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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

-------------- Archive aapornet, file log9612. 
Part 1/1, total size 107211 bytes: 

>From JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu Mon Dec  2 04:22:57 1996
Return-Path: JTANUR@CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU
Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (ccvm.sunysb.edu [129.49.2.183])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id EAA05674 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Mon, 2 Dec 1996 04:22:55 -0800 (PST)
Received: from CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU by ccvm.sunysb.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R3) with BSMTP id 3167; Mon, 02 Dec 96 07:21:33 EST
Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (NJE origin JTANUR@SBCCVM) by CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 7907; Mon, 2 Dec 1996 07:21:33 -0500
Date:         Mon, 02 Dec 96 07:18:24 EST
From: Judy Tanur <JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>
Organization: State University of New York at Stony Brook
Subject:      Conference submission info?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer:     MailBook 95.01.000
Message-Id:   <961202.072132.EST.JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>

Help! I seem to have misplaced my mailing re: submission of proposed papers for the 1997 conference. I know it's all posted on the web, but I don't have access from where I am. Can someone send me details -- number of copies, length, mailing address, etc.? Sorry to bother you all and many thanks, Judy Tanur JTANUR@CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU It probably makes sense to respond directly to me rather than to the list, unless folks think there are others in the same boat as I. And am I right that the deadline is Dec. 15?
I'm looking for some background info for an article and was wondering if anyone has data/stats/guesses for the following:

(1) How many surveys are conducted in the United States each year (all types);

(2) How many interviews are conducted in the United States each year;

    and .... for the grand prize ...

(3) Are trend data available on these questions?

I realize the closest we can probably come is via guesstimates, but I thought I'd ask anyway. Thanks in advance for the help!
I'm looking for some background info for an article and was wondering if anyone has data/stats/guesses for the following:

(1) How many surveys are conducted in the United States each year (all types);

First question: What counts a survey? Professionals only or do surveys conducted on campus by student groups count? For instance, our local pre-law committee just did a survey of those who had taken prep courses for the LSAT. A public opinion course does a survey of fellow students and sometimes includes local residents as well. A student polls school board candidates for a senior honors thesis. Which, if any, of these count? Does doing it for money matter? Is there a minum sample size? What if I poll my colleagues to see where to have lunch? How do I know to throw that out but keep in a survey about which textbooks they use?

Mary Thornberry
Box 1719  Davidson College
Davidson NC 28036
mathornberry@davidson.edu
I would include just about ANY survey. The article has to do with the essentials policymakers need to know to evaluate a "good" survey. As background I'd like to illustrate the enormity of the survey research field, hence the general question: How "polled" is the public? To make it a little easier, I guess we could limit the scope of the question to surveys of "the general public" (although the things "policymakers" need to know are the things ALL "consumers" of polls need to know). Hope this focuses things a bit!

>From Barbara_Bryant@ccmail.bus.umich.edu Mon Dec 2 07:25:37 1996
Return-Path: Barbara_Bryant@ccmail.bus.umich.edu
Received: from runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.144.15])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA24182 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Dec 1996 07:25:34 -0800 (PST)
Received: from ccmail.bus.umich.edu by runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.5/2.3)
    with SMTP id KAA13213; Mon, 2 Dec 1996 10:25:26 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ccMail by ccmail.bus.umich.edu (SMTPLINK V2.11)
    id AA849550985; Mon, 02 Dec 96 10:18:24 EDT
Date: Mon, 02 Dec 96 10:18:24 EDT
From: "Barbara Bryant" <Barbara_Bryant@ccmail.bus.umich.edu>
Message-Id: <9611028495.AA849550985@ccmail.bus.umich.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re[2]: Research on Survey Research

Here's partial information in quantifying surveys and interviews:

Census Bureau alone conducts about 200 surveys a year--some are monthly, some are quarterly, some annual so there are about 700 waves of interviews, each with very large sample sizes. (This does not count the decennial census with about 93,000,000 household interviews counting one-quarter of a billion people). Bureau of Labor Statistics and National Agricultural Statistical Service are also large survey organizations.

I now deal with several major private sector survey firms which collect 200,000-4 million interviews per year each--The Gallup
Organization, Market Strategies, Market Opinion Research-PACE (MOR-PACE), Wirthlin Worldwide to name a few.

Some companies in the fast food industry are collecting 50,000 interviews a month via handout/mailback with coupon incentives!

In other words—you are talking about multi-millions of interviews and thousands of surveys.

Best trend data on mostly-private-sector-collected surveys is Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut which has data since 1930s. Phone: 203-486-4440. You need to be a subscriber for data access. Academic surveys mostly archived at Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. If you are at a university, it probably belongs to the ICPSR. Phone: 313-764-2570

Barbara_Bryant@ccmail.bus.umich.edu

Subject: Re: Research on Survey Research
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date: 12/2/96 9:23 AM

I'm looking for some background info for an article and was wondering if anyone has data/stats/guesses for the following:

(1) How many surveys are conducted in the United States each year (all types);

(2) How many interviews are conducted in the United States each year;

and .... for the grand prize ...

(3) Are trend data available on these questions?

I realize the closest we can probably come is via guesstimates, but I thought I'd ask anyway. Thanks in advance for the help!
I would also be interested in such information. I recently moved and AAPOR has not caught up with me yet.

Sorry to send this to the whole list.

------------------------------------------
Mark S. Jendrysik, Ph.D.  e-mail: jendrysk@bucknell.edu
Visiting Assistant Professor  phone: (717) 524-3511
Department of Political Science  fax: (717)524-3760
Bucknell University office: 270 Coleman
Lewisburg, PA 17837 office hours: MWF 1-3 pm.

I just caught up with my E-mail at WESTAT, and so am a bit late to join
the chorus of thanks and appreciation for Jim and AAPORNET. One of the
great things about AAPORNET is the "window on the AAPOR world" for
those of us who are semi-retired, don't go to meetings as often as we
used to, and interact less frequently with AAPOR colleagues and
friends. Here is wishing you many more birthday celebrations.

Laure Sharp

--- A Reminder ---

The deadline to submit your proposals to the
1997 AAPOR Conference Chair nears --- 15 December 1996.

Your proposal submission (with an attached "author
information form") should be sent to:

Roger Tourangeau
 c/o JPSM
 1218 LeFrak Hall
 College Park, MD 20782

AAPOR Conference
 May 15-18, 1997
 Norfolk Waterside Marriott
 Virginia

If you need additional details, please reply directly
to AAPOR@umich.edu

Thanks.
A report to AAPOR members from Diane Colasanto:

The AAPOR Executive Council met in Chicago on the Friday before Thanksgiving, in conjunction with the annual MAPOR conference. We shared a nice lunch with our MAPOR colleagues, and listened with great interest to Evans Witt's luncheon speech about the election. I thought you all might be interested in knowing some of the things that we accomplished at the meeting, so here are the highlights:

(1) We signed a new three-year contract with The University of Michigan for the administration of AAPOR's business. We're very pleased that Marlene Bednarz will continue running the AAPOR Secretariat's office, and also pleased we've been able to add a new part-time assistant, Carol Milstein, to help Marlene.

(2) Evans Witt has agreed once again to take on the responsibilities of heading AAPOR's ad hoc committee for public affairs. Evans will be working with the Council to shape a plan for strengthening AAPOR's voice and impact on issues affecting our industry. In particular, we'd like AAPOR to be able to speak out effectively about the quality of opinion research that is reported publicly.

(3) Council, on recommendation of the ad hoc committee for site selection (Paul Lavrakas and Dawn von Thurn), chose St. Louis as the site of the 1998 conference. The committee identified two downtown hotels that would suit our purposes, and is in the process of negotiating a contract.

(4) Council approved the selection of a new editor of Public Opinion Quarterly, Vincent Price. Price is chair of the Department of Communications at the University of Michigan and was enthusiastically recommended by both the selection committee chaired by Larry Bobo and by the POQ Advisory Board. Council heartily endorsed the choice and we offer our congratulations to Vince!

(5) We established a plan for publishing some newly-approved Council documents, i.e., one that describes our consensus about the best practices for survey research and another that describes some practices AAPOR condemns.

