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>From Patricia.Gallagher@umb.edu Wed Aug  1 06:39:21 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f71DdLJ27398 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001
06:39:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ems.cc.umb.edu (ems.cc.umb.edu [158.121.2.232])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA28322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 06:39:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by ems.cc.umb.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
  id <321B76JJ>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 09:37:39 -0400
Message-ID: <S309A83D07C5D211A2970000F80836D80479A536@ems.cc.umb.edu>
From: Patricia Gallagher <Patricia.Gallagher@umb.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: 65+ Pretest Sample
Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2001 09:37:37 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

Many thanks to those of you who were kind enough to reply to my query.

-----Original Message-----
From: Patricia Gallagher [mailto:Patricia.Gallagher@umb.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2001 9:54 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: 65+ Pretest Sample

Dear AAPORNET,

Does anyone know of a vendor that will supply names and contact information for some people 65 years old and older residing in a couple of target states? The goal is to pretest a telephone instrument.

Thanks!

Trish Gallagher

Patricia M. Gallagher, PhD
Center for Survey Research
University of Massachusetts
Boston MA 02125

This is about the most overdue study I can think of, at the moment--what took so long, do you think?

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/health/01DATE.html
Their faces are far younger than those that appear in public service advertisements about domestic violence. They are too young to drink legally and, in many cases, too young to vote.

But a new report suggests that one in five adolescent girls become the victims of physical or sexual violence, or both, in a dating relationship.

And the experience of such violence, the researchers found, is frequently associated with serious health problems, including drug abuse, unhealthy weight control practices, risky sexual behavior, teenage pregnancy and suicide attempts.

Of the high school girls, ages 14 to 18, surveyed in the study, about 20 percent reported that they had been hit, slapped, shoved or forced into sexual activity by a dating partner.

Dr. Jay Silverman, an assistant professor of health and social behavior at the Harvard School of Public Health and the lead author of the report, called the numbers "extremely high." It appears today in The Journal of the American Medical Association.

"Unfortunately," Dr. Silverman said, "the prevalence estimate is not surprising considering what we know about intimate partner violence with adult women."

In a recent national survey, 25 percent of adult women reported being the victims of violence by a romantic partner.

Commenting on Dr. Silverman's study, Esta Soler, the executive director of the Family Violence Prevention Fund in San Francisco, said: "Those are disturbingly high statistics for young women. Adolescence is such a hard developmental time anyway, and young girls feel so off balance in so many respects that to now learn that violence is such a factor in their lives is very disturbing."

Ms. Soler said the study provided hard data to back up what those who work
in the field of domestic violence had suspected for many years.

Dr. Silverman said the findings underscored the need for more prevention programs and services for both the victims and the perpetrators of adolescent abuse.

The researchers analyzed responses to a single question about dating violence in both the 1997 and 1999 versions of the Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey, part of a national assessment of public high school students, grades 9 through 12, in schools across the country.

Students were asked if they had ever been hurt physically or sexually by a date or someone they were going out with. They responded by indicating, "No, I was not hurt by a date," "Yes, I was hurt physically," "Yes, I was hurt sexually," or "Yes, I was hurt physically and sexually."

The survey, administered in randomly selected classrooms, also included questions about smoking, drinking, thinking about or attempting suicide, sexual intercourse, condom use, pregnancy and unhealthy eating behaviors like laxative abuse or self-induced vomiting.

Of 1,977 high school girls who participated in the survey in 1997, 20.2 percent said they had been physically or sexually abused by a dating partner. In 1999, 18 percent of 2,186 girls said they had been the victims of physical or sexual violence.

In both years, the majority of girls who reported sexual abuse said they had also been physically abused.

The study is the most comprehensive to examine dating violence among adolescents, and the first to ask adolescents if they had ever been victims of violence in a dating situation. Previous studies have come up with similar statistics, though with smaller numbers of subjects and a more restricted focus.

A study by Dr. Ralph DiClemente and his colleagues at Emory University, which appeared in the journal Pediatrics in May, found that 18 percent of 522 black girls from 14 to 18 years old reported having been physically abused by a dating
Dr. Silverman said he thought the most striking finding of the new study was the strong link between dating violence and risky behavior.

For example, in the 1999 survey, being the victim of sexual violence by a dating partner was also associated with binge drinking; laxative use or vomiting to lose weight; not using a condom during sexual intercourse; having three or more sexual partners within the previous three months; and having been pregnant.

Girls who had experienced both physical and sexual abuse were also more likely to report cocaine, nicotine and alcohol use; unhealthy weight-control practices; suicide attempts; pregnancy; and to say that they had first had sexual intercourse when they were younger than 15.

But Dr. Silverman said it was not possible to tell from the study whether such risky behaviors preceded the dating violence or were the result of the abuse. Other studies, he noted, had found high rates of depression among adult battered women.

"A plausible explanation would be that adolescent women are also suffering from depression due to the abuse and degradation they have suffered that is making them more vulnerable," he said.

According to estimates by the Justice Department, more than 1.5 million women experience physical or sexual violence by a boyfriend, husband or date each year in the United States.

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/health/01DATE.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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>From ACiemnecki@mathematica-mpr.com Wed Aug 09:28:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTPT
Jan,

When you have a chance, can I please have a copy of this article from JAMA. Thanks.
Anne

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2001 11:59 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Study Says 20% of Girls Reported Abuse by a Date (E Goode NYTimes)

This is about the most overdue study I can think of, at the moment--what took so long, do you think?

-- Jim

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/health/01DATE.html

AUG 01, 2001

STUDY SAYS 20% OF GIRLS REPORTED ABUSE BY A DATE

By ERICA GOODE

Their faces are far younger than those that appear in public service advertisements about domestic violence. They are too young to drink legally and, in many cases, too young to vote.
But a new report suggests that one in five adolescent girls become the victims of physical or sexual violence, or both, in a dating relationship.

And the experience of such violence, the researchers found, is frequently associated with serious health problems, including drug abuse, unhealthy weight control practices, risky sexual behavior, teenage pregnancy and suicide attempts.

Of the high school girls, ages 14 to 18, surveyed in the study, about 20 percent reported that they had been hit, slapped, shoved or forced into sexual activity by a dating partner.

Dr. Jay Silverman, an assistant professor of health and social behavior at the Harvard School of Public Health and the lead author of the report, called the numbers "extremely high." It appears today in The Journal of the American Medical Association.

"Unfortunately," Dr. Silverman said, "the prevalence estimate is not surprising considering what we know about intimate partner violence with adult women."

In a recent national survey, 25 percent of adult women reported being the victims of violence by a romantic partner.

Commenting on Dr. Silverman's study, Esta Soler, the executive director of the Family Violence Prevention Fund in San Francisco, said: "Those are disturbingly high statistics for young women. Adolescence is such a hard developmental time anyway, and young girls feel so off balance in so many respects that to now learn that violence is such a factor in their lives is very disturbing."

Ms. Soler said the study provided hard data to back up what those who work in the field of domestic violence had suspected for many years.

Dr. Silverman said the findings underscored the need for more prevention programs and services for both the victims and the perpetrators of adolescent abuse.

The researchers analyzed responses to a single question about dating violence in both the 1997 and 1999 versions of the Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey, part of a national assessment of public high school students, grades 9 through 12,
Students were asked if they had ever been hurt physically or sexually by a date or someone they were going out with. They responded by indicating, "No, I was not hurt by a date," "Yes, I was hurt physically," "Yes, I was hurt sexually," or "Yes, I was hurt physically and sexually."

The survey, administered in randomly selected classrooms, also included questions about smoking, drinking, thinking about or attempting suicide, sexual intercourse, condom use, pregnancy and unhealthy eating behaviors like laxative abuse or self-induced vomiting.

Of 1,977 high school girls who participated in the survey in 1997, 20.2 percent said they had been physically or sexually abused by a dating partner. In 1999, 18 percent of 2,186 girls said they had been the victims of physical or sexual violence.

In both years, the majority of girls who reported sexual abuse said they had also been physically abused.

The study is the most comprehensive to examine dating violence among adolescents, and the first to ask adolescents if they had ever been victims of violence in a dating situation. Previous studies have come up with similar statistics, though with smaller numbers of subjects and a more restricted focus.

A study by Dr. Ralph DiClemente and his colleagues at Emory University, which appeared in the journal Pediatrics in May, found that 18 percent of 522 black girls from 14 to 18 years old reported having been physically abused by a dating partner within the previous six months.

Dr. Silverman said he thought the most striking finding of the new study was the strong link between dating violence and risky behavior.

For example, in the 1999 survey, being the victim of sexual violence by a dating partner was also associated with binge drinking; laxative use or vomiting to lose weight; not using a condom during sexual intercourse; having three or more
sexual partners within the previous three months; and having been pregnant.

Girls who had experienced both physical and sexual abuse were also more likely to report cocaine, nicotine and alcohol use; unhealthy weight-control practices; suicide attempts; pregnancy; and to say that they had first had sexual intercourse when they were younger than 15.

But Dr. Silverman said it was not possible to tell from the study whether such risky behaviors preceded the dating violence or were the result of the abuse. Other studies, he noted, had found high rates of depression among adult battered women.

"A plausible explanation would be that adolescent women are also suffering from depression due to the abuse and degradation they have suffered that is making them more vulnerable," he said.

According to estimates by the Justice Department, more than 1.5 million women experience physical or sexual violence by a boyfriend, husband or date each year in the United States.

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/health/01DATE.html

-----------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Aug 1 10:16:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f71HG3J21140 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001
10:16:03 -0700 (PDT)
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 KAA06333 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:16:04 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f71HPdt00368 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:15:39 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:15:39 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Here's a good overview of some of the more recent research on America's poor, including a new study by Heather Boushey, for the Economic Policy Institute in Washington, and also Barbara Ehrenreich's new book, "Nickel and Dimed."

-- Jim

© 2001 The New York Times Company

JUL 30, 2001

UNMASKING THE POOR

By BOB HERBERT

The poor are pretty well hidden from everyone except each other in the United States. You won't find them in the same neighborhoods or the same schools as the well-to-do. They're not on television, except for the local crime-casts. And they've vanished from the nation's political discussion.

Hiding the poor has been quite a trick, because there are still millions upon millions of them out here. And despite all the rosy scenarios we've been fed -- the end of welfare as we know it, rising tides lifting everybody's yachts -- they're not doing very well at all.

This has been made clear in a new report from the Economic Policy Institute in Washington and in Barbara Ehrenreich's latest book, "Nickel and Dimed."

Ms. Ehrenreich spent the better part of two years trying to survive on jobs that paid $6 or $7 an hour. It wasn't pretty. She worked in Florida, Maine and Minnesota in jobs that included waitress, hotel maid, cleaning woman, nursing-home aide and Wal-Mart sales clerk.
She tried valiantly. She lived in a trailer park in Key West, Fla., and stayed, briefly, in a hideous motel room in Minnesota that was "pretty much open to anyone's view or to anything that might drift in from the highway."

She ate cereal, chopped meat, kidney beans and noodles. And she listened to the ghastly stories that are common to poverty, like that of the roofer who lost his job because he missed too much time from work. It seems he had cut his foot and he "couldn't afford the prescribed antibiotic."

Ms. Ehrenreich did just about everything she could, but she was unable to make ends meet. "In Portland, Maine, I came closest to achieving a decent fit between income and expenses," she wrote, "but only because I worked seven days a week." And even in Portland, there was no margin for car trouble, a new pair of shoes, the loss of the few free meals she got at work, or any unexpected expense.

The only honest conclusion you can reach after reading Ms. Ehrenreich's book is that you can't make it in America on $6 or $7 an hour. Not if you're only working one job. And if you have children, you can't even come close to making it.

The biggest problem is housing. Affordable housing has gone the way of the double-feature movie and 30-cents-a-gallon gas. It is not uncommon for poor people to spend more than half their meager monthly incomes on housing.

"There are no secret economies that nourish the poor," Ms. Ehrenreich wrote. "On the contrary there are a host of special costs. If you can't put up the two months' rent you need to secure an apartment, you end up paying through the nose for a room by the week. If you have only a room, with a hot plate at best, you can't save by cooking up huge lentil stews that can be frozen for the week ahead. You eat fast food or the hot dogs and Styrofoam cups of soup that can be microwaved at a convenience store."

These kinds of economic struggles are much more widespread than most Americans realize. And they are by no means limited to the people we tend to categorize as poor. The report by the Economic Policy Institute, released last week at a briefing
attended by Ms. Ehrenreich, flies in the face of the happy talk we've heard for so long about how well American families are doing. Many families, according to the report, earn too little to cover "basic necessities like food, housing, health care and child care."

The report said that over the course of a year, nearly a third of poor and working-class families with children under 12 -- many with two parents and incomes above the official poverty line -- faced at least one "critical hardship, such as missing meals, being evicted from their housing, having their utilities disconnected, doubling up on housing, or not having access to needed medical care."

These struggling families are not easily stereotyped. Many are white. Many are headed by workers with a high school education or better. Many of the parents are over the age of 30.

In the absence of policy changes designed to strengthen the social safety net and significantly boost wages, they will continue to struggle, and at times suffer. Because, as Heather Boushey, the lead author of the study, commented, "Work alone doesn't ensure a decent standard of living."

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/30/opinion/30HERB.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Aug  1 10:42:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f71HgHJ27160 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:42:17 -0700 (PDT)
10:42:17 -0700
(RSAMTP)
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 ESMTy
   id KAA00858 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:42:18 -0700 (PDT)
10:42:18 -0700
(RSAMTP)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTy
   id f71Hfrn16085 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:41:53 -0700 (PDT)
10:41:53 -0700
(RSAMTP)
Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2001 10:41:53 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Speaking of the poor in America, another hot topic would appear to be the new urban homeless, who seem conveniently concentrated in the SMSAs with the best survey research centers (see second paragraph below).

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/nyregion/01HOME.html

AUG 01, 2001

USE OF SHELTERS BY FAMILIES SETS RECORD IN NEW YORK

By NINA BERNSTEIN

The number of homeless families lodging nightly in New York City's shelter system has risen higher than ever and the trend is accelerating, city officials said yesterday. With a critical shortage of low-cost housing, and applications for shelter running 30 percent higher than last year, officials say they expect new records to be set this winter.

No single factor explains the startling growth in homeless families in New York, which has been echoed in cities around the country, including Washington, Chicago and Oakland, Calif. But city officials and national researchers said likely explanations include housing costs driven higher in an economic boom, followed by a slowdown that has hit poor families harder in an America cutting welfare and a new reluctance by landlords to accept subsidized tenants.

By July, there were a record 6,252 families, with 11,594 children, in temporary beds, city figures show. Overall, there were 20,655 members of homeless families in the shelter system, surpassing the previous peaks of the late 1980's and mid-1990's,
when about 18,700 people in 5,700 families were in temporary shelter. Current figures reflect an increase of more than 1,000 families since July 2000 alone.

"This is off the charts," said Leonard Koerner, the city's chief assistant corporation counsel, who has been defending the city's homeless policies in court.

At the Emergency Assistance Unit in the Bronx, New York City's sole access point for homeless families seeking shelter, city figures show a number of applicants at levels not seen since the recession of the early 1990's. But with the city no longer supplying the stream of low-cost housing that absorbed thousands of families from the shelters in the past, fewer people are leaving the shelter system even as hundreds more crowd in each month.

Among them yesterday were Elizabeth Marrero, 29, and her two children, Bianca, 7, and Peter, 8, who have been shuttling between short-term beds and the unit since July 19.

"There's people sleeping on the floor, kids crying, the place is dirty -- it's like a nightmare," Ms. Marrero said. "If I would have a place to go I wouldn't put my kids through this."

She added that her son had been unable to attend summer school for lack of a stable place to live, and would have to repeat the third grade.

New York City has the only shelter system in the nation that operates under a court-ordered right to shelter for the truly homeless. On a typical night in July, it gave beds to 28,029 people, including 5,682 single men and 1,692 single women.

The number of single adults in the municipal shelters traditionally rises in cold weather, so by the end of the year, city officials and advocates for the homeless predict, the number of homeless people in the shelter system will exceed the previous high of 28,737, recorded in March 1987. That level spurred the Koch administration to begin a 10-year effort to get permanent housing for the homeless.
"This is completely careening out of control," said Mary Brosnahan Sullivan, executive director of the Coalition for the Homeless. "The next mayor may be sworn in on Jan. 1 with an all-time high in the number of homeless. How shocking that is at the end of an economic boom."

The boom itself has played a role, by raising rents to levels even many working families cannot pay, city officials and advocates agreed. Even as housing costs stay high, families at the bottom now seem to be catching the brunt of a national slowdown in the economy. And in a recent change in policy, the Giuliani administration is now scrambling to add low-cost permanent housing to the mix, but city officials say they are having little success.

Hundreds of Section 8 vouchers, federal subsidies that bridge the difference between income and a moderate rent, are going unused, Mr. Koerner said, because landlords are rejecting them despite city bonuses and a streamlined bureaucracy.

"It's not peculiar to New York City," Mr. Koerner said. "It may be a function of the good economy -- they're treating Section 8 as tenants of last resort."

Martha Burt, an authority on homelessness who directs social service research programs at the Urban Institute in Washington, said similar complaints were echoed by providers of homeless services in 25 research sites around the country this spring.

"There is nowhere in this country that anybody can find housing with what you can pay under Section 8," she said. "All over the country that is the story, and getting people placed is extremely difficult. New York City, with its right to shelter, is actually experiencing something closer to the truth than other communities whose actual delivery of family shelter is limited by the resources the community is willing to supply, and whose level of requests is limited by people's knowledge that they will be turned away."

But advocates for the homeless in New York attribute much of the current problem to the lack of low-cost housing initiatives since thousands of tax-delinquent apartments were rehabilitated under the Koch administration's 10-year plan.

The city's Department of Housing Preservation and Development, which had
produced
1,500 apartments a year for the homeless at the peak of the Koch plan, provided only
117 apartments in a nine-month period last year, city officials told the City Council recently.

Mayor Giuliani and his predecessor, David N. Dinkins, both turned away from the use of hotels as family shelters in the 1990's, and most regular shelter is now provided by private nonprofit groups by city contract. But under pressure from court orders to stop leaving homeless families to sleep on the floor of the Emergency Assistance Unit, the city has sharply increased the use of temporary beds.

Last month the city had more than 2,100 families in hotels and "scattered site" shelter, paying landlords the equivalent of $3,000 a month for night-to-night apartments.

"The city has created an incentive and a market for landlords to rent apartments for three times what either a federal subsidy or a city subsidy would cover," said Steven Banks, director of the Homeless Rights Project of the Legal Aid Society. "The city's put itself in this bind by neglecting the housing needs of low-income and working families for eight years."

Last January, Judge Helen E. Freedman of State Supreme Court in Manhattan found that more than 700 people were crowded into the Emergency Assistance Unit daily, including children missing school because only one-night beds were provided for them, and that as many as 32 families a night were left to sleep on the floor or on benches.

In April, the judge found that the city had redoubled its efforts, and extracted a promise from Mr. Koerner to show a steady reduction of families repeatedly shuttled to different shelters for a few hours of sleep.

But Mr. Koerner said yesterday that city plans had anticipated an 8 percent increase in homeless families applying for shelter, not a 30 percent rise.

Monday night, 8 adults and 14 children were left to sleep on the floor of the Emergency Assistance Unit. They were still there yesterday morning when the
Marrero family returned from a temporary shelter placement in Queens to reapply.

"I felt so sorry for them," Ms. Marrero said.

So did Bianca, her daughter. "I'm hoping they'll replace us somewhere where we know we'll be all right," Bianca said. "The worst thing is when your friends see you they, like, tease you and stuff -- 'You're in the shelter, you don't have no home.' "

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/nyregion/01HOME.html
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Bush's Approval Stabilizes, Though Reservations Remain

George W. Bush's job approval rating has stabilized, but six months into his presidency he faces persistent doubt on key issues, a sense he's out of touch with average Americans and broad suspicion that he's overly influenced by business corporations and the wealthy.

Countering these public concerns are two prime factors in Bush's favor: Broad approval for his work specifically on education - an issue central to his election strategy - and high ratings for personal qualities such as character, honesty and vision.

These fuel Bush to a 59-percent job approval rating, respectable albeit less than usual for a postwar president. Of his nine predecessors Bush's six-month rating is better only than Bill Clinton's and Gerald Ford's. Bush's father at six months had 73 percent approval.

The question is how long Bush can maintain overall popularity while lagging on specific issues. He lacks majority support on the environment, energy, patients' rights, Social Security, prescription drugs and campaign finance reform. And while he's stronger than usual for a Republican on education, he's weaker than usual on the economy.
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D.C. Voting Rights Effort Goes International
Activist Takes Case to U.N. Committee on Racial Discrimination in Geneva

By Sewell Chan
Washington Post Staff Writer
Wednesday, August 1, 2001; Page B01

A local activist left yesterday for Switzerland, traveling an unprecedented distance to press the case for voting representation in Congress and full self-government for District of Columbia residents before a United Nations panel. Timothy Cooper, a 38-year District resident, is scheduled to testify in Geneva on Friday before the 59th session of the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. He plans to argue that the lack of empowerment of District residents, two-thirds of whom are members of racial minorities, violates an international convention the United States ratified in 1994. "The government's denial of voting rights to District residents contradicts its international policy of promoting democracy and human rights around the globe," said Cooper, 48, who is paying for the trip. The session began Monday and continues until Aug. 17. Officials from the State and Justice departments, after presenting the first U.S. report on compliance with the treaty Friday, could be obliged to answer critical questions about the District's political status from committee members Monday. The 102-page report, completed in September, does not mention the issue. "Until the U.S. delegation receives questions from the committee, it's premature to comment," said a spokesman for the U.S. mission to the United Nations in Geneva. "The report is in the public domain, and the next comment will be made in response to the committee's questions." The case of District residents' political rights has come before the United Nations once before, also spurred by Cooper, a democracy activist who recently has focused on human rights in China. U.S. officials had to defend the limited voting representation of District residents during 1995 hearings at U.N. headquarters in New York on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the United States ratified in 1992. Meanwhile, advocates await a ruling on a 1993 action they filed against the United States before the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, which is a part of
the Organization of American States. Cooper, long active in statehood and pro-
democracy efforts, said he is one of several nongovernmental representatives who received a
time slot from the U.N. secretariat's office to comment on aspects of the U.S.
report. "Clearly this is an hour of history when we can shine the international
spotlight of human rights concerns on the plight of D.C. residents, and this
opportunity will not come again for at least another five years, at least before this
committee," he said. Legal scholars said the turn to international forums is increasingly popular for activists who have been stymied at home. "It's long been an
extremely effective strategy for disenfranchised groups or oppressed groups in
dictatorships of various kinds," said Anne-Marie Slaughter, a professor at Harvard
Law School. What is new, she said, is the use of such panels to embarrass or pressure
advanced industrial democracies. "It's a strategy that's likely to seem quixotic or
counterproductive in the short term but that over the long term could well produce
changes in surprising ways," she said. Critical findings by international panels may
not have immediate legal consequences but are still significant, said Ruth Wedgwood,
a professor at Yale Law School. "In practice, enforcement is really by persuasion,
she said, adding that such efforts risk a backlash by those who perceive a threat to
domestic sovereignty. Amy Whitcomb Slemmer, executive director of D.C. Vote, an
advocacy group founded in 1998, applauded the effort. "Foreign governments have no
idea that residents of the District don't have voting rights, so Tim's effort is
terrific," she said. The advocates need any help they can get. Their effort has been
frustrated at nearly every turn: the 1978 constitutional amendment granting voting
representation that failed, the 1993 House rejection of statehood, and October's
Supreme Court ruling that D.C. residents do not have a constitutional right to
voting members of Congress. And although last year's Democratic platform endorsed
statehood, the GOP platform argued that the District should continue its "unique status."
Cooper argues that the city's unique political status is at odds with the International
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which defines
discrimination as any policy based on race that "has the purpose or effect" of denying fundamental freedoms, including the right to vote. During the 1995 hearings, U.S. representatives quoted from the Federalist Papers to argue that the District, the capital since 1800, was envisioned as an enclave "responsible to the federal government alone." They also said that granting District residents full voting rights might give the city undue influence over federal officials. Cooper believes both arguments are anachronistic. He said denial of voting rights is linked to the nation's history of racial discrimination, citing the repeal of the District's short-lived territorial government in 1874 and the domination of the House District Committee by Southern segregationists through the 1970s. The District became majority-black in 1957 and achieved limited self-government in 1974.

---

Mark David RICHARDS, Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
A local activist left yesterday for Switzerland, traveling an unprecedented distance to press the case for voting representation in Congress and full self-government for District of Columbia residents before a United Nations panel. Timothy Cooper, a 38-year District resident, is scheduled to testify in Geneva on Friday before the 59th session of the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. He plans to argue that the lack of empowerment of District residents, two-thirds of whom are members of racial minorities, violates an international convention.
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Residents' political rights has come before the United Nations once before, also spurred by Cooper, a democracy activist who recently has focused on human rights in China. U.S. officials had to defend the limited voting representation of District residents during 1995 hearings at U.N. headquarters in New York on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the United States ratified in 1992.

Meanwhile, advocates await a ruling on a 1993 action they filed against the United States before the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, which is a part of the Organization of American States.

Cooper, long active in statehood and pro-democracy efforts, said he is one of several nongovernmental representatives who received a time slot from the U.N. secretariat's office to comment on aspects of the U.S. report. "Clearly this is an hour of history when we can shine the international spotlight of human rights concerns on the plight of D.C. residents, and this opportunity will not come again for at least another five years, at least before this committee," he said.
Legal scholars said the turn to international forums is increasingly popular for activists who have been stymied at home.

"It's long been an extremely effective strategy for disenfranchised groups or oppressed groups in dictatorships of various kinds," said Anne-Marie Slaughter, a professor at Harvard Law School. What is new, she said, is the use of such panels to embarrass or pressure advanced industrial democracies. "It's a strategy that's likely to seem quixotic or counterproductive in the short term but that over the long term could well produce changes in surprising ways," she said.

Critical findings by international panels may not have immediate legal consequences but are still significant, said Ruth Wedgewood, a professor at Yale Law School. "In practice, enforcement is really by persuasion," she said, adding that such efforts risk a backlash by those who perceive a threat to domestic sovereignty."
Amy Whitcomb Slemmer, executive director of D.C. Vote, an advocacy group founded in 1998, applauded the effort. "Foreign governments have no idea that residents of the District don't have voting rights, so Tim's effort is terrific," she said.

The advocates need any help they can get. Their effort has been frustrated at nearly every turn: the 1978 constitutional amendment granting voting representation that failed, the 1993 House rejection of statehood, and October's Supreme Court ruling that D.C. residents do not have a constitutional right to voting members of Congress. And although last year's Democratic platform endorsed statehood, the GOP platform argued that the District should continue its "unique status."

Cooper argues that the city's unique political status is at odds with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which defines discrimination as any policy based on race that "has the purpose or effect of denying fundamental freedoms, including the right to vote."

During the 1995 hearings, U.S. representatives quoted from the Federalist Papers to argue that the
District, the capital since 1800, was envisioned as an enclave "responsible to the federal government alone." They also said that granting District residents full voting rights might give the city undue influence over federal officials.

Cooper believes both arguments are anachronistic. He said denial of voting rights is linked to the nation's history of racial discrimination, citing the repeal of the District's short-lived territorial government in 1874 and the domination of the House District Committee by Southern segregationists through the 1970s. The District became majority-black in 1957 and achieved limited self-government in 1974.
David RICHARDS, Sociologist

Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.

2610 Woodley Place NW

Washington, District of Columbia 20008

202/ 347-8822

202/ 347-8825 = FAX

mark@bisconti.com
The write-up which follows is from Nightline which is devoting tonight's show to this topic. (At the end of it is a URL where you can sign up for daily emails, I find them to be useful guides to viewing - and often interesting reads in themselves).

Does anyone have access to the actual question that was the basis of this assertion?

The NYT article appears to be a close paraphrase:
Students were asked if they had ever been hurt physically or sexually by a date or someone they were going out with. They responded by indicating, "No, I was not hurt by a date," "Yes, I was hurt physically," "Yes, I was hurt sexually," or "Yes, I was hurt physically and sexually."

I note also that, buried in the article, was an indication, though statistically marginal, of a decrease in incidence in the last two years—that went without comment.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

TONIGHT'S SUBJECT: A new study out today in the Journal of the American Medical Association says that one out of five teenage girls reported being physically or sexually abused in a date situation. Have things changed, or are these types of incidents just being reported more often than a generation ago? What's going on here?

----

This is the type of story that makes me wonder if I'm just naïve. In talking about this story with some of the young women on the staff this morning, they all nodded their heads. The results of this study came as no surprise to them. They all said they knew someone that this had happened to. Now I'm a generation older. When I think back to high school, I remember a couple of things that scandalized the school, but I don't remember any of them involving physical abuse. Was it going on all around us, and no one talked about it? Ted is of the generation before mine. He grew up at a time when girls were expected to say "no," but boys were expected to try as hard as they could for a "yes." The old line went, "your mouth says no, but your eyes say yes." Actually I guess that line is passed from generation to generation.

Was the same level of abuse going on then, but people just didn't talk about it? Was there just a different standard from generation to generation as to what even constituted abuse? I have to admit that I find that number in the study extremely troubling. How can physical abuse be at that level, and continue at that level? How
many lives are being shattered all around us? I know that I am just asking more and more questions here, but that's because I don't have any answers.

And another interesting thing came up this morning. Some of the young women said they knew other women who had lied about being assaulted, who had made false accusations. I can just keep asking more and more questions here, but that is actually Ted's job. We're trying to bring together a group of young women, and maybe one or two who are older, to talk about this. It's a hard subject to talk about in public, especially for someone who has been a victim, but that's also one of the reasons that it continues to happen.

We always joke about "these kids today." I heard that from my parents' generation, I'm sure they heard it from theirs. I know that today's teenagers roll their eyes the way we did when they hear it from their parents. I guess I am troubled most by two aspects of this story. The first is obvious, that the level of abuse appears to be so high today. But secondly, that it may have been going on all along, and those who were victims had to suffer in silence.

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

Leroy Sievers
Executive Producer
Nightline Offices
Washington, D.C.
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STUDY SAYS 20% OF GIRLS REPORTED ABUSE BY A DATE

By ERICA GOODE

Their faces are far younger than those that appear in public service advertisements about domestic violence. They are too young to drink legally and, in many cases, too young to vote.

But a new report suggests that one in five adolescent girls become the victims of physical or sexual violence, or both, in a dating relationship.

And the experience of such violence, the researchers found, is frequently associated with serious health problems, including drug abuse, unhealthy weight control practices, risky sexual behavior, teenage pregnancy and suicide attempts.

Of the high school girls, ages 14 to 18, surveyed in the study, about 20 percent reported that they had been hit, slapped, shoved or forced into sexual activity by a dating partner.

Dr. Jay Silverman, an assistant professor of health and social behavior at the Harvard School of Public Health and the lead author of the report, called the
numbers "extremely high." It appears today in The Journal of the American Medical Association.

"Unfortunately," Dr. Silverman said, "the prevalence estimate is not surprising considering what we know about intimate partner violence with adult women."

In a recent national survey, 25 percent of adult women reported being the victims of violence by a romantic partner.

Commenting on Dr. Silverman's study, Esta Soler, the executive director of the Family Violence Prevention Fund in San Francisco, said: "Those are disturbingly high statistics for young women. Adolescence is such a hard developmental time anyway, and young girls feel so off balance in so many respects that to now learn that violence is such a factor in their lives is very disturbing."

Ms. Soler said the study provided hard data to back up what those who work in the field of domestic violence had suspected for many years.

Dr. Silverman said the findings underscored the need for more prevention programs and services for both the victims and the perpetrators of adolescent abuse.

The researchers analyzed responses to a single question about dating violence in both the 1997 and 1999 versions of the Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey, part of a national assessment of public high school students, grades 9 through 12, in schools across the country.

Students were asked if they had ever been hurt physically or sexually by a date or someone they were going out with. They responded by indicating, "No, I was not hurt by a date," "Yes, I was hurt physically," "Yes, I was hurt sexually," or "Yes, I was hurt physically and sexually."

The survey, administered in randomly selected classrooms, also included questions about smoking, drinking, thinking about or attempting suicide, sexual intercourse, condom use, pregnancy and unhealthy eating behaviors like laxative abuse or self-induced vomiting.

Of 1,977 high school girls who participated in the survey in 1997, 20.2 percent said they had been physically or sexually abused by a dating partner. In 1999, 18
percent of 2,186 girls said they had been the victims of physical or sexual violence.

In both years, the majority of girls who reported sexual abuse said they had also been physically abused.

The study is the most comprehensive to examine dating violence among adolescents, and the first to ask adolescents if they had ever been victims of violence in a dating situation. Previous studies have come up with similar statistics, though with smaller numbers of subjects and a more restricted focus.

A study by Dr. Ralph DiClemente and his colleagues at Emory University, which appeared in the journal Pediatrics in May, found that 18 percent of 522 black girls from 14 to 18 years old reported having been physically abused by a dating partner within the previous six months.

Dr. Silverman said he thought the most striking finding of the new study was the strong link between dating violence and risky behavior.

