```
========================================================================
Date:          Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender:        AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From:          Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject:       December 1998 archive - one BIG message
```

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

Turning this into individual messages that ASU's Listserv software can
index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time
permits.
New messages are of course automatically formatted and indexed correctly,
and I have converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to
the present.

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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9812.
Part 1/1, total size 507914 bytes:

----------------------------- Cut here ------------------------------
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 1 06:54:54 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id GAA06912 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 06:54:54 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
      by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id GAA23800 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 06:54:53 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 1 Dec 1998 06:54:53 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: London Conference - Final Call for Papers (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9812010652400.23359-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---------- Forwarded message ----------
```

```
*********************************************************
*** an announcement from:
      The Association for Survey Computing.
*** Apologies for any cross-postings;
*** Please feel free to pass this on;
*** Please reply to asc@essex.ac.uk;
*** Thank you.
*********************************************************
```

ASC '99

...LEADING SURVEY AND STATISTICAL COMPUTING INTO THE NEW
MILLENNIUM

Wednesday to Friday, 22nd to 24th September 1999
at The University of Edinburgh in Scotland, UK

SECOND ANNOUNCEMENT AND FINAL CALL FOR PAPERS

Building on the success of its 1992 and 1996 international events and to set
the scene for the millennium, The Association for Survey Computing is
pleased to announce that in 1999 it will be hosting its Third International
Conference on Survey and Statistical Computing in Edinburgh.

The Scientific Programme will comprise both invited and contributed papers
which will be included in the Proceedings and published prior to the
Conference.

The official language of the conference will be English.

The Conference is sponsored by SPSSmr.

INVITED SPEAKERS

Invited speakers will address plenary sessions on the first
and last days of the Conference and will include:

*   Mick Couper (University of Michigan)
*   Ian Durrell (SPSSmr)
*   David Hand (Department of Statistics, The Open University)
*   Rory Morgan (Research International Group)
*   Andy Teague (Office for National Statistics)

CONTRIBUTED PAPERS

Contributed papers will be refereed and will address topics covering all
aspects of survey and statistical computing, including, but not limited to:

*   Case studies
*   Computer aided data capture technologies
*   Data interchange
*   Data management and database design
*   Data modelling techniques and data visualisation
*   Data quality, editing and imputation
*   Dissemination of survey results
*   Meta-data and survey documentation
*   Networking technology and its impact
*   Quantitative and Qualitative data handling
*   Sample and field management
*   Sample design and weighting
*   Secondary data
*   Statistical languages
*   Surveys and the Internet
*   Survey systems

CALL FOR PAPERS

Interested contributors should send a brief abstract (maximum 500 words),
including title, relevant keywords and topic headings under which it would
best fit, to the following address:

  => ASC, P.O. BOX 60.
      CHESHAM, BUCKS, HP5 3QH, ENGLAND
      Tel/Fax: +44 (0)1494 793033
      E-mail: asc@essex.ac.uk

Please include your full address with 'phone and fax numbers and, if
possible, electronic mail address.

IMPORTANT DATES

14th December 1998	Deadline for receipt of proposals for contribution to parallel streams
30th January 1999	Notification of acceptance sent out
Early March 1999	Deadline for receipt of first drafts of papers for review
Mid April 1999	Referees' comments sent out

```
Early June 1999               Deadline for receipt of final
                              copy of papers for inclusion
                              in Conference Proceedings

22nd - 24th September 1999    THE ASC CONFERENCE

For complete information, updated as available, please see

     http://www.assurcom.demon.co.uk/Events/Sep99/index.htm

or, send an e-mail message to

     asc99-info@essex.ac.uk

which will automatically reply.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------
This message has been sent, on behalf the ASC, by:

Randy Banks (randy@essex.ac.uk)              tel: +44 (0)1206 873067
Chair, Association for Survey Computing       fax: +44 (0)1206 873151
Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER)
University of Essex
Colchester, Essex
United Kingdom CO4 3SQ             http://www.assurcom.demon.co.uk
-----------------------------------------------------------------------


>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Tue Dec  1 07:56:00 1998
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id HAA20381 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 07:55:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mindspring.com (user-38lcfs8.dialup.mindspring.com
[209.86.63.136])
      by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA01948;
      Tue, 1 Dec 1998 10:55:58 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3664113D.682B0FC@mindspring.com>
Date: Tue, 01 Dec 1998 10:54:37 -0500
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="------------CA7D10DA822F2A542163A0A6"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
--------------CA7D10DA822F2A542163A0A6
```

For those of you who are following the debate over the use of statistical sampling in the census the following from today's NY Times may be of interest:

file:///D|/NETSCAPE DOWNLOAD/Download/POLITICS/scotus-census.html

```
<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html> <head>
   <meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
   <meta name="slug" content="BC-SCOTUS-CENSUS-950&ADD-NYT">
   <meta name="date" content="19981130">
   <meta name="length" content="1302">
   <meta name="byline" content="By LINDA GREENHOUSE">
   <meta name="headline" content="Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute">
   <meta name="GENERATOR" content="Mozilla/4.5 [en] (Win95; U) [Netscape]">
   <title>Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute</title> <NYT_HEADER
version="1.0" type="main"> </head> <body bgcolor="#FFFFFF">
```

```
<blockquote>
<blockquote> 
<h2>
Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute</h2>