(6) Council appointed several subcommittees to address issues of continuing concern. One will consider proposed changes to our code enforcement procedures that were drafted last year by Al Gollin, and recently revised by AAPOR's attorney. This committee consists of me, Dick Kulka and Clyde Tucker. A second committee will consider changes to our conference site
selection and administration procedures. This committee consists of Jim Beniger, Murray Edelman, Karen Goldenberg, Diane O'Rourke, Dawn von Thurn, and Marlene Bednarz. A third will consider whether AAPOR should establish one or more new awards in addition to the two awards (student paper competition and the AAPOR Award) that already exist. This last committee consists of Bob Groves, Don Dillman, Susan Pinkus and Karen Goldenberg.

That's all folks! Our next meeting is mid-January in Washington, so look for another update then.

Diane Colasanto  
dcolasanto@aol.com

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Tue, 3 Dec 1996 11:33:47 -0500 (EST)
From: elinsonteanec@juno.com
Full-Name: Jack Elinson

Worst Case Estimates for Polls with Various Nonresponse Rates

Holiday Musings by Jack and Mitchell Elinson

We intend this table to be used by pessimistic pollsters who fear that all their nonresponders would have gone all one way or the other in the case of a dichotomous question, with response categories X and nonX.

The top row in the table shows the actual percent responding, by 10 percent intervals, from 10% (ech!) to 90% (great!).
The left column gives the actual poll result: i.e., the percent of responders who responded X.

To find what the result would have been if all the responses of the nonresponders were one way or the other - all X or nonX - look up the intersect for a given nonresponse percentage (column) and an actual poll result for the responders (row).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONRESPONSE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: 20% nonresponse; 60% of responders responding X:

* If all nonresponders were X, then 68% of the surveyed population would have been X.
* IF all nonresponders were nonX, then 48% of the surveyed population would have been X.

In other words, for an obtained nonresponse rate of 20%, and an obtained poll result of 60%X, the possible range is 48%-68%X.

HAPPY HOLIDAYS! December, 1996

>From JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu Tue Dec  3 15:44:54 1996
Return-Path: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: from umailsrv1.umd.edu (umailsrv1.umd.edu [128.8.10.53])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id PAA28469 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Dec 1996 15:44:51 -0800
   (PST)
From: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: by umailsrv1.umd.edu (5.57/Ultripx3.0-C)
   id AA15806; Tue, 3 Dec 96 18:44:47 -0500
Received: from BSOSCATI/MAILQUEUE1 by cati.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
   Tue, 3 Dec 96 18:44:48 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by BSOSCATI (Mercury 1.13); Tue, 3 Dec 96 18:44:27
   +1100
Organization: Survey Research Center, UMCP
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Tue, 3 Dec 1996 18:44:17 EDT
Subject: Re: Seeking Email Survey Software
Reply-To: johnny@cati.umd.edu
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: PMail v3.0 (R1)
The Survey Research Center at the U. of Maryland is in the process of selecting a software vendor for an email survey. The software should have the ability to create a moderately complex survey instrument [e.g. skips and filters, handle the range of commonly used response formats, handle id numbers etc], distribute the questionnaire to email addresses [hopefully across various platforms and email systems], permit simple questionnaire completion and return, and extract the answers into a database.

Two vendors we are considering are RAOSOFT and DECISIVE. I would like to correspond with any survey researchers who have used [or tried to use] the products from either company. If there are other software packages for administering email surveys that anyone has had experience with, I'd be interested in finding out about those as well.

Please reply to: johnny@cati.umd.edu

>From J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz Tue Dec 3 16:01:33 1996
Return-Path: J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz
Received: from cc-server9.massey.ac.nz (cc-server9.massey.ac.nz [130.123.128.11])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id QAA01661 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Dec 1996 16:01:26 -0800
    (PST)
From: J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz
Message-Id: <199612040001.QAA01661@usc.edu>
Received: from 130.123.48.25 (actually mk-pc20) by cc-server9 with SMTP(PP);
    Wed, 4 Dec 1996 13:00:12 +1300
Sender: J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz
To: aapornet@usc.edu, por@frosty.irss.unc.edu
Date: Wed, 4 Dec 1996 12:59:43 NZT-12
Subject: Effects of crime reporting on social attitudes
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.22

A colleague of mine hopes to explore how the news media report crime and the effects of the various reporting styles on different sectors of the public. In particular, she hopes to explore the relationship between sensationalist reporting and levels of fear in the community.

I have never done any work in this area, and so am unsure whether any similar studies have been conducted. I would be very grateful for any references I could pass on to her, or for any advice about how such a study could be undertaken. Please reply directly to me.

Many thanks

Janet Hoek

Janet Hoek                          Phone:      646 350 5583 (Bus)
Senior Lecturer in Marketing        Fax  :      646 350 2260
Fellow AAPORneters:

A scholar of English literature with an interest in public opinion recently discovered this long-lost sonnet by the Bard, coincidentally on the first anniversary of the creation of the AAPORnet. It seemed appropriate to pass it on to all members:

Once we wondered weak and weary
Searching o'er the Web in vain
Wondering where to send a query
Re: polling, sampling frames,
Question formats, useful software,
Job announcements, survey cost;
Our requests were sent to nowhere.
Our sharp insights all were lost.

Till a man Jim did determine
"AAPORnet exists today!"
Thereby saving us from certain
Roadkill on the Info Highway.
Without the AAPORnet's reprieve
Throughout a tangled Web we'd weave.

---w.w.w.Shakespeare

Happy first anniversary!

>From N.Moon@maires.co.uk Thu Dec  5 06:21:30 1996
Return-Path: N.Moon@maires.co.uk
Received: from savoy.maires.co.uk (savoy.maires.co.uk [193.129.1.205])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA22104 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Dec 1996 06:21:23 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from itserv.maires.co.uk by savoy.maires.co.uk id aa24859;

Twas a wonderful piece of poetry, but I must query the attribution.

It read far more like Wordsworth to me. Has it been carbon dated??

Nick Moon
nickm@nopres.co.uk
tel 0171 612 0830        fax 0171 612 0744
NOP Social and Political, Tower House, Southampton St
London WC2E 7HN

Manager, Survey Support Services Department

Research Triangle Institute has an opening in its Survey Research Division for a manager of four survey support units: Telephone Survey, Data Entry, Data Preparation, and Field Services.

Manager administers the department by projecting workloads, recruiting staff, evaluating performance, and monitoring overhead costs; develops, implements, and monitors general policies, production processes, and quality assurance procedures; allocates resources across projects; meets with
project directors to solve technical, system, cost, and project management problems; meets with systems programmers to specify and develop improved CATI and other systems; supervises four unit managers.

Candidates must have advanced knowledge of the principles, processes, and methods of survey research gained through ten or more years of broad experience in the field. Candidates should possess advanced knowledge of telephone survey data collection operations and procedures, good project management skills, and experience in managing a large telephone calling center.

Please mail your resume to Mr. Kirk Pate, Research Triangle Institute, P.O. Box 12194, Research Triangle Park, NC, 27709. Or send your resume by e-mail to dkp@rti.org. No phone calls please.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer M/D/F/V

Rachel A. Caspar
Survey Methodologist
Research Triangle Institute Phone:
(919) 541-6376
P.O. Box 12194 Fax:
(919) 541-1261
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194 Email: caspar@rti.org

We are planning a CATI-based survey on the subject - unfaithfulness/infidelity. Have we become more or less faithful in our relations? What is the appropriate reaction if you find out that your partner has been unfaithful to you? Which moral stands are taken towards the phenomenon? etc...
We have been running a series of tests in order to detect the frequency of unfaithfulness. In order to secure the anonymity of the respondents, we have applied the so-called “unrelated second question method.”

We would be delighted to hear from you if you have any experience (not personal!) or if you know of any studies on this delicate subject.