For example, in the 1999 survey, being the victim of sexual violence by a dating partner was also associated with binge drinking; laxative use or vomiting to lose weight; not using a condom during sexual intercourse; having three or more sexual partners within the previous three months; and having been pregnant.

Girls who had experienced both physical and sexual abuse were also more likely to report cocaine, nicotine and alcohol use; unhealthy weight-control practices; suicide attempts; pregnancy; and to say that they had first had sexual intercourse when they were younger than 15.

But Dr. Silverman said it was not possible to tell from the study whether such risky behaviors preceded the dating violence or were the result of the abuse. Other studies, he noted, had found high rates of depression among adult battered women.

"A plausible explanation would be that adolescent women are also suffering from
depression due to the abuse and degradation they have suffered that is making them more vulnerable," he said.

According to estimates by the Justice Department, more than 1.5 million women experience physical or sexual violence by a boyfriend, husband or date each year in the United States.

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/01/health/01DATE.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

*****

This is not very new news.

The Gelles, Steinmetz, Strauss etc. group reported 25% of adult women had reported such an incident during the lifetime of their marriages in their book Behind Closed Doors over 20 years ago. The incidence in cohabiting relationships is higher. I was on an MA committee about 15 years ago that surveyed the literature and reported about
20% for dating couples. This is considered highly significant because married and
even cohabiting couples have constraints that make it more difficult to leave the
relationship than dating couples do, yet the figures are close.

Places to examine this literature include Journal of Marriage and the Family, Social
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one paragraph synopsis to the list?
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Susan Carol Losh, PhD
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Call for Abstracts: ICIS, Copenhagen, August 2002

You are cordially invited to submit abstracts for the International Conference on Improving Surveys (ICIS 2002), which will take place in Copenhagen, Denmark from the 25th to the 28th August, 2002.

Main themes are (1) Impact of New Technology, (2) Quality of Surveys, (3) Comparability of International Assessments, (4) Comparability of Survey and Register Statistics.

An abstract of no more than 500 words should be send by e-mail to ICIS@sfi.dk.

Information is available at http://www.sfi.dk (click on news and then on conferences).

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)
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)
over four computer hard drives used to draft correspondence
during the presidential race for an inspection by news organizations to
determine
if any records were destroyed during the election stalemate in Florida last
November.

The computers were turned over only after a consultant that Ms. Harris
hired
conducted closed-door tests on the hard drives a day earlier. Ms. Harris
said
the consultant, William Morgan, had been retained to determine whether any
information
had been removed from the computers.

Ms. Harris has not made Mr. Morgan available to reporters, and her office
said
today that the results of his investigation might not be released for weeks.

In permitting the inspection now under way by nearly a dozen Florida
newspapers,
The Associated Press and The New York Times, Ms. Harris reversed two earlier
decisions in which her office first denied access to the computers and later
agreed
to permit an inspection of only two of the four computers that were used by
aides in
a "war room" outside her office during the protracted election.

The issue of the hard drive contents stems from an article in The Times last
month
about the handling of overseas absentee ballots in Florida. It said that
Republican
political consultants worked in the "war room" to help shape post-election
instructions on which absentee ballots were valid.

In interviews for the article, Ms. Harris's lawyers said records from her
office
computers had been erased, and they refused requests by the newspaper to
examine the
computers' hard drives. Ms. Harris's spokesman, David Host, now says no
records were
ever erased, but he has not explained the contradictory version of events
provided
by the secretary of state's office and has not returned calls seeking clarification.

The news organizations that were given the hard drives have hired Ontrack
Data
International, an electronic data retrieval firm in Minneapolis that has been
used
by the F.B.I. and the Secret Service, to conduct the examination.

"The very first thing we do is make an exact snapshot of the immediate
device,"
said Stuart Hanley, an electronic information management specialist at
Ontrack.

The company will then ship the contents to its laboratories for inspection. Technicians will look for two things: data that currently exists on the computers and any signs that information has been deleted or altered, which they would then try to recover.

Ontrack said its analysis would take several days at least, depending on how much information was on the computers.

Ms. Harris has issued statements saying she is permitting the examination to assure the public that her office has maintained and released all public records and because of "the historical importance these records hold."

During the six-month investigation by The Times, Ms. Harris declined requests to give her version of events. Since the article was published, she has issued two statements about it in which she defended her role in the election and said the article failed to report some of her actions accurately. She has since declined to return repeated telephone calls seeking further information, including two placed to her office today.

The Florida Democratic Party said today that it was concerned about the guidelines Ms. Harris established to conduct the inspection, specifically Mr. Morgan's private examination of the computers.

Mr. Morgan, who has a Ph.D in business information systems from the University of Sarasota, could not be reached for comment.

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/02/politics/02VOTE.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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Most accurate election forecast...ever

During the 2000 USA electoral race, Harris Interactive produced the most accurate prediction of the election outcome, despite the extraordinary cliff-hanger result. This Internet-based survey polled one quarter of a million panelists in 38 States -- the largest ever political poll. The 99 percent accuracy rate led to correct predictions in 71 of the 72 electoral races. Gordon Black, chairman and CEO at Harris Interactive, described it as "the single most accurate election forecast in the history of the polling industry."

From "The Super Pollsters" by David W. Moore (1992, page 42):

Any doubts skeptics may have had about The Literary Digest poll, however, were obliterated by the results of the 1932 election. The final straw poll results predicted Roosevelt would win the popular vote with a margin of 59.85 percent. The election results showed Roosevelt with 59.14 percent, a difference of less than three-quarters of a percentage point. The straw poll said Roosevelt would win 41 states with 474 electoral votes, and he actually won 42 state with 472 electoral votes. Even more amazing, the average error of prediction for all of the 48 states was just three percent.

These results were truly impressive. It is probable that no organization has surpassed this degree of accuracy for all of the states in the six decades since that election.

So who's the best ever?
Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
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Full-Time or Part-Time
BI-LINGUAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

Chicago-based opinion & marketing research firm has immediate need for an experienced bi-lingual (English-Spanish) research associate.

RESPONSIBILITIES. The candidate will work on all aspects of survey research projects including questionnaire design, data collection, data analysis, report writing, and client presentations.

REQUIREMENTS: At least one year work experience in survey research. Coursework in the social sciences, statistics, or marketing research. The successful candidate must have excellent communication skills, analytical skills, and a thorough working knowledge of Windows, WORD, EXCEL, and SPSS (or other statistical package).

SALARY: negotiable and commensurate with experience.

THE COMPANY. The Gary Siegel Organization, Inc. (GSO) is a full-service opinion/marketing research firm with an excellent reputation and a 25-year history. We conduct mail, telephone, and focus group research for corporations, professional service firms, and trade and professional associations. Small, entrepreneurial,
nonbureaucratic, growing. Ideal for an energetic, ambitious, talented person interested in career growth.

LOCATION. Charming Edgebrook community, across the street from forest preserve, northwest side of Chicago. One block from Metra station, two minutes off I-94.

Mail, email, or fax (no phone calls, please) letter of interest and resume to:

Gary Siegel Organization, Inc.
6411 N. Caldwell
Chicago, IL  60646
FAX:  773-763-4302
Email: info@gsoresearch.com
www.GSOresearch.com

We're virus averse. So if you email, please do not send attachments. Include all information in the body of the email.

Gordon Black said "the single most accurate election forecast in the history of the polling industry." I think "the polling industry" might well be seen to postdate and exclude both the Literary Digest and straw polls, in which case Gordon Black would be correct.

David Moore wrote: "It is probable that no organization has surpassed this degree of accuracy for all of the states in the six decades since that election." Because the Literary Digest is most certainly an "organization," I find that David Moore is also correct.

In short, both men are correct about the particular claims they
carefully specified.

So, do I win the Tupperware--or not?                -- Jim

On Thu, 2 Aug 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> >From the August 2001 issue of "mrfocus", a newsletter distributed by
> SPSS:
> >
> > Most accurate election forecast...ever
> >
> > During the 2000 USA electoral race, Harris Interactive produced
> the most accurate prediction of the election outcome, despite the
> extraordinary cliff-hanger result. This Internet-based survey
> polled one quarter of a million panelists in 38 States -- the
> largest ever political poll. The 99 percent accuracy rate led to
> correct predictions in 71 of the 72 electoral races. Gordon
> Black, chairman and CEO at Harris Interactive, described it as
> "the single most accurate election forecast in the history of the
> polling industry."
> >
> > From "The Super Pollsters" by David W.Moore (1992, page 42):
> >
> > Any doubts skeptics may have had about The Literary Digest poll,
> however, were obliterated by the results of the 1932 election. The
> final straw poll results predicted Roosevelt would win the popular
> vote with a margin of 59.85 percent. The election results showed
> Roosevelt with 59.14 percent, a difference of less than
> three-quarters of a percentage point. The straw poll said
> Roosevelt would win 41 states with 474 electoral votes, and he
> actually won 42 state with 472 electoral votes. Even more
> amazing, the average error of prediction for all of the 48 states
> was just three percent.
> >
> > These results were truly impressive. It is probable that no
> organization has surpassed this degree of accuracy for all of the
> states in the six decades since that election.
> >
> > So who's the best ever?
> >
> > Jan Werner
> > jwerner@jwdp.com
> >
> >From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu Aug  2 14:27:47 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f72LRLj0671 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Aug 2001
> 14:27:47 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
There are different ways of calculating accuracy. I take it that Gordon gets his 99% from predicting the outcome in 71/72 cases. But the more common method is to compare the winner's percent of the total with the poll's percent (after undecided are either allocated or dropped). Gordon, if you are guarding this channel, can you tell us your mean absolute error in those 72 races?
that election." Because the Literary Digest is most certainly an "organization," I find that David Moore is also correct.

In short, both men are correct about the particular claims they carefully specified.

So, do I win the Tupperware--or not?  -- Jim

On Thu, 2 Aug 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> From the August 2001 issue of "mrfocus", a newsletter distributed by SPSS:
> Most accurate election forecast...ever
> During the 2000 USA electoral race, Harris Interactive produced the most accurate prediction of the election outcome, despite the extraordinary cliff-hanger result. This Internet-based survey polled one quarter of a million panelists in 38 States -- the largest ever political poll. The 99 percent accuracy rate led to correct predictions in 71 of the 72 electoral races. Gordon Black, chairman and CEO at Harris Interactive, described it as "the single most accurate election forecast in the history of the polling industry."

> From "The Super Pollsters" by David W.Moore (1992, page 42):
> Any doubts skeptics may have had about The Literary Digest poll, however, were obliterated by the results of the 1932 election. The final straw poll results predicted Roosevelt would win the popular vote with a margin of 59.85 percent. The election results showed Roosevelt with 59.14 percent, a difference of less than three-quarters of a percentage point. The straw poll said Roosevelt would win 41 states with 474 electoral votes, and he actually won 42 state with 472 electoral votes. Even more amazing, the average error of prediction for all of the 48 states was just three percent.

> These results were truly impressive. It is probable that no organization has surpassed this degree of accuracy for all of the states in the six decades since that election.

> So who's the best ever?

> Jan Werner
> jwerner@jwdp.com

>
Hi,

We have followed the lead of Mosteller (1949) & Mitofsky (1998) in measuring the error/accuracy of Harris Interactive's E2000 forecasts. Please see below and feel free to call or email with questions.

Harris Interactive's accuracy for the 72 races:
Spread Error*: 3.6
Standard Deviation: 3.4
Mean Square Error**: 24.6

Notes:
*The "spread error," is the error in percentage points in estimating the margin between the first and second candidates. See Mitofsky (1998). **Mosteller (1949) first proposed using the MSE to compare two sets of polls in his article titled "Measuring the Error" in SSRC's "The Pre-election Polls of 1948."

Harris Interactive's accuracy in the 55 statewide races in which telephone polls (N=121) were mounted: Spread Error: 3.3 Standard Deviation: 2.8 Mean Square Error: 18.9

The accuracy of the 121 telephone forecasts in the 55 statewide races in which Harris Interactive surveys were also mounted: Spread Error: 4.5 Standard Deviation:
4.0
Mean Square Error: 36.6

MSE Comparison: 36.6/18.9 = 1.9X

------------------------------
George Terhanian, Ph.D.
Vice President, Research & Methodology
Harris Interactive, Inc.
(800) 866-7655 ext. 7507
www.harrisinteractive.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Philip Meyer [mailto:pmeyer@email.unc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2001 5:28 PM
To: AAPORN
Cc: Jan Werner
Subject: Re: Most accurate election forecast...ever

There are different ways of calculating accuracy. I take it that Gordon
gets his 99% from predicting the outcome in 71/72 cases. But the more common method is to
compare the winner's percent of the total with the poll's percent (after undecided
are either allocated or dropped). Gordon, if you are guarding this channel, can you
tell us your mean absolute error in those 72 races?

====================================================================
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365
Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425
http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
====================================================================

On Thu, 2 Aug 2001, James Beniger wrote:

> Date: Thu, 2 Aug 2001 13:45:30 -0700 (PDT)
> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwp.com>
> Cc: AAPORN <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: Re: Most accurate election forecast...ever
> >
> >
Gordon Black said "the single most accurate election forecast in the history of the polling industry." I think "the polling industry" might well be seen to postdate and exclude both the Literary Digest and straw polls, in which case Gordon Black would be correct.

David Moore wrote: "It is probable that no organization has surpassed this degree of accuracy for all of the states in the six decades since that election." Because the Literary Digest is most certainly an "organization," I find that David Moore is also correct.

In short, both men are correct about the particular claims they carefully specified.

So, do I win the Tupperware--or not?  

-- Jim

On Thu, 2 Aug 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> From the August 2001 issue of "mrfocus", a newsletter distributed by SPSS:
> Most accurate election forecast...ever
> During the 2000 USA electoral race, Harris Interactive produced the most accurate prediction of the election outcome, despite the extraordinary cliff-hanger result. This Internet-based survey polled one quarter of a million panelists in 38 States -- the largest ever political poll. The 99 percent accuracy rate led to correct predictions in 71 of the 72 electoral races. Gordon Black, chairman and CEO at Harris Interactive, described it as "the single most accurate election forecast in the history of the polling industry."

> From "The Super Pollsters" by David W.Moore (1992, page 42):
> Any doubts skeptics may have had about The Literary Digest poll, however, were obliterated by the results of the 1932 election. The final straw poll results predicted Roosevelt would win the popular vote with a margin of 59.85 percent. The election results showed Roosevelt with 59.14 percent, a difference of less than three-quarters of a percentage point. The straw poll said roosevelt would win 41 states with 474 electoral votes, and he actually won 42 state with 472 electoral votes. Even more amazing, the average error of prediction for all of the 48 states was just three percent.

These results were truly impressive. It is probable that no organization has surpassed this degree of accuracy for all of the states in the six decades since that election.
So who's the best ever?

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

From mitofsky@mindspring.com Thu Aug 2 15:37:27 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f72MbQJ21442 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Aug 2001
    15:37:26 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ren-3.cais.net (ren-3.cais.net [205.252.14.78])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA17526 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Aug 2001 15:37:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from WARREN.mindspring.com (63-216-231-13.sdsl.cais.net [63.216.231.13])
    by ren-3.cais.net (8.11.1/8.11.1) with ESMTP id f72MahE30891
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Aug 2001 18:36:43 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20010802182936.02661690@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Thu, 02 Aug 2001 18:38:33 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: RE: Most accurate election forecast...ever
In-Reply-To: <714D7563BF88D411ABFE00508BCFF0B002AD640B@midas.harrisinteractive.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="="
--="
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

What follows is an exchange I had with Harris Interactive about
day-after-the-election press release. Following their press release is my
note and table showing the accuracy of their state polls. As you can see,
their 97 percent figure is misleading.
warren mitofsky

From the Nov. 8, 2000 Harris Interactive press release:

Internet Polling Produces Accurate Results
The Harris Interactive Internet-based poll results based on over 240,000
responses proved to be accurate 97% accurate to be exact. Based on
election results reported as of 11:00am EST November 8, 2000, our
Internet-based poll correctly predicted (within a +/- 2% confidence level):

April 4, 2001

George,
I have enclosed the Harris press release statement. It claims the 97% of the results are within +/- 2%. As you can see from the table I put together only 30 of the 71 state polls are within +/- 2%.

I got the Harris numbers from your November 7, 2000 press release. I took the final election numbers from the VNS compilation, which was just issued last week. (attached below) It has corrections from the official numbers. I also did the same compilation from the presidential numbers I found on the FEC web site. It changes a few states by a point, but the FEC numbers were not final error checked vote totals. I could find no other final numbers for the senate and governor other than VNS that were complete.

It seems to me the least HI should do is correct its press release. 30 out of 71 is a long way from 97% accurate within +/- 2%.

warren

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-D</th>
<th>PRESIDENT</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>MD,MI,NV,OK,</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IN,MA,MN,MO,</td>
<td>FL,MD,MI,</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NJ,OH,PA,TN</td>
<td>NJ,OH,TX</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AK,WV</td>
<td>CT,NM,WA*</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FL*,HI,ID,ME,</td>
<td>GA,MO,UT</td>
<td>MO*,NH</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH*,TX,VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CO,GA,KS,KY</td>
<td>ME,MN,WI</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IA,NM</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AZ,CA,CT,IL,</td>
<td>NV,TN</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>CA,MA,NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NE,NY</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMITTED AZ 1
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What follows is an exchange I had with Harris Interactive about
day-after-the-election press release. Following their press release is my
note
and
table showing the accuracy of their state polls. As you can see, their 97
percent
figure is misleading.

From the Nov. 8, 2000 Harris
Interactive press release:
The Harris Interactive Internet-based poll results based on over 240,000
responses proved to be accurate; 97% accurate to be exact. Based on
election results reported as of 11:00am EST November 8, 2000, our Internet-based poll
correctly predicted (within a +/- 2% confidence level):

April 4, 2001
George,
I have enclosed the Harris press release statement. It claims the 97% of the
results are within +/- 2%. As you can see from the table I put together only 30 of the
71 state polls are within +/- 2%.

I got the Harris numbers from your November 7, 2000 press release. I took the final election numbers from the VNS compilation, which
was just issued last week. (attached below) It has corrections from the official
degress. I also did the same compilation from the presidential numbers I
found on the FEC web site. It changes a few states by a point, but the FEC numbers were not
final error checked vote totals. I could find no other final numbers for the senate and
governor other than VNS that were complete.

It seems to me the least HI should do is correct its press release. 30 out of 71 is a long way from 97% accurate
within +/- 2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-D</th>
<th>PRESIDENT</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD, MI, NV, OK,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WV UT WI 17 IN, MA, MN, MO, FL, MD, MI, NJ, OH, PA, TN, UT VA

AK, WV CT, NM, WA 6

FL*, HI, ID, ME, GA, MO, NH*, TX, VA

GA, MO, UT, WA 12

NH*, TX, VA
August 1, 2001

New products

Arbitron hopes its numbers are updated

By John-John Williams IV
Tribune staff reporter

Tracking media audiences has always been subject to some dispute, and the pressure
on the existing methods has only grown as the range of media options has widened.

So hello, Portable People Meter.

The PPM is a pager-size device that its developer, the Arbitron ratings service, hopes will replace the timeworn standards -- diaries kept by target households and boxes that monitor television viewing, usually in homes.

The PPM, which is carried by participants, detects codes that TV and radio broadcasters place in their programming using encoders provided by Arbitron. The device "hears" and records the signals, whether at home or outside it. When the PPM is recharged on its base every night, the base sends the collected codes to Arbitron.

This eliminates the need for people to constantly track their listening or viewing behavior by writing in a diary, according to Marshall Snyder, president of Worldwide PPM Development, Arbitron Inc. It also enables one device to measure participants' use of broadcast TV, cable TV and radio outside the house, a flaw in set-top boxes.

"I think the system that is there now is an antiquated system," said Mike Kupinski, vice president of media and entertainment analysis at AG Edwards in St. Louis. "This system addresses this issue.

"Advertisers are looking for better accuracy for viewership. They're looking for consistency for how media is measured."

"We're encouraged by the initial results," Snyder said. "The PPM is easy, thorough, reliable and fast." In initial tests, the PPM reported higher usage for television and cable and equivalent usage for radio when compared with more conventional systems.

Although the PPM is just in testing and is not available to the public, some media insiders are impressed with the potential it has shown and the difficulties the PPM might address. These range from perceived underreporting of minority and younger viewers' habits to concerns over existing systems' emphasis on household use.
"Both [broadcast] TV and cable should benefit because it will pick up out-of-home viewing," said Katie Bachman, senior editor with Mediaweek magazine. "Group viewing at sports bars have hurt ratings in the past."

Another interesting development has been the teaming of competitors Arbitron and Nielsen for this project. The two have invested time and money, but, according to Jack Loftus, vice president of communications for Nielsen in New York, the two companies are on different pages.

"Nielsen is not as concerned with early audience response as much as with the technology," Loftus said. "We're more focused on the technology . . . and if it holds up."

Arbitron first tested 300 people in the Wilmington, Del., market in December 2000, with 260 people completing the initial study.

Arbitron's next step will be to expand the PPM to the Philadelphia market this fall, testing 1,500 people.

When will the PPM go full-scale?

That depends on the marketplace, according to Thom Mocarsky, vice president of communications for Arbitron. "For this to work, the media outlets have to accept it."

In the Wilmington study, 64 of 71 possible media outlets are now encoding full-time. All 38 radio stations participated, along with all eight local television stations. Eighteen of the 25 cable outlets participated as well.

Getting the media outlets to participate could be problematic, Kupinski said. "There will be the issue of those who want to participate and pay for the service and those who don't want to."

Loftus agreed.

"The question is will it become one of several standards, or will it be a standard at all," Loftus said. "You may come up with best system in the world [but] it doesn't matter if no one buys it."

Over the years, rating media use has generated controversy. "The diary
system really relies on the memory of the participant," Kupinski said. "They have to remember where and when they listened to the radio station. Generally, I can't remember where I was a couple of days ago."

Arbitron also looked to specifically combat racial and age inaccuracies. First, it included children as young as 6 in the study. Arbitron used a point incentive to encourage children to participate. The points translated to higher cash premiums for participants. Arbitron used coloring books and other activities to generate interest in children. There were also raffles to promote PPM usage. Arbitron plans to heighten its targeting of Hispanic television and radio stations. It says it has several Hispanic stations encoding right now and that they will participate in the next round of testing.

In the past, fatigue has played a part in rating inaccuracy. Many participants simply got tired of completing the diaries.

The Wilmington test seems to have solved that problem.

"We haven't seen fatigue," Snyder said. "People are getting used to carrying their PPM around like a cell phone, pager or Palm Pilot."

Aside from the technology holding up, the PPM's success depends on whether or not media outlets nationwide accept this as the new standard. The media outlets have to buy into the installation of the encoding equipment. That will cost money.

Arbitron will provide the media outlets with the initial equipment, Mocarsky said.

www.chicagotribune.com/features/lifestyle/chi-0108010018aug01.story
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright (C) 2001, Chicago Tribune <www.chicagotribune.com>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
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>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Aug  3 03:48:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f73AmVJ17754 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Aug 2001
The following op-ed piece appears in today's Washington Post and also in the on-line magazine Slate (edited by Kinsley), where it sports the additional subtitle "A Presidential Commission endorses a nutty complaint."

Electoral Hypochondria
By Michael Kinsley
Friday, August 3, 2001; Page A19

"For decades," says the National Commission on Federal Election Reform in its report issued this week, "public opinion surveys have disclosed abiding irritation with early projection of election results by the news media." It's true: Nearly everyone thinks that it is very naughty of the TV networks to project election results before voting is over. Many people who hear the networks call an election before they have exercised their franchise believe, in all sincerity, that their votes are being stolen. But, like primitives who believe their souls are being stolen when someone takes their photograph, these people are mistaken. It is a form of democratic hypochondria.

The commission, appointed by President Bush and chaired by Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, seems dead to the irony of citing poll results to justify a call for the
suppression of poll results. The commission apparently does not worry that by revealing that public opinion is settled on this issue, it has somehow denied you the right to make up your own mind. The commission not only is not alarmed that readers of its report might be influenced by these poll results -- it thinks that people ought to be influenced by these poll results.

But exit polls, taken as people leave the voting booth, apparently are different. With extraordinary vehemence, "The Commission condemns" the practice of reporting poll results before all voting is officially over (except in Alaska and Hawaii, which apparently don't count). "This practice demeans democracy," the commission intones. "It robs candidates . . . of votes." It "discriminates against citizens and candidates in much of the nation." Tragically, the commission concedes, even vile and filthy exit polls are protected by the First Amendment. But the report "strongly encourages citizens not to participate." And it calls for new laws forbidding public disclosure of the official results until all polls have closed. "At the very least," the report notes vindictively, this would make the network projections more "unreliable."

It's a startling notion that the government ought to be trying to make news media information more unreliable. Much of the effort of government officials is devoted to precisely this, of course, but you don't expect to find it among the recommendations of a hifalutin commission. Especially since "unreliability" is one of the commission's major complaints against network projections in the first place. The idea seems to be that network projections must be made more unreliable so that people will recognize how unreliable they are. Communists used to call this kind of strategy "heightening the contradictions."

The depravity of exit polls knows no bounds, apparently. Striking a pose more like Margaret Dumont than Captain Renault, the commission declares it "was shocked" at "reports" that exit pollsters have enticed voters with "tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or [gasp!] cigarettes." This creates "an unhealthy polling place environment," the report notes primly.
It is, to be sure, an outrage if people attempting to exercise their sacred right to vote must pass through clouds of secondhand smoke. But as to the larger issue, it is the commission that is blowing smoke. Consider a few undeniable facts:

(1) If people have voted, they have voted. And if so many of them have voted before you do that the result is preordained when you enter the voting booth, that remains true whether or not the media report it.

(2) Every voter is at the mercy of other voters. The chance of your vote determining the result is exactly the same whether you are the very first voter or the very last. That chance is virtually nil, even if you live in Palm Beach County. To the extent other things matter besides declaring the winner, such as the margin of victory or the size of the turnout, every vote matters equally no matter when it was cast.

(3) Polls are conducted throughout the campaign, not just on Election Day. In most cases every voter who watches or reads the news knows the probable result before he or she enters the voting booth. The only difference between Election Day exit polls and earlier polls is that the exit polls are more likely to be accurate.

The only difference between a voter who has not heard the exit poll results and one who has is that the second voter knows something that the first one doesn't. It truly baffles me how it can be considered "discrimination" against someone to give him or her a piece of information that he or she is free to act on or ignore. The slightly different argument that exit-poll projections, by reducing voter turnout, harm democracy generally is an insult to these same people. It says that either they can't be trusted with accurate information, or they can't be trusted to assess the possibility -- which the commission itself considers obvious -- that the information may be inaccurate. It says, essentially, that people should be tricked into voting by keeping them in the dark.

The commission mocks network objections on the grounds that the networks long ago
agreed not to report projected results in individual states until polls have closed in each state. The commission is right that the networks have already abandoned the point of principle, and its new demands demonstrate that they were foolish to do so. Instead of agreeing to extend their pseudo-self-censorship, the networks should reassert their right to do their job of gathering information and sharing it with the public.

If network projections were as routinely wrong as the commission suggests, no one would believe them and the alleged problem would solve itself. The commission's real complaint is that exit polls tend to be accurate. As such, they tell a truth that these high-minded formers and worthies would like to suppress, which is that any individual vote does not matter, if by "matter" you mean affecting the result.

The important point is that every vote doesn't matter equally, no matter when it was cast.

Michael Kinsley, editor of Slate (www.slate.com), writes a weekly column for The Post.
WASHINGTON, Aug. 2 - Senate Republicans boycotted the year's first vote on an election overhaul today, laying bare the intense partisan divisions that threaten to kill any change in the nation's electoral system.

Lacking their Republican colleagues, the 10 Democrats on the Senate Rules Committee unanimously passed and sent to the Senate floor a measure that would set three voting criteria that all states would have to meet by 2004 and would pay for meeting those requirements.

Dozens of bills have been introduced in Congress to revamp the nation's election system. But today's bill was the first to be reported out of committee. The bill is to be debated by the full Senate in the fall.

At the heart of the dispute was whether to require states to upgrade their election systems or to leave any such action to them.

Democrats, in general, favor mandating upgrades as a way of guaranteeing that states allow all registered citizens to vote, and that those votes are counted. Republicans, in general, oppose mandates, saying that Washington should not impose its will on states in election administration.

The division was evident today. Senator Christopher J. Dodd, the Connecticut Democrat who is the committee chairman, proposed the bill with mandates, contending that without requirements, some states would not improve their systems.

The other major Senate bill - sponsored by Senators Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky, and Charles E. Schumer of New York and Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey, both Democrats - does not impose mandates but sets voting standards as a condition for receiving federal money.

Mr. Dodd offered his bill today. Mr. McConnell wanted to offer his as well, but Mr. Dodd would not allow both bills to be considered. As a result, Mr. McConnell
boycotted the meeting and asked his Republican colleagues to do likewise.

In a letter to Mr. Dodd, Mr. McConnell called the refusal to bring his bill to a vote a sign "that the majority intends to manipulate this debate in a divisive, partisan manner that dooms the election-reform effort."

Analysts said they thought Congress and the White House could agree on plans to improve voting.

Norman Ornstein, a co-author of a new study on election revisions, said that today's split showed that Congress was starting to grapple seriously with the issue. "As we get closer to the possibility of doing something, inevitably, we're starting to see some of the fissures," he said.
Jan Werner wrote:

> The following op-ed piece appears in today's Washington Post and also
> in the on-line magazine Slate (edited by Kinsley), where it sports the
> additional subtitle "A Presidential Commission endorses a nutty
> complaint."
>
> _____________________________________________________
>
> Electoral   Hypochondria
> By Michael Kinsley
> Friday, August 3, 2001; Page A19
>
> "For decades," says the National Commission on Federal Election Reform
> in its report issued this week, "public opinion surveys have disclosed
> abiding irritation with early projection of election results by the
> news media." It's true: Nearly everyone thinks that it is very
> naughty of the TV networks to project election results before voting
> is over. Many people who hear the networks call an election before
> they have exercised their franchise believe, in all sincerity, that
> their votes are being stolen. But, like primitives who believe their
> souls are being stolen when someone takes their photograph, these
> people are mistaken. It is a form of democratic hypochondria.
>
> The commission, appointed by President Bush and chaired by Gerald Ford
> and Jimmy Carter, seems dead to the irony of citing poll results to
> justify a call for the suppression of poll results. The commission
> apparently does not worry that by revealing that public opinion is
> settled on this issue, it has somehow denied you the right to make up
> your own mind. The commission not only is not alarmed that readers of
> its report might be influenced by these poll results -- it thinks that
> people ought to be influenced by these poll results.
>
> But exit polls, taken as people leave the voting booth, apparently are
> different. With extraordinary vehemence, "The Commission condemns"
> the practice of reporting poll results before all voting is officially
> over (except in Alaska and Hawaii, which apparently don't count).
> "This practice demeanes democracy," the commission intones. "It robs
> candidates . . . of votes." It "discriminates against citizens and
> candidates in much of the nation." Tragically, the commission
> concedes, even vile and filthy exit polls are protected by the First
> Amendment. But the report "strongly encourages citizens not to
> participate." And it calls for new laws forbidding public disclosure
> of the official results until all polls have closed. "At the very
> least," the report notes vindictively, this would make the network
> projections more "unreliable."
>
> It's a startling notion that the government ought to be trying to make
> news media information more unreliable. Much of the effort of
> government officials is devoted to precisely this, of course, but you
> don't expect to find it among the recommendations of a hifalutin
> commission. Especially since "unreliability" is one of the
> commission's major complaints against network projections in the first
> place. The idea seems to be that network projections must be made
more unreliable so that people will recognize how unreliable they are. Communists used to call this kind of strategy "heightening the contradictions."

The depravity of exit polls knows no bounds, apparently. Striking a pose more like Margaret Dumont than Captain Renault, the commission declares it "was shocked" at "reports" that exit pollsters have enticed voters with "tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or [gasp!] cigarettes." This creates "an unhealthy polling place environment," the report notes primly.

It is, to be sure, an outrage if people attempting to exercise their sacred right to vote must pass through clouds of secondhand smoke. But as to the larger issue, it is the commission that is blowing smoke. Consider a few undeniable facts:

1. If people have voted, they have voted. And if so many of them have voted before you do that the result is preordained when you enter the voting booth, that remains true whether or not the media report it.

2. Every voter is at the mercy of other voters. The chance of your vote determining the result is exactly the same whether you are the very first voter or the very last. That chance is virtually nil, even if you live in Palm Beach County. To the extent other things matter besides declaring the winner, such as the margin of victory or the size of the turnout, every vote matters equally no matter when it was cast.

3. Polls are conducted throughout the campaign, not just on Election Day. In most cases every voter who watches or reads the news knows the probable result before he or she enters the voting booth. The only difference between Election Day exit polls and earlier polls is that the exit polls are more likely to be accurate.