<h5>

<hr size=1></h5>
 
<p> 
<br> 
<br> 
<br> 
<br> 
<p><img SRC="w.gif" ALT="W"  align=LEFT>ASHINGTON -- Members of the Supreme
```
Court expressed considerable doubt Monday about whether they should resolve the legal and constitutional issues surrounding the Clinton administration's plan to use statistical sampling to make the 2000 census more accurate. ```<p>```The justices seemed to agree with the administration's arguments that the House of Representatives, which had already lost a legislative round with President Clinton over sampling, should not drag the courts into a highly charged political feud. ```<p>```"I don't like injecting us into a battle between the two political branches," Justice Antonin Scalia told a lawyer representing the House of Representatives, which sued the administration

this year over the sampling plan. The House won its case before a special three-judge U.S. District Court here, as did a group of 16 private plaintiffs, organized by a conservative public interest law firm, who brought a similar suit before a three-judge panel in Alexandria, Va. <p>In arguing its appeal from both rulings before the Supreme Court Monday, the administration, represented by Solicitor General Seth Waxman, maintained that neither case should have been allowed to proceed in the lower courts because the plaintiffs lacked the kind of concrete injury necessary to have standing to bring a case in federal court. <p>With the emphasis on jurisdictional issues, very little time was spent during the 90-minute argument on the intricate legal framework on which the sampling plan foundered in the lower courts. Both courts interpreted the opaque provisions of the Census Act to prohibit the use of sampling for the purpose of allocating congressional seats among the 50 states. Both courts then found it unnecessary to address whether the constitutional mandate of an "actual enumeration" rules out statistical sampling. <p>While the courtroom was crowded with members of Congress and with representatives of groups with a stake in this dispute, there was only glancing acknowledgment of just what those stakes might be or of the raw politics at the heart of the matter. Sampling, a form of statistical estimation, is aimed at correcting an anticipated undercount of millions of people that disproportionately misses members of minority groups and poor people living in cities. <p>These areas tend to be Democratic strongholds -- the three worst undercounts in 1990 were in congressional districts in the New York City boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx, according to one study -- and Democrats are confident they will gain in political power if the missing millions are counted. Republicans are determined not to let that happen. <p>An exchange between Justice John Paul Stevens and Maureen Mahoney, representing the House of Representatives, demonstrated the depth of the Republicans' commitment to the traditional headcount. What should a census taker be allowed to do, Stevens asked, when trying to count people in an apartment complex with a large population of illegal aliens? Suppose an apartment appeared occupied, but no one answered the door and the neighbors refused to reveal anything. Would the census taker have any options? <p>"Your honor, they can't guess," Ms. Mahoney replied. <p>So the census taker should put down "zero" even if an apartment was evidently occupied? Stevens asked. <p>Yes, the lawyer replied, because the Constitution requires an "objective standard," not an estimate. <p>"So an objective standard requires 'zero'?" Stevens persisted, as Justice Stephen Breyer broke in to ask: "Even if the lights go on and off in the evening?" <p>The argument then veered back to whether the House should have been allowed to bring its suit in the first place. The Republican leadership went to court to stop sampling after failing last year to override Clinton's veto of a bill that would have barred "any statistical adjustment" of the population numbers used for apportioning House seats. Waxman said the House should not be permitted to accomplish through litigation what it could not achieve by legislation, a point with which justices across the ideological spectrum appeared inclined to agree. <p>"I don't see a stopping point," Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg told Ms. Mahoney. Ginsburg went on to characterize the House's position as: "Gee, this is really important, and we want you to resolve this, court."

<p>Scalia provided the day's most vivid commentary. "There are 900 ways the House can stymie the president if it has the political will to do it," he said, suggesting as one clearly fanciful option a refusal to appropriate money for the White House staff. <p>"Your honor, this has become an intractable controversy," Ms. Mahoney said. <p>"When you say 'intractable,' you mean the president has won, and the House doesn't have the political will to do anything about it," Scalia replied. "It's a political controversy, and we don't get into that." <p>Various justices also expressed doubt, although less definitively, about the standing of the private plaintiffs. The 16 individuals, organized by the Southeastern Legal Foundation, of Atlanta, live in various states, including Connecticut, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, that the plaintiffs assert are likely to lose congressional seats under an adjusted census that they would keep under a traditional headcount. The administration's position is that the prediction is premature and too speculative a basis for standing. <p>The justices indicated discomfort with the lack of agreement on basic facts; since the lower courts decided the two lawsuits on summary judgment, without a trial, the two sides' factual assertions were never tested. The court appeared uncertain on how to proceed. <p>If the justices were to reverse the lower courts by finding that summary judgment was inappropriate, Chief Justice William Rehnquist said, "we'd have no definitive resolution before June," by which time the court's current term is expected to end. In urging the court several months ago to accept these cases on an expedited basis -- a request the court accommodated with unusual speed -- both sides asserted that the dispute needed to be resolved by March in order to keep the census on schedule. In the budget agreement last month, Congress agreed to pay for census preparations only until June 15. <p>Michael Carvin, representing the private plaintiffs, tried without much success to focus the court's attention on the merits of his case. "The key point is that there will be no 100 percent headcount," he said. <p>"Has there ever been a 100 percent headcount?" Ginsburg asked. "Haven't there always been people missed?" <p>Unless the Supreme Court issues a definitive constitutional ruling, which does not appear probable, any ruling is likely to leave some important loose ends, of which an appropriations battle is only one. The only question actually before the court is whether sampling can be used for apportionment -- the allocation of congressional delegations among the states, which is the only function the Constitution assigns to the census. <p>But census figures are also used for districting within states, as well as for determining federal aid under a variety of programs. The administration takes the view that a statistical adjustment for those purposes could proceed
-- and under one reading of the Census Act would, in fact, be required
-- even if the court ruled it out for apportionment purposes. <p>The cases are Department of Commerce vs. House of Representatives, No. 98-404, and Clinton vs. Glavin, No. 98-564.

 </blockquote>
</blockquote>

</body>
</html>

--------------CA7D10DA822F2A542163A0A6--

Dear AAPOR,

This note is long overdue.

I want to extend my thanks to the many who wrote to congratulate me for
receiving the AAPOR Award this year. Your letters were much appreciated; I
wish I could reply personally to each one, but it was not possible due to
illness. I am very grateful nonetheless.

Apologies for (mis)using the Net.

Je vous aime, l'AAPOR!

Al Gollin
algollin@worldnet.att.net

To give you an idea of what Hill staffers are reading about election =
polls...

The Wed., Nov. 18th edition of The Hill Rag ran an article by Philippe =
Shepnick entitled "Pollsters say polls were merely trends." The Rag is = a
free Capital Hill neighborhood paper distributed in D.C. that covers = Hill
issues, both local and national, provides a calendar, local Hill = gossip,
and is widely read by staffers, etc. Interest groups, = lobbyists, and
others advertise there as a way to target their = Congressional audience.

A photo of Sen. Faircloth is featured with the caption "Sen. Lauch =
Faircloth (R-NC) was given the edge by pollsters, but lost on Election =
Day." In fact, the article says that he was given a slim 44 to 43 lead, =
with a 3.5% margin of error. His opponent, John Edwards (D-NC), won 51 = to
47.

(Incidentally, many DC locals were THRILLED at Faircloth's loss-he was =
largely responsible for engineering the takeover of our local =
self-government by a Control Board and the federalization of our = judicial
system last July at midnight. He used race baiting in his ads. = Local
democracy activists held a post election press conference to give = him a
token bus ticket back to his pig farms that are said to be causing =
environmental hazards in NC water).

The Rag reports that:

"The surprising results in last week's Senate races had some pollsters =
questioning their pre-election data and giving credit to the strong =
get-out-the-vote efforts by Democrats and the unions in the weekend = before
the Nov. 3 election."

"...some pollsters believe that it is becoming harder to get an accurate =

pulse of the voters because of the refusal rate of callers-the number of =
people who refuse to take part in the survey-which sometimes reaches 50 =
percent. The refusal rate on public policy issues hovers around 20 =
percent."

"The refusal rate is something many people in the research community = have
been concerned with for a long time," said pollster Brian Vargus, = director
of the Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory. "For = those of us who