Troels Palner & Villy Josefsen
Utrp@Gallup.dk or Uvij@Gallup.dk
Gallup Denmark

>From fneurohr@interport.net Sun Dec  8 10:04:31 1996
Return-Path: fneurohr@interport.net
Received: from broadway.interport.net (broadway.interport.net [199.184.165.4])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP id KAA20319 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Dec 1996 10:04:29 -0800 (PST)
Received: from fneurohr.port.net (fneurohr.port.net [207.38.236.163]) by broadway.interport.net (8.8.1/8.8.1) with SMTP id NAA21292 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Dec 1996 13:04:27 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sun, 8 Dec 1996 13:04:27 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199612081804.NAA21292@broadway.interport.net>
X-Sender: fneurohr@pop.interport.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: fneurohr@interport.net (Fred Neurohr)
Subject: Participation rates for sweepstakes

Can anyone recommend existing research concerning the effects of prize notification on participation rates? Specifically, are consumers more likely to participate in a contest that provides instant knowledge of results of winning (say by using a scratch-off ticket) than a contest where participants are required to return a postcard and wait for a reply?

I am also looking for demographic characteristics of participants in each type of promotion. I remember hearing that in New York, for example, that people who report buying lottery (Lotto) tickets (where players must wait for the drawings to learn if they have won or not) are more educated and have a higher income than people who report buying scratch-off lottery tickets (where people learn immediately whether they’ve won or not). Does anyone know of similar research for direct mail efforts?

Also, what existing research addresses changes in response rates for contests or sweepstakes when the prizes are different in number or size? In other words: is there any evidence that consumers are more or less likely to participate in sweepstakes where there is one huge prize compared to when there are many smaller prizes?

Thanks for your thoughts on this matter.
>From edithl@educ.uva.nl Mon Dec  9 02:05:56 1996
Return-Path: edithl@educ.uva.nl
Received: from pooh.educ.uva.nl (pooh.educ.uva.nl [145.18.96.16])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
    id CAA11450 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 02:05:54 -0800 (PST)
Received: from gregorius.educ.uva.nl (gregorius [145.18.103.16]) by
    pooh.educ.uva.nl (8.7.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id LAA02097 for
    <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 11:04:57 +0100 (MET)
Received: from localhost (edithl@localhost) by gregorius.educ.uva.nl
    (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id LAA11512 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996
    11:05:26 +0100 (MET)
X-Authentication-Warning: gregorius.educ.uva.nl: edithl owned process doing -bs
Date: Mon, 9 Dec 1996 11:05:25 +0100 (MET)
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@educ.uva.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@gregorius
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Participation rates for sweepstakes
In-Reply-To: <199612081804.NAA21292@broadway.interport.net>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.95.961209110212.11505B-100000@gregorius>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Contact John Goyder & Keith Warriner, who did a nice experimental study.
 Their main conclusion was that a prepaid incentive is still the best we have got (mail surveys). (e-mail wnrr@watarts.uwaterloo.ca

Please keep me noted of the results of this query.
Happy Chanukka!
Edith

==========================================
      Edith de Leeuw, Department of Education, University of Amsterdam | 
      Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN, Amsterdam, the Netherlands  | 
      tel + 31 20 525 1530, or + 31 20 622 3438, fax + 31 20 525 1500  | 
      e-mail edithl@educ.uva.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

==========================================

>From PENALOZA@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu Mon Dec  9 09:56:12 1996
Return-Path: PENALOZA@conted2.uwex.edu
Received: from shaggy.uwex.edu (shaggy.uwex.edu [144.92.105.17])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA27141 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 09:56:10 -0800 (PST)
AAPORNETERS:

I am interested in your thoughts on the confidentiality of telephone numbers generated for an RDD survey. We have historically held that when we tell a respondent that his/her responses are confidential, that we will not reveal his/her phone numbers to anyone - including the client. The only way the client can have access to this information would be if we had included the client's name or organization in the confidentiality statement up front (i.e. "information you give us is held confidential between our survey lab and the sponsor of the study"). Otherwise, we tell them that we will not reveal any information that allows identification of the respondent or his/her household.

We are not inclined to include the phone numbers as part of the data set, but are being pressured to do so, despite having provided respondents with a statement assuring confidentiality. I think we are taking a justifiable stance, but am curious what your ideas on this are.

Linda Penaloza
Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory
penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

**********************************************************************
Linda J. Penaloza
Associate Director and Head of Field Operations
Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory
1930 Monroe St., Madison, WI 53711

Phone: (608) 265-2796  FAX: (608) 262-3366
email: penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu
**********************************************************************

"The researches of many commentators have already thrown much darkness on this subject, and it is probable that, if they continue, we shall soon know nothing at all about it."  - Mark Twain

>From N.Moon@maires.co.uk Mon Dec  9 10:22:30 1996
Return-Path: N.Moon@maires.co.uk
Received: from savoy.maires.co.uk (savoy.maires.co.uk [193.129.1.205])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id KAA03799 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 10:22:13 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from itserv.maires.co.uk by savoy.maires.co.uk id aa24058;
For what it's worth, on this side of the pond the Market Research Society's code of conduct, and the Data Protection legislation, would both prohibit the inclusion of telephone numbers in a dataset without respondents' permission. You could actually be prosecuted for so doing.

Why not give all but the last two digits of the phone number, or safer all but the last three. That would allow any sub-analysis you are likely to want.

Nick Moon
nickm@nopres.co.uk
tel 0171 612 0830        fax 0171 612 0744
NOP Social and Political, Tower House, Southampton St
London WC2E 7HN

My two cents worth.
I have never included the phone numbers with the data set. Data sets are too public. I think it would be a poor move for the industry to condone such a breach in confidentiality and anonymity. The success of the industry depends on all of us maintaining high ethical standards in our treatment of human subjects. Privacy is no trivial matter.

I usually include the phone prefix in the data set in case it turns out that I need a double check on county information, etc. As I understand it, any digits after the first six of a ten digit number are not useful for
identifying geographic location.

If a client really wants the phone number in the data set, then the respondents' permission should be obtained. They should be told that they may be called again (if there is any chance of it), and that the information they are providing could be linked back to them. If a client really wants the information, he or she will have to live with the consequences of gaining permission to report it, primarily a very low response or permission rate.

Lois Haggard, Ph.D.
Utah Department of Health
lhaggard@state.ut.us

>From t00001@TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU Mon Dec 9 11:51:56 1996
Return-Path: t00001@TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU
Received: from tigger.stcloud.msus.edu (tigger.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU [199.17.25.1])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA24311 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 11:51:53 -0800 (PST)
Received: from sfrank.stcloud.msus.edu ([199.17.2.7])
   by TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU (PMDF V5.1-4 #16214)
   with SMTP id <01ICT4A7H6TE000ECA@TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU> for
   aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 13:55:51 CST
Date: Mon, 09 Dec 1996 13:55:50 -0600 (CST)
Date-warning: Date header was inserted by TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU
From: t00001@TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU
Subject: usefulness of phone directories on the www v. print listings.
X-Sender: t00001@tigger.stcloud.msus.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01ICT4A7JQ6C000ECA@TIGGER.STCLOUD.MSUS.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

While explaining the advantages and disadvantages of rdd v listed telephone samples to my public opinion class this a.m. it struck me that some phone companies such as US West are putting their directories online. Are these listings just a reprint of the print directories or are they kept up to date?

=======================================================
When I was a boy I was told that anybody could become President; I'm beginning to believe it. - Clarence Darrow

---
Steve Frank, Department of Political Science
St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, MN. 56301 FAX (320)-654-5198
VOICE (320)-255-4131

>From smarcy@datastat.com Mon Dec 9 12:35:41 1996
Return-Path: smarcy@datastat.com
Received: from smarcy ([152.160.28.9])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id MAA01195 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 12:35:38 -0800 (PST)
Date:     Mon,  9 Dec 96 15:36:12 EST
We at DataStat also do not include full phone numbers in data sets, although we *do* include the first six digits if the client would like us to. However, we also allow clients to identify *themselves* as the "caller", so that any confidentiality promised is promised by them.

We might say, "This is Sherry Marcy, calling for <client name>." Or, "This is Sherry Marcy of DataStat calling for <client name>." If asked specifically who we are by a respondent, we always accurately identify ourselves as DataStat, but reiterate that we are calling *for* another organization. If asked, confidentiality also is accurately explained as promised by the client organization, not by us.