The only difference between a voter who has not heard the exit poll results and one who has is that the second voter knows something that the first one doesn't. It truly baffles me how it can be considered "discrimination" against someone to give him or her a piece of information that he or she is free to act on or ignore. The slightly different argument that exit-poll projections, by reducing voter turnout, harm democracy generally is an insult to these same people. It says that either they can't be trusted with accurate information, or they can't be trusted to assess the possibility -- which the commission itself considers obvious -- that the information may be inaccurate. It says, essentially, that people should be tricked into voting by keeping them in the dark.

The commission mocks network objections on the grounds that the networks long ago agreed not to report projected results in individual states until polls have closed in each state. The commission is right that the networks have already abandoned the point of principle, and its new demands demonstrate that they were foolish to do so. Instead of agreeing to extend their pseudo-self-censorship, the networks should reassert their right to do their job of gathering information and sharing it with the public.
If network projections were as routinely wrong as the commission suggests, no one would believe them and the alleged problem would solve itself. The commission's real complaint is that exit polls tend to be accurate. As such, they tell a truth that these high-minded formers and worthies would like to suppress, which is that any individual vote does not matter, if by "matter" you mean affecting the result.

The important point is that every vote doesn't matter equally, no matter when it was cast.

Michael Kinsley, editor of Slate (www.slate.com), writes a weekly column for The Post.

\* \* \* 2001 The Washington Post Company
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Unfortunately, the actual report posted on the commission web page looks more like a political puff piece than anything else. It is available only as a scanned .pdf file, bloated with numerous self-serving photos of the illustrious members in thoughtful poses and patriotic photographs of flags and voting materials.

There is no plain text version available and no effort was made to make the .pdf document more readable by linking the table of contents to the chapters listed. Wide margins (to make room for the pictures) make the text too small to read on-screen except on a very large high-resolution monitor, and the 114-page length, along with the many photographs, make it costly and time-consuming to print out. The report is also posted as individual chapters, but these simply consist of the full report broken into chunks for downloading.

The March 21st supporting report "Voting Technologies in the United States: Overview and Issues for Congress" prepared by the Congressional Research Service is listed on the individual chapters page, but only a brief abstract is provided, with no link to obtain the full text.

My feeling is that, if the commission were serious about election reform, they would have tried a little harder to make the contents of the report available, instead of the self-promoting brochure they have produced.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
> Here is the full report.
> >
> >
> Jan Werner wrote:
Electoral Hypochondria
By Michael Kinsley
Friday, August 3, 2001; Page A19

"For decades," says the National Commission on Federal Election Reform in its report issued this week, "public opinion surveys have disclosed abiding irritation with early projection of election results by the news media." It's true: Nearly everyone thinks that it is very naughty of the TV networks to project election results before voting is over. Many people who hear the networks call an election before they have exercised their franchise believe, in all sincerity, that their votes are being stolen. But, like primitives who believe their souls are being stolen when someone takes their photograph, these people are mistaken. It is a form of democratic hypochondria.

The commission, appointed by President Bush and chaired by Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, seems dead to the irony of citing poll results to justify a call for the suppression of poll results. The commission apparently does not worry that by revealing that public opinion is settled on this issue, it has somehow denied you the right to make up your own mind. The commission not only is not alarmed that readers of its report might be influenced by these poll results -- it thinks that people ought to be influenced by these poll results.

But exit polls, taken as people leave the voting booth, apparently are different. With extraordinary vehemence, "The Commission condemns" the practice of reporting poll results before all voting is officially over (except in Alaska and Hawaii, which apparently don't count). "This practice demeaned democracy," the commission intones. "It robs candidates . . . of votes." It "discriminates against citizens and candidates in much of the nation." Tragically, the commission concedes, even vile and filthy exit polls are protected by the First Amendment. But the report "strongly encourages citizens not to participate." And it calls for new laws forbidding public disclosure of the official results until all polls have closed. "At the very least," the report notes vindictively, this would make the network projections more "unreliable."

It's a startling notion that the government ought to be trying to make news media information more unreliable. Much of the effort of government officials is devoted to precisely this, of course, but you don't expect to find it among the recommendations of a hifalutin commission. Especially since "unreliability" is one of the commission's major complaints against network projections in the first place. The idea seems to be that network projections must be made more unreliable so that people will recognize how unreliable they are. Communists used to call this kind of strategy
"heightening the contradictions."

The depravity of exit polls knows no bounds, apparently. Striking a pose more like Margaret Dumont than Captain Renault, the commission declares it "was shocked" at "reports" that exit pollsters have enticed voters with "tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or [gasp!] cigarettes." This creates "an unhealthy polling place environment," the report notes primly.

It is, to be sure, an outrage if people attempting to exercise their sacred right to vote must pass through clouds of secondhand smoke. But as to the larger issue, it is the commission that is blowing smoke. Consider a few undeniable facts:

(1) If people have voted, they have voted. And if so many of them have voted before you do that the result is preordained when you enter the voting booth, that remains true whether or not the media report it.

(2) Every voter is at the mercy of other voters. The chance of your vote determining the result is exactly the same whether you are the very first voter or the very last. That chance is virtually nil, even if you live in Palm Beach County. To the extent other things matter besides declaring the winner, such as the margin of victory or the size of the turnout, every vote matters equally no matter when it was cast.

(3) Polls are conducted throughout the campaign, not just on Election Day. In most cases every voter who watches or reads the news knows the probable result before he or she enters the voting booth. The only difference between Election Day exit polls and earlier polls is that the exit polls are more likely to be accurate.

The only difference between a voter who has not heard the exit poll results and one who has is that the second voter knows something that the first one doesn't. It truly baffles me how it can be considered "discrimination" against someone to give him or her a piece of information that he or she is free to act on or ignore. The slightly different argument that exit-poll projections, by reducing voter turnout, harm democracy generally is an insult to these same people. It says that either they can't be trusted with accurate information, or they can't be trusted to assess the possibility -- which the commission itself considers obvious -- that the information may be inaccurate. It says, essentially, that people should be tricked into voting by keeping them in the dark.

The commission mocks network objections on the grounds that the networks long ago agreed not to report projected results in individual states until polls have closed in each state. The commission is right that the networks have already abandoned the point of principle, and its new demands demonstrate that they were foolish to do so. Instead of agreeing to extend their pseudo-self-censorship, the networks should reassert their right to do their job of gathering information and sharing it with the public.

If network projections were as routinely wrong as the commission
suggests, no one would believe them and the alleged problem would solve itself. The commission's real complaint is that exit polls tend to be accurate. As such, they tell a truth that these high-minded formers and worthies would like to suppress, which is that any individual vote does not matter, if by "matter" you mean affecting the result.

The important point is that every vote doesn't matter equally, no matter when it was cast.

Michael Kinsley, editor of Slate (www.slate.com), writes a weekly column for The Post.
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I would like to show a video on the cognitive interviewing process in my research methods class (fall and spring semesters). Could someone recommend one for purchase or loan me a copy? Please respond to me privately. Thank you all in advance.

******************************************************************************
Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
SLIS, The Information Science School
Indiana University
005A Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-5389    Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.edu
Poll shows approval for Koizumi falling

ASSOCIATED PRESS in Tokyo

Approval ratings for Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi's Cabinet fell below 70 in August, sliding to their lowest levels as voters turned increasingly wary of his economic reforms, according to a newspaper poll published Saturday.

Sixty-nine per cent of respondents support Mr Koizumi's administration, with many citing the prime minister's political stance and his commitment to revamp the government and financial sector, the nationwide Asahi newspaper reported.

Seventeen per cent of those polled said they are opposed to Mr Koizumi, up from 9 per cent last month, the Asahi said.

The figures reflect a steady erosion in Mr Koizumi's popularity –
his ruling coalition's win in upper house parliamentary elections last month.

His approval ratings soared to 84 per cent in May, a month after he swept into office promising to do away with pork-barrel politics and usher in an era of prosperity. But his popularity has since cooled, with his ratings sinking to 81 per cent in June and 77 per cent in July.

Mr Koizumi has said his programmes will dispel Japan's economic woes, but they are also expected to send corporate bankruptcies and unemployment higher over the near term. Japan's jobless rate is hovering at 4.9 per cent, a record high.

Thirty-seven per cent say they believe Mr Koizumi's policies will bring a turnaround.

Many voters, however, are uneasy about the future. Fifty-two percent of Japanese surveyed said they feel uneasy about how the changes will affect their well-being, and 56 per cent said they would prefer that the government focus on creating jobs, the Asahi said.

Only 35 per cent of respondents want the government to proceed aggressively with reforms, the newspaper said.

The newspaper telephoned 3,753 eligible voters across Japan on Wednesday and Thursday, of whom 58 per cent responded. No margin of error was given.

http://asia.scmp.com/

Voters concerned about war shrine visit

ASSOCIATED PRESS in Tokyo

A poll published on Saturday found that many voters think Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi should cautiously approach his plans to visit a shrine honouring Japan's war dead.

Mr Koizumi has said he would pay his respects at Tokyo's Yasukuni Shrine on
August 15, the anniversary of Japan's World War II surrender. The proposed visit has infuriated neighbours such as China and South Korea who remember atrocities committed by Japanese soldiers.

Sixty-five per cent of respondents of a survey this week by the nationwide Asahi newspaper said they want Mr Koizumi to be 'careful' about the shrine issue.

Only 26 per cent of respondents thought Mr Koizumi should ignore the criticism and commit himself to a visit.

That was a sharp turn in public opinion toward a go-slow approach, compared with July's poll results. Last month, 41 per cent of respondents urged caution, while 42 per cent said he should definitely go.

The newspaper said it telephoned 3,753 registered Japanese voters Wednesday and Thursday nationwide, of whom 58 per cent responded. No margin of error was given.

The shrine was used to encourage militarist fervor before and during the war, and among the 2.5 million Japanese war dead enshrined there are executed war criminals, including war-era Prime Minister Hideki Tojo.

If Mr Koizumi visits, it would be the first by a sitting prime minister since 1996. Japan's main opposition party has warned it would damage the country's relations with its neighbors.

Foreign Minister Makiko Tanaka has told Chinese and South Korean officials that she would try to convince Mr Koizumi to forego the visit.

Mr Koizumi himself told China's ambassador on Thursday that he was 'thinking carefully' about whether to go to the shrine. But it is unclear whether he was trying to quiet criticism or indicating a change of heart.
Michael Kinsley's Friday's op-ed from the Washington Post was posted on aapornet last week. It quotes one line from the Carter-Ford Commission on Federal Election Reform that must have puzzled people: "network interviewers have offered tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or cigarettes, as enticements to citizens to participate in exit polling."

I've tracked down, by speaking with Commission representatives, their source for that statement. It turns out to be an excerpt from testimony before the House Commerce Commission (February 14, 2001), which I've attached to this email.

If you read the excerpt, you'll see that it in no way supports the statement contained in the report and quoted by Kinsley.

Paul Biemer, of Research Triangle Institute (which did the technical review of VNS), was being questioned on how response rates can be improved. He mentioned incentives, and noted that VNS had experimented with them, but found incentives created problems of their own. So yes, VNS has experimented with incentives, but "in the past."

Then Committee Chairman Tauzin asked additional questions, which Biemer answered by
talking about what "we" in "survey work" sometimes do to increase response
rates and
reduce respondent burden. Biemer is clearly talking in general, and not
about
anything VNS did in 2000. Tauzin, not Biemer, actually speaks the word
"cigarettes,"
and there is no response from Biemer.

So -- VNS has experimented with incentives (in the past); the survey industry
(not
specifically VNS) sometimes uses incentives, including small sums of money;
nobody
but Chairman Tauzin talked about
cigarettes. (For the record, the VNS experiment of the past involved
giving respondents pens.)

That's a far cry from the Commission's statement, which seems rapidly en
route
to
urban myth status.

Kathy Frankovic
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Kathy's point is useful and appreciated, although I fear this is well beyond "urban legend" since the assertion about the alleged "tawdry" actions by the "network interviewers" is now included as fact in a searchable, citable, published document. This is the sort of thing that leads to trails of apparently reliable information as it gains credibility from repeated citations. Something parallel happened with comparative male and female interest in local politics, I believe it was, based originally on voting rates in a northwest state soon after women's suffrage. The original finding was repeatedly cited and those citations were cited and so on so that it looked like a string of references to reinforcing findings over decades when in fact there was only the one bit of evidence. Ah well.

The exchange also is useful to remind us of a point almost everyone concedes in principle, but many forget in application. While it is undoubtedly true that if one actually got 100% compliance rate, one avoids all bias due to non-response, it does not follow that a lower response rate is necessarily worse in terms of representativeness than a higher, if the higher was achieved by means which disproportionately attracted those already more likely to come into the final achieved sample. The question is what patterns of differential likelihood of making it from a theoretical sample to a final achieved sample there are, and whether whatever tactics are employed reinforce, mitigate, or are irrelevant to those patterns.

Don

---

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue Room 102B
Madison Wisconsin 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688
Michael Kinsley's Friday's op-ed from the Washington Post was posted on aapornet last week. It quotes one line from the Carter-Ford Commission on Federal Election Reform that must have puzzled people: "...network interviewers have offered tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or cigarettes, as enticements to citizens to participate in exit polling."

I've tracked down, by speaking with Commission representatives, their source for that statement. It turns out to be an excerpt from testimony before the House Commerce Commission (February 14, 2001), which I've attached to this email.

If you read the excerpt, you'll see that it in no way supports the statement contained in the report and quoted by Kinsley.

Paul Biemer, of Research Triangle Institute (which did the technical review of VNS), was being questioned on how response rates can be improved. He mentioned incentives, and noted that VNS had experimented with them, but found incentives created problems of their own. So yes, VNS has experimented with incentives, but "in the past." Then Committee Chairman Tauzin asked additional questions, which Biemer answered by talking about what "we" in "survey work" sometimes do to increase response rates and reduce respondent burden. Biemer is clearly talking in general, and not about anything VNS did in 2000. Tauzin, not Biemer, actually speaks the word "cigarettes," and there is no response from Biemer.

So -- VNS has experimented with incentives (in the past); the survey industry (not specifically VNS) sometimes uses incentives, including small sums of money; nobody but Chairman Tauzin talked about cigarettes. (For the record, the VNS experiment of the past involved giving respondents pens.)

That's a far cry from the Commission's statement, which seems rapidly en route to urban myth status.

Kathy Frankovic
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Don Feree makes a good point about the Kinsley quote being a matter of record on the web. Perhaps Kathy could be persuaded to put her excellent scholarship in a piece for the Post to set the record straight.

Rob Daves
Commission (February 14, 2001), which I've attached to this email.

If you read the excerpt, you'll see that it in no way supports the statement contained in the report and quoted by Kinsley.

Paul Biemer, of Research Triangle Institute (which did the technical review of VNS), was being questioned on how response rates can be improved. He mentioned incentives, and noted that VNS had experimented with them, but found incentives created problems of their own. So yes, VNS has experimented with incentives, but "in the past."

Then Committee Chairman Tauzin asked additional questions, which Biemer answered by talking about what "we" in "survey work" sometimes do to increase response rates and reduce respondent burden. Biemer is clearly talking in general, and not about anything VNS did in 2000. Tauzin, not Biemer, actually speaks the word "cigarettes," and there is no response from Biemer.

So -- VNS has experimented with incentives (in the past); the survey industry (not specifically VNS) sometimes uses incentives, including small sums of money; nobody but Chairman Tauzin talked about cigarettes. (For the record, the VNS experiment of the past involved giving respondents pens.)

That's a far cry from the Commission's statement, which seems rapidly en route to urban myth status.

Kathy Frankovic
FYI-letter from Conyers and Donn RE: Thurs. Post editorial on National Commission on Electoral Reform. Mark Richards

'A Response to Florida'

The Washington Post
Saturday, August 4, 2001; Page A22

The Post's Aug. 2 editorial "A Response to Florida" lacked balance. Its central thesis was that a consensus exists on how to fix our electoral system -- namely a conditional, voluntary program whereby states would have the option of correcting shortcomings in their electoral system but would not be required to do so. We believe that no such consensus exists. The editorial asserted that the National Commission on Electoral Reform proposed that an optional grant model was preferable to requiring states to meet minimum federal standards for federal elections. Yet notwithstanding this assertion, policy recommendation No. 13 of the commission's report explicitly states that "[t]he Commission as a whole takes no position on whether Congress should use the powerful incentive of conditional grants or instead establish requirements or mandates wholly independent of funding."

In our view, the Constitution Project's report does not support this supposed consensus either. The report does not say that an optional approach is preferable to minimum requirements but instead says that conditional funding is the very least -- not the most -- that Congress should do. In fact, the report specifically recognized that Congress can act "through incentives or requirements." Additionally, a number of
civil rights organizations that worked with the Constitution Project on its report declined to sign on to it because of its lack of a clear call for minimum national voting rights standards. We believe that neither report provides the basis for claiming that there is an emerging consensus on election reform. The editorial also repeatedly prognosticates that the Conyers-Dodd Equal Protection of Voting Rights Act has little chance of enactment, but it offers no more than conclusory statements in support of that opinion. The facts speak to the contrary. Ours is a tri-partisan bill, which has the support of a majority of the Senate and 150 members of the House. Indeed, no other election reform bill introduced in Congress has as much support as ours. Moreover, it is the consensus bill of the civil rights and disability rights communities. The bill was just reported on a 10 to 0 vote by the Senate Rules Committee and is clearly moving forward. Outreach to Republican members has been productive and is ongoing.

As veterans of decades of civil rights struggles, we would suggest that this debate is not new. We are used to opposition to voting reform and civil rights laws being cloaked in a mantra of "states' rights." If we had allowed states over the past 40 years to opt out of voting reform and civil rights laws by simply refusing to cash a federal check, millions of Americans would still be paying poll taxes and drinking out of separate water fountains. In the 21st century, we believe that such an approach would mean that the most antiquated machines that routinely discard votes would continue to be reserved for poor and minority precincts and individuals with disabilities would continue to be denied an accessible, private and independent vote. To belittle such a reasonable and principled position by sarcastically referring to it as theology is beneath the standards of The Post. Over the course of our nation's struggle for civil rights, we have heard many faint-hearted pleas for early surrender on civil rights issues. We are surprised, however, that such pleas are now coming from The Post, which has been a crusader for such issues. We are also disappointed that such a plea was based on such a feeble factual record. The right to vote is the foundation of our democracy. If we learned anything last November it is that
this foundation is cracked and damaged. Repairing it will require more than the legislative equivalent of a new coat of paint. It requires reform that will ensure that every American voter is treated equally.

JOHN CONYERS JR.
U.S. Representative (D-Mich.)
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee

CHRISTOPHER DODD
U.S. Senator (D-Conn.)
Chairman, Senate Rules Committee
Washington
(c) 2001 The Washington Post Company
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From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Kathy Frankovic
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2001 6:05 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Exit Polls, Kinsley and the Commission

Michael Kinsley's Friday's op-ed from the Washington Post was posted on aapornet last week. It quotes one line from the Carter-Ford Commission on Federal Election Reform that must have puzzled people: "...network interviewers have offered tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or cigarettes, as enticements to citizens to participate in exit polling."

I've tracked down, by speaking with Commission representatives, their source for that statement. It turns out to be an excerpt from testimony before the House Commerce Commission (February 14, 2001), which I've attached to this email.

If you read the excerpt, you'll see that it in no way supports the statement contained in the report and quoted by Kinsley.

Paul Biemer, of Research Triangle Institute (which did the technical review of VNS), was being questioned on how response rates can be improved. He mentioned incentives, and noted that VNS had experimented with them, but found incentives created problems of their own. So yes, VNS has experimented with incentives, but "in the past." Then Committee Chairman Tauzin asked additional questions, which Biemer answered by talking about what "we" in "survey work" sometimes do to increase response rates and
reduce respondent burden. Biemer is clearly talking in general, and not about anything VNS did in 2000. Tauzin, not Biemer, actually speaks the word "cigarettes," and there is no response from Biemer.

So -- VNS has experimented with incentives (in the past); the survey industry (not specifically VNS) sometimes uses incentives, including small sums of money; nobody but Chairman Tauzin talked about cigarettes. (For the record, the VNS experiment of the past involved giving respondents pens.)

That's a far cry from the Commission's statement, which seems rapidly en route to urban myth status.

Kathy Frankovic
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Message-ID: <20010806.112643.-484031.3.jelinson@juno.com>
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.15
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0,2-67
From: Jack Elinson <jelinson@juno.com>

Second the motion.
On Mon, 06 Aug 2001 09:18:30 -0600 "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com> writes:
> Don Feree makes a good point about the Kinsley quote being a matter
> of record on the web. Perhaps Kathy could be persuaded to put her
> excellent scholarship in a piece for the Post to set the record
> straight.
>
> Rob Daves
Michael Kinsley's Friday's op-ed from the Washington Post was posted on aapornet last week. It quotes one line from the Carter-Ford Commission on Federal Election Reform that must have puzzled people:

"...network interviewers have offered tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or cigarettes, as enticements to citizens to participate in exit polling."

I've tracked down, by speaking with Commission representatives, their source for that statement. It turns out to be an excerpt from testimony before the House Commerce Commission (February 14, 2001), which I've attached to this email.

If you read the excerpt, you'll see that it in no way supports the statement contained in the report and quoted by Kinsley.

Paul Biemer, of Research Triangle Institute (which did the technical review of VNS), was being questioned on how response rates can be improved. He mentioned incentives, and noted that VNS had experimented with them, but found incentives created problems of their own. So yes, VNS has experimented with incentives, but "in the past."

Then Committee Chairman Tauzin asked additional questions, which Biemer answered by talking about what "we" in "survey work" sometimes do to increase response rates and reduce respondent burden. Biemer is clearly talking in general, and not about anything VNS did in 2000. Tauzin, not Biemer, actually speaks the word "cigarettes," and there is no response from Biemer.

So -- VNS has experimented with incentives (in the past); the survey industry (not specifically VNS) sometimes uses incentives, including small sums of money; nobody but Chairman Tauzin talked about cigarettes. (For the record, the VNS experiment of the past involved giving respondents pens.)

That's a far cry from the Commission's statement, which seems rapidly en route to urban myth status.

Kathy Frankovic
The problem here is not the availability of Kinsley's article, which, after all, points out the hypocrisy of the Commission's attack on exit polls.

What is of far more concern is the report itself, which reads as follows (page 64):

The Commission was shocked by reports that network interviewers at polling precincts have offered tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or cigarettes, as enticements to citizens to participate in exit polling. Such conduct cheapens journalism and creates an unhealthy polling place environment. The commission strongly encourages citizens not to participate in exit polling.

As Kathy's evidence makes clear, these "reports" were pure fiction, and appear to have been concocted for the express purpose of justifying the exhortation for voters not to respond to exit polls.

This is what must not be allowed to stand unchallenged.

As an aside, one has to wonder who actually wrote the Commission's report, what their agenda was, and how much of it the members actually read before affixing their
signatures to the final document.

The full Commission report may be obtained at:


The full draft transcript of the Feb. 14 hearing before the House committee can be obtained at:


Both documents are in Acrobat format.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

__________________

Rob Daves wrote:
> Don Feree makes a good point about the Kinsley quote being a matter of record on the web. Perhaps Kathy could be persuaded to put her excellent scholarship in a piece for the Post to set the record straight.
> Rob Daves
> Robert P. Daves, director v: 612.673-7278
> The Minnesota Poll f: 612.673-4359
e: daves@startribune.com
> Star Tribune
> 425 Portland Av. S.
> Minneapolis MN USA 55488
> >>> Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com> 08/05 4:05 PM >>>
> Michael Kinsley's Friday's op-ed from the Washington Post was posted on aapornet last week. It quotes one line from the Carter-Ford Commission on Federal Election Reform that must have puzzled people:
> "...network interviewers have offered tawdry inducements, such as small sums of money or cigarettes, as enticements to citizens to participate in exit polling."
> I've tracked down, by speaking with Commission representatives, their source for that statement. It turns out to be an excerpt from testimony before the House Commerce Commission (February 14, 2001), which I've attached to this email.
> If you read the excerpt, you'll see that it in no way supports the statement contained in the report and quoted by Kinsley.
> Paul Biemer, of Research Triangle Institute (which did the technical review of VNS), was being questioned on how response rates can be improved. He mentioned incentives, and noted that VNS had experimented with them, but found incentives created problems of their own. So yes, VNS has experimented with incentives, but "in the past."
> Then Committee Chairman Tauzin asked additional questions, which Biemer answered by talking about what "we" in "survey work" sometimes
We are considering submission of a bid for a survey project that involves small area estimation at the analysis stage. The dependent variable is percent uninsured.

If anyone can suggest someone who could possibly undertake this part of the project as a subcontractor to our organization, I would appreciate receiving those suggestions directly. Thanks!

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE  CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
Hi aaporneters,

This one goes back to the data on the incidence of dating violence, which a recent national study estimated at 20%. I asked Suzanne Steinmetz, who literally "wrote the book" (more than one) on this topic and who is a pioneer in the field for a short paragraph of commentary. Here is her paragraph. Suzanne is at Indiana University/Indianapolis in Sociology for folks who want to pursue the topic further.

>>The newest data revealing the high number of abused women is really not so new. Unfortunately, we have had this information since the mid-1950's (but it was referred to as "agression on the part of college male"). During the 1980s and early 1990s there were numerous smaller studies as well as several national ones which supported the fairly high rates of sexual and physical abuse of women. What is
most
distressing is that during the nearly half century that we have known about this
problem, we have put men on the moon, but have not allocated the resources necessary
to help reduce violence among women and men. Each new study brings on a new
sense of alarm. Unfortunately, the priority given to family violence (including child abuse)
still remains low.

Suzanne Steinmetz
Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available
(850) 644-8776 FAX
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453
(904) 249-1683

Visit the site:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

A client has inquired about the availability of university sponsored national omnibus telephone studies. Is anyone involved in such an endeavor?

Thanks for your feedback.

Bob Steen
The Univ. of Wisconsin Survey Center has been running a continuous one since 1987. Contact Associate Director John Stevenson (608-262-1688).

Bob Lee
Thanks. I also learned that the University of New Mexico does one.

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob33iam@aol.com [mailto:Bob33iam@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2001 11:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: University sponsored national omnibus surveys

The Univ. of Wisconsin Survey Center has been running a continuous one since 1987. Contact Associate Director John Stevenson (608-262-1688).

Bob Lee
Thanks. I also learned that the University of New Mexico does one. 

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob33iam@aol.com [mailto:Bob33iam@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2001 11:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: University sponsored national omnibus surveys

The Univ. of Wisconsin Survey Center has been running a continuous one since 1987. Contact Associate Director John Stevenson (608-262-1688).

Bob Lee

---------=_NextPart_001_01C120D8.4ED17860--

Here's the hyperlink to a series of articles about a study of "Third Culture Kids"
Kids", or TCK's. The term TCK was coined to refer to the children who accompany their parents into another society. The term Adult TCKs (ATCKs) is also used interchangeably to refer to TCKs after they reach adulthood.

http://www.tckworld.com/useem/home.html#articles

Parts of the articles:

***************
TCKs four times more likely to earn bachelor's degrees

This is the second of several reports on a study of adult Third Culture Kids (see January 1993 NewsLinks). It is being completed by three sociologists/anthropologists: Drs. John Useem and Ruth Hill Useem of Michigan State University, and Dr. Ann Baker Cottrell of San Diego University, and Dr. Kathleen A. Fiendjordan, a counselor in Washington, D.C.

In the fall of 1991 when we began asking adult Third Culture Kids to participate in our exploratory study of the long-term effects of having been TCKs, we hoped to get 100 people to fill in a lengthy questionnaire.

We must have tapped a largely unrecognized and unexamined sector of American life. We, and our computers, have been overwhelmed by the number of adult TCKs (680 to date) who have so graciously shared their lives and thoughts with us by filling in the long schedule. In addition, many have given us names to contact, some have sent alumni lists and newsletters, and a few have sent us books and articles they have written.

The nearly 700 people who returned the unconscionably long schedule range in age from 25 to 84. Seven percent were overseas only during the elementary grades, 11 percent had only a secondary school experience outside the U.S., and 82 percent lived abroad both as pre-teens and teenagers.

What are some of our more striking findings to date? One characteristic of these adult TCKs which stands out is that the overwhelming majority of them are committed to continuing their education beyond high school graduation.

Only 21 percent of the American population (24 percent of men and 18 percent of
women) have graduated from a four-year college. In sharp contrast, 81 percent of the adult TCKs have earned at least a bachelor's degree (87 percent of the men, 76 percent of the women). Half of this number have gone on to earn master's degrees and doctorates.

It would seem that their teachers and counselors in the overseas schools, as well as their parents, must have been doing a lot right over the last 50 years to have such unusual long-term results.

But these remarkable educational accomplishments are seldom attained in a straightforward manner. A considerable proportion of the young adult TCKs change colleges and/or majors two or three times. Others drop out, as they put it, to "take advantage of opportunities" that happen to come up.

Such detours on their road to obtaining a degree may range from taking a semester off to "bum around Africa. Occasionally they drop out because a course of study is beyond their capacity, but more often they feel their over-seas schooling and experience put them ahead of their peers (and even their teachers). Thus they are often "out of synch" with their all-American-reared peers.

A second finding is that adult TCKs are also somewhat out of synch in aspects of their lives outside of education. Throughout their lifetimes there are subtle differences between them and the American generation that came into adulthood in the same historical period. Not being like their peers is usually of great import (and sometimes extremely painful) in the late teens and twenties, but it is of lessening centrality with increasing age.

How long does it take for TCKs to become adjusted to American life? The majority of our adult TCKs, including those over 65, report mild to severe difficulties with what has been called "re-entry problems" or "reverse culture shock."

The answer to the question of how long it takes them to adjust to American life is: they never adjust. They adapt, they find niches, they take risks, they fail and pick themselves up again. They succeed in jobs they have created to fit their particular
talents, they locate friends with whom they can share some of their interests, but they resist being encapsulated. Their camouflaged exteriors and understated ways of presenting themselves hide the rich inner lives, remarkable talents, and often strongly held contradictory opinions on the world at large and the world at hand.

Two-thirds of our sample feel that it is important to them to have an international dimension to their lives, although they prefer to establish their homes in the U.S. Three-fourths of them feel different from people have not had an overseas experience. As one woman put it, "I don't feel different, I AM different!"

Two-thirds feel they have more transnational knowledge and skills than they have opportunity to use in their domestic lives.

Whether or not they have occupations or professions with an international dimension, in their daily lives they do reach out to foreigners, exchange students, and non-English speaking minorities. As one adult TCK put it, "We know what it is like to be confused in a country where we can-not speak the language well."

Most of them keep up on the happenings outside the US., especially in the countries in which they lived as teenagers. When events concerning those countries are in the news, friends and acquaintances ask their opinions about the situation.

As we summarize our questionnaires, begin our in-depth interviews of selected respondents, read biographies and autobiographies of adult TCKs, and scan the alumni newsletters of overseas schools, we are further convinced that this relatively small number of people, about two percent of the American population, has been a rich resource.

They relate Americans to the rest of the world and interpret the outside world to the immediate world in which they live. Significant proportions of them actually do this for a living.

We think adult TCKs are creative and innovative because they have robust educational experiences. The teachers and administrators of the overseas schools have made
TCKs experience prolonged adolescence

In this report we would like to reflect a little bit on an observation we made earlier. When we asked her if she felt the same way when she was in India (where she grew up, worked for a while as an adult, and continues to visit), she replied, "There I am a partial outsider and they know I live a different life in the United States. If I make a mistake, they just say that is because I am a crazy American. In the U.S. I don't appear to be different, so if I openly deviate from my friend in my attitudes, opinions, ambitions, or even leisure pursuits, they don't say that it is because I am a crazy TCK who grew up in India, they just say I'm nuts."

Only one out of every 10 of our nearly 700 adult TCKs, who-range in age from 25 to 80, say that they feel completely attuned to everyday life in the U.S. The other 90 percent say they are more or less "out of synch" with their age group throughout their lifetimes.

Being out of step with those around them is especially noticeable (and painful) in the late teens and twenties when choice of mate, occupation, and lifestyle are being worked out. Some young adult TCKs strike their close, peers, parents, and counselors as being self-centered adolescents, as having champagne tastes on beer incomes (or no incomes), as not being able to make up their minds about what they want to do with their lives, where they want to live, and whether or not they want to "settle down, get married, and have children." They have what some call "prolonged adolescence."

Others do what those around them are doing. They marry at the appropriate time, get a "good" job, have a child or children, take on a mortgage, and then throw it all over at 40 in order to take a job overseas. Some resign from high-paying positions and return to college to be retrained for a low-paying teaching job. Still others withdraw from all social contact because of extreme depression and others withdraw because they have come into inheritance and are quite happy doing nothing but writing.
French poetry, or traveling to all the places they have never been. That is what some have called delayed adolescence.

On the surface, most adult TCKs conform to what is going on around them in such a way that attention is not drawn to them. As they meet new people and situations, they are slow to commit themselves until they have observed what is expected behavior. If what is expected is unacceptable or incomprehensible, they will quietly withdraw rather than make fools of themselves or hurt the feelings of others.

Their bland and unremarkable exteriors, however, belie not only depths of feelings, but also considerable talents and a wealth of memories of other countries and places, including the expatriates communities in which they have lived abroad and continue to take an interest in. They also have a fresh perspective on the American scene which they are learning about all of their lives.