do telephone research, we've got to find something = that's better."

"Richard Niemi, a political science professor at the University of =
Rochester, said that, in the last 15 to 20 years, more voters are = refusing
to participate in telephone polls, but he's not sure how they = affect the
results. "That could be a factor [affecting a poll's = accuracy], but we
don't really know," he said. "We can't interview = those who chose not to
participate in polls, so we don't have a good = handle on their effect on a
race."

Another factor affecting polls is the deluge in media outlets, which =
allows voters to frequently change their minds, Vargus said. Those two =
elements diminish the shelf life of a poll. "As Election Day approaches, =
polls are only as good as the day they were done," he said.

Polls should be viewed as trends, Zogby said. "What polls need to do is =
provide a reasonable exception for voters," he said. "My balls are made =
of steel, not crystal. I can't see into the future. None of use can, =
especially with such voter volatility."

Voters need a better understanding of the numbers behind a poll, Zogby =
added, and that is the fault of the press. "There needs to be a careful =
explanation every time a poll number comes out," he said. "God knows =
there are enough 24-hour news stations, they can give an extra 15 = minutes
of explanation."

Despite these problems, most good pollsters can do a pretty good job, =
Niemi said. "In defense of polls, it'[s amazing how accurate they are, =
given the problem with the response rate."

Maurice Carroll, director of the Quinnipiac Polling Institute at =
Quinnipiac College in Connecticut, doesn't think the criticism is =
warranted if the numbers are right. "A poll has to be judge3d by its =
results not by its process. It's the pundits in Washington that are out = of
touch with voters."

>From murray.edelman@vnsusa.org Tue Dec 1 09:21:20 1998
Received: from libra.vnsusa.com (libra.vnsusa.com [205.183.239.99] (may be
forged))
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id JAA13733 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 09:21:19 -0800

(PST)
Received: from mail.vnsusa.org by libra.vnsusa.com
          via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.19.136]) with SMTP; 1 Dec 1998
17:19:09 UT
Received: by nts_1.vnsusa.org with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
      id <RPVTY9XF>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 12:15:40 -0500
Message-ID: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE21FF9F@nts_1.vnsusa.org>
From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Req for Info on CATI Systems
Date: Tue, 1 Dec 1998 12:15:39 -0500
X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
Content-Type: text/plain

Voter News Service is exploring the possibility of moving from our custom
coded exit poll questionnaire input system to a flexible CATI system.

These are the characteristics we are looking for in a CATI system:

1.   It must be highly reliable; we have yet to find a way to
postpone an election because of operational difficulties.

2. It must support 300 terminals or workstations.

3. We prefer that it run on an HP-UX platform but will consider Windows NT

4. It needs to be flexible; we will need to insert custom logic

5. if it uses a relational database, it should be Oracle.

I would appreciate being pointed in some fruitful directions as well as
hearing your own thoughts and experiences.

Thank you.

Murray Edelman, Ph.D.
Editorial Director
Voter News Service
>From chris_brogan@abtassoc.com Tue Dec 1 10:44:25 1998
Received: from abtassoc.com (abtmail.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.7])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id KAA09716 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 10:44:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from hadrian.abtassoc.com (hadrian.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.2])
      by abtassoc.com (8.9.1/8.9.1/Cohesive-2.3 (1998-08-10)) with SMTP id
NAA08745

Preparation and Processing Manager

Responsibilities
As a Preparation and Processing Manager, you will be responsible for
managing
the daily activities in coding, editing, key entry, and data processing
operations. Additional responsibilities will include hiring, staff
training,
monitoring task budgets, and monitoring work flow productivity. The
position
requires a thorough knowledge of data preparation and task processing and a

high attention to service excellence both in terms of internal and external
clients.

Qualifications
We seek candidates who are highly motivated with outstanding organizational,

interpersonal and writing skills.   Successful candidates should be able to
demonstrate through industry experience the capability of managing a staff
of
temporary and regular employees, as well as the abilities to self-motivate,
appropriately delegate, and effectively communicate. The position requires
an
Bachelor's degree and 3-5 years of survey research and/or operations
experience.

Interested applicants should submit their resume and salary history to one
of
the following:

E-mail: o._david_jackson@abtassoc.com

Fax: (312) 867-4200

Mail:
Abt Associates Inc.
Human Resources

Job Code--PPM
640 No. LaSalle, Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60610

Abt Associates is committed to fostering a diverse, multicultural work
environment.

Company Profile

Abt Associates Inc. has been providing research-based services for business
and
government since 1965. Our firm is built on the concept that sound
information
and empirical analysis are the best foundation for decision making in both
the
public and private sectors. We are a client-focused organization dedicated
to
providing practical, measurable, high-value solutions to problems brought to
us
by a wide variety of clients: U.S. government agencies, corporations,
foreign
governments, and international organizations. Today Abt Associates'
practice
extends around the world and spans four domains: Social and economic policy

research; International economic development; Business research and
consulting;
and Abt Associates Clinical Trials.

Our full-time, regular staff of over 700 includes nationally and
internationally recognized experts known for their grasp of their respective
disciplines,
innovative research techniques, and insightful, and often ground breaking,
analysis and recommendations.

Our professional development opportunities include competitive salaries,
outstanding comprehensive benefits, and an Employee Stock Ownership Plan.

>From sgoold@unm.edu Tue Dec 1 11:35:34 1998
Received: from io.unm.edu (io.unm.edu [129.24.8.7])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id LAA26482 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 11:35:32 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [204.134.5.30](ppp-128.unm.edu[129.24.14.128]) (1014 bytes)
by io.unm.edu
      via sendmail with P:smtp/R:bind_hosts/T:inet_zone_bind_smtp
      (sender: <sgoold@unm.edu>)
      id <m0zkva5-0000yCC@io.unm.edu>
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 12:35:29 -0700 (MST)

Hello George,
I would greatly appreciate any information you recieve on this issue. I am
working on my dissertation in an area linked to this topic.

Thanks in advance.
Scott

>A colleague has asked me for examples of where opinion polls have been
>inappropriately used to influence a decision or formulate a policy and
>consequently the decision or policy dramatically failed.
>
>Thanks in advance.
>
>George M.
>gimons@xmission.com

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

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

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

AAPOR's conference operations committee consists of volunteer members who
help run parts of the annual conference. The committee is currently seeking
volunteers to fill the role of Social Coordinator.

Duties of the Social Coordinator include:

- exploring opportunities for social events at AAPOR conferences (recent
events have included evening boat cruises and baseball outings; future
activities will depend on opportunities available near conference
sites)

- making arrangements for AAPOR members' attendance at these events

- coordinating the "fun run" traditionally held at the conference, as well
as the creation of the conference t-shirt.

AAPOR relies heavily on volunteer efforts in running the annual conference,
which saves considerable expense to the organization. Volunteers will have
the opportunity to make a real contribution to AAPOR, work closely with
other members of the committee, and help shape the Social Coordinator role
as it continues to develop. It is a great way to get involved, and AAPOR
generally pays for the Social Coordinator's hotel room and meals at the
conference.

AAPOR members who have general familiarity of AAPOR's conference and
membership, and who expect to attend the conference over the next few years,
are welcome to submit their names for consideration. In addition to
selecting the Social Coordinator, we hope to draw on the list of volunteers
to help with other tasks for the 1999 and future conferences.

If you are interested, or have additional questions, please send your name
and contact information to Paul Beatty by email (pbeatty@umich.edu) or fax
(734-764-8263).

Thanks,

Paul Beatty
AAPOR Conference Operations Committee

>From JonRicht@aol.com Tue Dec 1 13:20:32 1998
Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id NAA16300 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 13:20:30 -0800
(PST)
From: JonRicht@aol.com
Received: from JonRicht@aol.com
      by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOv16.10) id FIKEa10603
       for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 16:18:20 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <1445fe05.36645d1c@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Dec 1998 16:18:20 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Industry Ratings
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Casablanca - Windows sub 214

Does anyone know a good source to find information on how the public rate
various companies and industries (favorability ratings). Specifically, I am
looking for ratings of the pharmaceautical industry, the life or health