This applies to mail surveys as well, e.g., in the covers letter. We are accurate in our identification of who promises confidentiality. Sometimes clients are matching files to other files they have, thus necessitating their acquisition of a respondent identifier. If the respondent does not feel comfortable giving information to the client organization, then the response rate drops.

It is very dangerous to include respondents' telephone numbers in a survey dataset, especially an RDD one that up-front has pledged confidentiality, as it opens up all kinds of possibilities for abuse if that file leaves your control.

However, it is common for surveys to ask respondents on their client's behalf if their name and number can be passed along to the client. We often
do this in surveys that are meant to generate news stories by media organizations. This question is always the last one asked and we get approx. 70% of interviewed respondents saying "Yes" to the possibility that a reporter will call them back and therefore it's OK to pass along their names/numbers to the client. Nonetheless, we NEVER pass along the entire dataset with telephone numbers in it to the media client -- we simply fill requests, one by one, from the client by generating information on some subset of people who said they could be called back.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Communication & Journalism *
* Director, Survey Research Unit *
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126 *
* 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210 *
* Voice: (614)-292-6672 Fax: (614)-292-6673 *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

>From NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU Mon Dec 9 13:04:02 1996
Return-Path: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
Received: from UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (uchimvs1.uchicago.edu [128.135.19.10]) by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id NAA07025 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 13:03:59 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <199612092103.NAA07025@usc.edu>
Received: from UCHIMVS1.BITNET by UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (IBM MVS SMTP V3R1)
   with BSMTP id 8583; Mon, 09 Dec 96 15:02:32 CDT
From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: confidentiality of phone numbers

The procedure of restricting client access to phone numbers without explicit, prior consent from respondents is the correct policy to follow and you should not deviate from it. tom w smith

>From JBASON@uga.cc.uga.edu Mon Dec 9 13:55:10 1996
Return-Path: JBASON@UGA.CC.UGA.EDU
Received: from uga.cc.uga.edu (uga.cc.uga.edu [128.192.232.5])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id NAA17386 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 13:55:07 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <961209.165405.EST.JBASON@UGA.CC.UGA.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

In our case, (and many other academic survey organizations), to release respondent phone numbers would be in violation of our Institutional Review Board approval, although we do from time to time release the exchange of the
Several replies correctly interpret the AAPOR Code's application in my view, ie no dice on keeping full phone nos. in a dataset, INCLUDING the masterset kept by the surveying organization once validity checks have been done and if it's not a panel design. It's the equivalent in these CATI days of separating the face sheet (and throwing it away) from the p&p interview schedule. OR anyway it would be wise to remove nos. from the grasp of subpoenas or greedy clients AS A MATTER OF EXPLICIT POLICY FOR ALL SURVEYS. In the Wisc. Lab. case why does the client want the nos. -- for what purpose? It seems a strange request if they know confidentiality was promised. Al Gollin
Subject: confidentiality of phone numbers

Responding to: "Linda Penaloza  5-2796" <PENALOZA@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu>

> AAPORNETTERS:

> I am interested in your thoughts on the confidentiality of telephone numbers generated for an RDD survey. We have historically held that when we tell a respondent that his/her responses are confidential, that we will not reveal his/her phone numbers to anyone - including the client. ...

> We are not inclined to include the phone numbers as part of the data set, but are being pressured to do so, despite having provided respondents with a statement assuring confidentiality. I think we are taking a justifiable stance, but am curious what your ideas on this are.

> Linda Penaloza  
> Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

1. I wonder if there might be an "agency" relationship here; in which the supplier might be construed as acting as an agent of the client. In such a case, the client probably would be under the confidentiality umbrella and entitled to access.

2. While I appreciate the need to protect respondents from Illicit use of their identities or responses, there are at least two reasons that clients might be entitled to access to the numbers:

   a. Survey validation.

   b. Simple documentation of the proper performance of the survey/contract.

I realize that the use of phone-banks with on-line monitoring of interviewers greatly reduces the need for validation of interviewers' work; but clients should retain the right to validate the work of the supervisors and suppliers. If the idea of validation to check up on the work of supervisors and suppliers would seem to question their competence or integrity: Yes.

For any who are not familiar with the practice, "validation" is the process of re-contacting respondents to verify that they were indeed interviewed and that the interview was properly administered. This can include verifying specific responses. I know from personal experience that validation of surveys can yield some shocking results.

Perhaps one solution would be to supply a separate data set of telephone numbers with the responses to only selected questions (if needed for validation, and agreed upon with the client after field work is completed) for validation purposes. This would preserve confidentiality for the remainder of the interview content.

Certainly, restrictions on any client or third-party use of telephone
numbers
or validation information should be spelled out in the survey contract.

Frankly, as a long-time member of the American Marketing Association and
AAPOR, always on the client side, I'm afraid that I would be outraged by a
supplier denying me access to any details of a survey that was done for me.
I consider it my responsibility to make certain that the surveys are
properly executed and that I have a responsibility even greater than that of the
supplier to see that obligations to the respondents were honored.

Hope this will contribute to the discussion.

Jack P.

>From MPRNJ!ABC@mprnj.com Mon Dec 9 15:23:42 1996
Return-Path: mprnj!MPRNJ!ABC@mprnj.com
Received: from tigger.jvnc.net (tigger.jvnc.net [128.121.50.145])
  by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id PAA04792 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 15:23:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mprnj.com by tigger.jvnc.net with UUCP id AA16650
  (5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for AAPORNET@USC.EDU); Mon, 9 Dec 1996 18:23:39 -0500
From: MPRNJ!ABC@mprnj.com (Anne Ciemnecki)
Date: 9-Dec-96 18:21:41
Received: by mprnj.com (UUCP-MHS-XtcN) Mon Dec 09 18:23:46 1996
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
Cc: MPRNJ!pbs@mprnj.com
Subject: Job Posting
Message-Id: 86CCA83A01B4ACD1
Importance: Normal
Encoding: 44 TEXT

Survey Operations Center Manager
Manage our new facility in Columbia, MD

Mathematica Policy Research (MPR), a national leader in social policy
research, is opening a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI)
center in Columbia, Maryland. This multi-shift, 80 workstation facility
will be a center for large scale survey research projects in health care,
welfare, education, employment, food and nutrition, and child
development.

We are looking for a survey professional with the ability to assume
leadership of this new operations center. You will be responsible for
start-up activities, administrative matters, and overseeing interviewers
and supervisors, as well as facility management. You will also have
solid grounding in survey research methods and play an active,
professional role in managing surveys.

The successful candidate will have the following qualifications:

- BA/BS in a social science or business discipline (graduate
  training/degree a plus)

- Minimum five years experience as a senior survey director or as
director of a mid to large size telephone center, emphasizing computer
assisted telephone surveys
- Experience budgeting surveys and overseeing financial performance on survey projects and/or telephone center

- Availability and willingness to travel occasionally

We offer a competitive salary, complete benefits package (including three weeks vacation in the first year). Interested candidates should submit a resume and professional references to:

Patricia A. Shirkness
Human Resources Department
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543
Internet: PBS@MPRNJ.COM

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Mon Dec 9 16:59:25 1996
Return-Path: tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu
Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu (mhub1.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.51])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id QAA20146 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Dec 1996 16:59:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Mon, 9 Dec 96 18:59:21 -0600
Received: by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Mon, 9 Dec 96 18:59:21 -0600
Date: Mon, 9 Dec 1996 18:59:20 -0600 (CST)
From: Phillip J Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: confidentiality of phone
In-Reply-To: <9612091353.0JIAI001@support.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961209185014.23404A@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Mon, 9 Dec 1996 jack.pfisterer@support.com wrote (in part):

> I realize that the use of phone-banks with on-line monitoring of interviewers
> greatly reduces the need for validation of interviewers' work; but clients
> should retain the right to validate the work of the supervisors and suppliers.
> If the idea of validation to check up on the work of supervisors and suppliers
> would seem to question their competence or integrity: Yes.
> ... I know from personal experience that validation of surveys can yield some shocking results.
>
> Perhaps one solution would be to supply a separate data set of telephone numbers with the responses to only selected questions (if needed for validation, and agreed upon with the client after field work is completed)
Certainly, restrictions on any client or third-party use of telephone numbers or validation information should be spelled out in the survey contract.