And of course they are not callow youths. They are extremely complex people who are weaving together their memories in a rapidly changing present for an uncertain future. No two adult TCKs come up with identical ways of putting their lives together, but they are actively creating provisional answers to some of the major and minor problems which daily face human beings in this complex world. Their prolonged/delayed adolescent behavior is usually a marker that adult TCKs are trying to bring order out of the chaotic nature of their lives.

********************
ATCKs have problems relating to own ethnic groups

ATCKs generally agree that their international back-grounds contribute positively to their adult lives. Two thirds or more report a beneficial impact on most roles and relationships.

The TCK experience is given less credit for benefiting relations with spouse and community activities; not because of any detrimental effects, but because more regard it as irrelevant to those relationships.

Three-quarters of our respondents also agreed that "on the whole, I feel fairly
satisfied with the way my life has unfolded," further supporting the position that a
TCK experience does not pose significant difficulties in the long run.

To explore feelings of connection, alienation, and/or rootlessness, as well as
cross-culturally relevant skills and behaviors, respondents were asked to indicate
whether they agree or disagree with a list of statements. A general portrait of ATCK
characteristics can be developed from those statements with which at least half
agree. Skimming the data in this way actually underrepresented the amount of agreement because it does not include those who expressed some agreement by choosing
"both agree and disagree." An asterisk (*) after a statement indicates that more than
two-thirds agreed

1) ATCKs are internationally experienced and continue their international
involvement. ATCKs build on a foundation of international awareness, over 90 percent
report having more understanding and awareness of other peoples/cultures than most
Americans*, but most say they have more cross-cultural knowledge and skills than
opportunity to use them. Most also say an international dimension in their lives is
important; they work toward that goal by keeping international touches in their
homes, welcoming opportunities to meet foreigners*, and keeping informed on the
places they lived abroad. Most would like to visit the countries they lived in,
would like to live abroad again (though not necessarily in the places they
lived as children), and most keep their passports current. (Other data shows a high
level of continuing international activity such as speaking foreign languages,
traveling abroad, and engaging in internationally related occupational and/or volunteer
activities.)

2) ATCKs are adaptable and relate easily to a diversity of people. These
respondents are comfortable in a variety of settings, as indicated by interest in travel and
living abroad. They feel at home everywhere (and nowhere). More than eight of 10
report that they can relate to anyone, regardless of differences such as race,
ethnicity, religion, or nationality. Most establish relationships easily in new
situations and have hobbies or interests which help by connecting them to people
wherever they go.
3) ATCKs are helpers and problem solvers. Drawing on their own experiences in new situations, ATCKs reach out to help those who appear unsure and play the role of mediator when conflicts arise. Nearly 90 percent say they can usually figure out a way to handle unexpected or difficult situations.*

4) ATCKs feel different, but not isolated. These respondents feel (and are) different from people who have not been overseas. Most do not identify with members of their ethnic group, and nearly half do not feel central to any group. For some, especially the recently returned, such feelings are painful and create a profound sense of isolation; such ATCKs emphasize feeling at home nowhere, and for some, this feeling lasts a lifetime. Others recognizing these feelings as part of broader, more global identities, stress feeling at home everywhere.

The majority in this study reject statements of alienation and isolation such as often feeling lonely, feeling adrift, and hesitating to make commitments to others. ATCKs' international experiences make them appreciate much in the U.S. that Americans take for granted, and most feel the U.S. is the best place for them to be living presently.

Sponsorship greatly influences the TCK experience. Answers of military and missionary ATCKs are usually at the two ends of an agree-disagree continuum.

Military ATCKs had the least difficulty re-entering the U.S. because of the Americanized overseas bases, their highly mobile lifestyle, and only living abroad for short periods, five years or less. As adults they are least critical of the U.S. and have least interest in international involvement.

The "other" ATCKs (e.g., children of educators, researches, UN personnel), most likely to have lived abroad for only a year or two, are the most eager to live abroad again, are most likely to keep a current passport, and have the strongest desire to maintain an inter-national dimension in their lives.

Differences between responses of women and men to these questions reflect general gender differences more than different TCK experiences. Women reveal a greater concern with interpersonal relations; they are far more likely to have
experienced difficulty leaving childhood friends and re-entering the U.S. Yet, as adults they are more likely to believe that TCK experiences enhance their social relations and community involvement. They establish relationships in new situations more easily than men, and more women reach out to help those who seem unsure. Women also experience more stress over conflicting desires for both stability and mobility. Overall, females are more prone to see many sides to an issue and to answer "both agree and disagree."

Men report a greater satisfaction with how their lives have unfolded, possibly because they worry less about interpersonal relations and because their self-esteem ties more to external achievements than relationships. Men have a higher rate of agreement with statements related to things over which they have control, such as setting long-term goals and keeping informed about American politics and about places they lived when they were young.

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

ATCKs maintain global dimensions throughout their lives

In this article we look at the actual life choices made by 400 of these ATCKs to see what kinds of educational and career choices they make, the volunteer roles in which they contribute to their local or world communities, and with whom they share their adult lives.

Two underlying questions are: the extent to which their adult lives suggest rootlessness or alienation, and the extent to which they maintain an international dimension to their activities:

Higher Education. One of the most notable characteristics of ATCKs is their high achievement. Nearly 90 percent have some academic post-secondary education and over 40 percent have completed a graduate degree; others are near completion of such degrees. They are influenced by highly educated parents and the excellent education most report getting in overseas schools.
Third culture childhood experiences affected college choices and experiences; 43 percent say greatly, 27 percent say somewhat. Most commonly, this influenced what they studied. Majors chosen by a quarter of this sample were obviously international (e.g., foreign language, anthropology, international relations). Many others were influenced by overseas experiences. For example: biologists captivated early by exposure to African wildlife; historians and artists influenced by exposure to European art and historical sites; pre-med, nursing, and economics majors who decided early to help peoples they knew in a less developed nation.

Still others sought mainly to "get abroad again" and so majored in teaching, international relations, international business. In addition to studying many subjects connected to international interests, over a quarter have studied abroad since high school. For some, a study abroad program was a factor in choice of college.

The second most commonly mentioned effect of a TCK background on college experience was, indeed, the issue of adjustment. Many reported that they "just didn't fit in" with their parochial peers. A small number felt they fared better than other freshmen because new situations were "old hat" to them. Third, many of these ATCKs had to select a U.S. college sight unseen and attend while their families remained overseas. Accordingly, a number chose colleges their parents or friends had attended. "Missionary Kids", (MKs) often chose church-related schools which were tuition-free and where there would be other MKs. Others selected small universities like their international schools, large universities which would have foreign students, or colleges near grandparents.

Although they may have been influenced by their parents' work overseas, they have not followed in parental footsteps. Twenty percent of this sample were MKs, but only 2 percent have a career in the church. Likewise, 25 percent were military dependents, but only 6 percent are in the armed forces.

Most (56 percent) have incorporated an international dimension in some occupational role. For some, jobs have been highly international, such as working overseas or foreign student advising. Others weave an international dimension into their
work;
for example a teacher enlivening her social studies class with tales and
photos of
her Brazilian childhood.

Volunteering. Reflecting, or perhaps explaining, the relative lack of
alienation
reported in the last article, most (over 75 percent) actively participate in
their
local community or in a broader network. For most, volunteer activity centers
on
their children (PTA, sports, scouts, etc.) and their church.

About half 47 percent of those who report volunteer activities include an
international dimension, such as: participating in organizations such as
United
Nations Association; hosting exchange students; or translating in courts,
schools, or
hospitals.

Contacts. Whether in professional or volunteer roles, through friendship or
family
networks, the vast majority (92 percent) have at least yearly contact with
people
from other countries. Nearly a quarter associate with internationals at least
once a
month, some daily. A majority also report some, though often infrequent,
contact with
people they knew as children abroad. Increasingly popular are school reunions
which
validate the third culture and TCK identity and maintain contacts.

A characteristic which truly distinguished ATCKs from most Americans is their
ability
in foreign languages. Fully 80 percent of these respondents use a language
other than
English at least occasionally. Twenty percent use another language regularly;
some
are bilingual and work daily in one or more foreign language. Half of those
who
communicate in a language other than English use two or more.

Family and Community. A number of our respondents continue to feel rootless,
alienated, and unable to make commitments to people or places. Most, however,
marry
(80 percent) and settle into their communities. Commitment is suggested by
the
fact
that the divorce rate is lower than the national average; two out of three
who
marry
do so only once. However, ATCKs tend to marry late 41 percent did not wed
until after
25. While nearly all married Americans, most (60 percent) in this study
married
someone who had at least some international experience when they met; a
number
married other TCKs.

Most of those who marry (80 percent) have children and typically report that their child-rearing is in some way influenced by having lived abroad. These answers are undoubtedly an important way TCKs differ from other globally mobile individuals such as immigrants. Rather than stress a national or ethnic identity, these ATCKs seek ways to introduce their offspring to the diversity of the world's people and cultures. Their message, overwhelmingly, is one of accepting, respecting, and treasuring differences.

A sense of fitting in, of finding a home, is indicated by the fact that 70 percent say it would be somewhat or very difficult to leave their present community. For some this is a matter of obligations, but for most it is because they are integrated into community or friendship groups, and, as a number pointed out, "I've lived here longer than any place in my life." While saying that they would hate to leave, the TCK background surfaces in many who added that they could move easily and would, in fact, enjoy meeting new people and new challenges.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------
Mark David RICHARDS, Missionary Kid (MK), ATCK
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place, NW
Washington, District of Columbia  20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Aug 10 09:17:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f7AGHTJ25700 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Aug 2001
09:17:29 -0700 (PDT)
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 JAA29550 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Aug 2001 09:17:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f7AGGPgL19449 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Aug 2001 09:16:51 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 10 Aug 2001 09:16:51 -0700 (PDT)
The Code Red worm is rearing its ugly head again, crashing some servers even though they have been patched against the buffer overflow the worm exploits. Reports have been filtering in that servers running Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 and Microsoft's IIS 4.0 Web server software, and which also utilize URL redirection, are prone to crashing due to the worm. This particular problem does not affect patched versions of IIS 5.0 Windows 2000. Machines running Windows NT 4.0 or Windows 2000 and unpatched versions of IIS 4.0 or 5.0, are vulnerable to the worm. However, in this case, the crashes occur due to the fact that when IIS 4.0 is set to redirect URLs it will accept any URL, leaving it vulnerable to an overflow that crashes IIS.

According to a Microsoft IIS Technical Support staffer posting to a message board, Microsoft is working on a fix but it is not yet ready. Currently, the only solution to the problem is to remove all redirected IIS Web sites and URLs from the server, apply the patches Microsoft issued in June, and reboot the server.

"Removing the [.ida] script mappings will not avoid all the problems if you
are
running IIS 4.0," the staffer posted. "Removing the redirections is
currently
the
best solution (this is in addition to installing the fix or removing the
script
mappings)."

Code Red first appeared in July and was discovered by eEye Digital
Security.
At the
time, eEye said the worm was similar to the sadmind/IIS worm that propagated
near
the end of the U.S.-China hacker skirmishes in May.

The worm exploits a well-known hole in IIS for which Microsoft published a
patch in
June.

Code Red appears to propagate on a cyclical basis, and some officials,
particularly
Ronald Dick, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National
Infrastructure
Protection Center, have predicted that there is a good chance the worm will
continue
to spread on a periodic basis.

The patch for Windows NT 4.0 is available here, and the patch for Windows 2000
Professional, Server and Advanced Server is available here.

http://www.internetnews.com/wd-news/print/0,,10_863251,00.html

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 INT Media Group, Incorporated <http://www.internet.com>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****

>From rys4@columbia.edu Fri Aug 10 12:57:59 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7AJvxJ19304 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Aug 2001
12:57:59 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from merhaba.cc.columbia.edu (IDENT:cu61174@merhaba.cc.columbia.edu
[128.59.59.130])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA07637 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Aug 2001 12:57:59 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost by merhaba.cc.columbia.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP
id PAA13183;
    Fri, 10 Aug 2001 15:54:33 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 10 Aug 2001 15:54:32 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Robert Y. Shapiro" <rys4@columbia.edu>
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K. Viswanath, Ph. D.
Senior Health Communication Scientist
Health Communication & Informatics Research Branch
Behavioral Research Program
Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences
National Cancer Institute
6130 Executive Blvd., EPN 4070
Bethesda, MD 20892-7363
[Rockville, MD 20852 - express mail]

Tel: (301) 594-6644 (Voice)
(301) 480-2198 (FAX)
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National Cancer Institute

6130 Executive Blvd., EPN 4070

Bethesda, MD 20892-7363

Tel: (301) 594-6644 (Voice)

(301) 480-2198 (FAX)

E-mail Address: Viswanav@mail.nih.gov

[Rockville, MD 20852 - express mail]
Decline of Latino Groups in Census Has Agencies Angry, Experts Puzzled (R Fields LAT)
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Subject: Decline of Latino Groups in Census Has Agencies Angry, Experts Puzzled (R Fields LAT)
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Decline of Latino Groups in Census
Has Agencies Angry, Experts Puzzled

POPULATION: SOME BLAME THE FORM FOR NOT LISTING ALL PLACES
OF ORIGIN. OTHERS CITE EVOLVING PAN-HISPANIC SELF-IMAGE

By ROBIN FIELDS
TIMES STAFF WRITER

Newly released 2000 census data depict several of California's largest
Latino
groups as shrinking in the 1990s, an unexpected, improbable result that has
community agencies complaining and demographers concerned.

Some experts attribute it to a simple change in the census form. Others
believe it
is a consequence of an evolving pan-Latino consciousness that discourages
people
from retaining strong national identities.

Community leaders had expected the census to reflect an increase, not a
drop, in
their numbers, considering that the state's overall Latino population grew
by
almost
43% in the last decade. Instead, they suspect their members may be hidden,
tucked
into the catchall category "Other Hispanic/Latino," which ballooned
statewide
by
more than 1.1 million.

As a result, more than 100,000 fewer Guatemalans, Salvadorans and other
Central and
South Americans appear to live in California than did 10 years ago, with the
sharpest drops coming in Los Angeles County.

The effects of this statistical reshuffling could be far-reaching, molding
everything from the fortunes of nonprofit community agencies to immigration
policy.
"The decisions about how to allocate and channel resources depend on what public officials see as the size and needs of these communities," said John Logan, director of the Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research at the State University of New York at Albany. "Undercounted can easily turn into underserved."

In asking about Latinos' origins, the 2000 census form gave checkoff boxes for Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and "other Hispanic," under which it provided a blank box for respondents to give specifics about their roots.

In 1990, the form gave examples, such as "Dominican," for how to fill in the box, but the examples were dropped from the 2000 form.

Census officials say tests showed the alteration made no difference in how Latinos responded and firmly resist theorizing about why so many Latinos wrote in "Hispanic," "Spanish," "Latino" or other general answers rather than a specific country of origin.

"We can only tell you what people told us," said Betsy Guzman, a statistician with the U.S. Census Bureau's population division.

More complete information about Latinos' ancestry may emerge next year when the bureau releases data from the long form, which is filled out by 1.9 million American households. But otherwise, the agency is stuck with what it's got, Guzman acknowledged.

Some Latino advocacy groups say the shifting numbers suggest that more Latinos are letting go of parochial or national self-definitions.

"There is a growing awareness among Latinos that they are part of a broader, pan-Hispanic category, particularly in terms of things like social status and political power," said Sonia Perez, deputy vice president of research at the National Council de la Raza.

But where Perez sees progress, demographers see confusion--and a painful void.

"You can't really tell anything about where their roots are from," said Harry Pachon, director of the Tomas Rivera Policy Institute in Claremont.

Nationally, about 6.1 million Latinos cast themselves into the inseparable
"sea of "other," 17% of their overall population.

A smaller census survey conducted in March 2000 through personal interviews, not mail-in forms, showed 1 million Latinos in that category, suggesting the form had a pivotal impact, Logan said.

In New York City, the census shows the Dominican population dwindling from 407,473 in 1990 to 332,977 in 2000, when analysts estimate it actually increased to almost 600,000. Similar patterns have emerged in breakdowns for other Latino hubs, including South Florida and Boston.

In California, the numbers are particularly striking in Los Angeles County, home to the state's most complex Latino community.

Local organizations say the county's Salvadoran population at least doubled in the last decade, but the census shows Salvadorans declining 26% from 253,086 in 1990 to 187,193 in 2000.

"I don't think that can be accurate," said Carlos Vaquerano, executive director of the Salvadoran-American Leadership and Educational Fund. "We've taken a lot of pride in being the second-largest Latino group here and the fastest-growing. We expected the census to prove that."

The effect of the paper reductions could be devastating, he added. Growing communities, with burgeoning economic and political clout, attract more corporate investment and marketing attention, as well as more government aid.

The census delivered similar statistical blows to a long list of local Latino subgroups. The county's large Guatemalan community appeared to decrease by 20%, while its smaller Colombian and Ecuadorean contingents purportedly dropped by 40% and 30%, respectively. Logan estimates the Guatemalan population actually increased 89% to more than 236,000.

In the Inland Empire and Orange and Ventura counties, where the vast majority of Central and South Americans have Mexican roots, few Latino communities shrank, but the "other" category grew an astonishing tenfold.
Vaquerano said the diminished figures for Salvadorans and other Central and South American groups might influence the ongoing national debate about whether and how to expand legal residency to undocumented immigrants. President Bush initially proposed changing the rules only for Mexicans; Democrats have pressed for a more expansive plan that includes illegal immigrants from other nations.

"Why did Bush target Mexicans first? Because they are the majority," Vaquerano said. "Numbers make a difference."


Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times

*****
Dear All:

Take a look at this. The Mumford Center is re-estimating the size of the Hispanic groups based upon the methodology that was used in 1990. The instruction was changed on the form. It affects Hispanics everywhere. Note that the numbers reported in the LA Times on NYC are wrong.

Andy Beveridge

July 6, 2001

Sociologist Offers New Estimates of City Hispanic Census Groups

By JANNY SCOTT

A sociologist said yesterday that he had come up with new estimates of the numbers of Dominicans, Colombians and other Hispanics in New York City, estimates that he and planners for the city believe are much closer to the truth than the 2000 census figures released by the Census Bureau last week.

The sociologist, John R. Logan, a professor at the State University at Albany, said he had used existing Census Bureau data to recalculate the 2000 census numbers, and had concluded that the number of Dominicans in the city was 593,777, a figure that is 186,304 higher than the bureau's official count.

He put the city's Colombian population at 115,312, or 36,700 more than the bureau's estimate, and the Ecuadorean population at 148,392, or 46,935 higher than the bureau's. His estimates of the size of more than a dozen other Central and South American groups significantly exceeded the bureau's numbers.

"What's most interesting here is to see the magnitude of the effects," Professor Logan said at a news conference in Manhattan. "Instead of a rather mild increase of the Dominican population, our conclusion is there was more than 50 percent growth of Dominicans in New York City in the last decade."

He recommended that the Census Bureau revise its estimates of the Hispanic population groups by using procedures like his. "It's possible to get better numbers,"
Professor Logan said, "numbers that will be more useful to public officials and planners and city organizations."

Demographers for New York City, and others, believe the bureau significantly underestimated the size of numerous Hispanic groups in data from the 2000 census released last week. They trace the apparent problem at least in part to a change in the wording of a question about Hispanic origin on the census form.

An unusually high percentage of Latinos in New York City and nationwide failed to identify their specific Hispanic group or national origin on the form. As a result, many Dominicans, Colombians, Ecuadoreans and others appear to have ended up categorized by the bureau as simply "other Hispanic."

The uncertainty of the numbers causes problems for social scientists studying ethnic change; for social service organizations trying to obtain funds and to plan services; for advocacy groups; and for local governments, which use them for planning and other purposes.

The city's Planning Department and others had urged the bureau to rethink its estimates of the size of those Hispanic groups. Several people said yesterday that Professor Logan's work, done in a week, suggested that a reliable revision could be done.

"The approach he uses, I think, is very reasonable," said A. Peter Lobo, deputy director of the planning department's population division. "And it jells with estimates that we have come up with that have been constructed in a totally different manner."

There was no comparable problem with the count of Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and Cubans. Members of those groups have a separate question on the census form.

Professor Logan, who plans to post his methodology and findings on the university's Web site (www.albany.edu/mumford/census), used data on ancestry and place of birth taken from the 1990 census, and data on birthplace from a survey done by the bureau in March 2000, to try to determine the specific Hispanic origin of people categorized "other Hispanic" in more than 100 cities.
Using that method, he reduced the number of people in New York City categorized as "other Hispanic" from 403,952 to 51,317, and recategorized the rest - Dominican, Salvadoran, Honduran, Panamanian, Colombian, Ecuadorean and so on.

Professor Logan and others said yesterday that the Census Bureau could develop even more accurate estimates than his by using data from the 2000 census that it had not yet released - data from the longer, more detailed questionnaire filled out by one in every six citizens. That form has a question about ancestry.

In a telephone interview yesterday, Arthur Cresce, a demographer in the population division of the Census Bureau, said: "I don't think there will be any sort of reprocessing of the data or anything like that. The answers are what they are. They have been provided by the respondents."

But Mr. Cresce said the numbers would probably be analyzed, especially after the long-form data are made public. "Any time you have these kinds of responses or changes or shifts," he said, "you do want to understand them better."
If interested in applying, please follow the instructions at the bottom of this job description.

Job: Evaluation Manager (Staff Research Associate III - Supervisor)

This is a great research opportunity to work on a statewide parenting education project.

The Center for Community Wellness is part of the School of Public Health at UC Berkeley and is a nationally renowned health promotion organization. The Center has many projects including health promotion publications, school-based programs, and evaluation and research. The evaluation manager will be responsible for coordinating major components of a $1.8 million 2-year statewide evaluation of the Kit for New Parents developed by the California Children and Families Commission (CCFC). The CCFC developed the Kit for New Parents to be distributed to California's 500,000 new parents each year. The Kit contains a set of videos, a guide for parents, a set of brochures and a book to be read to babies. During the past year, a research team consisting of the UC Berkeley faculty, consultants, and a subcontracted research firm conducted a pilot study of parents' use of and satisfaction with the Kit, and its impact on their knowledge and practices. The evaluation also assessed the effectiveness of Kit distribution through prenatal centers, hospitals, and home visiting programs. Under the guidance of the research team, the evaluation manager will coordinate an expanded evaluation of the Kit. This evaluation will have three primary components: interviews with 5,000 parents; qualitative studies with parents and providers; and a process evaluation of Kit training, distribution, and other issues in 58 California counties.

Job Description:

Serve as a key member of a research team with UCB faculty, consultants, subcontractors, graduate students, advisory committee and State Commission to conduct a major quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the Kit for New Parents with multiple sites throughout California. The evaluation manager will:

* Implement a survey with parents and providers of the Kit. Supervise and
train field interviewers at multiple sites throughout California. With input from research team members, develop materials, forms, tracking systems, etc. Track data collection at all survey sites. Monitor completion of study activities through communication with sites and a subcontracted research firm. Report progress of study to team members. 55%

*Coordinate process evaluation activities about the distribution of the Kit in all 58 counties including: tracking provider trainings, number of Kits distributed, distribution venues, demographics of kit recipients and assessing issues and recommended "best practices" through an interactive Web site. Work closely with the programmer and provide detailed technical specifications about website content and data retrieval. Conduct site visits in six counties to document processes of Kit training, distribution and provider experience and satisfaction on an ongoing basis. Develop protocols for process evaluation with sensitivity to political issues to maximize provider participation. 30%

*Coordinate qualitative study activities in 6-10 counties including: in-depth interviews, focus groups and videotaping with parents and providers in approximately 6-10 counties. 10%

* Prepare reports for publications and presentation. 5%

Required Qualifications:
Proven capacity to manage a large-scale, multi-method evaluation. Three to five years experience working in research or evaluation. Ability to communicate with policy makers and local and state county commission directors. Demonstrated initiative and organizational, planning, and time management skills. Proven interpersonal skills. Ability to multi-task in a fast-paced environment. Strong problem solving and oral/written communication skills. Ability to work independently and complete tasks with minimal supervision. Strong attention to detail. Strong computer skills, including Word, Excel, and database management. Masters Degree preferred.
Pluses: Fluent in Spanish, knowledge of PowerPoint, knowledge of child health and development and/or parenting education; knowledge of HTML, focus group facilitation skills.

If interested, please refer to http://hrweb.berkeley.edu/jvl/index.php and search for Job Listing #: 07-124-20. Follow the instructions to apply for the job through the University of California, Berkeley system.
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7EKccJ12580 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Aug 2001
13:38:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mailexchanger.gao.gov (gao-cp.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA23819 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Aug 2001 13:38:39 -0700 (PDT)
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Date: Tue, 14 Aug 2001 16:37:41 -0400
From: "Fran A Featherston" <FeatherstonF@gao.gov>
Sender: Postmaster@gao.gov
Reply-To: FeatherstonF@gao.gov
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: position available (Fran is out of the office)
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 listproc.usc.edu id f7EKcdJ12581

I will be out of the office between now and Wednesday, September 5th, except for Monday, August 20th. If you need help in the meantime, please call Barry Seltser at 202-512-4946.
(fran)
Fran Featherston
<html><font face="Arial, Helvetica"><b>PART TIME SENIOR RESEARCH ASSISTANT POSITION</b><br>Available Immediately<br><br>The Position:<br><br>Assists senior staff (a sociologist and an anthropologist) in conducting and disseminating research on the prevalence, consequences and social context of vision problems in the U.S. Familiarity with the substantive issues of visual impairment not necessary, but experience in secondary data analysis of large surveys, e.g. federal surveys, is a strong plus. Responsibilities include research on the web, interviewing, coding, data entry, data processing, and answering public information requests. Tasks also may include assisting in designing questionnaires.
and focus group discussion guides, and data analysis, write-ups, and dissemination. The ideal candidate has a social science background with some graduate research courses and/or experience, including qualitative and quantitative research skills. Knowledge of SPSS, EXCEL and WordPerfect is desirable. Flexibility is essential; the senior research assistant handles diverse tasks and works with more than one supervisor.

Salary: Twenty hours per week; scheduling is negotiable; $17-$20 per hour, depending on qualifications.

Contact:

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D. (Director, Policy Research & Program Evaluation) or Elaine Gerber, Ph.D. (Senior Research Associate, Policy Research & Program Evaluation).

---

The American Foundation for the Blind is an Equal Opportunity Employer. People with disabilities are encouraged to apply.

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.
Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation

American Foundation for the Blind

From wconstantine@home.com Tue Aug 14 14:59:19 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f7ELxJJ17212 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Aug 2001 14:59:19 -0700 (PDT)
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Received: from micron ([24.5.194.243]) by femail36.sdc1.sfba.home.com
Position: Field Director
Description: The March of Dimes/California Birth Defects Monitoring Program Field Director will manage our bilingual (Spanish/English) interviewer team. Requires senior level survey research competencies and proven management experience. Responsible for overseeing performance quality and production levels of a team that interviews mothers by phone and in person. Responsible for assuring that technical and management support is available to the staff to achieve the excellence required for superior scientific outcomes. Must have excellent leadership, organization and interpersonal communication skills. Fluency in Spanish helpful. Valid CA driver license, car, and ability to travel statewide on occasion. Must have word processing skills, preferably Word, and data base experience. Position Type: Full time
Location: Oakland (San Francisco Bay Area)
Salary: $55k - $63k
How to apply: Send cover letter, resume, 3 references and salary history to MLI@cbdmp.org or California Birth Defects Monitoring Program, 1830 Embarcadero, Suite 100, Oakland, CA 94606 Company Information: http://www.cbdmp.org AA/EOE (posted 07/20/01)
Dear Aapornet:

We've just received a request to conduct a short survey on the use of Premarin Vaginal Cream. Any suggestions on acquiring a projectable sample?

We know RDD will give us the most scientific data, but due to the low incidence, I was wondering if there were any other options.

Thanks,
Dan
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Hello! I have a question for a colleague that is not a member of AAPOR. Does anyone know of a patient satisfaction tool / instrument geared specifically toward health research subjects / participants? Any suggestions would be greatly appreciated!

Thanks! Patricia Commiskey

Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702 pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu
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To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Rands <rrands@cfmc.com>
At 02:32 PM 8/15/01 -0400, you wrote:
> Hello!  I have a question for a colleague that is not a member of
> AAPOR. Does anyone know of a patient satisfaction tool / instrument
> geared specifically toward health research subjects / participants?
> Any suggestions would be greatly appreciated!
>
> Thanks!  Patricia Commiskey

You can contact Vic O'Neil at UNC Hospital - Patient Relations
Dept.  919-966-5006.

Richard Rands
CFMC

> From dorijessop@aol.com Wed Aug 15 17:45:42 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7G0jaJ08871 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Aug 2001
17:45:36
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-m07.mx.aol.com (imo-m07.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.162])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id RAA02161 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Aug 2001 17:45:36 -0700
(PDT)
From: dorijessop@aol.com
Received: from dorijessop@aol.com
    by imo-m07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.3.) id 5.134.db24a (3875)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Aug 2001 20:44:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <134.db24a.28ac717d@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 15 Aug 2001 20:44:45 EDT
Subject: Re: Question...
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 138

Are you interested in satisfaction with health care? Satisfaction with
participation in a study? or, satisfaction instrument that can be used in a
survey study? There are a number of satisfaction instruments but it would be
necessary to be clearer about the intent.
I asked the same question. At this point, my colleague is gathering information and is interested in seeing what has been developed. The only criteria is that they would like to see an instrument developed to evaluate satisfaction of persons involved in clinical research projects (clinical trials), rather than tools that were developed for other things but have applications or could be adapted.

Hope this helps for clarity! Thanks in advance for the feedback!

Patricia
Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702 pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: dorijessop@aol.com [mailto:dorijessop@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2001 8:45 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Question...

Are you interested in satisfaction with health care? Satisfaction with participation in a study? or, satisfaction instrument that can be used in a survey study? There are a number of satisfaction instruments but it would be necessary to be clearer about the intent.
What 'push polling' is and what it isn't

http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/228/oped/What_push_polling_is_and_what_it_isn'tP.shtml

By Globe Staff, 8/16/2001

WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE between lightning and a lightning bug? That's one question that comes to mind as headlines fan the firestorm over alleged 'push polling' in the 9th District. Sometimes people get confused by terms that sound similar but have very different meanings. That's what appears to be going on here; a lot of otherwise sophisticated political observers are confused about what push polling is and what it isn't.

At a cookout last weekend, we chatted with two good friends, savvy journalists who clearly didn't understand the issue. Putting aside our own partisan differences for the moment, we decided to try our hands at a brief explanation.

By all descriptions the disputed poll, which included questions that featured negative, and sometimes inaccurate, information about state Senator Stephen Lynch, seems in our opinion to have been a flawed - but legitimate - political poll. Reportedly undertaken for EMILY's List, the national women's organization that has endorsed state Senator Cheryl Jacques, it included several questions designed to gauge the impact of negative information that voters might hear about Lynch, Jacques, and a third candidate, state Senator Brian Joyce.
Such questions are standard fare in any political poll, that is, a poll undertaken to benefit a particular candidate, rather than a more general media poll conducted by a news organization. These questions are called "push" questions because they are used to see how far voters can be pushed away from - or toward - a particular candidate. Push questions are an integral part of any detailed political poll: They produce information that allows campaigns to judge their own strengths and vulnerabilities, as well as those of their opponents. Push questions are an accepted and essential part of any candidate's research effort. Virtually all political polls employ push questions. Sometimes, though, these questions go over the line. As was the case in the 9th District survey, they may contain inaccurate information or may unfairly distort a candidate's record. Questions like that are bad poll questions and a waste of time for the campaign sponsoring them. But they are not an example of push polling.

Push polling is a specific type of political dirty trick in which telemarketers employed by Candidate A pretend to be conducting an opinion poll, but in fact are determinedly spreading dirt about Candidate B. The term is a misnomer because push polling isn't polling at all - it's an underhanded and unethical form of negative advertising that is shunned by reputable political consultants. Unlike legitimate polls - which involve detailed interviews of up to 20 minutes or more, with a scientifically selected sample of a few hundred voters - push-poll calls are very brief but directed indiscriminately at thousands of voters at a time. The interviewers don't bother recording answers because their purpose is not to gather information but simply to get out the dirt, to "push" as many people as they can away from a candidate. Politicians often complain about push polling when none has taken place; it's an effective way to generate sympathetic media attention. Their complaints are often seized upon by political observers who don't understand the difference between a badly written poll, like the one in the 9th, and push polling.
This confusion arises because many so-called experts assume that any poll that includes push questions must be a push poll. It's a simple, but completely erroneous, assumption. By this definition, virtually all political polls would qualify as push polls, and the term itself would lose meaning. That would make it easier for push-poll charlatans to hide behind a guise of legitimacy. Savvy reporters can help prevent this from happening by understanding what push polling is and by closely examining the claims of politicians who complain about it.

Whenever candidates raise the specter of push polling, reporters should ask those candidates to release their own campaign polls for public review. That should settle the argument, every time. It's not such a difficult thing to keep straight, really — no more difficult than understanding the difference between lightning and a lightning bug.