insurance industry and trial lawyers. I seem to remember a discussion or
posting on AAPORNET about this recently but can't recall the specifics.
Replies should be sent to me directly at jrichter@bsmg.com   Thanks.
>From surveys@wco.com Tue Dec 1 15:35:27 1998
Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com
[204.247.247.54])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id PAA12213 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 15:35:25 -0800
(PST)
Received: from compaq (cetus168.wco.com [209.21.28.168])
      by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id PAA06241
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Dec 1998 15:35:19 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <013a01be1d83$2e5fbca0$192cfea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute
Date: Tue, 1 Dec 1998 14:42:42 -0800
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

>For those of you who are following the debate over the use of
>statistical sampling in the census the following from today's NY Times

>may be of interest:

Say, how about we all refuse to do any polls for any member of Congress who
votes against sampling? After all, they don't believe in it anyway <g>.

On a more serious note: Has AAPOR issued any statements in support of
sampling in the census? If not, should we?

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
http://www.surveysystem.com mailto:surveys@wco.com

>From david@lha.gsbc.com Wed Dec 2 04:32:15 1998
Received: from vserver1.gsbc.com (vserver1.gsbc.com [206.1.46.4])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id EAA15755 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 04:32:13 -0800
(PST)
Received: by vserver1.gsbc.com with VINES-ISMTP; Wed, 2 Dec 98 7:31:22 -0500
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 98 7:20:48 -0500
Message-ID: <vines.UTk8+U0HNqB@vserver1.gsbc.com>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, "HTAYLOR" <htaylor@lha.gsbc.com>
From: "David Krane" <david@lha.gsbc.com>
Reply-To: <david@lha.gsbc.com>
Subject: Huffington cont'd
X-Incognito-SN: 788
X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

TO: AAPORNET
FROM: Humphrey Taylor

Forgive me for surfacing an issue that was discussed weeks ago. However, I
thought some of you might be interested.

Over the last several weeks, I have exchanged several messages and voice
mails with Arianna Huffington. My latest letter to her went out on
November 19th. The contents of the letter are below. I also sent her a
press release I sent out on election night, November 3rd.

The press release makes the point that the Republican campaign managers
made the mistake Arianna was advocating. They chose not to believe the
polls.

****

November 19, 1998

Mrs. Arianna Huffington
300 North Carmelina Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Dear Arianna:

I have read some (possibly all?) of your columns on the polls and I agree
with almost everything you say. That may surprise you, or not.

The two areas where I (of course!) take exception are:

1. That good polls are remarkably accurate most of the time (even if we
don't know how accurate any one poll is). I believe most of the cases
where good polls get the winner of an election wrong are not because the
poll was inaccurate per se but because of late-swing, differential turnout,
etc.

2. I absolutely believe that if you want to know anything about public
opinion, you have no choice but to use and read the polls. Absent polls -
or even if polls were discredited - leaders, politicians, the media,
business and everyone else would be woefully misinformed and make some
terrible errors of judgment which can be avoided because of the polls.
Before polls existed they did. And politicians who disbelieve the polls
often get hurt (e.g. the Republicans this year).

American business would not spend billions of dollars a year on marketing
and survey research (and their methods are generally less high quality than
the best political polls) if they did not believe they were not getting
useful data. They are not that stupid.

With best wishes,

Humphrey Taylor

P.S. I attach my election-night press release which was not unrelated.

****
FOR RELEASE:
NOVEMBER 3, 1998 11:15 PM

Contact:
Humphrey Taylor, Chairman (212) 539-9657
David Krane, Executive Vice President (212) 539-9648

Louis Harris & Associates, Inc.

DEMOCRATS BENEFIT FROM BACKLASH AGAINST REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN ADS ON LEWINSKY
SCANDAL - AS PREDICTED

Republicans chose to disbelieve the data and ignore good advice.
_____

     Until a few weeks ago the Republicans looked set to win big in the
mid-term elections. The results so far suggest they have failed to do so.
A major reason for the weak Republican showing is that they decided to
re-introduce the impeachment issue and the Monica Lewinsky scandal into the
closing stages of the campaign.

     Recent Harris Polls had issued strong warnings to the Republicans
against doing this.

     The headline over the Harris Poll released on October 23, read "Modest

Backlash Against Republicans' Handling of Impeachment Process Helping to
Sustain Democratic Turnout."

     On October 28, Humphrey Taylor, Harris Chairman, wrote of "the danger
to Republicans of (an) anti-impeachment backlash," and that if the
Republicans raised the impeachment issue in the final days of the campaign
"they would be likely to inflame potential Democratic turnout." Harris's
analysis was based on the fact that a majority of likely voters opposed the
impeachment process and wanted to put the issue behind them.

     Specifically, the Harris Poll data showed that a 57% to 38% majority
of all adults, and a 54% to 42% majority of likely voters, did not believe
that the charges against President Clinton - even if all were true -
amounted to the kinds of "high crimes and misdemeanors which would justify
impeaching him and removing him from office." A 60% to 37% majority of the
public, including 43% of likely Republican voters, favored a "severe
rebuke" of the president - as suggested by President Ford, so that the
President "would remain in office" and the "country can put this scandal
behind us." A 55% to 43% majority of the public also believed that "the
Republicans in Congress are just out to get the president, whatever it
takes, fair or unfair."

     In reviewing the results tonight, Humphrey Taylor said, "It is bad
manners to say 'I told you so' - but sometimes the urge is irresistible.
The Republican decision to spend $10 million on their attack ads at the end
of the campaign reminds me of Aesop's fable of the Scorpion And The Frog.
The Republicans chose to ignore our advice. But then our advice was free.
As independent pollsters, Harris does not do, or accept, work from
political candidates or parties in the U.S.A. We haven't done so for
thirty-five years. And who takes free advice seriously?"

-xxx-

David Krane
Louis Harris and Associates
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003
(Tel) 212-539-9648
(Fax)212-539-9669
(Email) david@lha.gsbc.com
>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Wed Dec 2 07:11:53 1998
Received: from outbound.Princeton.EDU (outbound.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.74])
        by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
        id HAA06957 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 07:11:52 -0800
(PST)
Received: from IDENT-NOT-QUERIED@outbound.Princeton.EDU (port 53437
[128.112.129.74]) by outbound.Princeton.EDU with ESMTP id <68123-14112>;
Wed, 2 Dec 1998 10:10:58 -0500
Received: from mail.Princeton.EDU (mail.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.14])
        by Princeton.EDU (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA11951
        for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 10:10:47 -0500 (EST)
Received: from princeton.edu (wws-9nkmv.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.125])
        by mail.Princeton.EDU (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA00045
        for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 10:10:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36655850.D95870E9@princeton.edu>
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 10:10:08 -0500
From: Edward Freeland <efreelan@Princeton.EDU>
Reply-To: efreelan@Princeton.EDU
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (WinNT; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute
References: <013a01be1d83$2e5fbca0$192cfea9@compaq>
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="------------16D9B0BAC6271E6507A6CD58"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
--------------16D9B0BAC6271E6507A6CD58
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I second Hank's suggestion. Congress needs to know that the social science
research community is not happy about the prospect of being stuck for
another 10 years with data that are practically useless for studying certain

populations.

Ed Freeland
--------------16D9B0BAC6271E6507A6CD58
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="vcard.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Freeland, Edward
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="vcard.vcf"

begin: vcard
fn: Edward Freeland
n: Freeland;Edward
org: Princeton Survey Research Center
adr;dom: 202 Robertson Hall;;Princeton
University;Princeton;NJ;08544-1013;
email;internet: efreelan@princeton.edu
title: Associate Director
tel;work: (609) 258-1854
tel;fax: (609) 258-1985
x-mozilla-cpt: ;0
x-mozilla-html: FALSE
version: 2.1
end: vcard

--------------16D9B0BAC6271E6507A6CD58--

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Dec 2 07:14:13 1998
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id HAA07924 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 07:14:12 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-37kbutj.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.251.179])
      by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA16877
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 10:14:10 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981202095338.00827b10@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 09:53:38 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute
In-Reply-To: <013a01be1d83$2e5fbca0$192cfea9@compaq>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Hans Zuker writes:

>On a more serious note: Has AAPOR issued any statements in support of

>sampling in the census? If not, should we?

>

>

Part of me would be very much in favor of taking a strong stand favoring the use of statistical sampling in conducting the next census. However, another part of me is uneasy because of the highly partisan political nature of the debate. The issue of whether or not to use sampling is not exactly black and white and for AAPOR to take a strong stand on such a highly partisan political issue might have undesirable effects on AAPOR's name and reputation. Having said that, however, I would still be in favor of AAPOR taking a stand, but I felt that the con issue should at least be explored. The fact that the issue is so politically charged should not deter us from standing up for what we believe in and practice.

Dick Halpern

>

>

>

>

>

<color><param>0000,0000,ffff</param><smaller><smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121</smaller></smaller></color>
>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Dec 2 07:20:33 1998
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])

While I understand the political reasons behind opposition to using sampling
in the census, the legal roadblocks have me dumbfounded. As I understand the
situation, the constitution does not prohibit sampling, but the Census Act
passed by congress (in the 70s?) precludes anything but enumeration as the
basis for apportionment. This latter issue apparently forms the basis of the
lower court ruling against sampling.

My understanding of the plan proposed by the Census Bureau is that
enumeration will still occur. However, sampling will also occur and be used
to ADSJUST the enumeration. This is being suggested because past experience
and research has clearly demonstrated that enumeration is inaccurate in very
predictable ways, i.e., urban populations, particularly non-white urban
populations, are significantly undercounted. The object then is to "correct"
an enumeration we know to be flawed. Therefore, enumeration is STILL the
basis of the census, and for apportionment and anything else census data are
used for, it's just that it has been adjusted to make it more accurate.

It is hard for me to believe anything other than that the intention of the
founding fathers for the census was to obtain as ACCURATE a picture as
possible of the United States. Sampling, when executed correctly, is a
mature and scientifically reliable methodology that can yield demonstrably
accurate information about a population extrapolated from much smaller
portions of that population.

If AAPOR does make public statements, I think it should include the
following:

1)   Sampling is a reliable and proven methodology;

2)   The kind of sampling and data collection being talked about is
not the kind used for marketing research or overnight political polling, but
a much more thorough process;

3)   Sampling is intended as a supplement to traditional enumeration,

not as a replacement.

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

Let the politicians make the political decisions. We should stand up for
our scientific understanding of the best way to collect the data we need.

Ken Sherrill
Hunter College, CUNY

On Wed, 2 Dec 1998, richard s. halpern wrote:

> Hans Zuker writes:
>
>
> >On a more serious note: Has AAPOR issued any statements in support
> >of
>
> >sampling in the census? If not, should we?
>
> Part of me would be very much in favor of taking a strong stand
> favoring the use of statistical sampling in conducting the next census.
However, another part of me is uneasy because of the highly partisan
political nature of the debate. The issue of whether or not to use sampling
is not exactly black and white and for AAPOR to take a strong stand on such
a highly partisan political issue might have undesirable effects on AAPOR's
name and reputation. Having said that, however, I would still be in favor of
AAPOR taking a stand, but I felt that the con issue should at least be
explored. The fact that the issue is so politically charged should not deter
us from standing up for what we believe in and practice.
>

>From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Wed Dec 2 08:10:35 1998
Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id IAA20244 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 08:10:32 -0800
(PST)
Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
9181 ; Wed, 02 Dec 1998 11:09:45 EST
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by
UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 4583; Wed, 2 Dec 1998
11:09:45 -0500
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 98 11:01:53 EST
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Re: Sampling and the Census
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
In-Reply-To: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213047029@psg.ucsf.EDU>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <981202.110944.EST.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

"Politics" may be a reason for being cautious, and certainly suggests that
AAPOR as an organization should not endorse any "partisan" position as such.
As an organization, we do have expertise in how sampling might properly be
used to improve data quality, and where public debate seems uninformed (in
either direction), it might well be appropriate for us to issue a "white
paper". But one additional caution might be in order. As survey and
statistical professionals we can have a legitimate voice on standards and
how our techniques can be employed well. But we are NOT experts on the
interpretation of various constitutional and statutory provisions, nor on
the advisability of using or not using sampling from the standpoint of
PERCEIVED legitimacy of the Census (save insofar as that might come from
well conducted surveys of public opinion) and AAPOR should not take any
stand on THOSE issues. As individual citizens we quite appropriate have

views, as a "corporate expert witness" we must confine our comments to our area of expertise.

 G. Donald Ferree, Jr.   (860) 486-4440 / 6308(FAX)
 Institute for Social Inquiry/Roper Center   SSDCF@UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU
University of Connecticut U-164 341 Mansfield Road, Room 421 Storrs CT
06269-1164

richard s. halpern wrote:

>Part of me would be very much in favor of taking a strong stand
>favoring the use of statistical sampling in conducting the next census.
>However, another part of me is uneasy because of the highly partisan
>political nature of the debate.

I think it's hard to argue the fact that the Republicans oppose sampling
precisely because they realize it's more accurate, and would boost the count
of the wrong kinds of people, for them - poor, dark, urban. The party has a
generally hostile attitude towards the social sciences (except neoclassical
economics), because social scientists often tell them things they don't want
to hear. They've bullied independent agencies like the BLS in unprecedented
ways. This is all obnoxious, and independent statisticians and researchers
should denounce it whenever they can.

Doug

--

Doug Henwood

Left Business Observer
250 W 85 St
New York NY 10024-3217 USA
+1-212-874-4020 voice +1-212-874-3137 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>

>From CaplanJR@aol.com Wed Dec 2 09:39:06 1998
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id JAA22231 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 09:39:04 -0800
(PST)
From: CaplanJR@aol.com
Received: from CaplanJR@aol.com
      by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOv16.10) id FWIUa18464
       for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 12:37:22 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <e4bced4c.36657ad2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 12:37:22 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Justices Wary of Entering Census Dispute
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Casablanca - Windows sub 214

In a message dated 12/2/98 12:13:10 PM EST, dhenwood@panix.com writes:

<< Republicans oppose sampling
 precisely because they realize it's more accurate, and would boost the
count of the wrong kinds of people, for them >>

This is a terribly biased statement! It has to do with preventing waste.
Why waste money on research when you already know all the answers?

Jim
>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Dec 2 09:49:02 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id JAA26231 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 09:49:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org (Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id
<B0000341094@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 02 Dec 1998
12:47:16 -0500
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
      id YC27R993; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 12:50:55 -0500
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
      id <01BE1DF1.468E3040@mark-bri>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 12:42:52 -0500

Message-Id: <01BE1DF1.468E3040@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: History question
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 12:42:51 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

When the federal Constitution was adopted in 1788 (and we in the = District
of Columbia lost our right to be represented in the federal = legislature),
many people who lived in this country were not considered = "people" by the
founding fathers, but were considered property (slaves). = Others were
thought to be too emotional/unstable to vote (women). = Others were
considered to be separate or outside the federal system = (natives). These
people could not vote even if they wanted to.

I don't know much about the history of the census--was everyone counted, =
or just those who were considered worthy of the 1 person, 1 vote = concept?
If everyone was counted, was the data segmented into "worthy" = versus "not
worthy" for reasons of representation/apportionment? How = does it work
today for those who are still not represented, like people = of the District