Frankly, as a long-time member of the American Marketing Association and AAPOR, always on the client side, I'm afraid that I would be outraged by a supplier denying me access to any details of a survey that was done for me. I consider it my responsibility to make certain that the surveys are properly executed and that I have a responsibility even greater than that of the supplier to see that obligations to the respondents were honored.

Hope this will contribute to the discussion.

Jack P.

There seems to be a consensus that a promise made, i.e., of confidentiality is a promise that must be kept. That principle was the basis of the Cohen v. Minneapolis StarTribune case a few years ago, in which a promise of confidentiality to a news source was breached. The U.S. Supreme Court accepted the argument that breaking that promise is a breach of contract.

If validation is such a serious problem, as this message suggests, the profession may need a system for validation per se, by a means that does not reveal respondent names or numbers to a client, in any way. Has there ever existed, or been considered, an auditing agency that would be independent of clients but would provide a validating service without revealing personal data to them?

Phil Tichenor

Proposals for papers and poster sessions for AAPOR's 52nd Annual Conference, to be held in Norfolk, Virginia, May 15 - 18, 1997,
are due by December 15. Please submit three copies of an abstract (of no more than 300 words) of your proposal, INCLUDING TWO OR THREE KEY WORDS DESCRIBING THE TOPIC, by December 15, 1996, to this year's Conference Committee Chair:

Roger Tourangeau  
aveled by The Joint Program in Survey  
Methodology  
1218 LeFrak Hall  
College Park, Maryland 20742

Be sure to attach an Author Information form, including your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and, if possible, an electronic mail address. You will receive confirmation that your proposal has been received. Final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January and you will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

Entries for the Student Paper Prize are also due by December 15. The prize is open both to current students (graduate or undergraduate) and to those who graduated during the 1995-1996 academic year. Entries should be roughly 15 to 25 pages in length and may have two or more authors. (All of the authors on an entry must be eligible for the prize, however.)

A prize of $500 is awarded to the winning paper; in addition, one or more papers may receive an Honorable Mention and be listed in the 1997 Conference Program. Please submit FIVE COPIES OF EACH ENTRY TO ARRIVE BY DECEMBER 15, 1996, to this year's Conference Committee Chair at the address given above. You should sure to include your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and, if possible, an electronic mail address. You will receive confirmation that your proposal has been received.
Market Facts, Inc., one of North America's largest marketing research companies, is looking for one or more individuals to join its growing suburban Washington practice. Our local professionals are a highly trained, multi-disciplinary staff (Psychology, Political Science, Marketing, Statistics) who conduct both public policy research for Federal agencies and marketing research. The marketing research staff work heavily in areas such as financial services, telecommunications, media, and health care. Currently, we are looking for an Associate Study Director, but we may have interests in other levels as well.

ASSOCIATE STUDY DIRECTOR -- Ideal candidates would have an advanced degree in social sciences or marketing research with a strong interest in quantitative primary research. One or more years of marketing or survey research experience is desirable. Excellent writing and interpersonal skills are crucial. The ability to design research, manage studies, and analyze and interpret data is required. Successful candidates typically have outstanding academic credentials. Professional staff in our unit conduct research in a team atmosphere on significant business and public policy issues. There is considerable opportunity for skill growth in research design, analysis, project management, and marketing. Professionals who have excellent skills and who build strong relationships with clients can be very successful.

Send or fax a letter and resume to:
Ms. Denise Ransome
Market Facts, Inc.
1650 Tysons Blvd. - Suite 110
McLean, VA 22102
FAX: 703 790-9181
Market Facts, Inc., one of North America's largest marketing research companies, is looking for one or more individuals to join its growing suburban Washington practice. Our local professionals are a highly trained, multi-disciplinary staff (Psychology, Political Science, Marketing, Statistics) who conduct both public policy research for Federal agencies and marketing research. The marketing research staff work heavily in areas such as financial services, telecommunications, media, and health care. Currently, we are looking for an Associate Study Director, but we may have interests in other levels as well.

ASSOCIATE STUDY DIRECTOR -- Ideal candidates would have an advanced degree in social sciences or marketing research with a strong interest in quantitative primary research. One or more years of marketing or survey research experience is desirable. Excellent writing and interpersonal skills are crucial. The ability to design research, manage studies, and analyze and interpret data is required. Successful candidates typically have outstanding academic credentials.

Professional staff in our unit conduct research in a team atmosphere on significant business and public policy issues. There is considerable opportunity for skill growth in research design, analysis, project management, and marketing. Professionals who have excellent skills and who build strong relationships with clients can be very successful.

Send or fax a letter and resume to:

Ms. Denise Ransome
Market Facts, Inc.
1650 Tysons Blvd. - Suite 110
McLean, VA 22102
FAX: 703 790-9181
It has been suggested that AAPOR members would appreciate receiving a number to which those very few and rare last minute 1997 Conference Proposal submissions can be faxed.

Conference Chair  
Roger Tourangeau  
301.314.7912

--- December 15th deadline ---

Amen to you!

Subject: confidentiality of phone numbers
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date: 12/9/96 1:53 PM

Subject: confidentiality of phone numbers

Responding to: "Linda Penaloza  5-2796" <PENALOZA@ws1.cee.uwex.edu>

> AAPORNETERS:

> I am interested in your thoughts on the confidentiality of telephone numbers generated for an RDD survey. We have historically held that when we tell a respondent that his/her responses are confidential, that we will not reveal his/her phone numbers to anyone - including the client. ...
We are not inclined to include the phone numbers as part of the data set, but are being pressured to do so, despite having provided respondents with a statement assuring confidentiality. I think we are taking a justifiable stance, but am curious what your ideas on this are.

Linda Penaloza  
Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory  
penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

1. I wonder if there might be an "agency" relationship here; in which the supplier might be construed as acting as an agent of the client. In such a case, the client probably would be under the confidentiality umbrella and entitled to access.

2. While I appreciate the need to protect respondents from illicit use of their identities or responses, there are at least two reasons that clients might be entitled to access to the numbers:
   a. Survey validation.
   b. Simple documentation of the proper performance of the survey/contract.

I realize that the use of phone-banks with on-line monitoring of interviewers greatly reduces the need for validation of interviewers' work; but clients should retain the right to validate the work of the supervisors and suppliers. If the idea of validation to check up on the work of supervisors and suppliers would seem to question their competence or integrity: Yes.

For any who are not familiar with the practice, "validation" is the process of re-contacting respondents to verify that they were indeed interviewed and that the interview was properly administered. This can include verifying specific responses. I know from personal experience that validation of surveys can yield some shocking results.

Perhaps one solution would be to supply a separate data set of telephone numbers with the responses to only selected questions (if needed for validation, and agreed upon with the client after field work is completed) for validation purposes. This would preserve confidentiality for the remainder of the interview content.

Certainly, restrictions on any client or third-party use of telephone numbers or validation information should be spelled out in the survey contract.

Frankly, as a long-time member of the American Marketing Association and AAPOR, always on the client side, I'm afraid that I would be outraged by a supplier denying me access to any details of a survey that was done for me. I consider it my responsibility to make certain that the surveys are properly executed and that I have a responsibility even greater than than of the supplier to see that obligations to the respondents were honored.
Hope this will contribute to the discussion.

Jack P.

>From CTalkov@aol.com Wed Dec 11 15:00:15 1996
Return-Path: CTalkov@aol.com
Received: from emout03.mail.aol.com (emout03.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.94])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/uscd) with SMTP
    id PAA16120 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 11 Dec 1996 15:00:13 -0800
(PST)
From: CTalkov@aol.com
Received: by emout03.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id RAA04862 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 11 Dec 1996 17:59:39 -0500
Date: Wed, 11 Dec 1996 17:59:39 -0500
Message-ID: <961211175937_808999989@emout03.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Job posting

Opinion Dynamics Corporation, a market and opinion research firm based in
Cambridge, Massachusetts has the following opening:

MARKET RESEARCH ANALYST
Market and Opinion research firm has an immediate opening for a motivated
person with the following qualifications: advanced degree in social science
or statistics, market research experience, knowledge of multivariate
statistical techniques, ability to write and speak clearly and explain
findings to corporate decision makers.