Francis J. Connolly is an associate at Kiley & Company, a national Democratic polling firm based in Boston. Charley Manning is president of CPMA Inc. and has run numerous Republican campaigns. Both are unaligned in the 9th Congressional District race.

This story ran on page 11 of the Boston Globe on 8/16/2001.

Good summary Howard. For those interested, I have written a piece covering this issue in depth with recommended courses of action for researchers which will
appear in the From The Field section of the September issue of Public Perspective. I'm happy to forward the text upon request.

Regards,

Karl Feld

-----Original Message-----
From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2001 8:43 AM
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)
Subject: Globe: What 'push polling' is and what it isn't

What 'push polling' is and what it isn't
http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/228/oped/What_push_polling_is_and_what_it_isn_t.shtml
By Globe Staff, 8/16/2001
WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE between lightning and a lightning bug? That's one question that comes to mind as headlines fan the firestorm over alleged ''push polling'' in the 9th District. Sometimes people get confused by terms that sound similar but have very different meanings. That's what appears to be going on here; a lot of otherwise sophisticated political observers are confused about what push polling is and what it isn't.
At a cookout last weekend, we chatted with two good friends, savvy journalists who clearly didn't understand the issue. Putting aside our own partisan differences for the moment, we decided to try our hands at a brief explanation. By all descriptions the disputed poll, which included questions that featured negative, and sometimes inaccurate, information about state Senator Stephen Lynch, seems in our opinion to have been a flawed - but legitimate - political poll. Reportedly undertaken for EMILY's List, the national women's organization that has endorsed state Senator Cheryl Jacques, it included several questions designed to gauge the impact of negative information that voters might hear about Lynch, Jacques, and a third candidate, state Senator Brian Joyce. Such questions are standard fare in any political poll, that is, a poll undertaken to benefit a particular candidate, rather than a more general media poll conducted by a news organization. These questions are called ''push'' questions because they are used to see how far
voters can be pushed away from - or toward - a particular candidate. Push questions are an integral part of any detailed political poll: They produce information that allows campaigns to judge their own strengths and vulnerabilities, as well as those of their opponents. Push questions are an accepted and essential part of any candidate's research effort. Virtually all political polls employ push questions. Sometimes, though, these questions go over the line. As was the case in the 9th District survey, they may contain inaccurate information or may unfairly distort a candidate's record. Questions like that are bad poll questions and a waste of time for the campaign sponsoring them. But they are not an example of push polling.

Push polling is a specific type of political dirty trick in which telemarketers employed by Candidate A pretend to be conducting an opinion poll, but in fact are determinedly spreading dirt about Candidate B. The term is a misnomer because push polling isn't polling at all - it's an underhanded and unethical form of negative advertising that is shunned by reputable political consultants. Unlike legitimate polls - which involve detailed interviews of up to 20 minutes or more, with a scientifically selected sample of a few hundred voters - push-poll calls are very brief but directed indiscriminately at thousands of voters at a time. The interviewers don't bother recording answers because their purpose is not to gather information but simply to get out the dirt, to ''push'' as many people as they can away from a candidate. Politicians often complain about push polling when none has taken place; it's an effective way to generate sympathetic media attention. Their complaints are often seized upon by political observers who don't understand the difference between a badly written poll, like the one in the 9th, and push polling. This confusion arises because many so-called experts assume that any poll that includes push questions must be a push poll. It's a simple, but completely erroneous, assumption. By this definition, virtually all political polls would qualify as push polls, and the term itself would lose meaning. That would make it easier for push-poll charlatans to hide behind a guise of legitimacy.
Savvy reporters can help prevent this from happening by understanding what push polling is and by closely examining the claims of politicians who complain about it. Whenever candidates raise the specter of push polling, reporters should ask those candidates to release their own campaign polls for public review. That should settle the argument, every time. It's not such a difficult thing to keep straight, really – no more difficult than understanding the difference between lightning and a lightning bug.

Francis J. Connolly is an associate at Kiley & Company, a national Democratic polling firm based in Boston. Charley Manning is president of CPMA Inc. and has run numerous Republican campaigns. Both are unaligned in the 9th Congressional District race.

This story ran on page 11 of the Boston Globe on 8/16/2001.

----Original Message-----
From: Abigail [mailto:Abigail@141.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2001 10:48 PM

My name is Abigail McIntosh. I am a full participant in the International Baccalaureate Program at West High School in Salt Lake City. Currently I am writing an extended essay on the 'statistical accuracy of projecting the outcome of presidential elections'. As of yet I have been unable to find information concerning the actual statistical calculations that are done to determine when the results can be projected "safely".
I have tried everywhere else including the Voter News Service, but no one seems to know or be willing to tell me. If you have any information, or even a reference as to where I could find this information please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Abigail M. McIntosh
(abigail@141.com)

Karl Feld wrote:

> Good summary Howard. For those interested, I have written a piece
> covering this issue in depth with recommended courses of action for
> researchers which will appear in the From The Field section of the
> September issue of Public Perspective. I'm happy to forward the text
> upon request.
>
What 'push polling' is and what it isn't
http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/228/oped/What_push_polling_is_and_wh
at_it_.shtml
By Globe Staff, 8/16/2001
WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE between lightning and a lightning bug? That's one
question that comes to mind as headlines fan the firestorm over alleged
'push polling' in the 9th District. Sometimes people get confused by terms
that sound similar but have very different meanings. That's what appears to
be going on here; a lot of otherwise sophisticated political observers are
confused about what push polling is and what it isn't.
At a cookout last weekend, we chatted with two good friends, savvy
journalists who clearly didn't understand the issue. Putting aside our own
partisan differences for the moment, we decided to try our hands at a brief
explanation.
By all descriptions the disputed poll, which included questions that
featured negative, and sometimes inaccurate, information about state
Senator Stephen Lynch, seems in our opinion to have been a flawed - but legitimate -
political poll. Reportedly undertaken for EMILY's List, the national
thems organization that has endorsed state Senator Cheryl Jacques, it included
several questions designed to gauge the impact of negative information that
voters might hear about Lynch, Jacques, and a third candidate, state
Senator Brian Joyce.
Such questions are standard fare in any political poll, that is, a poll
undertaken to benefit a particular candidate, rather than a more general
media poll conducted by a news organization.
These questions are called 'push' questions because they are used to see
how far voters can be pushed away from - or toward - a particular
candidate.
Push questions are an integral part of any detailed political poll: They
produce information that allows campaigns to judge their own strengths and
vulnerabilities, as well as those of their opponents. Push questions are an
accepted and essential part of any candidate's research effort. Virtually
all political polls employ push questions.
Sometimes, though, these questions go over the line. As was the case in the
9th District survey, they may contain inaccurate information or may
unfairly distort a candidate's record. Questions like that are bad poll questions
and a waste of time for the campaign sponsoring them. But they are not an
example of push polling. Push polling is a specific type of political dirty
trick in which telemarketers employed by Candidate A pretend to be
conducting an opinion poll, but in fact are determinedly spreading dirt
about Candidate B. The term is a misnomer because push polling isn't
polling
at all - it's an underhanded and unethical form of negative advertising
that
is shunned by reputable political consultants.
Unlike legitimate polls - which involve detailed interviews of up to 20
minutes or more, with a scientifically selected sample of a few hundred
voters - push-poll calls are very brief but directed indiscriminately at
thousands of voters at a time. The interviewers don't bother recording
answers because their purpose is not to gather information but simply to
get
out the dirt, to ''push'' as many people as they can away from a candidate.
Politicians often complain about push polling when none has taken place;
it's an effective way to generate sympathetic media attention. Their
complaints are often seized upon by political observers who don't
understand
the difference between a badly written poll, like the one in the 9th, and
push polling.
This confusion arises because many so-called experts assume that any poll
that includes push questions must be a push poll. It's a simple, but
completely erroneous, assumption. By this definition, virtually all
political polls would qualify as push polls, and the term itself would lose
meaning. That would make it easier for push-poll charlatans to hide behind a
guise of legitimacy.
Savvy reporters can help prevent this from happening by understanding what
push polling is and by closely examining the claims of politicians who
complain about it. Whenever candidates raise the specter of push polling,
reporters should ask those candidates to release their own campaign polls
for public review. That should settle the argument, every time. It's not
such a difficult thing to keep straight, really - no more difficult than
understanding the difference between lightning and a lightning bug.
Francis J. Connolly is an associate at Kiley & Company, a national
Democratic polling firm based in Boston. Charley Manning is president of
CPMA Inc. and has run numerous Republican campaigns. Both are unaligned in
the 9th Congressional District race.
This story ran on page 11 of the Boston Globe on 8/16/2001.
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Abigail,

There is an excellent summary of what results were obtained by various companies using different polling and calculation methods in a recent AAPOR newsletter which you can access here http://www.aapor.org/newsletter/polls.html. I would recommend after you read this article by Michael Traugott that you call him and e-mail the firms listed in Table 1. Michael may be able to help you get some info. on contacts at each. Many of these firm's have members on this listserv who will read this message. Hopefully someone will also contact you directly. If all else fails, feel free to give me a call in Provo. I certainly have high-profile political clients who can answer your questions from decades of experience and will probably be happy to help.

Best of luck.

Karl G. Feld
Vice President, Research Development
-----Original Message-----
From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2001 9:01 AM
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)
Subject: exit poll question

I just got this query from a high school kid. VNS won't talk to her. Any takers?

-----Original Message-----
From: Abigail [mailto:Abigail@141.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2001 10:48 PM

My name is Abigail McIntosh. I am a full participant in the International Baccalaureate Program at West High School in Salt Lake City. Currently I am writing an extended essay on the 'statistical accuracy of projecting the outcome of presidential elections'. As of yet I have been unable to find information concerning the actual statistical calculations that are done to determine when the results can be projected "safely".

I have tried everywhere else including the Voter News Service, but no one seems to know or be willing to tell me. If you have any information, or even a reference as to where I could find this information please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Abigail M. McIntosh
(abigail@141.com)

>From mtrau@umich.edu Thu Aug 16 12:37:15 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7GJbEJ26888 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Aug 2001
    12:37:14 -0700 (PDT)
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 ESMTP
    id MAA16478 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Aug 2001 12:37:14 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
    by stayawayjoe.mr.itd.umich.edu (8.9.3/3.3rv) with ESMTP id PAA20482
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Aug 2001 15:37:09 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
It's a little unusual for push polls to be around this time of year, but there is a reported incident last week in the mayor's race in Minneapolis as well. I spoke to a reporter about this from the Minneapolis Star Tribune, and there are a couple of stories about it on the paper's Web site.

Connolly's remarks are well taken, especially the distinction between collecting and analyzing data on strategic possibilities versus just making large numbers of calls under the guise of a poll but not recording any data. There is a discussion of push polls and a typology available in Traugott and Kang, "Push Polls As Negative Persuasion Strategies," Chapter 12 in Election Polls, the News Media, and Democracy by Lavrakas and Traugott.

It is important to point out that push polling is the only practice to be decried simultaneously by AAPOR, NCPP, and the American Association of Political Consultants.

-----Original Message-----
From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2001 10:43 AM
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)
Subject: Globe: What 'push polling' is and what it isn't

What 'push polling' is and what it isn't
http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/228/oped/What_push_polling_is_and_what_it_isn_tP.shtml

By Globe Staff, 8/16/2001
WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE between lightning and a lightning bug? That's one question that comes to mind as headlines fan the firestorm over alleged 'push polling' in the 9th District. Sometimes people get confused by terms that sound similar but have very different meanings. That's what appears to be going on here; a lot of
otherwise sophisticated political observers are confused about what push polling is and what it isn't.
At a cookout last weekend, we chatted with two good friends, savvy journalists who clearly didn't understand the issue. Putting aside our own partisan differences for the moment, we decided to try our hands at a brief explanation.
By all descriptions the disputed poll, which included questions that featured negative, and sometimes inaccurate, information about state Senator Stephen Lynch, seems in our opinion to have been a flawed - but legitimate - political poll. Reportedly undertaken for EMILY's List, the national women's organization that has endorsed state Senator Cheryl Jacques, it included several questions designed to gauge the impact of negative information that voters might hear about Lynch, Jacques, and a third candidate, state Senator Brian Joyce. Such questions are standard fare in any political poll, that is, a poll undertaken to benefit a particular candidate, rather than a more general media poll conducted by a news organization. These questions are called 'push' questions because they are used to see how far voters can be pushed away from - or toward - a particular candidate. Push questions are an integral part of any detailed political poll: They produce information that allows campaigns to judge their own strengths and vulnerabilities, as well as those of their opponents. Push questions are an accepted and essential part of any candidate's research effort. Virtually all political polls employ push questions. Sometimes, though, these questions go over the line. As was the case in the 9th District survey, they may contain inaccurate information or may unfairly distort a candidate's record. Questions like that are bad poll questions and a waste of time for the campaign sponsoring them. But they are not an example of push polling. Push polling is a specific type of political dirty trick in which telemarketers employed by Candidate A pretend to be conducting an opinion poll, but in fact are determinedly spreading dirt about Candidate B. The term is a misnomer because push polling isn't polling at all - it's an underhanded and unethical form of negative advertising that is shunned by reputable political consultants.
Unlike legitimate polls – which involve detailed interviews of up to 20 minutes or more, with a scientifically selected sample of a few hundred voters – push-poll calls are very brief but directed indiscriminately at thousands of voters at a time. The interviewers don't bother recording answers because their purpose is not to gather information but simply to get out the dirt, to 'push' as many people as they can away from a candidate.

Politicians often complain about push polling when none has taken place; it's an effective way to generate sympathetic media attention. Their complaints are often seized upon by political observers who don't understand the difference between a badly written poll, like the one in the 9th, and push polling. This confusion arises because many so-called experts assume that any poll that includes push questions must be a push poll. It's a simple, but completely erroneous, assumption. By this definition, virtually all political polls would qualify as push polls, and the term itself would lose meaning. That would make it easier for push-poll charlatans to hide behind a guise of legitimacy.

Savvy reporters can help prevent this from happening by understanding what push polling is and by closely examining the claims of politicians who complain about it. Whenever candidates raise the specter of push polling, reporters should ask those candidates to release their own campaign polls for public review. That should settle the argument, every time. It's not such a difficult thing to keep straight, really – no more difficult than understanding the difference between lightning and a lightning bug.

Francis J. Connolly is an associate at Kiley & Company, a national Democratic polling firm based in Boston. Charley Manning is president of CPMA Inc. and has run numerous Republican campaigns. Both are unaligned in the 9th Congressional District race.

This story ran on page 11 of the Boston Globe on 8/16/2001.

>From mark@bisconti.com Sat Aug 18 10:11:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f7IHBrJ26216 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 18 Aug 2001 10:11:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from robin.mail.pas.earthlink.net (robin.mail.pas.earthlink.net
This article is from the latest American Prospect - any thoughts on Professor (American University) Raskin's proposal? Mark

A Right to Vote
by Jamin B. Raskin

Of everything we learned about American politics from the Supreme Court's ruling in Bush v. Gore last December, nothing was more important than the Court's insistence that the people still have "no federal constitutional right to vote." We (the people) have only the voting privileges our states choose to grant us. If the Florida legislature wishes to select presidential electors without public input, the people shall not stand in the way. More than presidential elections are at stake here.

Several weeks before Bush v. Gore, for example, the Supreme Court upheld a 2-1 federal-district-court decision that rejected an equal-protection attack on the denial of voting rights and congressional representation to the more than half a million U.S. citizens who live in the District of Columbia. "The Equal Protection Clause does not protect the right of all citizens to vote," the lower-court ruling stated, "but rather the right 'of all qualified citizens to vote.'" Thus two Clinton-appointed federal judges overruled the senior judge on the panel--Louis Oberdorfer, a Jimmy Carter appointee--and found that however "inequitable" the
condition of D.C.'s residents may be, simply being subject to federal taxation and military conscription does not confer on Washingtonians a right to vote and to be represented in the Senate and the House or other governing institutions. This may be a conservative reading of the Constitution, but it is black-letter law. True, the Constitution contains specific, hard-won language in the 15th and 19th Amendments that forbids discrimination in voting on the basis of race or sex. But these prohibitions don't establish a universal right to vote. Thus, Congress cannot selectively disenfranchise women in the District of Columbia but can, and does, render all of its residents voiceless in Congress by denying them representation in the House and Senate. The Florida legislature may not (theoretically, anyway) dismiss only the votes of African Americans; but as the Supreme Court kindly reminded us in Bush v. Gore, it can dismiss everyone's votes. Likewise, Florida cannot selectively deny African-American ex-convicts the right to vote in state and federal elections, but it disenfranchises all ex-offenders—some 400,000 of them. The nation's tolerance for disenfranchisement in the twenty-first century is quite exceptional. The constitutions of at least 135 nations—including our fellow North American countries, Canada and Mexico—explicitly guarantee citizens the right to vote and to be represented at all levels of government. In fact, every new constitution adopted over the past decade makes the right to vote the very foundation of government. Constitutional silence on a basic right to vote leaves the United States in miserable, backward company. By my count, only Azerbaijan, Chechnya, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Pakistan, Singapore, and, of course, the United Kingdom (whose phony doctrine of "virtual representation" the colonists rebelled against centuries ago) still leave voting rights out of their constitutions and therefore to the whims of state officials. This sin of omission violates—to the extent that anyone cares—the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and numerous other international conventions inspired by the democratic triumph over totalitarianism in World War II. It is time for American progressives to engage in serious constitutional politics on behalf of the right to vote. This is the only way to redeem the chaos of the 2000 presidential election and to begin to ensure that such an assault on democracy will never be repeated.
28th Amendment:

Section 1. Citizens of the United States have the right to vote in primary and general elections for President and Vice President, for electors for President and Vice President, for Representatives and Senators in the Congress, and for executive and legislative officers of their state, district, and local legislatures, and such right shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State.

Section 2. The right of citizens of the United States to vote and to participate in elections on an equal basis shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of political-party affiliation or prior condition of incarceration.

Section 3. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall elect Senators and Representatives in the Congress in such number and such manner as it would be entitled if it were a State.

Section 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. A campaign for such an amendment would give coherence and energy to the scattered efforts across the country to reform the anachronistic, malleable electoral structures that exist in literally thousands of self-regulated jurisdictions. The movement behind the amendment would help sweep away not only disenfranchisement but reactionary partisan and sectional opposition to a number of democratic reforms: the push to upgrade and equalize voting technology and machinery, the effort to require equal and adequate funding of voting systems, and unsung efforts by third parties and independents to end discriminatory practices against candidates and voters based on party identification. (In many states, "major party" candidates automatically appear on the ballot while "minor party" candidates must collect tens of thousands of signatures to secure the right to compete. Along similar lines, the Supreme Court in 1998 upheld the partisan gerrymandering of government-run candidate debates.) Instead of treating these seemingly disparate causes as a patchwork of local grievances, a right-to-vote amendment would elevate the agenda of electoral reform to a matter of national self-definition and fundamental constitutional values. The reason that the Bush v. Gore decision--that unthinkably radical statement about the urgent need for absolute equality of voting procedures and standards across county lines--won't work in these other cases can be
found in the disclaimer appended by the Supreme Court's conservative majority: "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities." Like Cinderella's dress, the conservatives' gallant defense of voting rights after last year's presidential election turned to rags at midnight. In Yale Law School professor Bruce Ackerman's phrase, "constitutional moments" don't come around all that often, so it is crucial to seize the political opportunity created by the continuing scandal of the 2000 election. But even when the time is right for change, reformers face hard choices. In this case, the biggest headache is the electoral college. A deliberately undemocratic institution that made the popular-vote loser (George W. Bush, by more than half a million votes) the president of the United States, the electoral college is an international embarrassment. Since the nation's founding, it has entrenched the power of the slave states (four of the first five presidents were slave masters), white supremacy (throughout the twentieth century, southern states ran regional candidates and manipulated the electoral college to thwart the civil rights movement), and now the Republican electoral-college coalition, which represents a minority of voters nationally and a much smaller minority of the people. George W. Bush took every single electoral-college vote in the South and found a majority of his electoral-college votes there. Meanwhile, the majority of African Americans, more than 20 million, live in the South and gave Al Gore better than 90 percent of their vote. Yet because of the winner-take-all method of distributing electoral-college votes, black votes in the South—even when counted—had zero impact on the election. In a more rational world, abolition of the electoral college would be a key part of a 28th Amendment. But too many states and senators buy in to the myth that the electoral college helps them. It is extremely unlikely that even a simple majority of states would ratify an amendment abolishing the electoral college, much less the 38 required constitutionally. Only a handful of senators, including New York Democrat Hillary Clinton, have voiced support for the idea; and the Senate, where small states hold great power, will be a long time coming around on the issue. As outrageous as the situation is, it does not make sense to load down a right-to-vote
amendment with this kind of baggage. Few things would stop this amendment, but the electoral college is one of them. That issue's time will come. Some may wonder about the wisdom of tackling the disenfranchisement of Washingtonians and ex-convicts. But these battles of basic principle are eminently winnable. Public-opinion polls show that commanding majorities of the people favor giving residents of Washington, D.C., equal voting rights in Congress, and the rallying cry of "No taxation without representation" has persistent and broad cross-partisan appeal. The amendment would not restore rights to incarcerated citizens—only to those who have already served their time and been released. Disenfranchisement of 1.4 million citizens, disproportionate numbers of whom are people of color, makes no sense. It drives ex-offenders away from political participation and civic belonging precisely at the moment they need to be encouraged and invited back into mainstream society. Most states already extend voting rights to this group and have crime rates no higher than the 13 states that turn a period of former incarceration into a permanent civic disability. Americans are fair-minded people and most would be shocked to learn that one in three African-American men has permanently lost the vote in Florida because of a prior felony conviction. A provision protecting former inmates' voting rights would have a good chance to make it through Congress and be adopted by the states. It now falls to the people to bring the U.S. Constitution into line with the fundamental tenets of American political thought that emerged in the aftermath of the modern civil rights movement. As Robert P. Moses and Charles Cobb tell us in their important new book Radical Equations, the concept of "one person, one vote" in the early 1960s gave "Mississippi sharecroppers and their allies" a principle of "common conceptual cohesion" that was taken up by the Justice Department and then embraced by the Warren Court in the redistricting cases. As Justice Hugo Black put it in 1964, "Our Constitution leaves no room for classification of people in a way that unnecessarily abridges [the right to vote]." But universal suffrage, a radical axiom established by the blood and sweat of civil rights activists in the South, has steadily eroded on the conservative
Rehnquist
Court's watch. Over the past decade, the Supreme Court has dismantled congressional districts composed mostly of African Americans or Hispanics--districts brought into being by the Voting Rights Act of 1965--and in the course of doing so has inscribed into law a presumption that whites shall be in the majority. It has allowed states to deny voters the right to "write in" the candidates of their choice. And it has upheld state laws that ban "fusion" and thus deny new political parties the capacity to build by "cross-nominate" candidates and creating multiparty political coalitions.

The principles of universal suffrage and democracy now lie in tatters. Yet the American movement for "one person, one vote" has traveled around the world, from Poland to South Africa. The United States must now catch up with its own legacy. We must disprove the French observation, much deployed after the 2000 election, that the Americans have no antiques--except, of course, for the Constitution. The political question is whether progressives, accustomed to fighting off countless proposed amendments by the right on issues like school prayer and flag desecration, can overcome their knee-jerk suspicion of all constitutional changes. Many liberals treat the Constitution like an untouchable religious text and the republic's founders as omniscient. This is ironic, for we have traditionally understood that the original Constitution was deeply compromised by white supremacy and fear of popular democracy.

Many of the amendments enacted since the founding are suffrage amendments championed by progressives--most recently, the 23rd Amendment (adopted in 1961), which gave residents of Washington, D.C., votes in the presidential electoral college; the 24th Amendment (1964), which banned poll taxes; and the 26th Amendment (1971), which extended the vote to 18-year-olds. Meaningful democratic politics requires an aggressive constitutional politics. Let them come at us with proposals about the flag, school prayer, and the Ten Commandments. We can return fire with the constitutional right to vote, which in a democracy must take moral precedence and logical priority over everything else. Under Article V of the Constitution, an amendment requires either a two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress followed by
ratification by three-fourths of the states or passage in a constitutional
convention
called upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states
followed
by ratification by three-fourths of the states. Starting with the League of
Women
Voters, the secretaries of state, the NAACP, journals of opinion, the labor
movement,
political parties that are willing to place democratic principle above
factional
designs, and the state legislatures, we should reach out to our fellow
citizens and
take the irresistible case for a voting-rights amendment to the people.
Certain
progressive members of Congress already see the logic of such an effort.
Democratic
Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr., of Illinois has been arguing eloquently for a
whole
series of new constitutional rights, including health care and housing. His
broader
agenda is more complicated, but his spirit is perfect for the new
century: We have to stop treating the Constitution like a fragile heirloom
hidden
away in the attic. And we must begin by providing what was missing when the
Constitution was first drafted--the right of the people to vote and,
therefore, to
govern. Jamin B. Raskin </authors/raskin-j.html>
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From: Karl Feld [mailto:KFeld@humanvoice.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2001 10:50 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Globe: What 'push polling' is and what it isn't

Good summary Howard. For those interested, I have written a piece covering this issue in depth with recommended courses of action for researchers which will appear in the From The Field section of the September issue of Public Perspective. I'm happy to forward the text upon request.

Regards,

Karl Feld

-----Original Message-----
From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2001 8:43 AM
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)
Subject: Globe: What 'push polling' is and what it isn't

What 'push polling' is and what it isn't
http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/228/oped/What_push_polling_is_and_what_it_isn_t.shtml
By Globe Staff, 8/16/2001
WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE between lightning and a lightning bug? That's one question that comes to mind as headlines fan the firestorm over alleged 'push polling' in the 9th District. Sometimes people get confused by terms that sound similar but have very different meanings. That's what appears to be going on here; a lot of otherwise sophisticated political observers are confused about what push polling is and what it
isn't.
At a cookout last weekend, we chatted with two good friends, savvy journalists
who
clearly didn't understand the issue. Putting aside our own partisan differences for
the moment, we decided to try our hands at a brief explanation.
By all descriptions the disputed poll, which included questions that featured
negative, and sometimes inaccurate, information about state Senator Stephen
Lynch,
seems in our opinion to have been a flawed - but legitimate - political poll.
Reportedly undertaken for EMILY's List, the national women's organization that
has
endorsed state Senator Cheryl Jacques, it included several questions designed to
gauge the impact of negative information that voters might hear about Lynch,
Jacques,
and a third candidate, state Senator Brian Joyce.
Such questions are standard fare in any political poll, that is, a poll undertaken to
benefit a particular candidate, rather than a more general media poll conducted by a
news organization.
These questions are called "push" questions because they are used to see how
far
voters can be pushed away from - or toward - a particular candidate. Push questions
are an integral part of any detailed political poll: They produce information that
allows campaigns to judge their own strengths and vulnerabilities, as well as those
of their opponents. Push questions are an accepted and essential part of any
candidate's research effort. Virtually all political polls employ push questions.
Sometimes, though, these questions go over the line. As was the case in the 9th
District survey, they may contain inaccurate information or may unfairly distort a
candidate's record. Questions like that are bad poll questions and a waste of time
for the campaign sponsoring them. But they are not an example of push polling.
Push polling is a specific type of political dirty trick in which telemarketers
employed by Candidate A pretend to be conducting an opinion poll, but in fact are
determinedly spreading dirt about Candidate B. The term is a misnomer because push polling
isn't polling at all - it's an underhanded and unethical form of negative advertising that
is shunned by reputable political consultants.
Unlike legitimate polls - which involve detailed interviews of up to 20 minutes or
more, with a scientifically selected sample of a few hundred voters - push-
poll calls
are very brief but directed indiscriminately at thousands of voters at a
time.
The interviewers don't bother recording answers because their purpose is not to
gather
information but simply to get out the dirt, to 'push' as many people as they
can
away from a candidate.
Politicians often complain about push polling when none has taken place; it's an
effective way to generate sympathetic media attention. Their complaints are often
seized upon by political observers who don't understand the difference between
a
badly written poll, like the one in the 9th, and push polling. This confusion arises because many so-called experts assume that any poll that
includes push questions must be a push poll. It's a simple, but completely
erroneous, assumption. By this definition, virtually all political polls would qualify as
push
polls, and the term itself would lose meaning. That would make it easier for
push-poll charlatans to hide behind a guise of legitimacy.
Savvy reporters can help prevent this from happening by understanding what push
polling is and by closely examining the claims of politicians who complain about it.
Whenever candidates raise the specter of push polling, reporters should ask those
candidates to release their own campaign polls for public review. That should settle
the argument, every time. It's not such a difficult thing to keep straight, really - no more difficult than understanding the difference between lightning and a
lightning
bug.
Francis J. Connolly is an associate at Kiley & Company, a national Democratic
polling
firm based in Boston. Charley Manning is president of CPMA Inc. and has run numerous
Republican campaigns. Both are unaligned in the 9th Congressional District
race.
This story ran on page 11 of the Boston Globe on 8/16/2001.
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Unwed Partners Up 72% in U.S.

DEMOGRAPHICS: THE NUMBER OF COUPLES LIVING TOGETHER ROSE THE MOST IN THE BIBLE BELT AND THE GREAT PLAINS DURING THE '90S. THE TREND APPEARS TO BE FIRMLY ESTABLISHED.

By ROBIN FIELDS
Times Staff Writer

Like divorce and single parenthood in earlier times, cohabitation spilled out of big cities and university towns in the 1990s and has become part of life even in the nation's most conservative regions, U.S. census data show.

The number of unmarried-partner households rose 31% in the '90s in Los Angeles County, the birthplace of palimony, but shot up 72% nationwide. The largest gains came in the Bible Belt and across the Great Plains.

Even in seven states where laws against cohabitation remain on the books, living together almost doubled over the decade of the '90s, according to the 2000 census data.

"I don't see us formalizing," said Chris Sheets, who lives with her partner, John May, in the North Carolina Outer Banks hamlet of Kill Devil Hills. North Carolina is one of the states that still outlaws cohabitation. "Neither of us is religious and we need no wedding presents to further clutter our house."

So widespread has cohabitation become that some rural counties in Wyoming and Minnesota now have the same ratio of unmarried-partner households as do more urban counties in New York and California.

Within California, cohabitating couples are about as common in towns with populations of 5,000 or less as in cities of 100,000 or more.

"The tolerance is not just in the elite areas," said Stephanie Coontz, co-chairwoman of the Council on Contemporary Families. "Cultural acceptance
and science have broken the old tight equation of marriage and child-rearing. All forms of families are claiming legitimacy and, to some extent, are getting it."

Social scientists continue to debate whether the increase in cohabitation further undermines the stability of the traditional American family. Some studies have shown that cohabitation serves as a valuable premarital compatibility test, while others have found that couples who live together before marrying are more likely to get divorced.

But for good or ill, the trend seems firmly established. Government policies have changed to accommodate live-in relationships and those changes, in turn, have institutionalized them in both law and language.

Live-in lovers in the age of AIDS metamorphosed into domestic partners, removing much of the stigma of such relationships and fighting for health care and workplace rights.

"Just the term 'unmarried partner' gave it a dignity and social category," said Paula Ettelbrick, family policy director of the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force.

Pressured by courts and constituents, cities and states created registries of unmarried couples during the 1990s, giving them rights that were the same—or similar to—those granted to spouses on hospital visitations, access to children's school records and a variety of government benefits.

A number of prominent companies redefined their benefits policies to include partners, as did some insurers, credit unions, health clubs and airlines—concessions fought for and won mostly by gay groups, but enjoyed as well by the much larger population of heterosexual unmarried couples.

In California, opposite-sex couples constitute about 86% of unmarried-partner households.

For most people, cohabitation remains a transitory phase on the way to marriage or breakup. University of Wisconsin researchers have found that about 50% of
couples now live together before a first marriage, up from just 10% a generation ago, and about two-thirds do so before a second marriage.

But about 95% of such couples marry or end their relationship within five years.

Alternative to Marriage for Some

"It's a test run," said Kit Russell of Goleta, who expects to wed her live-in partner and is convinced that the experience saved her from a disastrous marriage to a previous boyfriend.

Still, researchers say the 2000 census also captured a burgeoning group of unmarried partners who see cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, not a precursor.

Made wary by their parents' divorces or their own missteps, long-term cohabitants look for individualistic arrangements that exist outside what their state, religion or relatives dictate, said Scott Coltrane, a sociology professor at UC Riverside.

"When couples get married, there are expectations about gender roles, about having children, about settling down," said Sidelia Reyna, who lives with Todd Bennett, her partner of more than five years, in Oxford, Ohio. "It makes more sense for couples to figure out their own rules."

For same-sex couples, three forces came together in the '90s that served to persuade partners to live more openly, even in places formerly thought of as hostile territory.

AIDS activism, the fight for domestic-partner status and an emerging movement that espoused legalizing gay marriages combined to make same-sex couples more visible than ever and more comfortable with being so, said Kim Mills, education director for the Human Rights Campaign.

In 1990, less than half the nation's counties reported any same-sex, unmarried-partner households. In 2000, almost all reported some.

Although San Francisco predictably led the list of metropolitan areas with the highest percentage of households made up of same-sex partners, Portland, Maine;

"We still run into politicians who say, 'I don't have any gay constituents,'" Mills said. "Once we get these [census] numbers, we can say, 'Yes, you do.'"