of Columbia and Puerto Rico?

>From S.DIENSTFREY@srbi.com Wed Dec 2 10:26:05 1998
Received: from srbi.com ([12.14.34.4])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id KAA09626 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 10:26:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
      with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 02 Dec 1998 13:22:46 -0500
Message-Id: <s6653f26.057@srbi.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 13:23:21 -0500
From: "Stephen Dienstfrey" <S.DIENSTFREY@srbi.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Sampling in the Census
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

The issue of sampling in the Census has been kicking around for two or =
three years but is now getting a lot more attention in the media.

The history of this issue can be traced back to the 1990 Census. After =
the results were released Cong. Sawyer, who chaired the census subcommittee=
, and Cong. Rodgers, who then was the ranking member and is now the chair =
of the appropriations subcommittee which census falls under, made =

statements that indicated support for new and better ways to conduct the census. The National Research Council (the principal operating agency of the National Academy of Sciences) came out with a report in November 1994, which suggested the use of sampling.=20

By this time the GOP now controlled the House. A consultant suggested something to the effect that as many as 25 House seats could be effected if sampling were used. This was interpreted as "the GOP would loose 25 seats" if sampling were used.

About two years ago, a consortium of organizations coordinated by TerriAnn Lowenthal <terriann2k@aol.com> a former staff member for the Sawyer subcommittee, keeping organizations up to date on the issues related to sampling and Census 2000.

At the moment, the alternative to the sampling methodology is a reworking of the methodology that was used in 1990. In truth, this methodology was first used in 1970 and then reworked around the edges in 1980 and 1990. I was recently at a conference where Tom Hofeller, the staff director for the census subcommittee, said that sampling was not going to happen. I asked what methodology he proposed instead. He said it was not his place, but the Presidents to propose something that the Republicans would accept. I suggested that the President had his proposal on the table and it was not the Republican's turn to come up with something that would produce a more accurate census that 1990.

What people overlook is there is no relationship between being counted in the census and voting. The relationship is not with who votes, but the block counts that are available to the people who draw the district lines. It might be wiser, and a little more devious, if the GOP let sampling go through and put all of their effort into capturing as many state legislatures as possible.

Three other tidbits:

Realizing that census results also impact on funds that are sent to the states, Republicans are supporting a two-number census - - one for apportionment (unadjusted) and one for the distribution of funds (adjusted).

A good comprehensive history of the census can be found in a book by Prof. Margo Anderson: "The American Census: A Social History."

In 1990, when there was an effort to adjust the results of the census, Newt Gingrich wrote a letter supporting adjustment since Georgia would have gotten one more seat.

Steve Dienstfrey

Mark Richards asks how "enumeration" took place in 1790. I have read that
in some areas of the country the census-taker pinned an enumeration form
(read "sign-up sheet) on a tree, and you signed up.
If you didn't sign up, you weren't counted. If you were a woman, you knew
better than to sign. If you owned slaves, I guess you indicated the number,
or 1/5 the number. And if you couldn't write your name...?
Whatever the faults of this method, it beat the rough guess method, which
was at that time the only alternative. Sampling was not a developed
science, and anyway, where would you have gotten an accurate list to sample
from? Let alone a telephone to do RDD from?

I agree with those who say we as an organization should issue a statement
about sampling. It may be that it will be _another_ statement about
sampling, but it can't be done too often. We should definitely _combat_ the
suggestion that sampling is less accurate than omitting people. I would
prefer omitting Lance Pollard's implication that sampling as used in
marketing research is of less good quality than the sampling plan that the
Census Bureau has: it depends on which market research, doesn't it? It
would be all right to encourage review of the Census Bureau's sampling plan
by statistical consultants, though.

Everything else that Lance says is quite to the point. And we should be
sure to state our dismay at the fact that a respected statistical procedure
has become entangled in political controversy, where it does not belong. I
was not aware that there is legislation expressly forbidding sampling
anywhere. Again, the intent would have to be to _increase_ accuracy for us
to find it acceptable. I hope we all agree on that, too.

AAPORibus Unum,

On the next census and sampling: One thing which we might all do to help
would be to call or write the science editor or reporter on our
local newspaper and suggest the timeliness of a piece on sampling as an
applied science. I suggest this because I think we suffer, more than
anything else, from sheer and utter ignorance of what sampling is, why it
works, and why it has value. If the general public, even the educated
public, even the supposedly educated political and media elite, could gain
even a rudimentary sense of systematic and statistical sampling as a part of
logic, inference and--might we hope--epistemology, all of our lives could
only be better, or at least easier. Response rates might even rise! And on
what else but sampling's essential intellectual core, after all, could all
of us in AAPOR ever really agree?

                                                      -- Jim

****

Although I understand the political views associated with the current discussions about sampling, AAPOR's credibility depends, in part, on its ability to defend the scientific method. I vote for a direct approach to Congress: the essence of assessing public opinion and representing the population in counts and other aggregate considerations is best served (most accurately) with scientific methods of sampling populations. Our discussions should not be based on political affiliation or ideology, but on science.

Sid Kraus

At 10:56 AM 12/2/98 -0800, you wrote:
>
>
>AAPORibus Unum,
>
>On the next census and sampling: One thing which we might all do to
>help would be to call or write the science editor or reporter on our
>local newspaper and suggest the timeliness of a piece on sampling as an
>applied science. I suggest this because I think we suffer, more than
>anything else, from sheer and utter ignorance of what sampling is, why
>it works, and why it has value. If the general public, even the
>educated public, even the supposedly educated political and media
>elite, could gain even a rudimentary sense of systematic and
>statistical sampling as a part of logic, inference and--might we
>hope--epistemology, all of our lives could only be better, or at least
>easier. Response rates might even rise! And on what else but
>sampling's essential intellectual core, after all, could all of us in
>AAPOR ever really agree?
>
>   -- Jim
>*******
>
>

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Wed Dec 2 14:12:54 1998
Received: from cicero.src.uchicago.edu (root@cicero.src.uchicago.edu
[128.135.232.3])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id OAA12820 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 14:12:53 -0800
(PST)
Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])
      by cicero.src.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id QAA01211
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 16:12:51 -0600 (CST)
Received: (from abcgss1@localhost)
      by nittany.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) id QAA24906
      for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 16:12:51 -0600 (CST)
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 16:12:51 -0600 (CST)
From: "Tom_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>
Message-Id: <199812022212.QAA24906@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago announces the fifth annual General Social Survey (GSS) Student Paper Competition. To be eligible papers must:
1) be based on data from the 1972-1998 GSSs or from the GSS's cross-national component, the International Social Survey Program (any year or combination of years may be used), 2) represent original and unpublished work, and 3) be written by a student or students at an accredited college or university. Both undergraduates and graduate students may enter and college graduates are eligible for one year after receiving their degree.
The papers will be judged on the basis of their: a) contribution to expanding understanding of contemporary American society, b) development and testing of social science models and theories, c) statistical and methodological sophistication, and d) clarity of writing and organization. Papers should be less than 40 pages in length (including tables, references, appendices, etc.)and should be double spaced.
Paper will be judged by the principal investigators of the GSS (James A. Davis and Tom W. Smith) with assistance from a group of leading scholars. Separate prizes will be awarded to the best undergraduate and best graduate-level entries. Entrants should indicate in which group they are competing. Winners will receive a cash prize of $250, a commemorative plaque, and the MicroCase Analysis System, including data from the 1972-1998 GSSs (a $1,395 value). The MicroCase software is donated by the MicroCase Corporation of Bellevue, Washington. Honorable mentions may also be awarded by the judges.
Two copies of each paper must be received by February 15, 1999. The winner will be announced in late April, 1999. Send entries to:

Tom W. Smith
General Social Survey
National Opinion Research Center
