets underway," said Alan I. Abramowitz, a professor of political science at Emory University. "Despite the time, effort and money devoted to campaigning, there is very little that the candidates can do during September and October to alter the eventual outcome of a presidential election."

Abramowitz's model--using a complex mathematical formula--combines economic growth in the first half of the election year, the popularity of the incumbent president on July 1 and the number of terms the incumbent party has been in power. This year his formula predicts that Gore will win 53.2 percent of the major-party vote, after docking the Democrat about 4 percent for the fact that he is trying to keep his party in office for a third term. Abramowitz says history shows that staying in office for a third or fourth term is difficult.

Christopher Wlezien of the University of Houston and Robert S. Erikson of Columbia University use a similar model that combines the approval rating for the incumbent president in the third quarter of the election year with statistics on economic growth from the beginning of the current presidential term through the first quarter of the election year. They do not have a "time for a change" factor like Abramowitz's. This year their formula foresees Gore winning 55 percent of the major-party vote.

James E. Campbell of the University of Buffalo argues that a party

seeking a third term is at a disadvantage because incumbents cannot persuasively promise change but "have to go with stability." In a booming economy, however, that isn't bad.

Campbell's forecast, combining the Gallup horse-race poll around Labor Day with economic growth in the second quarter of the election year, gives Gore 52.8 percent of the major-party vote. Campbell, a Republican, acknowledged some frustration with this result, his third in a row picking a Democrat. "Personally speaking, it would be nice to pick a Republican for a change," he said.

The mathematical forecasters all agree that campaigns matter, but not in the way politicians and political reporters often believe. Campbell and another forecaster, Thomas M. Holbrook of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, have written books on the subject. They argue that the campaign's real importance is in mobilizing partisans and reminding voters of the issues and of the state of affairs in the country. Their formulas assume that both sides run reasonably good campaigns.

Asked if watching this year's campaign unfold has challenged their assumptions or shaken their confidence in their formulas, the forecasters all said no. Holbrook said it made him "a bit nervous" earlier in the year to see opinion polls that put Bush in the lead, but he added, "I am confident in the basic assumptions of the model." His formula foresees the biggest Gore victory: 60.3 percent of the major-party vote.

"The forecast is about what the likely outcome is on Election Day, not what the polls say today," Holbrook said. "The fact that it's sunny today doesn't mean a forecast of rain tomorrow is going to be wrong. We'll just have to wait and see."