Though the new data indicate Americans' comfort with cohabitation deepened in the last decade, it lags well behind that of Western Europeans and Canadians, who have embraced and codified such relationships for decades. The U.S. Census Bureau's unmarried-partner category dates back only to 1990.

Even in middle age, many U.S. cohabitants confess they still struggle to reconcile their lifestyle with their parents' wishes.

In North Carolina, Sheets says her father has repeatedly told her he wants to see her married before he dies. "That's a bit of pressure, for sure," she said.

Younger couples get little guff; many of their parents have cohabited too.

"They didn't have the right to give me attitude," said James Olson, 28, who has lived with his girlfriend in South Pasadena for about six months.

On a societal scale, the backlash against increased cohabitation may take forms that go beyond parental disapproval.

Those who see the census figures as further evidence of the erosion of the traditional family are pushing for changes in the tax code and other federal programs to promote traditional unions.

Studies show that an increasing number of unmarried-partner households also include children. If these relationships are less stable than marriages, children will experience more flux as well, said Pamela Smock, a sociology professor at the University of Michigan.

Long-term unmarried couples, however, say their relationships are every bit as permanent as those cemented with wedding vows.

Shannon, a woman who lives in Burbank with her partner of six years but asked that her last name not be used, said the marriage ritual itself held little meaning for
her.

"Other than dressing up in a beautiful dress and having one day that is totally about me, I have no real desire to be married," she said. "Which is not to say that I don't want a committed relationship. I do, and that is what I have."
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Fellow AAPORNETERS,

One immediate reaction is that this raises all sorts of "baseline" questions, most of which the piece fails to answer. Consider that an increase from 4% incidence to 7% (a three percentage point increase) corresponds to a 75% increase. This contrasts with an increase from 60% to 80%, which is more than six times larger in terms of prevalence but a relative increase of one-third. This is parallel to saying that an increase in salary from $40,000 to $70,000 contrasted with one from $6,000,000
to
$8,000,000 means that a disproportionate amount of raise went to the person
with the
lower salary. If one looks just to percentage increase, the situation looks very
different than if one uses another metric (absolute increase or proportion of total
increase going to one person).

Don
>
>
My guess is that more than a few AAPORNETters will be
interested in this reporting by Robin Fields of the Los
Angeles Times. I look forward to your reactions.

-- Jim
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Unwed Partners Up 72% in U.S.

DEMOGRAPHICS: THE NUMBER OF COUPLES LIVING TOGETHER ROSE THE MOST IN
THE BIBLE BELT AND THE GREAT PLAINS DURING THE '90S. THE TREND
APPEARS TO BE FIRMLY ESTABLISHED.

By ROBIN FIELDS
Times Staff Writer

Like divorce and single parenthood in earlier times, cohabitation
spilled out of big cities and university towns in the 1990s and has
become part of life even in the nation's most conservative regions,
U.S. census data show.

The number of unmarried-partner households rose 31% in the '90s in Los
Angeles County, the birthplace of palimony, but shot up 72%
nationwide. The largest gains came in the Bible Belt and across the
Great Plains.

Even in seven states where laws against cohabitation remain on the
books, living together almost doubled over the decade of the '90s,
according to the 2000 census data.

"I don't see us formalizing," said Chris Sheets, who lives with her
partner, John May, in the North Carolina Outer Banks hamlet of Kill
Devil Hills. North Carolina is one of the states that still outlaws
cohabitation. "Neither of us is religious and we need no wedding
presents to further clutter our house."

So widespread has cohabitation become that some rural counties in
Wyoming and Minnesota now have the same ratio of unmarried-partner
households as do more urban counties in New York and California.

Within California, cohabitating couples are about as common in towns with populations of 5,000 or less as in cities of 100,000 or more.

"The tolerance is not just in the elite areas," said Stephanie Coontz, co-chairwoman of the Council on Contemporary Families. "Cultural acceptance and science have broken the old tight equation of marriage and child-rearing. All forms of families are claiming legitimacy and, to some extent, are getting it."

Social scientists continue to debate whether the increase in cohabitation further undermines the stability of the traditional American family. Some studies have shown that cohabitation serves as a valuable premarital compatibility test, while others have found that couples who live together before marrying are more likely to get divorced.

But for good or ill, the trend seems firmly established. Government policies have changed to accommodate live-in relationships and those changes, in turn, have institutionalized them in both law and language.

Live-in lovers in the age of AIDS metamorphosed into domestic partners, removing much of the stigma of such relationships and fighting for health care and workplace rights.

"Just the term 'unmarried partner' gave it a dignity and social category," said Paula Ettelbrick, family policy director of the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force.

Pressured by courts and constituents, cities and states created registries of unmarried couples during the 1990s, giving them rights that were the same—or similar to—those granted to spouses on hospital visitations, access to children's school records and a variety of government benefits.

A number of prominent companies redefined their benefits policies to include partners, as did some insurers, credit unions, health clubs and airlines—concessions fought for and won mostly by gay groups, but enjoyed as well by the much larger population of heterosexual unmarried couples.

In California, opposite-sex couples constitute about 86% of unmarried-partner households.

For most people, cohabitation remains a transitory phase on the way to marriage or breakup. University of Wisconsin researchers have found that about 50% of couples now live together before a first marriage, up from just 10% a generation ago, and about two-thirds do so before a second marriage.

But about 95% of such couples marry or end their relationship within five years.

Alternative to Marriage for Some
"It's a test run," said Kit Russell of Goleta, who expects to wed her live-in partner and is convinced that the experience saved her from a disastrous marriage to a previous boyfriend.

Still, researchers say the 2000 census also captured a burgeoning group of unmarried partners who see cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, not a precursor.

Made wary by their parents' divorces or their own missteps, long-term cohabitants look for individualistic arrangements that exist outside what their state, religion or relatives dictate, said Scott Coltrane, a sociology professor at UC Riverside.

"When couples get married, there are expectations about gender roles, about having children, about settling down," said Sidelia Reyna, who lives with Todd Bennett, her partner of more than five years, in Oxford, Ohio. "It makes more sense for couples to figure out their own rules."

For same-sex couples, three forces came together in the '90s that served to persuade partners to live more openly, even in places formerly thought of as hostile territory.

AIDS activism, the fight for domestic-partner status and an emerging movement that espoused legalizing gay marriages combined to make same-sex couples more visible than ever and more comfortable with being so, said Kim Mills, education director for the Human Rights Campaign.

In 1990, less than half the nation's counties reported any same-sex, unmarried-partner households. In 2000, almost all reported some.

Although San Francisco predictably led the list of metropolitan areas with the highest percentage of households made up of same-sex partners, Portland, Maine; Burlington, Vt.; Asheville, N.C.; and Springfield, Mass., all ranked in the top 15 in that category--ahead of New York and Los Angeles.

"We still run into politicians who say, 'I don't have any gay constituents,'" Mills said. "Once we get these [census] numbers, we can say, 'Yes, you do.'"

Though the new data indicate Americans' comfort with cohabitation deepened in the last decade, it lags well behind that of Western Europeans and Canadians, who have embraced and codified such relationships for decades. The U.S. Census Bureau's unmarried-partner category dates back only to 1990.

Even in middle age, many U.S. cohabitants confess they still struggle to reconcile their lifestyle with their parents' wishes.

In North Carolina, Sheets says her father has repeatedly told her he wants to see her married before he dies. "That's a bit of pressure, for sure," she said.

Younger couples get little guff; many of their parents have cohabited
"They didn't have the right to give me attitude," said James Olson, 28, who has lived with his girlfriend in South Pasadena for about six months.

On a societal scale, the backlash against increased cohabitation may take forms that go beyond parental disapproval.

Those who see the census figures as further evidence of the erosion of the traditional family are pushing for changes in the tax code and other federal programs to promote traditional unions.

Studies show that an increasing number of unmarried-partner households also include children. If these relationships are less stable than marriages, children will experience more flux as well, said Pamela Smock, a sociology professor at the University of Michigan.

Long-term unmarried couples, however, say their relationships are every bit as permanent as those cemented with wedding vows.

Shannon, a woman who lives in Burbank with her partner of six years but asked that her last name not be used, said the marriage ritual itself held little meaning for her.

"Other than dressing up in a beautiful dress and having one day that is totally about me, I have no real desire to be married," she said. "Which is not to say that I don't want a committed relationship. I do, and that is what I have."
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My apologies for cluttering your mailboxes again with the entire original article again with my reply.
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At 12:43 PM 08/20/2001 -0700, you wrote:
>
> My guess is that more than a few AAPORNETters will be interested in this reporting by Robin Fields of the Los Angeles Times. I look forward to your reactions.
>
> -- Jim

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu
While Don Ferree has usefully moved our attention to "baseline" distortions, it might be worthwhile to consider a different but related problem in the follow-up story by Robin Fields (see below).

Although certainly I'm not qualified to question the news judgment of the Los Angeles Times, nor to challenge its staff on how to write headlines, I myself might have ever so slightly changed its headline below to read:

43 States Still Classify Cohabitation as Legal

Not only would this have attracted more attention, it would have made talk shows much more interesting for the entire week--no easy trick during the final days of August.

What do you think?

-- Jim

P.S. If nothing else, this exercise might demonstrate just how easy it is to slip an editorial position into even a modest seven-word headline--if there should remain anyone who hasn't already noticed.

---

Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
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7 States Still Classify Cohabitation as Illegal

LAWS: COUPLES LIVING TOGETHER OUTSIDE MARRIAGE CAN BE CITED FOR "LEWD, LASCIVIOUS" CONDUCT AND REJECTED FOR CERTAIN JOBS

By ROBIN FIELDS
Times Staff Writer

The question lurked toward the bottom of a six-page affidavit, part of her application to become a juvenile probation officer in Phoenix.

"Are you living in open and notorious cohabitation?" it asked, adding that doing so was a misdemeanor sex offense that would disqualify her for employment.

"I thought, well, I keep the blinds closed," said Debbie Deem of her then eight-year live-in relationship with her male partner. "This is none of the state's
business."

At a time when new census data show that more American couples than ever are living together outside marriage, seven states still ban such arrangements.

Arizona is no longer one of them, having repealed its law in May.

But in Florida, Michigan, Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, Virginia and West Virginia, "lewd and lascivious" male-female cohabitation remains illegal, a reminder that in parts of the nation, the conservative past still rubs up against the more liberal present.

Most such laws date from the 19th century; several lump cohabitation in with prohibitions against adultery and fornication. Typically, the offense is a misdemeanor punishable by a short prison term or a fine of up to $500.

The statutes are rarely enforced, but they still can have dramatic effects, even if violators are never directly charged.

The state of Virginia, for example, has threatened not to renew the home day-care license of a Norfolk woman because a state inspector categorized her live-in partner of 17 years as her companion, rather than as a boarder, as previous inspectors had done. The ACLU has taken up her case.

"I was really upset," said Darlene Davis, adding that she had never misrepresented her relationship to state regulators. "This is how I make my living. Why now, after all these years?"

In Charlotte, N.C., U.S. Magistrate Carl Horn habitually asks defendants, regardless of why they are before him, if their living arrangements violate the state's no-cohabitation law. If so, he refuses to release them unless they agree to marry, move or get their partner to relocate.

Dozens of people have been moved to marry, and at least one has proposed right in the courtroom.

In states where private citizens can file misdemeanor criminal charges without triggering police investigations, people sometimes pursue cohabitation complaints against former spouses, often to gain leverage in divorce or custody
disputes, attorneys said.

The laws do not appear to provide much of a deterrent to cohabitation, however.

In the decade of the ‘90s, the number of unmarried-partner households nearly doubled from about 500,000 to more than 930,000 in the seven states that still ban cohabitation. By comparison, the nation overall experienced a 15% increase in the number of such households.

Gay-rights and singles-rights groups have joined forces to lobby against the measures still lingering on the books.

"It's out of sync with reality," said Thomas Coleman, executive director of the American Assn. for Single People.

Debbie Deem had a different solution. Sick of feeling like an outcast in Arizona, she moved to California several years ago, settling in Camarillo.

"After a certain point, I just said, 'Get me out of here,' " she said. "If I'm considered a sex offender . . . it's time to go."
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Well, I'm enclosing the full text of the current piece that made me sigh, but it could be about any topic. All of my editorials have percentages and data and references...

When I first started writing editorials a year ago, I was so determined to do a thorough job of research, and to properly cite and credit everything.

I hated it when those dumb journalists would gloss over my own studies to the point of misinterpretation, or failed to give proper credit. By golly, I was gonna do it RIGHT.

But then I ran up against the 450-word space limitation. Okay, I can get up to 650 words if I write a "Sunday thumbsucker" like this one, a longer "think" piece. But that's not much longer!!!

It's hardly enough to do ANYTHING. You can't have more than maybe three ideas. You don't get to really explore any issue. And you sure as heck shortchange the citations.

I know the 1997 study below was really by the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and the Harvard School of Public Health. I just ran out of room. Sorry about that.

A few months ago I did an editorial about the Bush plan to offer vouchers so that people without health insurance could purchase coverage. I wrote....

When asked why they didn't have health insurance, "Can't afford it" was the most common reason cited, for about 74 percent of uninsured Floridians.

Of course, to save words, it was tempting to say......

About 74 percent of uninsured Floridians said they couldn't afford health insurance.

Except that isn't accurate; many proxy responses were involved, so people didn't always "say" but had the reason told about them. Fortunately, my editor trusts that if I'm going to be that obtusely wordy,
there's a reason for it.

I happened to know the details of that survey, because I managed the data collection. But I can't know that level of detail for every study on which I report. I am going to make a blooper of a mistake, eventually. Even though I was trying.

I do enough research to write a very solid 25-page term paper and instead distill it down to 450 words. Which means I often make no money at all writing these pieces, because I'm paid by the piece. Ah well, my gift to the community.

I am learning to develop a lot of sympathy for those dumb journalists, after all. Try to be patient with them when they call you asking questions about your studies!

Colleen Kay Porter, editorial writer and columnist, The Gainesville Sun
Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, University of Florida
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
Department of Health Services Administration
P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195


Sunday, August 19, 2001

SUN EDITORIAL: Screening for HIV

Nearly half of pregnant women in the U.S. have not been tested for HIV, according to a study in this month's issue of the American Journal of Public Health. Prenatal testing has long been controversial, as we struggle to balance women's privacy rights with concern over newborn's health.

While mother-to-baby transmission is the most common cause of HIV infection in children, drug treatment during pregnancy drastically lowers the risk that the baby will be born infected. AIDS among children is becoming a preventable disease; the number of new pediatric AIDS cases in the U.S. has dropped 75 percent over the years from 1992 to 1998.

In 1995, the U.S. Public Health Service issued guidelines suggesting universal counseling and voluntary testing for all expectant mothers. The rate of testing has increased, from 41% in 1994 to 56% in 1999.

Those guidelines were revised last year, with
continued emphasis on making HIV testing just another of the routine battery of prenatal tests, which has long included screening for syphilis. The new policy also affirmed that testing should be voluntary, with expectant moms having the right to refuse the test for HIV.

However, leaving the test voluntary does raise some issues, since the guidelines are not being followed uniformly.

The study published this month found that pregnant women were more likely to be tested if they lived in the South, were not employed, were young (18 to 24 years), and had never been married.

A report by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also found that some health care providers did not offer testing to every pregnant woman because "of the provider's belief that they could predict which women were most at risk."

What's happening is "profiling," as physicians choose which women to test for HIV based on their demographics. It would be fairer and more effective to encourage testing for every expectant mom.

Consider the case of Mary Fisher, the white, well-to-do mother of two whose compelling speech about AIDS was a highlight of the 1992 Republican National Convention. Fisher had acquired HIV through marital sex. Would her private doctor in an affluent suburban office have recommended testing for HIV?

Thanks to the new treatment and increased testing, the number of babies born with HIV has plummeted over the last decade, with estimates of 300 to 400 infected babies born each year. But the staggering price tag of caring for each of those children offsets the cost of testing, not to mention the moral implications of giving a child a death sentence at birth.

In the absence of an effective voluntary system of HIV testing for pregnant women, some public health advocates will continue to push for mandatory testing. In 1996, the American Medical Association passed a resolution favoring mandatory testing. A 1997 poll conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that 73 percent of Americans thought requiring HIV tests for all pregnant women was "a good idea."

In reality, mandating testing will not ensure identification of all babies at risk, if the pregnant woman never sees a health care provider. About 15 percent of HIV-infected mothers get no prenatal care at all, compared to only 2 percent of
pregnant women in general.

New York state has side-stepped the issue of women's rights by passing a law requiring HIV testing of newborns, but that is really too late to make a difference. Testing of newborns merely allows an early diagnoses--it is too late to actually prevent the baby from acquiring the virus.

The steps toward a workable policy of voluntary testing seem clear: every physician should recommend testing to all pregnant women, irregardless of skin color or social status. Health insurance companies should cover the cost of HIV testing as they would any other prenatal test. And every expectant mother should consider having the HIV test as the first of many steps she will take to ensure her child's health.
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Apparently the LA Times does not read the Census WEBSITE See Below on why this is invalid:

>From the Census Bureau.

Technical Note on Same-Sex Unmarried Partner Data From the 1990 and 2000 Censuses The
release of data in the SF1 Files from the 2000 census has brought with it a number of analyses documenting change that has occurred since the last census was conducted in 1990. While many of the variables and processes between the two censuses are comparable, some are not, and direct comparison of some estimates may lead to misleading conclusions. This note discusses one such topic, that of "unmarried partners", and advises that for some analyses - those involving unmarried same-sex partners -- direct comparison of the 1990 and 2000 estimates is not substantively valid. The household relationship item in both the 1990 and the 2000 Censuses offered many ways of identifying how other people in the household were related to the householder (the person in whose name the house is owned or rented). Categories included spouse, child or other relative of the householder, housemate/roommate, roomer/boarder, and unmarried partner. In all circumstances, the respondent was asked to choose the category that best represented how other members of the household were related to the householder.

In both censuses, the "spouse" and "unmarried partner" response categories were defined and asked the same way. However, there were important differences in data processing that mean that some of the data are not comparable, limiting the usefulness of comparisons of the number of same-sex unmarried partners between these two censuses.

In both censuses, if a person was identified as the "spouse" of the householder and was the same sex as the householder, the "spouse" response was flagged for further review and allocation, that is, assignment of a value other than that originally reported, based on other data on the form. In 1990, the edit and allocation procedures did not allow same-sex "spouse" combinations to occur, thus resulting in the allocation of one of these two items in order to achieve editing consistency among the responses.

Processing steps were changed for Census 2000 for households which contained same-sex "spouses". If the person with the "spouse" category was the same sex as the householder, and if neither person had their sex previously allocated, a relationship response of "spouse" was allocated as an "unmarried partner" response. Since marital status was no longer on the short form, its given value could not be
considered (or modified) in this allocation procedure, as it had been in 1990.

Data allocation is a standard statistical practice that is followed by most data collection agencies. Data on the relationship item (as other items) were subject to allocation in the census, as they are in virtually all Census Bureau surveys. In 1990, the marital status item was available on the 100 percent (short) form, and aided in both the evaluation of the consistency of responses between the householder and the "spouse," and in the subsequent allocation procedure. The 1990 procedure allocated responses via a statistical model which distributed allocated responses from answers given by respondents in a closely proximate geographic area. This procedure used key demographic data from the census form, including marital status, as stratifying factors to provide a reasonable distribution of allocated responses. This procedure, while ensuring that no same-sex spouse response could be subsequently allocated, produced a set of allocated responses which could have included an "unmarried partner" response as well as any other response that was consistent with the age/sex/marital status profile of the respondent. This would include being allocated as a sibling or a relative, for example, or, if the age differences were far enough apart (15 or more years), even a parent or child of the householder.

Three principal factors affected our decision to take this approach for Census 2000.

1) Same-sex spouse responses were flagged as invalid to comply with the 1996 Federal Defense of Marriage Act (H.R. 3396) passed by the 104th Congress. This act instructs all federal agencies only to recognize opposite-sex marriages for the purposes of enacting any agency programs. In order for Census Bureau data to be consistent with this act and the data requirements of other federal agencies, same-sex spouse responses were invalidated. The legislation defines marriage and spouse as follows:

"In determining the meaning of any Act of Congress, or of any ruling, regulation or interpretation of the various administrative bureaus and agencies of the
United States, the word 'marriage' means only a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife, and the word 'spouse' refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or wife." In order for the Census Bureau to be consistent with this act and the data requirements of other federal agencies, same-sex "spouse" responses were invalidated.

2) The second issue was statistical in nature. The principal basis of any good statistical allocation routine rests on the selection of the stratifying or input factors to provide a good statistical model. Without marital status data on the 100 percent form in Census 2000, the allocation routine would be relatively weak. Since many partners are roughly the same age, a statistical routine without marital status as one of its factors would have likely resulted in an overestimate of adult siblings or relatives, as the majority of people living in households are relatives, and this is the population from which we would draw our allocated responses. Additionally, if the same-sex partners were more than 15 years difference in age, the statistical routine would have likely allocated the invalidated "spouse" response as either a "child" or "parent" of the householder, as these types of relatives predominate in households in this age range of differences. This was an unacceptable outcome, as it would actually destroy the intent of the original "spouse" response, which clearly indicated a non-parental type of relationship. It should be noted that the "spouse" response on the form is assumed to be deliberate -- not accidental -- as it was the first response category on the question, and was not placed between other possible response categories which may have been meant to be marked, such as housemates or roomers.

3) The third factor took into consideration that couples in long term same-sex relationships may consider themselves as "married partners" and thus respond as such on the Census form. In addition, at the time of writing the editing program for Census 2000, there were several challenges in the courts concerning the legality of
same-sex marriages. Clearly, we could not ignore the fact that same-sex spouse responses were going to be recorded on Census 2000. In light of these social and legal aspects—and the lack of a key variable in the statistical allocation routine (marital status)—the assignment of same-sex "married" couples to the same-sex "unmarried partner" category was the procedure chosen for the editing process. We were adverse to a randomized allocation of these responses after people had clearly marked a close relationship preference on the census form.

As a result of these changes in the processing routine, estimates of same-sex unmarried partners are not comparable between the 1990 and 2000 Census. We believe 2000 estimates of this category are better estimates than those produced in 1990. It should also be noted that estimates of opposite-sex unmarried partners, however, were not affected by these editing procedures and changes, and are comparable between the two censuses.

For further information on this topic, please contact the Fertility and Family Statistics Branch on 301-457-2416.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Don Ferree
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2001 2:46 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Unwed Partners Up 72% in U.S. (Fields LATimes)

Fellow AAPORNETERS,

One immediate reaction is that this raises all sorts of "baseline" questions, most of which the piece fails to answer. Consider that an increase from 4% incidence to 7% (a three percentage point increase) corresponds to a 75% increase. This contrasts with an increase from 60% to 80%, which is more than six times larger in terms of prevalence but a relative increase of one-third. This is parallel to saying that an increase in salary from $40,000 to $70,000 contrasted with one from $6,000,000 to $8,000,000 means that a disproportionate amount of raise went to the person
with the lower salary. If one looks just to percentage increase, the situation looks very different than if one uses another metric (absolute increase or proportion of total increase going to one person).

Don

My guess is that more than a few AAPORNeters will be interested in this reporting by Robin Fields of the Los Angeles Times. I look forward to your reactions.

-- Jim
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Unwed Partners Up 72% in U.S.

DEMGRAPHICS: THE NUMBER OF COUPLES LIVING TOGETHER ROSE THE MOST IN THE BIBLE BELT AND THE GREAT PLAINS DURING THE '90S. THE TREND APPEARS TO BE FIRMLY ESTABLISHED.

By ROBIN FIELDS
Times Staff Writer

Like divorce and single parenthood in earlier times, cohabitation spilled out of big cities and university towns in the 1990s and has become part of life even in the nation's most conservative regions, U.S. census data show.

The number of unmarried-partner households rose 31% in the '90s in Los Angeles County, the birthplace of palimony, but shot up 72% nationwide. The largest gains came in the Bible Belt and across the Great Plains.

Even in seven states where laws against cohabitation remain on the books, living together almost doubled over the decade of the '90s, according to the 2000 census data.

"I don't see us formalizing," said Chris Sheets, who lives with her partner, John May, in the North Carolina Outer Banks hamlet of Kill Devil Hills. North Carolina is one of the states that still outlaws cohabitation. "Neither of us is religious and we need no wedding presents to further clutter our house."

So widespread has cohabitation become that some rural counties in Wyoming and Minnesota now have the same ratio of unmarried-partner households as do more urban counties in New York and California.
Within California, cohabitating couples are about as common in towns with populations of 5,000 or less as in cities of 100,000 or more.

"The tolerance is not just in the elite areas," said Stephanie Coontz, co-chairwoman of the Council on Contemporary Families. "Cultural acceptance and science have broken the old tight equation of marriage and child-rearing. All forms of families are claiming legitimacy and, to some extent, are getting it."

Social scientists continue to debate whether the increase in cohabitation further undermines the stability of the traditional American family. Some studies have shown that cohabitation serves as a valuable premarital compatibility test, while others have found that couples who live together before marrying are more likely to get divorced.

But for good or ill, the trend seems firmly established. Government policies have changed to accommodate live-in relationships and those changes, in turn, have institutionalized them in both law and language.

Live-in lovers in the age of AIDS metamorphosed into domestic partners, removing much of the stigma of such relationships and fighting for health care and workplace rights.

"Just the term 'unmarried partner' gave it a dignity and social category," said Paula Ettelbrick, family policy director of the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force.

Pressured by courts and constituents, cities and states created registries of unmarried couples during the 1990s, giving them rights that were the same--or similar to--those granted to spouses on hospital visitations, access to children's school records and a variety of government benefits.

A number of prominent companies redefined their benefits policies to include partners, as did some insurers, credit unions, health clubs and airlines--concessions fought for and won mostly by gay groups, but enjoyed as well by the much larger population of heterosexual unmarried couples.

In California, opposite-sex couples constitute about 86% of unmarried-partner households.

For most people, cohabitation remains a transitory phase on the way to marriage or breakup. University of Wisconsin researchers have found that about 50% of couples now live together before a first marriage, up from just 10% a generation ago, and about two-thirds do so before a second marriage.

But about 95% of such couples marry or end their relationship within five years.

Alternative to Marriage for Some
"It's a test run," said Kit Russell of Goleta, who expects to wed her live-in partner and is convinced that the experience saved her from a disastrous marriage to a previous boyfriend.

Still, researchers say the 2000 census also captured a burgeoning group of unmarried partners who see cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, not a precursor.

Made wary by their parents' divorces or their own missteps, long-term cohabitants look for individualistic arrangements that exist outside what their state, religion or relatives dictate, said Scott Coltrane, a sociology professor at UC Riverside.

"When couples get married, there are expectations about gender roles, about having children, about settling down," said Sidelia Reyna, who lives with Todd Bennett, her partner of more than five years, in Oxford, Ohio. "It makes more sense for couples to figure out their own rules."

For same-sex couples, three forces came together in the '90s that served to persuade partners to live more openly, even in places formerly thought of as hostile territory.

AIDS activism, the fight for domestic-partner status and an emerging movement that espoused legalizing gay marriages combined to make same-sex couples more visible than ever and more comfortable with being so, said Kim Mills, education director for the Human Rights Campaign.

In 1990, less than half the nation's counties reported any same-sex, unmarried-partner households. In 2000, almost all reported some.

Although San Francisco predictably led the list of metropolitan areas with the highest percentage of households made up of same-sex partners, Portland, Maine; Burlington, Vt.; Asheville, N.C.; and Springfield, Mass., all ranked in the top 15 in that category--ahead of New York and Los Angeles.

"We still run into politicians who say, 'I don't have any gay constituents,' " Mills said. "Once we get these [census] numbers, we can say, 'Yes, you do.' "

Though the new data indicate Americans' comfort with cohabitation deepened in the last decade, it lags well behind that of Western Europeans and Canadians, who have embraced and codified such relationships for decades. The U.S. Census Bureau's unmarried-partner category dates back only to 1990.

Even in middle age, many U.S. cohabitants confess they still struggle to reconcile their lifestyle with their parents' wishes.

In North Carolina, Sheets says her father has repeatedly told her he wants to see her married before he dies. "That's a bit of pressure, for sure," she said.

Younger couples get little guff; many of their parents have cohabited too.
"They didn't have the right to give me attitude," said James Olson, 28, who has lived with his girlfriend in South Pasadena for about six months.

On a societal scale, the backlash against increased cohabitation may take forms that go beyond parental disapproval.

Those who see the census figures as further evidence of the erosion of the traditional family are pushing for changes in the tax code and other federal programs to promote traditional unions.

Studies show that an increasing number of unmarried-partner households also include children. If these relationships are less stable than marriages, children will experience more flux as well, said Pamela Smock, a sociology professor at the University of Michigan.

Long-term unmarried couples, however, say their relationships are every bit as permanent as those cemented with wedding vows.

Shannon, a woman who lives in Burbank with her partner of six years but asked that her last name not be used, said the marriage ritual itself held little meaning for her.

"Other than dressing up in a beautiful dress and having one day that is totally about me, I have no real desire to be married," she said. "Which is not to say that I don't want a committed relationship. I do, and that is what I have."
I will be out of the office until September 5th. If you need help in the meantime, please call Barry Seltser at 202-512-3234.

(fran)
Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
featherstonf@gao.gov
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Dear Aapornet,

We will be doing a project with a coffee house chain that plans to test 30 product concepts over a 3 day period (10 per day) at one store using wireless devices.

What type of sampling methodology is recommended to achieve a 95% confidence factor per product? We're interested in the attribute of randomness (i.e. interview every 7th person), and the recommended number of completes per product.

Thanks,
Dan

Can anyone give tell me if you report "don't know" and "refused" frequencies in your reports and charts or do you recode them and leave them out.
Thanks,
Terrie

> Can anyone give tell me if you report "don't know" and "refused" frequencies in your reports and charts or do you recode them and leave them out.

It depends on the purpose of the research.

For descriptive purposes (e.g., distribution of opinions on a topic), I keep the DK/NR since they represent a valid position. The same is true when describing a factual component such as income; in these cases, the proportion of DK/NR is an indicator of reliability.

For analytical purposes (e.g., the relationship between X and Y), I exclude the DK/NR most of the time.

Benoît Gauthier, mailto:gauthier@circum.com Rêseau Circum inc. / Circum Network Inc.
For us, it all depends on the context and objective of the survey, and the magnitude of the non-response.

And report to who? In the press release, the project summary report, or the technical report? Readers of each of those will have a different level of interest and expertise that would enable them to appreciate the details.

For "main reason they don't have health insurance," we include it even in the chartbook. Heck, that's an interesting data point, that 5% don't know or refuse to say why they don't have health coverage.

But for most other things, we do not include the don't know/refused as a category.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
I believe don't know or undecided are valid responses and should always be included. At one time undecided respondents were considered uncooperative; i.e., withholding their actual preference.

Occasionally, re-percentaging after excluding the don't knows to show response from "decided" respondents only can be useful.

Our refusals are generally quite low on questions we ask except for income. I generally include them in the base for percentaging - except for voting questions. On voting questions, refusal is quite low; e.g., in eight trial heats for Illinois Governor last May, refusals were less than 1% of the full sample.
I don't believe recoding is a valid option.

Nick

Teresa Hottle wrote:

> Can anyone give tell me if you report "don't know" and "refused" frequencies in your reports and charts or do you recode them and leave them out.
> Thanks,
> Terrie

--------------0A0F7C93B87B7A868D0AD26D8
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;
   name="mail.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Nick Panagakis
Content-Disposition: attachment;
   filename="mail.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Panagakis;Nick
tel;fax:847-259-7259
tel;work:847-259-7200
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Market Shares Corporation
adr:;;999 North Elmhurst;Mt Prospect;IL;60056;
version:2.1
eemail;internet:mail@marketsharescorp.com
x-mozilla-cpt:;1
fn:Nick Panagakis
end:vcard
--------------0A0F7C93B87B7A868D0AD26D8--
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MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
I would have to agree with Colleen.

Most journalists do a valiant effort of being as accurate as possible while being as economical with words as is humanly possible. It is easy to blabber on and on in an academic article — it is a different language, after all — but the average journalist has to make the same point (and make it relevant) in a fraction of the time and space. And the journalist often comes to the topic with little background understanding and has to crib in a hurry.

It is easy to sneer or throw your hands up in despair, until you have had to do it yourself...

Incidently, if any AAPORRees would like some help perfecting opinion-editorial articles of their own, feel free to contact me. I have several years of experience writing them and getting them published in major papers and am helping on a more organized basis with the American Statistical Association at the moment — we're aiming to get better statistical understanding into the public mix.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Colleen K.
Porter
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2001 7:22 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: confessions of a journalist

Well, I'm enclosing the full text of the current piece that made me sigh, but it could be about any topic. All of my editorials have percentages and data and references...

When I first started writing editorials a year ago, I was so determined to do a thorough job of research, and to properly cite and credit everything.