1155 East 60th St.
Chicago, Il 60637

For further information:

Phone: 773-256-6288
Fax: 773-753-7886
Email: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu

>From carolee.bush@bts.gov Wed Dec 2 15:06:54 1998
Received: from proto.bts.gov (proto.bts.gov [204.152.44.10])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id PAA09145 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 15:06:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from inet.bts.gov (inet.bts.gov [204.152.44.12])
      by proto.bts.gov (8.9.1/8.9.0) with SMTP id SAA00708
      for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 18:06:07 -0500 (EST)

Received: from BTS-Message_Server by inet.bts.gov
        with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 02 Dec 1998 18:01:32 -0500
Message-Id: <s665807c.079@inet.bts.gov>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 18:01:24 -0500
From: Carolee Bush <carolee.bush@bts.gov>
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: History of the Census
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=_21767FDC.9DFC93AE"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to
consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to
properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--=_21767FDC.9DFC93AE
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

I shared some of the APPORNET discussion on the above with Professor Margo
Anderson, an avid historian on the Census. She provides some useful and
interesting references for consideration.

Please feel free to respond directly to her.

Thanks,

Carolee Bush
--=_21767FDC.9DFC93AE
Content-Type: message/rfc822

Received: From [204.152.44.10] proto.bts.gov
        By inet.bts.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
        Wed, 2 Dec 98 16:47:55 EST
Received: from batch3.csd.uwm.edu (root@batch3.csd.uwm.edu [129.89.7.226])
        by proto.bts.gov (8.9.1/8.9.0) with ESMTP id QAA28985
        for <carolee.bush@bts.gov>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 16:52:28 -0500 (EST)
Received: from alpha3.csd.uwm.edu (margo@alpha3.csd.uwm.edu [129.89.7.203])
by batch3.csd.uwm.edu (8.8.4/8.6.8) with ESMTP id PAA11682 for
<carolee.bush@bts.gov>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 15:52:26 -0600 (CST)
Received: (margo@localhost) by alpha3.csd.uwm.edu (8.8.4/8.6.8) id PAA28334
for carolee.bush@bts.gov; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 15:52:26 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <199812022152.PAA28334@alpha3.csd.uwm.edu>
In-Reply-To: <s6656aec.052@inet.bts.gov> from "Carolee Bush" at Dec 2, 98
04:28:57 pm
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL24alpha3]
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 16:52:26 -0500
From: Margo J Anderson <margo@csd.uwm.edu>
To: carolee.bush@bts.gov
Subject: for you to post...

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

In response to the recent emails on historical questions on the Census and
sampling, AAPOR members should be made aware that historians have examined
the history of censustaking and demographic analysis at the time of the
first census. See for example,

Margo Anderson, The American Census: A Social History (Yale 1988). Patricia
Cline Cohen, A Calculating People (University of Chicago Press,
1983)
James Cassedy, Demography in Early America (Harvard University Press, 1969)
Robert Wells, The Population of the British Colonies in America before =
1776 (Princeton, 1975).=20

Feel free to contact me directly with questions,

Margo Anderson
Fellow, 1998-99, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (202 691
4069)
& Professor, History Department, University of Wisconsin=FBMilwaukee
margo=40uwm.edu

--=_21767FDC.9DFC93AE--
>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Dec 2 15:09:27 1998
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id PAA10687 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 15:09:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
      by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id SAA08478
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 18:09:57 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 18:09:57 -0500 (EST)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Sender: andy@troll
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Census and Sampling (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.981202180931.8449A-100000@troll>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear All:

There are procedural histories for most Censuses. There is a census

publication of all schedules through to 1980.

A very good cite to look at is the Steve Ruggles Historical site at
http://www.ipums.umn.edu. There you can also get Census data from 1850
through 1990 in a common format.

Ruggles is editing the enumerator instructions for 1850 through 1990, I
think

Andy Beveridge.

Jeanne Anderson wrote:
>
> Mark Richards asks how "enumeration" took place in 1790. I have read
> that in some areas of the country the census-taker pinned an
> enumeration form (read "sign-up sheet) on a tree, and you signed up.
> If you didn't sign up, you weren't counted. If you were a woman, you
>

>From surveys@wco.com Wed Dec 2 17:33:07 1998
Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com
[204.247.247.54])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id RAA00241 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 17:33:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from compaq (sextans128.wco.com [209.21.28.128])
      by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id RAA15459
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 17:33:02 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <01cb01be1e5c$c7470f20$192cfea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Sampling: What We Might Do
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 17:30:44 -0800
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I agree with Sid that we should take a direct approach in support of
sampling as the best available way to improve the accuracy of the next
census, and I agree with Jim that education should be part of what we do. A
combination of a press release and a letter to Congress, both backed up with
a white paper, might work.

In general, I think that AAPOR should stay away from taking political
positions, but I think we should not shy away from taking a scientific
position just because that scientific position has political implications.

Hank Zucker

-----Original Message-----
From: Dr. Sidney Kraus <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

>Although I understand the political views associated with the current
>discussions about sampling, AAPOR's credibility depends, in part, on
>its ability to defend the scientific method. I vote for a direct
>approach to
>Congress: the essence of assessing public opinion and representing the
>population in counts and other aggregate considerations is best served
(most
>accurately) with scientific methods of sampling populations. Our
discussions
>should not be based on political affiliation or ideology, but on
>science.
>
>Sid Kraus
>
>At 10:56 AM 12/2/98 -0800, you wrote:
>>
>>
>>AAPORibus Unum,
>>
>>On the next census and sampling: One thing which we might all do to
>>help would be to call or write the science editor or reporter on our
>>local newspaper and suggest the timeliness of a piece on sampling as
>>an applied science. I suggest this because I think we suffer, more
>>than anything else, from sheer and utter ignorance of what sampling
>>is, why it works, and why it has value. If the general public, even
>>the educated public, even the supposedly educated political and media
>>elite, could gain even a rudimentary sense of systematic and
>>statistical sampling as a part of logic, inference and--might we
>>hope--epistemology, all of our lives could only be better, or at least
>>easier. Response rates might even rise! And on what else but
>>sampling's essential intellectual core, after all, could all of us in
>>AAPOR ever really agree?
>>
>> -- Jim
>>*******
>>
>>
>

>From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Wed Dec 2 17:36:08 1998
Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id RAA01815 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 17:36:06 -0800
(PST)

To own and cherish because it contains facsimiles of all the schedules
through 1990 is: U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1989, November). 200 years of
U.S. census
taking: Population and housing questions, 1790-1990. Washington, DC:Author.

Alice Robbin

P.S. Also to own and read (and read again) are the books that Margo
Anderson cited, among them HERS.

On Wed, 2 Dec 1998, Andrew Beveridge wrote:

> Dear All:
>
> There are procedural histories for most Censuses. There is a census
> publication of all schedules through to 1980.
>
> A very good cite to look at is the Steve Ruggles Historical site at
> http://www.ipums.umn.edu. There you can also get Census data from
> 1850 through 1990 in a common format.
>
> Ruggles is editing the enumerator instructions for 1850 through 1990,
> I think
>
> Andy Beveridge.
>
> Jeanne Anderson wrote:
> >
> > Mark Richards asks how "enumeration" took place in 1790. I have
> > read that in some areas of the country the census-taker pinned an
> > enumeration form (read "sign-up sheet) on a tree, and you signed
> > up. If you didn't sign up, you weren't counted. If you were a
> > woman, you
> >
>
>

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

>From abider@earthlink.net Wed Dec 2 18:23:39 1998
Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.50])
       by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
       id SAA15173 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 18:23:28 -0800
(PST)
Received: from alvbynsy (sdn-ar-001dcwashP247.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.9])
       by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA12003
       for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 18:23:23 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <000f01be1e64$54ec7ca0$0916bfa8@alvbynsy>
Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: re: Census and Sampling
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 21:26:22 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