Send resume and salary requirements to: Department C at Opinion Dynamics
Corporation, 1030 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, MA 02138 or fax resume to
Department C at (617)497-7944.

Cynthia Talkov
12/11/96

>From featherstonf.rced@gao.gov Thu Dec 12 07:43:29 1996
Return-Path: featherstonf.rced@gao.gov
Received: from viper.gao.gov (viper.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/uscd) with ESMTP
    id HAA19040 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Dec 1996 07:43:20 -0800
(PST)
From: featherstonf.rced@gao.gov
Received: from viper.gao.gov (daemon=localhost) by viper.gao.gov
(8.7.2/8.7.2) with ESMTP id KAA08648 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Dec
1996 10:33:09 -0500 (EST)
Received: from mailgateway.gao.gov (mailgateway.gao.gov [161.203.15.2]) by
viper.gao.gov (8.7.2/8.7.2) with SMTP id KAA08633 for <aapornet@usc.edu>
 Thu, 12 Dec 1996 10:33:07 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ccMail by mailgateway.gao.gov (SMTPLINK V2.10.04o)
    id AA850415685; Thu, 12 Dec 96 10:22:27 EST
Date: Thu, 12 Dec 96 10:22:27 EST
Message-Id: <96112128504.AA850415685@mailgateway.gao.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: confidentiality

   It is very difficult to predict what inappropriate items your customer
will
want. I applaud Linda for trying to hold the line on giving up phone numbers to the survey sponsor.

In a related vein, I have started using an anonymity procedure in some of my mail surveys so that respondents can never be traced to their questionnaires. We used to use id numbers and then destroy the link. Our lawyers, however, wanted us to warn respondents that their answers could be obtained by Congressional request. That warning didn't seem to imply the responses were very confidential. So, now I've incorporated a perforated postcard for the respondent to tear out and mail back separately. The postcard has the id so I know who returned the questionnaires, but the questionnaire has no id on it. That way I am unable to link answers to individuals. The first time I used this procedure for Fortune 500 companies, I was very satisfied with the results. I had almost the same number of postcards as questionnaires, within two or three out of 650.

I'm preparing to mail three more surveys in January using this procedure (to government employees). In the earlier study, I mailed the questionnaire twice, but staggered it several months to prevent duplicate responses. I used other types of mailings in between. This time, I'm planning to have only 5 or 6 weeks between the questionnaire mailings, so I'll see if I get more duplicate ids this time. (I only got one or two last time.) I'm considering a stamp that says "2nd mailing" on the second questionnaire. Any ideas for how that would help me tease out my errors from duplicate surveys? I'm assuming that even the same respondent would answer questions differently on a different date so that I can't compare identical records.

(fran)
Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548
E-mail: FEATHERSTONF.RCED@GAO.GOV
Phone: 202.512.4946

Subject: confidentiality of phone
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date:   12/9/96 1:53 PM
Subject: confidentiality of phone numbers

Responding to: "Linda Penaloza  5-2796" <PENALOZA@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu>

>AAPORNETERS:

>I am interested in your thoughts on the confidentiality of telephone numbers generated for an RDD survey. We have historically held that when we tell a respondent that his/her responses are confidential, that we will not reveal his/her phone numbers to anyone - including the client. ...

>We are not inclined to include the phone numbers as part of the data set, but are being pressured to do so, despite having provided respondents with a statement assuring confidentiality. I think we are taking a justifiable stance, but am curious what your ideas on this are.

>Linda Penaloza
>Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory
>penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

1. I wonder if there might be an "agency" relationship here; in which the supplier might be construed as acting as an agent of the client. In such a case, the client probably would be under the confidentiality umbrella and entitled to access.

2. While I appreciate the need to protect respondents from Illicit use of their identities or responses, there are at least two reasons that clients might be entitled to access to the numbers:

   a. Survey validation.

   b. Simple documentation of the proper performance of the survey/contract.

I realize that the use of phone-banks with on-line monitoring of interviewers greatly reduces the need for validation of interviewers' work; but clients should retain the right to validate the work of the supervisors and suppliers.

If the idea of validation to check up on the work of supervisors and suppliers would seem to question their competence or integrity: Yes.

For any who are not familiar with the practice, "validation" is the process of re-contacting respondents to verify that they were indeed interviewed and that the interview was properly administered. This can include verifying specific responses. I know from personal experience that validation of surveys can yield some shocking results.

Perhaps one solution would be to supply a separate data set of telephone numbers with the responses to only selected questions (if needed for validation, and agreed upon with the client after field work is completed) for validation purposes. This would preserve confidentiality for the remainder of the interview content.
Certainly, restrictions on any client or third-party use of telephone numbers or validation information should be spelled out in the survey contract.

Frankly, as a long-time member of the American Marketing Association and AAPOR, always on the client side, I'm afraid that I would be outraged by a supplier denying me access to any details of a survey that was done for me. I consider it my responsibility to make certain that the surveys are properly executed and that I have a responsibility even greater than than of the supplier to see that obligations to the respondents were honored.

Hope this will contribute to the discussion.

Jack P.

>From SCHNEID@zuma-mannheim.de Fri Dec 13 08:08:44 1996
Return-Path: SCHNEID@zuma-mannheim.de
Received: from noc.belwue.de (root@noc.BelWue.DE [129.143.2.1])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA29219 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Dec 1996 08:08:37 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from hp-zuma.zuma-mannheim.de (hp-zuma.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.1])
    by noc.belwue.de (8.8.4/8.8.4) with SMTP
    id RAA19301 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Dec 1996 17:08:04 +0100
    (MET)
Received: from zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de by hp-zuma.zuma-mannheim.de with SMTP
    (1.38.193.4/BelWue-1.0HP) id AA18079; Fri, 13 Dec 1996 17:06:43 +0100
    Received: from ZUM-1/MAIL by zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de (Mercury 1.11);
    Fri, 13 Dec 96 17:08:01 +0100
    Received: from MAIL by ZUM-1 (Mercury 1.11); Fri, 13 Dec 96 17:08:01 +0100
    From: "Michael Schneid" <SCHNEID@zuma-mannheim.de>
    Organization: ZUMA
    To: aapornet@usc.edu
    Date: Fri, 13 Dec 1996 17:07:53 GMT+0100
    Subject: computerized field work
    X-Confirm-Reading-To: "Michael Schneid" <SCHNEID@zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de>
    X-Pmrqc: 1
    Priority: normal
    X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23DE)
    Message-Id: <47BA576A0E@zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de>

Has anyone experience with programs for computerized field work (especially face-to-face) or information about literature / articles about the use of such programs?

With such a program it's possible to select the interviewers for the studies, to control the field work process, to examine the realized sample and further more.

Please answer me directly and I can collect the answers.

Thanks in advance.
Bevestiging van lezing : uw bericht -  

Datum: 13 Dec 96 17:07  
Aan: aapornet@usc.edu  
Ondw.: computerized field work

Gelezen om 17:21, 13 Dec 96.
HArd to know whether to take this new warning seriously, but use your own judgement....

Forwarded from Krister Forsberg, Lidingo, SWEDEN

>Subject: FW: ATTENTION - New Virus!
>
>FYI. Received this message through a bulletin board I'm on. I have deleted
>interim messages down to the relevant message
>>>> --------
>>>>
>>>> This appears to be an important new virus to be aware of. You may want
>>>> to send this information to your colleagues as you deem appropriate.
>>>>
>>>> Subject: Virus Alert
>>>> Importance: High
>>>>
>>>> If anyone receives mail entitled: PENPAL GREETINGS! please delete
>>>> it WITHOUT reading it. Below is a little explanation of the
>>>> message, and what it would do to your PC if you were to read the message.
If
>>>> you have any questions or concerns please contact SAF-IA Info Office
>>>> on 697-5059.
>>>>
>>>> This is a warning for all internet users - there is a dangerous
>>>> virus propogating across the internet through an e-mail message
>>>> entitled "PENPAL GREETINGS!". DO NOT DOWNLOAD ANY MESSAGE
ENTITLED
>>>> "PENPAL GREETINGS!"
>>>>
>>>> This message appears to be a friendly letter asking you if you are
>>>> interested in a penpal, but by the time you read this letter, it
>>>> is
>>>> too late. The "trojan horse" virus will have already infected the
>boot
>>>> sector of your hard drive, destroying all of the data present. It
is
>>>> a self-replicating virus, and once the message is read, it will
>>>> AUTOMATICALLY forward itself to anyone who's e-mail address is
>present
>>>> in YOUR mailbox!
>>>>
>>>> This virus will DESTROY your hard drive, and holds the potential
to
>>>> DESTROY the hard drive of anyone whose mail is in your inbox, and
>>>> who's mail is in their inbox, and so on. If this virus remains
>>>> unchecked, it has the potential to do a great deal of DAMAGE to
computer networks worldwide!!!!