I hated it when those dumb journalists would gloss over my own studies to the point of misinterpretation, or failed to give proper credit. By golly, I was gonna do it RIGHT.
But then I ran up against the 450-word space limitation. Okay, I can get up to 650 words if I write a "Sunday thumbsucker" like this one, a longer "think" piece. But that's not much longer!!!

It's hardly enough to do ANYTHING. You can't have more than maybe three ideas. You don't get to really explore any issue. And you sure as heck shortchange the citations.

I know the 1997 study below was really by the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and the Harvard School of Public Health. I just ran out of room. Sorry about that.

A few months ago I did an editorial about the Bush plan to offer vouchers so that people without health insurance could purchase coverage. I wrote....

When asked why they didn't have health insurance, "Can't afford it" was the most common reason cited, for about 74 percent of uninsured Floridians.

Of course, to save words, it was tempting to say......

About 74 percent of uninsured Floridians said they couldn't afford health insurance.

Except that isn't accurate; many proxy responses were involved, so people didn't always "say" but had the reason told about them. Fortunately, my editor trusts that if I'm going to be that obtusely wordy, there's a reason for it.

I happened to know the details of that survey, because I managed the data collection. But I can't know that level of detail for every study on which I report. I am going to make a blooper of a mistake, eventually. Even though I was trying.

I do enough research to write a very solid 25-page term paper and instead distill it down to 450 words. Which means I often make no money at all writing these pieces, because I'm paid by the piece. Ah well, my gift to the community.

I am learning to develop a lot of sympathy for those dumb journalists, after all. Try to be patient with them when they call you asking questions about your studies!

Colleen Kay Porter, editorial writer and columnist, The Gainesville Sun
Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, University of Florida
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
SUN EDITORIAL: Screening for HIV

Nearly half of pregnant women in the U.S. have not been tested for HIV, according to a study in this month's issue of the American Journal of Public Health. Prenatal testing has long been controversial, as we struggle to balance women's privacy rights with concern over newborn's health.

While mother-to-baby transmission is the most common cause of HIV infection in children, drug treatment during pregnancy drastically lowers the risk that the baby will be born infected. AIDS among children is becoming a preventable disease; the number of new pediatric AIDS cases in the U.S. has dropped 75 percent over the years from 1992 to 1998.

In 1995, the U.S. Public Health Service issued guidelines suggesting universal counseling and voluntary testing for all expectant mothers. The rate of testing has increased, from 41% in 1994 to 56% in 1999.

Those guidelines were revised last year, with continued emphasis on making HIV testing just another of the routine battery of prenatal tests, which has long included screening for syphilis. The new policy also affirmed that testing should be voluntary, with expectant moms having the right to refuse the test for HIV.

However, leaving the test voluntary does raise some issues, since the guidelines are not being followed uniformly.

The study published this month found that pregnant women were more likely to be tested if they lived in the South, were not employed, were young (18 to 24 years), and had never been married.

A report by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also found that some health care providers did not offer testing to every pregnant woman because "of the provider's belief that they could predict which women were most at risk."

What's happening is "profiling," as physicians choose which women to test for HIV based on their demographics. It would be fairer and more effective
to encourage testing for every expectant mom.

Consider the case of Mary Fisher, the white, well-to-do mother of two whose compelling speech about AIDS was a highlight of the 1992 Republican National Convention. Fisher had acquired HIV through marital sex. Would her private doctor in an affluent suburban office have recommended testing for HIV?

Thanks to the new treatment and increased testing, the number of babies born with HIV has plummeted over the last decade, with estimates of 300 to 400 infected babies born each year. But the staggering price tag of caring for each of those children offsets the cost of testing, not to mention the moral implications of giving a child a death sentence at birth.

In the absence of an effective voluntary system of HIV testing for pregnant women, some public health advocates will continue to push for mandatory testing. In 1996, the American Medical Association passed a resolution favoring mandatory testing. A 1997 poll conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that 73 percent of Americans thought requiring HIV tests for all pregnant women was "a good idea."

In reality, mandating testing will not ensure identification of all babies at risk, if the pregnant woman never sees a health care provider. About 15 percent of HIV-infected mothers get no prenatal care at all, compared to only 2 percent of pregnant women in general.

New York state has side-stepped the issue of women's rights by passing a law requiring HIV testing of newborns, but that is really too late to make a difference. Testing of newborns merely allows an early diagnoses--it is too late to actually prevent the baby from acquiring the virus.

The steps toward a workable policy of voluntary testing seem clear: every physician should recommend testing to all pregnant women, irregardless of skin color or social status. Health insurance companies should cover the cost of HIV testing as they would any other prenatal test. And every expectant mother should consider having the HIV test as the first of many steps she will take to ensure her child's health.
I agree with Nick that removing refusals or not sures is unwise. It is equivalent of saying the true answers for these respondents fall proportionately the same as those who divulged their answers. And, that may not be true. There may be bias in non-response--those who refuse to report income may be higher on the scale than those who cooperate. So, we report the not sures and refusals.

There are exceptions with some analyses, which we make very clear to our clients. For example, if we are testing favorability toward candidates, then the proportion saying they are very favorable is highly dependent upon the proportion who don't know enough about the candidate to rate him or her. You can only get a very high favorability rating if the not sures are low. And, you cannot get a high favorability rating if the not sures are high. To put all candidates on a level playing field, we also report the favorability data with not sures removed, and label this as "among those who know enough to rate," along with the dropped base n. The inverse of the proportion saying not sure can be considered a recognition score, so you've doubled the amount of information you get from one question.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
equivalent of saying the true answers for these respondents fall proportionately the same as those who divulged their answers. And, that may not be true. There may be bias in non-response--those who refuse to report income may be higher on the scale than those who cooperate. So, we report the not sures and refusals.

There are exceptions with some analyses, which we make very clear to our clients. For example, if we are testing favorability toward candidates, then the proportion saying they are very favorable is highly dependent upon the proportion who don't know enough about the candidate to rate him or her. You can only get a very high favorability rating if the not sures are low. And, you cannot get a high favorability rating if the not sures are high. To put all candidates on a level playing field, we also report the favorability data with not sures removed, and label this as "among those who know enough to rate," along with the dropped base n. The inverse of the proportion saying not sure can be considered a recognition score, so you've doubled the amount of information you get from one question.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
I also endorse responses "out of the box" as valid responses. For example, I recently found that "don't know" rates on basic science knowledge significantly varied by gender and educational level, while refusal rates on these items were practically nonexistent.

Code separately. If you later want to create a new variable where you merge don't knows, item refusals and other responses, it is a moment's work.

Susan
Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776
For what it is worth I have long noticed that there are often significant
difference
in levels of DK responses by gender on knowledge type questions. Women more
so
than
men are likely to respond DK to these types of questions (in my experience).

I leave the hypothesizing about the underlying reason(s) for this apparent
difference
to those more brave than I.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
Greetings,

What are the latest findings on the effects of cash incentives on increasing response rates of surveys with 'Teachers or Principals'?

When the study is 'longitudinal' with teachers, principals, and district administrators over years, what insights do you have on the use of incentives to induce cooperation of teacher or principal respondents?

How would you vary the use of cash incentives in a mixed mode involving telephone survey, mail survey, f-t-f survey, or electronic survey over the course of data collection? Would up-front cash incentives of $20, or its variation (we see most effective in studies of incentives) be still effective in surveys with teachers, principals, and school district administrators?

Regards,

Asaph Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 944-5325
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION, AND TESTING METHODS (QDET)

CALL FOR ABSTRACTS FOR CONTRIBUTED PAPERS

DEADLINE: Abstracts of no more than 200 WORDS are due SEPTEMBER 1, 2001

Abstracts should be submitted online through the CONFERENCE WEBSITE: www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet

CONFERENCE DATES: November 14-17, 2002

LOCATION: Radisson Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina

QDET will be the first international conference devoted exclusively to the methods used for questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing, and will bring together researchers and survey practitioners working in this area, to stimulate research papers that contribute to the science of reducing measurement error through questionnaire evaluation, to provide documentation of the current practices, and to stimulate new ideas for future practice.

Both INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTED PAPER PROPOSALS and SPECIAL CONTRIBUTED PAPER SESSION PROPOSALS are encouraged. Special Contributed Sessions are arranged in advance by an organizer and include four speakers and a discussant (proposals should indicate Special Session status and include four abstracts).

Papers are encouraged in a wide range of areas related to questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing methods, including but not limited to:

Cognitive interviewing, behavior coding, interviewer/respondent debriefing, usability testing, split-sample experiments, psychometric analysis, establishment survey testing, question design for special populations, and questionnaire standards and practical issues.

QUESTIONS ABOUT CONTRIBUTED PAPERS: Contact Gordon Willis: willisg@mail.nih.gov
Some of you may remember last year when Harris filed a lawsuit against AOL, MAPs and other ISPs for blocking their mail. Now it seems that Harris has moved to what spam fighters call confirmed opt-in.

Here is MAPS Press Release http://www.mail-abuse.org/pressreleases/2001-08-21.html

And Harris'

BTW they still say this at the bottom of every press release "The Harris Interactive Internet-based forecasts for the 2000 election were the most accurate in the history of the polling industry."

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
WASHINGTON, Aug. 21 /U.S. Newswire/ -- In an attempt to breathe new life into a sputtering effort to secure amnesty for millions of illegal aliens living in the United States, two of the leading advocacy groups for illegal immigrants released a poll purporting to show popular support for such a measure. The poll, which was commissioned by the Service Employees International Union and Catholic Healthcare West, is a classic example of a "push poll" designed to elicit exactly the responses that those who paid to have in conducted want to hear, charged the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).

The amnesty idea, first floated by the White House in early July, has proven to be such an unpopular one that the administration does not expect that the issue will be dealt with until after the 2002 midterm elections. In an effort at damage control, the Bush Administration has been beating a hasty retreat, insisting that what they are proposing is not an amnesty, but rather a "guest worker" program, or "earned regularization."

"This push poll is a desperate attempt by some of the leading illegal alien advocacy groups to stop the bleeding," accused Dan Stein, executive director of FAIR. "By presenting some very carefully selected facts, they managed to get some poll results that are more favorable to their point of view. Unfortunately for them, when the debate about amnesty begins in earnest, all the facts about what a massive illegal alien amnesty will mean to the United States will be on the table."

A memo from pollsters Celinda Lake and Ed Goeas concedes that when first asked about the idea of an illegal alien amnesty, respondents were opposed to the idea. But, "when voters hear details about a potential proposal," their opinions change. "Goeas' and Lake's 'details were very carefully selected," charged Stein. "Respondents were told that the amnesty would legalize 'a limited number of undocumented immigrants.' What they
were not told was that it would be 'limited' to about 3 million people under the Administration's initial plan, and about 8 million under the proposal offered by congressional Democrats."

The poll also used vague language about "working at a job" and "paying taxes" to describe those who would be the beneficiaries of an amnesty. "Taxpayers includes everyone who has ever bought a pack of gum and paid sales tax," said Stein. "What the questioners do not reveal is that the basic services -- like public education, health care and the like -- far outweigh the tax contribution most illegal aliens can make on their meager wages, even if their employer is reporting and withholding.

"Other important 'details' that were omitted by the questioners is the extent to which illegal immigrants are receiving direct welfare assistance," Stein noted. "The latest Census data reveal that 25 percent of Mexican illegal immigrant-headed households are receiving at least one major form of welfare. Most of these people are taxpayers in addition to being tax consumers."

"When people are confronted with limited information, carefully selected by advocates for a particular viewpoint, it is easy to skew poll results," said Stein. "When people have all the facts about granting amnesty to millions of people who broke the law, their opinions are very different. If there was widespread public support for an illegal alien amnesty, the Administration would not have backed off so quickly, and an obvious push poll is unlikely to change that reality."

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org
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Subject: UNSUBSCRIBE AAPORNET
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MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain
I would like to temporarily suspend my inclusion on the AAPORNET listserve - until September 5.

Please advise if I have to go about this in another way.

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Decima Research Inc.
Ottawa, Ontario
613-230-2013
e-mail: kneuman@decima.ca

I have been unable to find the poll release to which this refers to check FAIRs slant on things. Does anyone know if it is on the web?

A quick check of Service Employees International Union and Catholic Healthcare West sites found nothing.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
from U.S. Newswire:

'Push Poll' Purports to Show Support for Illegal Alien Amnesty, Says FAIR

Amnesty, Says FAIR

To: National Desk

Contact: David Ray of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), 202-328-7004

WASHINGTON, Aug. 21 /U.S. Newswire/ -- In an attempt to breathe new life into a sputtering effort to secure amnesty for millions of illegal aliens living in the United States, two of the leading advocacy groups for illegal immigrants released a poll purporting to show popular support for such a measure. The poll, which was commissioned by the Service Employees International Union and Catholic Healthcare West, is a classic example of a "push poll" designed to elicit exactly the responses that those who paid to have in conducted want to hear, charged the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).

The amnesty idea, first floated by the White House in early July, has proven to be such an unpopular one that the administration does not expect that the issue will be dealt with until after the 2002 midterm elections. In an effort at damage control, the Bush Administration has been beating a hasty retreat, insisting that what they are proposing is not an amnesty, but rather a "guest worker" program, or "earned regularization."

"This push poll is a desperate attempt by some of the leading illegal alien advocacy groups to stop the bleeding," accused Dan Stein, executive director of FAIR. "By presenting some very carefully selected facts, they managed to get some poll results that are more favorable to their point of view. Unfortunately for them, when the debate about amnesty begins in earnest, all the facts about what a massive illegal alien amnesty will mean to the United States will be on the table."

A memo from pollsters Celinda Lake and Ed Goeas concedes that when first asked about the idea of an illegal alien amnesty, respondents were opposed to the idea. But, "when voters hear details about a potential proposal," their opinions change. "Goeas' and Lake's 'details were very carefully selected," charged Stein. "Respondents were told that the amnesty would legalize 'a limited number of undocumented immigrants.' What they were not told was that it would be 'limited' to about 3 million people under the Administration's initial plan, and about 8 million under the proposal offered by congressional Democrats."

The poll also used vague language about "working at a job" and "paying taxes" to describe those who would be the beneficiaries of an amnesty. "Taxpayers includes everyone who has ever bought a pack of gum and paid sales tax," said Stein. "What the questioners do not reveal is that the basic services -- like public education, health care and the like -- far outweigh the tax contribution most illegal aliens can make on their meager wages, even if their employer is reporting and withholding."

"Other important 'details' that were omitted by the questioners is the extent to which illegal immigrants are receiving direct welfare assistance," Stein noted. "The latest Census data reveal that 25 percent of Mexican illegal immigrant-headed households are receiving at least one major form of welfare. Most of these people
are taxpayers in addition to being tax consumers. "When people are confronted with limited information, carefully selected by advocates for a particular viewpoint, it is easy to skew poll results," said Stein. "When people have all the facts about granting amnesty to millions of people who broke the law, their opinions are very different. If there was widespread public support for an illegal alien amnesty, the Administration would not have backed off so quickly, and an obvious push poll is unlikely to change that reality."

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org

I have been involved in the development of a research program for a major nonprofit health organization for the past 3 years. As I go through the process, I am increasingly anxious to know what other nonprofits are doing in the way of volunteer research. Because this tends to be a rather specialized area, and because I have had little luck in finding comparables among other nonprofits, I feel as if I am forging new ground. However I am still hankering for other research I can use as I
move ahead in the process.

Does anyone have any literature references you can point me to that are specific to research among volunteers for nonprofits (health nonprofits preferred)?

Thanks.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com

You might contact the Indiana University Center for Philanthropy. They have tons of data on all sorts of NPO's. Brian Vargus Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory

Margaret Roller wrote:

> I have been involved in the development of a research program for a major nonprofit health organization for the past 3 years. As I go through the process, I am increasingly anxious to know what other nonprofits are doing in the way of volunteer research. Because this tends to be a rather specialized area, and because I have had little luck in finding comparables among other nonprofits, I feel as if I am forging new ground. However I am still hankering for other research I can use as I move ahead in the process.

> Does anyone have any literature references you can point me to that are specific to research among volunteers for nonprofits (health nonprofits preferred)? Thanks.
I was wondering if anyone has done research in which you asked respondents to fill out a physical activity log. We are doing an RDD study, and would send the activity log to them after the interview, with a $20 incentive. The log would cover a 7 day period. I would like to know what kind of response we could expect and whether or not the incentive is high enough. thanks, Linda
I've done an activity log. Because the client was cheap we just had a $2 incentive (!) and yet we got close to 70% response rate (using a panel). However, item non-response was probably high (did they not do the activity or just leave it blank?).

My advice is to make the activity log the only thing they have to fill out, make sure the log is designed in a way that's really logical, readable and straightforward. Test the log out before you send it out widely.

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Informative, Inc.
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 310
Brisbane, CA  94005
v: 650 534-1080; f: 650 534-1020
m: 650 303-4072
www.informative.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@srl.uic.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2001 12:41 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: activity logs

I was wondering if anyone has done research in which you asked respondents to fill out a physical activity log. We are doing an RDD study, and would send the activity log to them after the interview, with a $20 incentive. The log would cover a 7 day period. I would like to know what kind of response we could expect and whether or not the incentive is high enough. thanks, Linda
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-0700 (PDT)
Received: from tomts6-srv.bellnexxia.net (tomts6.bellnexxia.net
Aren't the time log experts at the U of Maryland, where diaries go back two generations?

- Marc Zwelling -

Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991

See what's new at Vector:
http://www.vectorresearch.com/

----- Original Message -----
From: "Linda Owens" <lindao@srl.uic.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2001 3:41 PM
Subject: activity logs

I was wondering if anyone has done research in which you asked respondents to fill out a physical activity log. We are doing an RDD study, and would send the activity log to them after the interview, with a $20 incentive. The log would cover a 7 day period. I would like to know what kind of response we could expect and whether or not the incentive is high enough.

> thanks,
> Linda
>
At 02:41 PM 8/22/01 -0500, you wrote:
> I was wondering if anyone has done research in which you asked
> respondents
> to fill out a physical activity log. We are doing an RDD study, and would
> send the activity log to them after the interview, with a $20
> incentive. The log would cover a 7 day period. I would like to know what
> kind of response we could expect and whether or not the incentive is high
> enough.
> thanks,
> Linda

The TV Rating System is still handled mostly with diaries. You might be
able to get some good info from Nielsen Media Research in Dunedin, FL. You
can start by contacting Bob Love at 727-738-3000 ex 7173.

Richard Rands
Margaret:

A few years ago, CSR assisted a team of researchers funded by RWJ in a nationwide, mail-out survey of volunteers at Hospices. The instrument was lengthy but quite well-developed and seemed to work well. The survey involved volunteers and also volunteer coordinators, I believe. Results should be available from RWJ, and you might also wish to contact one of the investigators, John Herrmann. John is now in the private sector and I believe his e-mail is Herrmannjohn@praintl.com.

Hope this helps.

Tom

cc: John H.

On Wed, 22 Aug 2001 13:59:14 -0400 Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com> wrote:

> I have been involved in the development of a research program for a
> major nonprofit health organization for the past 3 years. As I go
> through the process, I am increasingly anxious to know what other
> nonprofits are doing in the way of volunteer research. Because this
> tends to be a rather specialized area, and because I have had little
> luck in finding comparables among other nonprofits, I feel as if I am
> forging new ground. However I am still hankering for other research I
> can use as I move ahead in the process.
> >
> Does anyone have any literature references you can point me to that
> are specific to research among volunteers for nonprofits (health
> nonprofits preferred)? Thanks.
> >
> Margaret R. Roller
> Roller Marketing Research
> rmr@rollerresearch.com

Thomas M. Guterbock
Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From dhagan@partnersinc.com Wed Aug 22 13:40:21 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
id f7MKelJL19163 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Aug 2001
We did a 7 day Paper and Pencil TV Diary for a $5 incentive, given up front. We had returns from 40% of those that agreed to participate.

We also mailed a 92 page self-administered mailed questionnaire and got acceptably completed booklets back from 29%, again among an RDD sample of 'agreeers'. Topic was mostly personal = financial data and some attitudinal stuff. Outbound mailer used = USPS Priority Mail. Incentives in this case were either $10 or = $12. Either $2 or $5 up front, followed by either $10 or $5 upon completion.

And, then a 20 page self-administered mailed questionnaire with a $5 up front incentive yielded a 70% return rate. Topic was mostly attitudinal questions relating to life = styles and communication events. In this study, we used USPS = Priority Mail for the outbound service and we think it had a = significant impact compared with similar 1st class mailings completed = in the past. We hope to test this in the future.
All studies were large scale (mailed to over 4,000 = households in each case) national, fully proportionate RDD samples of = all adults 18+. All were conducted within the last 18 = months. </font></p>

Hope this helps!</font></p>

Dan Hagan</font></p>

LHK Partners Inc.</font></p>
<p>
<p>
<p></p>

-----Original Message-----</font></p>

From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@srl.uic.edu]</font></p>

Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2001 3:41 PM</font> <br><font SIZE=3D2>To: aapornet@usc.edu</font> <br><font SIZE=3D2>Subject: activity logs</font></p>

I was wondering if anyone has done research in which = you asked respondents to fill out a physical activity log.&nbsp; We are = doing an RDD study, and would send the activity log to them after the = interview, with a $20 incentive.&nbsp; The log would cover a 7 day = period.&nbsp; I would like to know what kind of response we could = expect and whether or not the incentive is high enough.</font></p>

thanks,</font></p>

Linda</font></p>

</font></p>

From pjlavrakas@tvratings.com Wed Aug 22 14:53:12 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7MLrCJ06677 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Aug 2001 14:53:12 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from reliant.nielsenmedia.com (reliant.nielsenmedia.com
    [63.114.249.15])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA10428 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Aug 2001 14:53:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com (nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com
Linda,

As you may know, Nielsen Media Research samples more than a million households each year (using RDD) in order to mail them diaries to record one week of television viewing by their household. These diaries are certainly what could be termed "activity logs."

Apart from the $20 incentive you plan to use, your response rate will much depend on how well the instructions explain how to fill out the logs, how "friendly" the logs are to fill out, how complicated (i.e., "cognitively complex") the task really is, what type of mailer and return mailer you use, and whether or not you use follow-up/reminder contacts to encourage compliance.

Compared to the monetary incentives Nielsen uses to incent its respondents to record viewing habits of the entire household for a 7-day week, your $20 is VERY generous.

But as noted above, the dollar value is simply one factor among many that will influence your response rates.

PJL

*********************************************************************
Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Vice President & Senior Research Methodologist
NIELSEN MEDIA RESEARCH
299 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10171
OFFICE/VOICE: 212-708-7002
FAX: 212-708-7013
I was wondering if anyone has done research in which you asked respondents to fill out a physical activity log. We are doing an RDD study, and would send the activity log to them after the interview, with a $20 incentive. The log would cover a 7 day period. I would like to know what kind of response we could expect and whether or not the incentive is high enough. thanks, Linda
would get—I think they said "a gift" (I asked the recruiter if she would benefit if I participated and I think she said she would, so I told her I would participate because of that). I think they sent me $1 with the diary. And, I think they followed up to remind me to fill out the diary and mail it back (an answering machine message).

Is there a relationship between the quality of responses (however defined) and the amount of incentive paid?

I suppose the response also depends on the perception of how important the research is and the respondent's contribution to society on that subject/issue (socio-psychological incentive).

Cheers, Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Lavrakas, Paul
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2001 5:53 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: activity logs

Linda,

As you may know, Nielsen Media Research samples more than a million households each year (using RDD) in order to mail them diaries to record one week of television viewing by their household. These diaries are certainly what could be termed "activity logs."

Apart from the $20 incentive you plan to use, your response rate will much depend on how well the instructions explain how to fill out the logs, how "friendly" the logs are to fill out, how complicated (i.e., "cognitively complex") the task really is, what type of mailer and return mailer you use, and whether or not you use follow-up/reminder contacts to encourage compliance.

Compared to the monetary incentives Nielsen uses to incent its respondents to record viewing habits of the entire household for a 7-day week, your $20 is VERY generous.

But as noted above, the dollar value is simply one factor among many that will
influence your response rates.

PJL

*******************************************************************************
Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Vice President & Senior Research Methodologist
NIELSEN MEDIA RESEARCH
299 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10171
OFFICE/VOICE: 212-708-7002
FAX: 212-708-7013
HOME: 740-587-0223
*******************************************************************************

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@srl.uic.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2001 3:41 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: activity logs

I was wondering if anyone has done research in which you asked respondents to fill out a physical activity log. We are doing an RDD study, and would send the activity log to them after the interview, with a $20 incentive. The log would cover a 7 day period. I would like to know what kind of response we could expect and whether or not the incentive is high enough. thanks, Linda

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Aug 23 06:30:19 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7NDUJJ26626 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Aug 2001 06:30:19
    -0700 (PDT)
Received: from fuji.hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.145])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA05187 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Aug 2001 06:30:18 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from HPDom-Message_Server by fuji.hp.ufl.edu
    with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 23 Aug 2001 09:28:36 -0400
Message-Id: <sb84ccc4.023@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1
Date: Thu, 23 Aug 2001 09:28:05 -0400
From: "Colleen Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The pollster on "West Wing"
Mime-Version: 1.0
Well, last December I was in the hospital and saw this show for the first time, and was amazed. While I usually never watch television (not since Babylon 5 finished, anyway) I found myself starting to schedule laundry folding around Wednesday nights at 9 p.m.

It's a writer's show, with pithy lines so artfully crafted that no mere human would spontaneously speak them. The characters always get in those zinger lines that most of us only think of five minutes later, as we are walking away from the situation.

But I digress. The reason I mention it here is that I have to wonder how realistic it is to have an accomplished pollster who is deaf?

I cannot imagine being able to craft good questions without being able to hear the answers. A transcript isn't the same as hearing a respondent pause for half a second, or the tone of voice when they say they disagree. And you can't read lips over the phone.

On the other hand, a lot of folks who have perfectly good ears don't bother to take the time to monitor their studies, so maybe it isn't as essential as I assume.

Is there a real pollster they were basing the character on? Were the producers just looking for a vehicle for a popular actress? Or were the writers poking fun at pollsters, implying that anyone could do this job? (Geez, next season maybe they'll have an ape....)

I don't mean to be politically incorrect or prejudicial against the hearing impaired. I realize that many folks can lead very productive lives and have fantastic careers despite their lack of hearing. I can certainly imagine a deaf editorial writer.

But a deaf telephone pollster seems a bit like a blind airplane pilot.

Colleen (whose grandmother ran a market research firm for many years after becoming legally blind.)

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
No comment on the hearing ability of the pollster, but a few observations and an answer. Pat Caddell, who was Jimmy Carter's pollster is one of the show's consultants and I think one of the producers. That said, I blanch when I hear them refer to "top sheet" data, rather than topline data. And, they consistently talk about the phone "banks," in the plural, rather than the phone bank--meaning a bank of phones. But, the conversations they've portrayed questioning the wording of the standard "right direction, wrong track" question are deadly accurate. So, it's a mix.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
the hearing ability of the pollster, but a few observations and an answer. Pat Caddell, who was Jimmy Carter's pollster is one of the show's consultants and I think one of the producers. That said, I blanch when I hear them refer to "top sheet" data, rather than topline data. And, they consistently talk about the phone "banks," in the plural, rather than the phone bank--meaning a bank of phones. But, the conversations they've portrayed questioning the wording of the standard "right direction, wrong track" question are deadly accurate. So, it's a mix. J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. Selzer &amp; Company, Inc. Des Moines for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

--part1_bf.12cb745c.28b66ccc_boundary--

Apparently the Los Angeles Times is not backing off on its very own relentless expose' of the shacking up of the older demographic categories. Here's the latest Robin Fields installment of "Cohabitation Among the Single Seniors."

-- Jim

http://latimes.com/features/lifestyle/la-082301older.story
They're Older but Not Old-Fashioned About Love and Marriage

THE NUMBER OF SENIORS WHO CHOOSE TO LIVE TOGETHER HAS JUMPED SIGNIFICANTLY IN THE LAST DECADE

By ROBIN FIELDS
Times Staff Writer

They may be the most low-profile participants in one of the 2000 census' most high-profile trends. A small but growing number of Americans over age 65 now live as cohabiting couples, almost twice as many as a decade ago, census surveys show.

For older people, living together holds both emotional and financial attractions, but requires shedding moral inhibitions ingrained in youth and, at times, dealing with the squeamishness of children and longtime friends.

Demographers expect the portion of senior couples who cohabit to grow dramatically in the 2010 and 2020 censuses as baby boomers who rebelled in their 20s bring their attitudes into old age. For the swing generation of 60-and-overs captured in this census, however, living together remains a liberating, if conflict-laced, option.

"We grew up in a different generation," said Ruth Nippe, 79, who has lived with partner Jim McDaniel, 81, in Mission Viejo for four years. "I came from a small town in Nebraska. I would have been ostracized for sure for living this way. I guess I used to care more what people said."

The 2000 census data released so far shows that unmarried-partner households overall increased 72% in the last decade. Age-specific data will come later, but a clutch of other census surveys suggests that seniors, though constituting only a drop in the pool of cohabitants, may have met or outpaced that growth rate.

According to the Census Bureau's annual Current Population Survey, households made up of opposite-sex senior couples rose 46% between 1996 and 2000, a bigger jump than that of their middle-aged counterparts. Other reports fold in same-sex couples,
showing the number of senior cohabitants rising 73% between 1990 and 1999, from 127,000 to 220,000.

Though couples' reasons for living together can be as idiosyncratic as relationships themselves, researchers link the shift to other social changes.

Higher divorce rates and longer life expectancies, especially for women, mean the population of single seniors is growing rapidly, sociologists said. For younger couples, marriage is often linked to the prospect of parenthood; older couples typically are beyond this stage in life. Though eager for love and companionship, they may be skittish about formal ties.

Retired St. Louis college professors Carol Kohfeld, 61, and John Sprague, 67, met after enduring painful marital breakups and were determined not to go down that road again. "Once burned, twice shy," Sprague said. "I was married in 1955 and there were people who lived together then, but it wasn't something that really crossed your radar screen. Society had changed a great deal by the time I found myself divorced and single."

Researchers say older women, too, can be reluctant to re-up for marriage if they associate it with traditional gender roles played out in earlier relationships.

As potent as the emotional issues can be, pragmatism, not romance, often governs whether those older than 60 live together instead of getting hitched. Cohabitation, like marriage, allows older couples to share expenses, a crucial concern to those living on fixed incomes as life spans extend.

Not marrying, however, means couples do not take on the financial obligations of each other's long-term medical care or intermingle their retirement benefits. Such practicalities have kept Darlene Davis, 61, from marrying her partner of 17 years, Cary Cohen, 63. If the Norfolk, Va., pair wed, she would lose military benefits and insurance from her second marriage, which ended long ago with her husband's death. "We were not brought up to live in this position, but with our lives such as they are, we just can't afford to give up my medical coverage," Davis said.
While cohabiting seniors can--and often do--expressly provide for each other in their wills, unmarried partners do not have the same claims as spouses in many states. Many couples say they have left late-in-life relationships unofficial to avert conflict between the surviving partner and relatives.

"We didn't want to tie up our estates," Nippe of Mission Viejo said. "At our age, we have to think about when one of us isn't going to be here. Even though I'm very good friends with his kids, I wouldn't be comfortable if they ended up owning half of my house."

In California, where domestic partners have substantial rights, attorneys recommend that older couples with such concerns put property agreements in writing.

"It sets out a road map," said Stuart D. Zimring, an elder-law specialist in Los Angeles. Zimring recommends that unmarried seniors execute powers of attorney designating their partners to make health-care decisions if they are incapacitated. "There's nothing worse, if something happens, for there to be World War III," he said.

The 2000 census count may serve as merely a preview of sorts for what demographers expect to be faster growth in senior cohabitation 10 or 20 years from now.

About 40% of Americans currently in their 40s have cohabited at least once, said Larry Bumpass, a sociology professor at the University of Wisconsin and co-director of the National Survey of Families and Households, which tracks cohabitation. "I expect a very rapid transformation in the behavior of the elderly as those who grew up in the age of rapid acceptance of cohabitation reach old age," he said.

Ultimately, the most powerful force altering seniors' living arrangements may be the changing nature of aging.
"People are healthy enough to extend their middle-aged lifestyles into their old age," said Helen Fisher, a Rutgers University professor who studies older love. "Sex and romance are not just for the young."

http://latimes.com/features/lifestyle/la-082301older.story

Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
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>From gferree@ssc.wisc.edu Thu Aug 23 14:56:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f7NLuHJ24766 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Aug 2001
14:56:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu (charles.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.190.84])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA00611 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Aug 2001 14:56:15 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from uwsc ([144.92.97.60])
   by ssc.wisc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA90176
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Aug 2001 16:54:15 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <4.1.20010823163355.00b65880@ssc.wisc.edu>
X-Sender: gferree@ssc.wisc.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Thu, 23 Aug 2001 16:53:10 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: The pollster on "West Wing"
In-Reply-To: <bf.12cb745c.28b66ccc@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="="
--
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Four comments.

First, while I would no more be willing to suggest that being unable to hear would rule one out as a responsible pollster, it WOULD be appropriate for someone with a hearing impairment to be sensitive to the nuances which might be lost if one could not hear tone of voice and such and how one could "make up for that". By the same token, one who cannot see misses cues which are available to those who can, and should ask how they could "make up" for that as well. The general point, all
too often overlooked I think, is that there are all sorts of dimensions beyond how questions "seem" on paper, which we must all pay attention to.

Second, I was quite struck by the pollsters easy assurance that she could address a complex (and hypothetical) question in ninety-six hours from the first formulation of the concern to questionnaire design, fieldwork, AND analysis including nuances of views among subgroups and how different "takes" on the situation might affect response. Pat Caddell did in fact write the story for last nights episode, according to the credits, and while this does not mean he approves of every line, of course, I would have liked the pollster to have suggested some difficulties in her assignment without necessarily refusing it. Of course, this is drama, but if I had been involved in a TV script like this, I would have wanted NOT to give the "piece of cake" impression.

Thirdly, there was an interesting ethical dilemma posed. The question was what public reaction would likely be to hearing that the President had been diagnosed with MS prior to running, but concealed it during the campaign and the first years of his administration (a situation not unlike the plot of William Safire's novel Full Disclosure). The way our heroine deals with it is to conduct a national poll asking people how they would react to the governor of Michigan having a degenerative disease but not disclosing it. From the context, it strongly suggested that they would present this as fact, not as a hypothetical, making it parallel (at least) with "suppose I told you that Governor Pataki had slept with an intern in his office".

Finally, there have been numerous specific "insider views" of polling on West Wing, routinely showing surveys tapping public reaction in the space of an hour or two and throwing around lines similar to "the response rate is 12% so we're in good shape" (this is cited from memory and not from reading a script or reviewing a tape, but I think the sense was clear enough). Again, one does not expect that drama should fully respect the complexity of "real life", but I would hope those who cite West Wing not only as great TV entertainment (which I would certainly agree with)
but
uniquely accurate might think twice before reinforcing this sort of
impression.

Don (a fan of both West Wing and responsible survey research)

At 10:27 AM 08/23/2001 -0400, you wrote:
>
> No comment on the hearing ability of the pollster, but a few
> observations and
>
> an answer. Pat Caddell, who was Jimmy Carter's pollster is one of the
> show's
> consultants and I think one of the producers. That said, I blanch when I
> hear them refer to "top sheet" data, rather than topline data. And, they
> consistently talk about the phone "banks," in the plural, rather than the
> phone bank--meaning a bank of phones. But, the conversations they've
> portrayed questioning the wording of the standard "right direction, wrong
> track" question are deadly accurate. So, it's a mix.
>
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
> Selzer & Company, Inc.
> Des Moines
> JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
> JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
> Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

---
Armin Vossen, Ph.D.
Institute for Social Research
3620 East Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48207-2801
313-577-6466
ArminVossen@ISR.umich.edu
Visit our website at www.isr.umich.edu

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

Four comments.<br>
<br>
First, while I would no more be willing to suggest that being unable to
hear would rule one out as a responsible pollster, it WOULD be
appropriate for someone with a hearing impairment to be sensitive to the
nuances which might be lost if one could not hear tone of voice and such
and how one could &quot;make up for that&quot;.&nbsp; By the same token,
one who cannot see misses cues which are available to those who can, and
should ask how they could &quot;make up&quot; for that as well.&nbsp; The
general point, all too often overlooked I think, is that there are all
sorts of dimensions beyond how questions &quot;seem&quot; on paper, which
we must all pay attention to.&lt;br&gt;
<br>
Second, I was quite struck by the pollsters easy assurance that she could
address a complex (and hypothetical) question in ninety-six hours from
the first formulation of the concern to questionnaire design, fieldwork,
AND analysis including nuances of views among subgroups and how different
&quot;takes&quot; on the situation might affect response. Pat Caddell did in fact write the story for last night's episode, according to the credits, and while this does not mean he approves of every line, of course, I would have liked the pollster to have suggested some difficulties in her assignment without necessarily refusing it. Of course, this is drama, but if I had been involved in a TV script like this, I would have wanted NOT to give the &quot;piece of cake&quot; impression.<br>

Thirdly, there was an interesting ethical dilemma posed. The question was what public reaction would likely be to hearing that the President had been diagnosed with MS prior to running, but concealed it during the campaign and the first years of his administration (a situation not unlike the plot of William Safire's novel Full Disclosure). The way our heroine deals with it is to conduct a national poll asking people how they would react to the governor of Michigan having a degenerative disease but not disclosing it. From the context, it strongly suggested that they would present this as fact, not as a hypothetical, making it parallel (at least) with &quot;suppose I told you that Governor Pataki had slept with an intern in his office&quot;.<br>

Finally, there have been numerous specific &quot;insider views&quot; of polling on West Wing, routinely showing surveys tapping public reaction in the space of an hour or two and throwing around lines similar to &quot;the response rate is 12% so we're in good shape&quot;: (this is cited from memory and not from reading a script or reviewing a tape, but I think the sense was clear enough). Again, one does not expect that drama should fully respect the complexity of &quot;real life&quot;, but I would hope those who cite West Wing not only as great TV entertainment (which I would certainly agree with) but uniquely accurate might think twice before reinforcing this sort of impression.<br>

Don (a fan of both West Wing and responsible survey research) <br>

At 10:27 AM 08/23/2001 -0400, you wrote: <br>

&lt;blockquote type=cite cite&gt;No comment on the hearing ability of the pollster, but a few observations and an answer. Pat Caddell, who was Jimmy Carter's pollster is one of the show's consultants and I think one of the producers. That said, I blanch when I hear them refer to &quot;top sheet&quot; data, rather than topline data. And, they consistently talk about the phone &quot;banks&quot; in the plural, rather than the &lt;br&gt; phone bank--meaning a bank of phones. But, the conversations they've portrayed questioning the wording of the standard &quot;right direction, wrong track&quot; question are deadly accurate. So, it's a mix. &lt;br&gt; J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. &lt;br&gt; Selzer &amp; Company, Inc. &lt;br&gt; Des Moines &lt;br&gt; JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, &lt;br&gt; JASelzer@SelzerCo.com &lt;br&gt;
Before we all get excited about having a pollster with major influence on West Wing it may be useful to recall the Pat Caddell was censured by AAPOR for political polling practices.

warren mitofsky

At 04:53 PM 8/23/01 -0500, you wrote:
> Four comments.
First, while I would no more be willing to suggest that being unable to hear would rule one out as a responsible pollster, it WOULD be appropriate for someone with a hearing impairment to be sensitive to the nuances which might be lost if one could not hear tone of voice and such and how one could "make up for that". By the same token, one who cannot see misses cues which are available to those who can, and should ask how they could "make up" for that as well. The general point, all too often overlooked I think, is that there are all sorts of dimensions beyond how questions "seem" on paper, which we must all pay attention to.

Second, I was quite struck by the pollsters easy assurance that she could address a complex (and hypothetical) question in ninety-six hours from the first formulation of the concern to questionnaire design, fieldwork, AND analysis including nuances of views among subgroups and how different "takes" on the situation might affect response. Pat Caddell did in fact write the story for last nights episode, according to the credits, and while this does not mean he approves of every line, of course, I would have liked the pollster to have suggested some difficulties in her assignment without necessarily refusing it. Of course, this is drama, but if I had been involved in a TV script like this, I would have wanted NOT to give the "piece of cake" impression.

Thirdly, there was an interesting ethical dilemma posed. The question was what public reaction would likely be to hearing that the President had been diagnosed with MS prior to running, but concealed it during the campaign and the first years of his administration (a situation not unlike the plot of William Safire's novel Full Disclosure). The way our heroine deals with it is to conduct a national poll asking people how they would react to the governor of Michigan having a degenerative disease but not disclosing it. From the context, it strongly suggested that they would present this as fact, not as a hypothetical, making it parallel (at least) with "suppose I told you that Governor Pataki had slept with an intern in his office".

Finally, there have been numerous specific "insider views" of polling on West Wing, routinely showing surveys tapping public reaction in the space of an hour or two and throwing around lines similar to "the response rate is 12% so we're in good shape" (this is cited from memory and not from reading a script or reviewing a tape, but I think the sense was clear enough). Again, one does not expect that drama should fully respect the complexity of "real life", but I would hope those who cite West Wing not only as great TV entertainment (which I would certainly agree with) but uniquely accurate might think twice before reinforcing this sort of impression.

Don (a fan of both West Wing and responsible survey research)

At 10:27 AM 08/23/2001 -0400, you wrote:
>>No comment on the hearing ability of the pollster, but a few observations
>>and
>>an answer. Pat Caddell, who was Jimmy Carter's pollster is one of the show's consultants and I think one of the producers. That said, I blanch when I hear them refer to "top sheet" data, rather than topline data. And, they consistently talk about the phone "banks," in the plural, rather than the phone bank--meaning a bank of phones. But, the conversations they've portrayed questioning the wording of the standard "right direction, wrong
A controversial anti-spam group said Wednesday that it has agreed to remove a polling and market research firm from its database of suspected junk
e-mailers. The Mail Abuse Prevention System (MAPS <http://mail-abuse.org/>) said it has removed Harris Interactive from its database, known as the Realtime Blackhole List <http://mail-abuse.org/rbl/>. Some Internet service providers use the list of IP addresses, linked to alleged spammers, to block unwanted e-mail.

MAPS said that under the deal, Harris Interactive has agreed to change its opt-in system to confirm that the people on its mailing list want to receive its e-mail polls.

The agreement comes after a lengthy dispute that brought MAPS and Harris Interactive into the center of the debate over spam control. Last year, Harris Interactive sued MAPS because it had listed the market research firm in its database. The lawsuit was later dismissed.

Since then, MAPS said the pair had been working to reach an agreement that would remove the addresses from its database.

The agreement "means we've done good," said Anne Mitchell, MAPS' director of legal and public affairs. "We advocated a more responsible mailing-list practice where you make sure that everyone who signs up really wants your e-mail."

Mitchell called the agreement a "win-win-win situation:" Consumers get only e-mail they want, the business doesn't spend money sending e-mail to uninterested people; and the ISPs don't pay to deal with millions of pieces of unwanted e-mail.

"We're pleased now that all of our mail is going to get through to our panel members who have asked us to send it to them," said Dan Hucko, vice president and director of marketing communications at Harris Interactive.

"For a long time, there has been a small portion of our panel we weren't able to communicate with because we had been blocked."

Rochester, N.Y.-based Harris Interactive has a poll, dubbed "The Harris Poll," which conducts scientific market research. The company said it maintains a database of more than 7 million online panelists.

---

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org
Five Massachusetts high school students have filed a lawsuit against their school after they were suspended early this year over comments they made on a confidential survey about race relations.

The complaint was filed last week in U.S. District Court in Worcester against the Montachusett Regional Technical Vocational School District in Fitchburg and three of its administrators. It alleges the students were suspended without due process and had their rights to privacy and free speech violated, according to the Sentinel and Enterprise of Fitchburg.

"The real crux of everything here is that the students were told their answers were confidential, and that it was completely voluntary to respond," attorney Beverly Chorbajian told the Associated Press.

According to the lawsuit, filed by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of those suspended, the students were asked in late January to respond to a survey about race relations at the school in Fitchburg, 40 miles west of Boston. They were told to answer all the questions and then turn the survey in without putting their names on the forms.

School officials allegedly learned the students' identities from their answers, removed them from class and interrogated them, the AP reported.

The lawsuit said they were then suspended for three days in January for what the school called "behavior causing a dangerous condition" and making "racist comments."

The ACLU said the students' answers included remarks that minority students were receiving preferential treatment from teachers, and that minorities were responsible for some recent fights, according to the AP.

The suit asks that the suspensions be expunged from the students' records and that one student who left the school be reimbursed $25,000 in tuition.

School Superintendent Stratos Dukakis referred calls to the school's attorney, the AP reported. A message left at his offices after business hours on Aug. 17 was not immediately returned.

"I think this is a terrible lesson," Ronald C. Madnick, executive director of the Worcester County ACLU chapter and a former teacher who taught for more than 30 years, told the Sentinel and Enterprise. "Who can you trust if you can't trust your teachers and administrators?"

---

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
Hello West Wing Fans!

I didn't start screaming at the TV until the pollster, off the top of her head, substituted the Gov. of a mid-western state with the Pres. of the US. Govs don't send kids off to war, which is one area where honesty is paramount. On the next episode they softened the generalization, which helped my feelings some. Personally, I didn't start watching the show until some friends (who's taste I respect) stopped everything they were doing to see it. Now I'm hooked.

WendyLanders@LandersSurveys.com

Available for part-time and temporary assignments.

From: Warren Mitofsky <MITOFSKY@MINDSPRING.COM>
Before we all get excited about having a pollster with major influence on West Wing it may be useful to recall the Pat Caddell was censured by AAPOR for political polling practices.

warren mitofsky

At 04:53 PM 8/23/01 -0500, you wrote:

Four comments.

First, while I would no more be willing to suggest that being unable to hear would rule one out as a responsible pollster, it WOULD be appropriate for someone with a hearing impairment to be sensitive to the nuances which might be lost if one could not hear tone of voice and such and how one could "make up for that". By the same token, one who cannot see misses cues which are available to those who can, and should ask how they could "make up" for that as well. The general point, all too often overlooked I think, is that there are all sorts of dimensions beyond how questions "seem" on paper, which we must all pay attention to.

Second, I was quite struck by the pollsters easy assurance that she could address a complex (and hypothetical) question in ninety-six hours from the first formulation of the concern to questionnaire design, fieldwork, AND analysis including nuances of views among subgroups and how different
"takes" on the situation might affect response. Pat Caddell did in fact write the story for last nights episode, according to the credits, and while this does not mean he approves of every line, of course, I would have liked the pollster to have suggested some difficulties in her assignment without necessarily refusing it. Of course, this is drama, but if I had been involved in a TV script like this, I would have wanted NOT to give the "piece of cake" impression. Thirdly, there was an interesting ethical dilemma posed. The question was what public reaction would likely be to hearing that the President had been diagnosed with MS prior to running, but concealed it during the campaign and the first years of his administration (a situation not unlike the plot of William Safire's novel Full Disclosure). The way our heroine deals with it is to conduct a national poll asking people how they would react to the governor of Michigan having a degenerative disease but not disclosing it. From the context, it strongly suggested that they would present this as fact, not as a hypothetical, making it parallel (at least) with "suppose I told you that Governor Pataki had slept with an intern in his office".
Finally, there have been numerous specific "insider views" of polling on West Wing, routinely showing surveys tapping public reaction in the space of an hour or two and throwing around lines similar to "the response rate is 12% so we're in good shape" (this is cited from memory and not reading a script or reviewing a tape, but I think the sense was clear enough). Again, one does not expect that drama should fully respect the complexity of "real life", but I would hope those who cite West Wing not only as great TV entertainment (which I would certainly agree with) but uniquely accurate might think twice before reinforcing this sort of impression.

Don (a fan of both West Wing and responsible survey research) At 10:27 AM 08/23/2001 -0400, you wrote: No comment on the hearing ability of the pollster, but a few observations and an answer. Pat Caddell, who was Jimmy Carter's pollster is one of the show's consultants and I think one of the producers. That said, I blanch when I hear them refer to "top sheet" data, rather than topline data. And, they consistently talk about the phone "banks," in the plural, rather than the
phone bank--meaning a bank of phones. But, the conversations they've portrayed questioning the wording of the standard "right direction, wrong track" question are deadly accurate. So, it's a mix.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at http://explorer.msn.com
I'm working with colleagues in developing a research proposal where we will need about 500 telephone surveys completed in a couple of non-US locations (in addition to the work we will do here in the US). We are having difficulty locating an academic survey organization in Mexico with the expertise necessary to do the required work.

Do list members have contacts of this sort in Mexico? Private replies are preferred to avoid cluttering up the list traffic, but I would be glad to summarize to the list if there is interest from the group. Thanks very much.

Tim Johnson
Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois at Chicago
Please respond directly to Richard Cutler (contact info at end of msg).

>From: Richard Cutler <Richard.Cutler@cgu.edu>
>Date: Mon, 27 Aug 2001 15:13:55 -0700
>Subject: Wanted: bilingual interviewers for study

Hello all,

...I am happy to be able to pass on this opportunity for someone with qualitative interview experience. TRPI has a grant to interview Latino parents about how they successfully gained information about how to send their children to college. A single interviewer for each city is needed for roughly one month -- mid October to mid November -- in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. The requirements are below. Good pay, training, and assistance are provided.

Interviewer requirements:
TRPI is looking for an interviewer who can conduct in-person interviews with Latino parents who would be selected from a sample of telephone survey respondents. We want to know what sources of information and actions they took that resulted in a higher than expected level of "parental college knowledge." What we want from the face-to-face interviews are in-depth social histories. Time is of the essence. We expect 15 interviews to be completed during the period Oct. 15 - Nov. 5, 2001.

The ideal interviewer is bi-lingual in English and Spanish and has some post-graduate experience. Females are preferred. She has face-to-face interviewing experience and skill. She has her own transportation and knows the City (LA, Chicago or New York as appropriate).
She must have access to email and preferably a cell phone.
She may have to make calls and conduct in-person interviews days and evenings, depending upon when interviewees can be reached.
She must have flexible working hours so as to conduct interviews when respondents are at home.
She will be provided with prepaid mailers for regular shipments of taped interviews and any notes.
She will be provided with a TRPI phone card or a similar arrangement.
She will be provided with a quality portable cassette recorder with microphone.
She will work very closely with TRPI's recruiter who will obtain commitments and possible interview dates from prospective interviewees.
She will receive a paid day's training at TRPI in Claremont, CA, sometime in early October, where the details of interviewing technique and the interview scheduling process will be worked out.

Please refer any interested interviewer candidates to Dr. Richard Cutler at 909/621-8897 or richard.cutler@cgu.edu. He can discuss details and fee.

Thanks so much.

Richard Cutler, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute
Jennifer Mitchell
Director, International Division
Hispanic & Asian Marketing Communication Research, Inc./ SuperDatos de Mexico, SA de CV
Phone 650. 595 5028 x. 227. Fax 650.595 5407

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
- Marc Zwelling -
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991

See what's new at Vector:
http://www.vectorresearch.com/
----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Timothy Johnson" <tjohnson@sr1.uic.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2001 9:59 AM
Subject: Looking for Mexican Survey Organizations

> I'm working with colleagues in developing a research proposal where we
will need about 500 telephone surveys completed in a couple of non-US
locations (in addition to the work we will do here in the US). We are
having difficulty locating an academic survey organization in Mexico with
the expertise necessary to do the required work.
>
> Do list members have contacts of this sort in Mexico? Private replies are
preferred to avoid cluttering up the list traffic, but I would be glad to
summarize to the list if there is interest from the group. Thanks very
much.
>
> Tim Johnson
> Survey Research Laboratory
> University of Illinois at Chicago
>
>From Kosicki.1@osu.edu Tue Aug 28 09:02:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f7SG2bJ06768 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Aug 2001
09:02:37 -0700 (PDT)
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 JAA21060 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Aug 2001 09:02:40 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from CSRA144 (csr-a144.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.93.144])
   by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA05117;
   Tue, 28 Aug 2001 12:02:31 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <004c01c12fda$d798dce0$905d9280@CSRA144>
From: "Gerald M. Kosicki" <Kosicki.1@osu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: OSU-CSR Dir of Operations
Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2001 12:02:30 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0049_01C12FB9.5068B860"
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_0049_01C12FB9.5068B860
Director of Operations
The Center for Survey Research at Ohio State University is searching for a Director of Operations to manage the Center's day-to-day business. CSR is a growing, lively interdisciplinary research operation with a 32-station CATI facility. The center also processes mail, fax-back and web-based surveys, as well as combinations of these modes, for a variety of university, public sector, nonprofit, and private sector clients.

The Director of Operations works under the supervision of the Faculty Director to plan and direct operations and services, anticipate organizational growth needs, establish operational policies and practices with regard to data collection and data processing, and oversee daily operations. We are seeking a candidate with considerable experience in the area of survey research methods, and applied statistical methods, including SPSS-PC. Candidates are expected to have experience in a social sciences survey research organization or an equivalent combination of education and experience. The Director of Operations designs and/or approves methods for survey projects, including sampling procedures and questionnaires, and works with the Faculty Director to develop and monitor the projected budget for the fiscal year. The Director of Operations also assists in marketing the center's services to faculty researchers and administrators within the university, cultivates and develops relationships with private and public sector users, and markets services to external clients. A master's degree or an equivalent combination of education and experience is required. A doctoral degree is highly desired. Salary is competitive and negotiable.

The CSR was established five years ago as a university-wide center administered by the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The Center administers a Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Survey Research, a 23-hour program of instruction in survey methodology; a faculty seed-grant program; and a graduate student summer fellowship program, as well as other activities to enhance the role of survey research on campus. A key product is the Buckeye State Poll, a monthly series of studies that track consumer confidence, credit card debts and debt stress, in addition to a great many political, social and other topical projects. The Center typically has 12 graduate research associates from nationally prominent social science fields in residence.

Additional information about the Center is available at www.csr.ohio-state.edu. Information about Ohio State University can be found at www.osu.edu and about the Columbus area at www.columbus.org. Interested candidates should send a letter of application and current resume or vita to:

Dr. Gerald Kosicki, Director, Center for Survey Research, 3045 Derby Hall, 154 North Oval Mall, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210-1330

Review of applications will begin immediately. Applications will be accepted until the position is filled. The Ohio State University is an
equal opportunity, affirmative action employer and especially encourages applications from women, minorities, Vietnam-era and disabled veterans, and other individuals with disabilities.

------=_NextPart_000_0049_01C12FB9.5068B860
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<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Director of Operations
<P class=3DMsoNormal>The Center for Survey Research at Ohio State University is
    searching for a Director of Operations to manage the Center's day-to-day
    business. CSR is a growing, lively interdisciplinary research operation
    with a 32-station CATI facility. The center also processes mail, fax-back and
    web-based surveys, as well as combinations of these modes, for a variety of
    university, public sector, nonprofit, and private sector clients. </P>
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    candidate with considerable experience in the area of survey research methods, and =
    statistical methods, including SPSS-PC. Candidates are expected to have experience in a social sciences survey research organization or an =
    equivalent combination of education and experience. The Director of Operations =
    designs and/or approves methods for survey projects, including sampling =
    procedures and questionnaires, and works with the Faculty Director to develop and =
    monitor the projected budget for the fiscal year. The Director of Operations also =
    assists in marketing the center's services to faculty researchers and =
    administrators within the university, cultivates and develops relationships with private and =
    public sector users, and markets services to external clients. A =
</DIV></FONT></BODY></HTML>
A doctoral degree is highly desired. Salary is competitive and negotiable.

The CSR was established five years ago as a university-wide center administered by the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The Center administers a Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Survey Research, a 23-hour program of instruction in survey methodology; a faculty seed-grant program; and a graduate student summer fellowship program, as well as other activities to enhance the role of survey research on campus. A key product is the Buckeye State Poll, a monthly series of studies that track consumer confidence, credit card debts and debt stress, in addition to a great many political, social and other topical projects. The Center typically has 12 graduate research associates from nationally prominent social science fields in residence.

Additional information about the Center is available at www.csr.ohio-state.edu. Information about Ohio State University can be found at www.osu.edu and about the Columbus area at www.columbus.org. Interested candidates should send a letter of application and current resume or vita to:

Dr. Gerald Kosicki, Director, Center for Survey Research
3045 Derby Hall, 154 North Oval Mall, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210-1330

Review of applications will begin immediately. Applications will be accepted until the position is filled. The Ohio State University is an equal opportunity employer and especially encourages applications from women, minorities, Vietnam-era and disabled veterans, and other individuals with disabilities.
I often get questioned by journalists for poll data on non-Christian religious behavior. So I thought I would share this survey I just found on Jewish behavior:

1990 NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY
http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/cjstu/highint.htm

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org
Contact Alejandro Moreno in Mexico City. He is an academic who also does work for Reforma.

Michael W. Traugott
Professor and Chair, Communication Studies
2020 Frieze 734 764-0420
Senior Research Scientist, Center for Political Studies, ISR
4230 ISR 734 763-4702

-----Original Message-----
From: Timothy Johnson [mailto:tjohnson@srl.uic.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2001 7:00 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Looking for Mexican Survey Organizations

I'm working with colleagues in developing a research proposal where we will need about 500 telephone surveys completed in a couple of non-US locations (in addition to the work we will do here in the US). We are having difficulty locating an academic survey organization in Mexico with the expertise necessary to do the required work.

Do list members have contacts of this sort in Mexico? Private replies are preferred to avoid cluttering up the list traffic, but I would be glad to summarize to the list if there is interest from the group. Thanks very much.

Tim Johnson
Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois at Chicago
From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RFERL: ALMOST HALF OF RUSSIANS WANT MOSCOW TO SEEK RETURN OF CRIMEA
Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2001 14:37:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

from Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty:

ALMOST HALF OF RUSSIANS WANT MOSCOW TO SEEK RETURN OF CRIMEA
According to a poll conducted by the Public Opinion Foundation and reported by Interfax on 25 August, 47 percent of Russians want the Russian government to do whatever it takes to secure the return of the Crimea to Russian control. Thirty-seven percent more would like to see Russian sovereignty restored on Crimea, but only if that could be achieved without a worsening of Russian-Ukrainian relations. PG

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org

>From jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov Tue Aug 28 12:11:02 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f7SJB2J28378 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Aug 2001
12:11:02
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from dispatch.tco.census.gov (dispatch.tco.census.gov
[148.129.129.22])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA08378 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Aug 2001 12:11:02 -0700
(PDT)
From: jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov
Received: from deliver.tco.census.gov ([148.129.126.70])
    by dispatch.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.4) with ESMTP id
    f7SJA0119024
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Aug 2001 15:10:24 -0400
Received: from it008nthqln.tco.census.gov (it008nthqln.tco.census.gov
[148.129.123.82])
    by deliver.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.16) with ESMTP id
    f7SJA0P25309
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Aug 2001 15:10:24 -0400
Subject: DEADLINE EXTENDED -- QDET CALL FOR CONTRIBUTED PAPERS
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.7 March 21, 2001
Message-ID: <OFE8709B89.C1A90090-ON85256AB6.006E2DF@tco.census.gov>
Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2001 15:06:57 -0400
UPDATED INFORMATION FOR -- INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION, AND TESTING METHODS (QDET):
ABSTRACTS FOR CONTRIBUTED PAPERS

DEADLINE IS EXTENDED ONE WEEK: Abstracts of no more than 200 WORDS are due FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2001

Abstracts should be submitted online through the CONFERENCE WEBSITE: www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet -- NOTE THAT THE WEB SUBMISSION SYSTEM WORKS BEST UNDER INTERNET EXPLORER - NETSCAPE HAS BEEN UNRELIABLE. IF ALL ELSE FAILS, E-MAIL ABSTRACT (IN WORDPERFECT, WORD, OR ASCII FORM) TO GORDON WILLIS AT WILLISG@MAIL.NIH.GOV

CONFERENCE DATES: November 14-17, 2002
LOCATION: Radisson Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina

QDET will be the first international conference devoted exclusively to the methods used for questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing, and will bring together researchers and survey practitioners working in this area, to stimulate research papers that contribute to the science of reducing measurement error through questionnaire evaluation, to provide documentation of the current practices, and to stimulate new ideas for future practice.

Both INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTED PAPER PROPOSALS and SPECIAL CONTRIBUTED PAPER SESSION PROPOSALS are encouraged. Special Contributed Sessions are arranged in advance by an organizer and include four speakers and a discussant (proposals should indicate Special Session status and include four abstracts).

Papers are encouraged in a wide range of areas related to questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing methods, including but not limited to:

Cognitive interviewing, behavior coding, interviewer/respondent debriefing, usability testing, split-sample experiments, psychometric analysis, establishment survey testing, question design for special populations, and questionnaire standards and practical issues.

QUESTIONS ABOUT CONTRIBUTED PAPERS: Contact Gordon Willis: willisg@mail.nih.gov

GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE QDET CONFERENCE: Contact Jennifer Rothgeb: Jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov
We have recently received funding to study Mexican Immigrants and Mexican-American families longitudinally. Though we have worked with these families before, we are now looking for information in several areas. Any help you could provide would be greatly appreciated. The areas are:

1) Mobility of these families, from one location within the US (preferably the Southwest) to another, and back to Mexico.
2) Evaluating questionnaire items for culturally sensitivity and equivalency.

Thanks in advance.

Toni Genalo
Director of Data Collection
Prevention Research Center
Arizona State University
PO Box 876005
Tempe, AZ 85287-6005
We have recently received funding to study Mexican Immigrants and Mexican-American families longitudinally. Though we have worked with these families before, we are now looking for information in several areas. Any help you could provide would be greatly appreciated: The areas are:

1) Mobility of these families, from one location within the US (preferably the Southwest) to another, and back to Mexico.

2) Evaluating questionnaire items for culturally sensitivity and equivalency.

Thanks in advance.

Toni Genalo
Director of Data Collection
Prevention Research Center
Arizona State University
PO Box 876005
Tempe, AZ 85287-6005
480-727-6142
480-727-6282 (FAX)
If you are still interested in Mexico, I suggest you approach GAUSSC. They are a first class operation. I worked closely with them during the Fox campaign and they did an outstanding job.

Hope it helps.

Nicolas

GAUSSC coordinates:

Grupo de Asesores Unidos S.C. (GAUSSC)
phone 52 5554 4212
gaussc#gaussc.com
Marco Antonio Robles Paez
marco.robles#gaussc.com
Stuffing MTV's ballot box

The premise is simple: Every day MTV fans vote for their favorite video via phone calls and e-mails. The results are tabulated and the top 10 clips air on the cable channel's flagship show, the Carson Daly-hosted "Total Request Live," or TRL.

But is TRL really as great an exercise in populist democracy as MTV would like us to believe? This is the music business, after all, built on smoke and mirrors. With TRL flexing so much hit-making power, do record company execs just sit back and cross their fingers, hoping their acts will top, or at least make, the mighty top 10 countdown? Nope. One prominent label, Interscope, is offering up big prizes and even specifically advising fans on ways to beat the computer defenses that MTV uses to counteract online ballot-box stuffing.

---

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org
Nicolas---thanks for your recommendation. regards, tim j

>>> <ncheca@medleyadvisors.com> 08/28 9:57 PM >>>
If you are still interested in Mexico, I suggest you approach GAUSSC. They are a first class operation. I worked closely with them during the Fox campaign and they did an outstanding job.

Hope it helps.

Nicolas

Gaussc coordinates:
Grupo de Asesores Unidos S.C. (GAUSSC)
phone 52 5554 4212
gaussc@gaussc.com
Marco Antonio Robles Paez
marco.robles@gaussc.com
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Date: Wed, 29 Aug 2001 11:04:59 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
  boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0040_01C1307A.71FC7B80"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-------=_NextPart_000_0040_01C1307A.71FC7B80
A new national survey updating many of the findings from the 1990 NJPS, which Howard Fienberg cites, was recently completed by the Council of Jewish Federations in New York. I believe that the first release of results from this decennial survey, is scheduled for late Fall. The full results and survey data file, though, may not be available until later.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
sidg@his.com
301 469-0813
www.groeneman.com

----- Original Message ----=
From: Howard Fienberg
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2001 12:20 PM
Subject: 1990 NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY

I often get questioned by journalists for poll data on non-Christian religious behavior. So I thought I would share this survey I just found on Jewish behavior:
CJP=20
1990 NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY
http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/cjstu/highint.htm

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-223-3193
(Fx) 202-872-4014
(email) hfienberg@stats.org

--------- _NextPart_000_0040_01C1307A.71FC7B80

A new national survey updating many of the findings from the 1990 NJPS, which Howard Fienberg cites, was recently completed by the Council of Jewish Federations in New York. I believe that the first release of results from this decennial survey, is scheduled for late Fall. The full results and survey data file, though, may not be available until later.

Sid Groeneman
Groeneman Research & Consulting
sidg@his.com
301 469-0813
www.groeneman.com

----- Original Message ----- 
From: HFienberg@stats.org
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2001 12:20 PM
Subject: 1990 NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY

I often get questioned by journalists for poll data on non-Christian religious behavior. So I thought I would share this survey I just found on Jewish behavior:

CJF 1990 NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY

http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/cjstu/highint.htm

Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
202-872-4014 (email)

From lindao@srl.uic.edu Thu Aug 30 07:56:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
Thanks to everyone who responded to my request.

Linda

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Thu Aug 30 12:43:48 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f7UJhmJ10462 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 30 Aug 2001 12:43:48
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id MAA07545 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 30 Aug 2001 12:43:47 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.65])
  by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA27582
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 30 Aug 2001 15:43:28 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from princeton.edu (wws-lq71j01.Princeton.EDU [128.112.150.51])
  by smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA04850
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 30 Aug 2001 15:43:28 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3B8E9760.CEE895DD@princeton.edu>
Date: Thu, 30 Aug 2001 15:43:28 -0400
From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Surveys in Less Developed Countries

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
For my seminar in survey methods, I'd like to add a discussion on conducting surveys in less developed countries. Can anyone recommend some good references? Thanks.

p.s. please reply directly to efreelan@princeton.edu. I'll be happy to share the replies with anyone who requests.

Ed Freeland
Princeton University