Please, delete the message entitled "PENPAL GREETINGS!" as soon as you see it! And pass this message along to all of your friends and relatives, and the other readers of the newsgroups and mailing lists which you are on, so that they are not hurt by this dangerous virus!!!!

-------------------------  end  ------------------------------

---------------------------------------------
Krister Forsberg        *  Quality Management Principles
k.forsberg@wineasy.se   *  http://www.wineasy.se/qmp/
Lidingo, SWEDEN

---------------------------------------------
Francois Boilard, M.Ing
Service regional de genie biomedical Chaudiere-Appalaches
143, rue Wolfe
Levis (Quebec)
CANADA
G6V 3Z1
Tel: (418) 835-7110
Fax: (418) 835-7120
E-mail: fboilard@intercime.qc.ca

---------------------------------------------
Julian Walsh
jpw@asiaonline.net
Phone: (852) 25210859
Fax: (852) 25211978

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

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Phone/Fax: (770) 434 4121
Halpern & Associates E-Mail: rshalp@cris.com
Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-4248
>From jack.pfisterer@support.com Sat Dec 14 12:20:03 1996
Return-Path: jack.pfisterer@support.com
Received: from netcomsv.netcom.com (uucp2.netcom.com [163.179.3.2])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id MAA21315 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 14 Dec 1996 12:19:37 -0800
    (PST)
From: jack.pfisterer@support.com
Received: from support.com by netcomsv.netcom.com with UUCP (8.6.12/SMI-4.1)
    id MAA18078; Sat, 14 Dec 1996 12:15:50 -0800
Received: by support.com
    id 0G9OG00D Sat, 14 Dec 96 11:34:50 -0800
Message-ID: <9612141134.0G9OG00@support.com>
Organization: L.A. Valley College Public BBS (818)985-7150
X-Mailer: TBBS/TIGER v1.0
Date: Sat, 14 Dec 96 11:34:50 -0800
Subject: For what it is worth....
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: For what it is worth.... A New Virus

>Forwarded from Krister Forsberg ,Lidingo, SWEDEN

>>Subject: FW: ATTENTION - New Virus!
>>
>>FYI. Received this message through a bulletin board I'm on. I have
deleted
>>interim messages down to the relevant message
>>>>> *******
>>>>>
>>>>> This appears to be an important new virus to be aware of. You may want
>>>>> to send this information to your colleagues as you deem
appropriate.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This is a warning for all internet users - there is a dangerous
>>>>>> virus propogating across the internet through an e-mail message
>>>>>> entitled "PENPAL GREETINGS!". DO NOT DOWNLOAD ANY MESSAGE
ENTITLED
>>>>>> "PENPAL GREETINGS!"

It really isn't worth much--an old hoax with a new name. It IS a form of
virus, but it operates by flooding the internet with warning messages.

The only "PENPAL GREETINGS!" message you are likely to encounter is a copy
of
the warning message that someone has unthinkingly labeled with the name of the
"virus."

Enjoy!

Jack P.
JOE ANNOUNCEMENT

Wirthlin Worldwide, an independent marketing research company is seeking qualified individuals for the position of PROJECT DIRECTOR.

SUMMARY: Mid-level project management position, working with guidance and supervision from senior researchers responsible for all phases of project management, including: project design and budgeting, designing survey instruments, monitoring field activities, specifying and checking data processing, and preparation of presentation materials.

RESPONSIBILITIES:
--Prepare project cost estimates based on research specifications
--Responsible for monitoring project costs
--Participate in questionnaire development and project setup
--Responsible for guiding and monitoring field activities, such as writing interviewer instructions, testing CATI programs, and working with field supervisors
--Develop coding specifications and monitor coding personnel
--Interact with data processing, including writing stub and banner specifications, other cross-tabulation specs, and checking tables.
--Communicate the status of all projects to senior staff on those projects and to office management
--Write analysis of survey results for projects
--Participate in report preparation, including producing graphics and presentation materials

CAREER DEVELOPMENT: This position would lead to a senior project director position as individual demonstrates proficiency.

QUALIFICATIONS: Ideal candidate would exhibit the following qualities: strong written and verbal communication skills, ability to work under tight deadlines, attention to detail, ability to manage and take responsibility for multiple tasks/projects, demonstrate initiative and have a team-oriented attitude. College degree is required; master's degree is appreciated (but not required). Past experience in research field is preferred, but an interest in survey research is essential.

ABOUT WIRTHLIN: Wirthlin Worldwide is one of the leading full-service opinion research and consulting firms in the United States, with particular expertise in marketing and communications strategy development, public opinion surveys, and marketing research. Our research employs a wide
range of research methodologies and analytical techniques, including qualitative methods (such as focus groups, in-depth interviews, and values laddering) and quantitative methods (such as telephone surveys, mail surveys, and statistical modeling). Our clients include many Fortune 100 companies, industry associations, government agencies, political candidates, consulting firms and advertising agencies. We are the exclusive research supplier to Burson-Marsteller, the world's largest public relations agency. Headquartered in McLean, Virginia, the firm has offices in: New York City, Chicago, Irvine (CA), Salt Lake City, Grand Rapids (MI), London, Hong Kong, and Canberra, Australia.

WHERE TO APPLY: Wirthlin Worldwide currently has openings in several locations. The contacts for two locations are listed below. Please specify which location you are interested in. Please send a resume and cover letter to:

New York:  Dave Richardson, Senior Research Executive, 708 Third Avenue, Suite 1000, New York, NY 10017 (drichardson@wirthlin.com)

McLean, VA:  Beth Strackbein, Research Manager, 1363 Beverly Road, McLean, VA 22101-3603 (bstrackbein@wirthlin.com)

>From sgoold@unm.edu Tue Dec 17 09:30:35 1996
Return-Path: sgoold@unm.edu
Received: from pyxis.unm.edu (pyxis.unm.edu [129.24.8.31])
    by usc.edu (8.8.4/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA22845 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Dec 1996 09:30:32 -0800
(PST)
Received: from DialupEudora(really [129.24.8.35]) by pyxis.unm.edu
    via sendmail with smtp
    id <m0va3DO-0001KUC@pyxis.unm.edu>
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Dec 1996 10:22:02 -0700 (MST)
    (Smail-3.2 1996-Jul-4 #51 built 1996-Oct-30)
Message-Id: <v02130500aedc88201018@DialupEudora>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 17 Dec 1996 10:33:29 -0700
To: phanke@unm.edu, sanagno127@aol.com, liedka@unm.edu, malachi@unm.edu, jiri@unm.edu, bigmatt@unm.edu, Leah@unm.edu, t644111@unm.edu, akit116@unm.edu, amelia@unm.edu, useem@unm.edu, lizzy@unm.edu, mstapia@unm.edu, lafree@unm.edu, liedka@unm.edu, bwilson@unm.edu, klasmich@cwis.isu.edu, kimlopez@unm.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
Subject: Happy Holidays

>>>For those of you in a giving mood...
>>>>
>>>>The Houghton-Mifflin publishing co. is giving books to children's hospitals; how many books they give depends on how many emails they receive from people around the world. For every 25 emails they receive, they give one book--it seems like a great way to help a good cause. All you have to do is email share@hmco.com. Hope you can spare the seconds...and let your friends know. So far they only have about 400 messages...last year they reached 23,000.
---Scott Goold---
PhD Candidate
University of New Mexico
505.247.3398
see my Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying" -- MJ on Pursuing Excellence, 1994
---

---From abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU Wed Dec 18 07:50:46 1996---
Return-Path: abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU
Received: from lists.Princeton.EDU (root@lists.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.249])
    by usc.edu (8.8.4/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA13158 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Dec 1996 07:50:43 -0800 (PST)
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU ([128.112.129.131]) by
lists.Princeton.EDU with ESMTP id <370357.s2-2>; Wed, 18 Dec 1996 10:50:30 -0500
Received: from bundespost.Princeton.EDU (bundespost.Princeton.EDU [128.112.128.119]) by
Received: from wws214.Princeton.EDU (wws214.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.69]) by
Message-ID: <32B83C75.3BAA@wws.princeton.edu>
Date: Wed, 18 Dec 1996 10:48:21 -0800
From: Herb Abelson <abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 442
References: <199612180803.AAA11453@usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Subject: Happy Holidays
> Date: Tue, 17 Dec 1996 10:33:29 -0700
> From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>
> >>>For those of you in a giving mood...
> >>>
> >>>>The Houghton-Mifflin publishing co. is giving books to children's
> >>>>hospitals; how many books they give depends on how many emails they
> >>>>receive from people around the world. For every 25 emails they
> >>>>receive, they give one book--it seems like a great way to help a
> >>>>good cause. All you have to do is email share@hmco.com. Hope you
> >>>>can spare the seconds...and let your friends know. So far they
> >>>>only have about 400 messages...last year they reached 23,000.
>>
> Scott Goold
> PhD Candidate
I understand this was a promotion thought up by a marketing manager without benefit of checking with technical staff. As of two days ago their email was so jammed with these messages that I heard they called the thing off. It is not clear whether it ever had the company's approval.

But for anyone who wants to document the flow of communication on the web... Happy Holidays anyway!

---

This is a last call for AAPOR nominations. Please give some thought to who might best lead AAPOR in the next few years. Nominations are sought for:

Vice-President and President-Elect (this year restricted to commercial members)

Councillor-at-large (this year restricted to noncommercial members)

Conference Associate Chair (this year restricted to noncommercial members)

Secretary-treasurer, associate (no restrictions)

Standards, associate (no restrictions)

Publications/Information, associate (no restrictions)
Membership/Chapter relations, associate (no restrictions)

****DO NOT SEND REPLIES TO AAPORNET****
****SEND NOMINATIONS DIRECTLY TO BGROVES@SURVEY.UMD.EDU****
****DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT IS JANUARY 4, 1997 ****

Thanks for your support of AAPOR!!

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Fri Dec 20 16:59:03 1996
Return-Path: Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com
Received: from mail3.pilot.net (mail3.pilot.net [205.139.40.11])
    by usc.edu (8.8.4/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA15615 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Dec 1996 16:59:01 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-23-147.pilot.net [204.48.23.147])
    by mail3.pilot.net with ESMTP id QAA00346 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 20
Dec 1996 16:59:00 -0800 (PST)
Received: from latimes.com (bierce.latimes.com [192.187.72.9]) by
    mailgw.latimes.com with SMTP id QAA26851 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Dec
1996 16:58:27 -0800 (PST)
Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by
    latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTP id PAA13575 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>;
    Fri, 20 Dec 1996 15:43:26 -0800
Date: Fri, 20 Dec 1996 15:43:26 -0800
From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: POSTING
In-Reply-To: <BF71BE2E87@survey.umd.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.A32.3.91.961220152709.78267B-100000@fowler.news.latimes.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

PART-TIME POLL RESEARCH ANALYST

The Los Angeles Times Poll has an opening for a part-time researcher/polling analyst. The person hired would work four days (9:30AM-6PM) per week. Occasionally, when a poll is in the field, this person would have to work overtime and possibly work five days. He/She would have to be flexible during these periods.

This person should have some experience in questionnaire design, which includes questionnaire writing and sample methodology. He/She should be able to analyze data and help reporters understand the results. Also, this person should be able to write up the analysis for News Alerts that go out to different news organizations, pundits, politicians and pollsters that are on the poll's mailing list, and also has the ability to work independently.

Would be a plus to have knowledge of SPSS and other software packages (Excel, Microsoft Word, XYwrite, Quark, ACCESS). The Times Poll has its own data tabulations package, which is very user friendly. He/She MUST work well under deadline pressure. He/She must be able to get along with others and work well with reporters, editors and people outside the
Times calling for information about the polls.

Interest in politics, current events, American lifestyle, and local issues highly desirable. Must have at least a bachelor's degree.

All interested persons should send their resumes to Susan Pinkus, Acting Director Los Angeles Times Poll, Times Mirror Square, Los Angeles, Ca. 90053. No phone calls, please.

*************************************************
Susan H. Pinkus
Los Angeles Times Poll
Internet: susan.pinkus@latimes.com
American Online: spinkus@aol.com
FAX: 213-237-2505
*************************************************

>From rww4@NCH07A.EM.CDC.GOV Tue Dec 24 07:55:48 1996
Return-Path: rww4@NCH07A.EM.CDC.GOV
Received: from msmail.em.cdc.gov (msmail.em.cdc.gov [158.111.3.15])
  by usc.edu (8.8.4/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
  id HAA04666 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Dec 1996 07:55:46 -0800 (PST)
Received: from SmtpOut.em.cdc.gov (smtpout.em.cdc.gov [158.111.3.16]) by
  msmail.em.cdc.gov (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id KAA21880 for
  <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Dec 1996 10:55:16 -0500 (EST)
Received: by SmtpOut.em.cdc.gov with Microsoft Mail
  id <32BF7EDD@SmtpOut.em.cdc.gov>; Tue, 24 Dec 96 10:57:33 EST
From: "Wilson, Ronald W." <rww4@NCH07A.EM.CDC.GOV>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: marijuana laws
Date: Tue, 24 Dec 96 10:52:00 EST
Message-ID: <32BF7EDD@SmtpOut.em.cdc.gov>
Encoding: 12 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

The National Center for Health Statistics is considering exploring the public's knowledge and attitudes related to changes in laws governing marijuana use for therapeutic purposes and the potential messages they may send to young people. We are interested in talking with anyone who has developed questions on this issue that would be appropriate for phone administration. While we ideally are interested in adolescents, the use of phone interviewing, privacy and informed consent issues will probably limit us to getting data only on persons 18 and over. Reply directly by aapornet, my own email (rww4@nch07a.em.cdc.gov), phone (301-436-7032 x153) or fax (301-436-8459). Thanks. Ron Wilson, National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

>From 6710GRIFFINR@vms.csd.mu.edu Thu Dec 26 05:39:55 1996
Return-Path: 6710GRIFFINR@vms.csd.mu.edu
Received: from VMSD.CSD.MU.EDU (vmsd.csd.mu.edu [134.48.20.5])
  by usc.edu (8.8.4/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
  id FAA09131 for <AApornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Dec 1996 05:39:53 -0800 (PST)
We're trying to get some guidance on what would be considered to be the common and the acceptable rates of response in RDD telephone surveys in metropolitan areas. Given that response rates can -- and probably should -- be reported in various ways, we're interested more in guidelines pertaining generally to the rate of completions per eligibles than in guidelines about the more general estimates of the efficiency of the random number generation system.

Assume the study would be of adult residents with some form of within-residence selection system.

In short, what are current industry standards among responsible survey interviewing organizations? Are there acceptable minimums?

Thank you.

Robert J. Griffin
Professor, Journalism
Marquette University
Milwaukee WI

Blum & Weprin Associates, a public opinion firm in New York City, has an opening for a full-time Polling Administrator. Opportunity to learn all aspects of public opinion polling by directly assisting principals of full-service firm.
Responsibilities would include:
Supervising telephone poll recruitment, administration and payroll.
Building and running of SPSS poll files, as well as some data input.
Assisting in analysis of poll results.
Some general office work.

Regular hours would be 9-5 three days a week, and 3-11 two days a week.
Hours must be somewhat flexible, with willingness to work additional
evenings and some weekends, with O-T pay.

Must have at least bachelor's degree, as well as some experience in public
opinion polling. SPSS knowledge a big plus.

Please fax resume to 212-929-6518. No phone calls please.