       boundary="----=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE1E3A.68E18860"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE1E3A.68E18860
Content-Type: text/plain;
       charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

QXMgb3RoZXJzIGhhdmUgc3VnZ2VzdGVkIGhlcmUsICBwb3xpdGljYWwgY29tcG9uZW50cyB0byB0
aGUgYXJndW1lbnQgcmVtYWluIGV2ZW4gYXBhcnQgZnJvbSB0aGUaW1tZWRpYXRlIGNvbnNlcXVl
bmNlcyBmb3IgYXBwb3J0aW9uaW5nIHJlcHJlc2VudGF0aW9uIChvciBmdW5kcykuICAgVGhlIHBv
bGl0aWNhbCBjaGFyYWN0ZXIgb2YgdGhlIENlbnN1cyBpcyBldmlkZW50IGluIHRoZWZhY3QgdGhR
YXQgIFJlcHVibGljYW4gcHJlc2lkZW50cyBhcHBvaW50IFJlcHVibGljYW5zIHRvIHJ1biB0aGUg
RGVjZW5uaWFsIENlbnN1cyBhbmQgRGVtb2NyYXRpYyBwcmVzaWRlbnRzIGFsc28gYXBwb2ludCBS
ZXB1YmxpY2FucyB0byBydW4gaXQuICAgDQogDQpJcm9uaWNhbGx5LCBhdCB0aGUgdGltZSBvZiB0
aGUgJzgwIENlbnN1cywgIHRoZXJlIHdlcmUgdmhvZW1lbnQgZGVudW5jaWF0aW9ucyBvZiBhIHdh
c3RlZnVsIEdvdmVybm1lbnQgdGhhdCBkaWQgbm90IHVzZSBzYW1wbGluZyBlbnRpcmVseSBmb3Ig

dGhlIENlbnN1cy4gIFRoZZBXYXNoaW5ndG9uIFBvc3QgcmFuIGFuDQplZGl0b3JpYWwgc3Ryb25n
bHkgZW5kb3JzaW5nIGFuIG9wIGVkIHBpZWNlIGJ5IEFuZHJldyBYWNrZXIgYWR2b2NhdGluZyBq
dXN0IHRoYXQuICBUaGUgcHVibGljIG9waW5pb24gcHJvZmVzc2lvbiB1c2VkIHRvIGdldCBzb21l
IHZpc2liaWxpdHkgYXQgQ2Vuc3VzIHRpbWUgIGJlY2F1c2UgR2VvcmdlIEdhbGx1cCB3b3VsZCBy
ZWxpYWJseSBiZSB2aXNpYmxlIGluIHRoZSBwcmVzcyBkZWNsYXJpbmcgdGhhdCBwcml2YXRlIHN1
cnZleSBmaXJtcyBjb3VsZCBkbyBpdCBiZXR0ZXIgYW5kIGNoZWFwZXIgYnkgdXNpbmcgc2FtcGxp
bmcgKGFsdGhvdWdoLCBtb3N0bHksICBieSBub3QgYm9pbmcgYSBnb3Zlcm5tZW50IGJ1cmVhdWNy
YWN5KS4gIA0KDQpBbGJlcnQgQmlkZXJtYW4gICAgDQphYmlkZXJAYW1lcmljYW4uZWR1ICAgIA0K

------=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE1E3A.68E18860
Content-Type: text/html;
        charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

PCFET0NUWVBFIEhUTUwgUFVCTElDICItLy9XM0MvL0RURCBXMyBIVE1MLy9FTiI+DQo8SFRN
PCFET0NUWVBFIEhUTUwgUFVCTElDICItLy9XM0MvL0RURCBXMyBIVE1MLy9FTiI+TD4N
CjxIRUFFPg0KDQo8TUVUQSBjb250ZW50PXRleHQvaHRtbDtjaGFyc2V0PWlzby04ODU5LTEgaHR0
cC1lcXVpdj1Db250ZW50LVR5cGU+DQo8TUVUQSBjb250ZW50PSciTVNIRE1IDQuNzIuMjEw
cC1lcXVpdj1Db250ZW50LVR5cGU+Ni42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cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj48L0ZPTlQ+Jm5ic3A7PC9ESVY+DQo8RElWPjxGT05UIGNvbG9y
cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj48L0ZPTlQ+PSMw
MDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iR3V0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXplPSJSIvbmljYWxseSwgYXQgdGhlIHRp
MDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iR3V0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXplPSJbWUg
b2YgDQp0aGUgJzgwIENlbnN1cywmbmJzcDsgdGhlcmUgd2VyZSB2ZWhlbWVudCBkZW51bmNpYXRp
b25zIG9mIGd2YXN0ZWdWwgZ292ZXJubWVudCANCnRoYXQgZGlkIG5vdCB1c2Ugc2FtcGxpbmcg
ZW50aXJlbHkgZm9yIHRoZSBDZW5zdXMuIFRoZSBYXNoaW5ndG9uIFBvc3QgcmFuIA0K
YW48L0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+DQo8RElWPjxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJh
YW48L0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+IE1k
IEJUIiBzaXplPSZWRpdG9yaWFsIHN0cm9uZ2x5IGVuZG9yc2luZyANCmFuIG9wIGVkIHBp
IEJUIiBzaXplPSZWNl
IGJ5IEFuZHJldyBYWNrZXIgYWR2b2NhdGluZyBqdXN0IHRoYXQuJm5ic3A7IFRoZSBwdWJsaWMg
b3BpbmlvbiANCnByb2Zlc3Npb24gdXNlZCB0byBnZXQgc29tZSB2aXNpYmlsaXR5IGF0IENlbnN1
cyB0aW1lJm5ic3A7IGJlY2F1c2UgR2VvcmdlIA0KR2FsbHVwIHdvdWxkIHJlbGlhYmx5IGJlIHZp
c2libGUgaW4gdGhlIHByZXNzIGRlY2xhcmluZyB0aGF0IHByaXZhdGUgc3VydmV5IA0KZmlybXMg
Y291bGQgZG8gaXQgYmV0dGVyIGFuZCBjaGVhcGVyIGJ5IHVzaW5nIHNhbXBsaW5nIChhbHRob3Vn
aCwgbW88L0ZPTlQ+PEZPTlQgDQpjb2xvcj0jMDAwMDAwIGZhY2U9Ikd1dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIg
aCwgbW88L0ZPTlQ+PEZPTlQgc2l6
ZT0yPnN0bHksJm5ic3A7IGJ5IG5vdCBiZWluZyBhIGdvdmVybm1lbnQgDQpidXJlYXVjcmFjeSku

Jm5ic3A7IDwvRk9OVD48L0RJVj4NCjxESVY+PEZPTlQgY29sb3I9IzAwMDAwMCBmYWNlPSJG
Jm5ic3A7IDwvRk9OVD48L0RJVj4NCjxESVY+dXR1
cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj48L0ZPTlQ+Jm5ic3A7PC9ESVY+DQo8RElWPjxGT05UIGNvbG9y
cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj48L0ZPTlQ+Jm5ic3A7PC9ESVY+PSMw
MDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXplPTI+QWxiZXJ0IA0KQmlkZXJtYW4bmJz
MDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXplPTI+cDSm
bmJzcDsmbmJzcDsmbmJzcDs8L0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+DQo8RElWPjxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAw
bmJzcDsmbmJzcDsmbmJzcDs8L0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+MDAg
ZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXplPTI+PEEgDQpocmVmPSJtYWlsdG86YWJpZGVyQGFt
ZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXplPTI+ZXJp
Y2FuLmVkSI+YWJpZGVyQGFtZXJpY2FuLmVkTwvQT4mbmJzcDsmbmJzcDsmbmJzcDsgDQo8
Y2FuLmVkSI+L0ZP
TlQ+PC9ESVY+PC9ESVY+PC9CT0RZPjwvSFRNTD4NCg==

------=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE1E3A.68E18860--

>From ande271@ibm.net Wed Dec 2 18:48:36 1998
Received: from out4.ibm.net (out4.ibm.net [165.87.194.239])
        by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
        id SAA23522 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Dec 1998 18:48:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (slip-32-100-113-166.ny.us.ibm.net [32.100.113.166])
by out4.ibm.net (8.8.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id CAA127656 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 3 Dec 1998 02:48:30 GMT
Message-ID: <366626C3.71A2@ibm.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 21:50:59 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Whom to approach]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Message-ID: <3665C9B9.51E0@ibm.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 15:14:01 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
Organization: Jeanne Anderson Research
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.net
Subject: Whom to approach
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with the member who suggests that we talk directly with Congressmen.
Especially Congressional committees. Especially those concerned with

approtionment, distribution of money, etc.

Trying to communicate our position to legislators via the press adds too
many possibilities of distortions, misunderstandings, inaccuracies, etc.
Even if Congressmen read newspapers. We are better off writing directly to
committee chairs, who will certainly pass on our communications to staff,
and perhaps to other committee members.

This is not lobbying: we are not paying anyone to represent our point of
view. We are simply over-volunterring our own AAPOR leaders!

>From ande271@ibm.net Thu Dec 3 04:51:44 1998
Received: from out4.ibm.net (out4.ibm.net [165.87.194.239])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id EAA29079 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 04:51:43 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (slip-32-100-252-175.ny.us.ibm.net [32.100.252.175])
by out4.ibm.net (8.8.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id MAA49816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 3 Dec 1998 12:51:39 GMT
Message-ID: <3666B422.1996@ibm.net>
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 1998 07:54:10 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: [Fwd: Census and Sampling]]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Message-ID: <3666B3FB.1C57@ibm.net>
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 1998 07:53:31 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
Organization: Jeanne Anderson Research
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aaoprnet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Census and Sampling]
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="------------58FB28A74AC0"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------------58FB28A74AC0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am re-sending this, because it has been quoted twice in truncated form.
Some of the points made in the remainder would, I believe, be

non-controversial.

The part about the tree-pinning is not just apocryphal. Census-takers may
not have been careless: we had itinerant hunters, trappers, merchants,
preachers, new settlers and assorted other people whose permanent
residences, if they existed, would have to be tracked down only at great
expense. Enumeration represented the most systematic way of determining the
population and apportionment for many of the decennial Censuses. That
sampling was not mentioned in the Constitution does not decrease our
(AAPOR's) respect for those who labored to establish sound methods in the
decades before our technology made it possible for us to gather data about
the U.S. population more efficiently. Tree-pinning or other "sign-ups"
probably identified individuals and households in some areas that would
otherwise not have been known to census-takers or even local big-wigs.

--------------58FB28A74AC0
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Message-ID: <3665B28D.6437@ibm.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Dec 1998 13:35:09 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
Organization: Jeanne Anderson Research
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
Subject: Census and Sampling
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mark Richards asks how "enumeration" took place in 1790. I have read that
in some areas of the country the census-taker pinned an enumeration form
(read "sign-up sheet) on a tree, and you signed up.
If you didn't sign up, you weren't counted. If you were a woman, you knew
better than to sign. If you owned slaves, I guess you indicated the number,
or 1/5 the number. And if you couldn't write your name...?
Whatever the faults of this method, it beat the rough guess method, which
was at that time the only alternative. Sampling was not a developed
science, and anyway, where would you have gotten an accurate list to sample
from? Let alone a telephone to do RDD from?

I agree with those who say we as an organization should issue a statement
about sampling. It may be that it will be _another_ statement about
sampling, but it can't be done too often. We should definitely _combat_ the
suggestion that sampling is less accurate than omitting people. I would
prefer omitting Lance Pollard's implication that sampling as used in
marketing research is of less good quality than the sampling plan that the
Census Bureau has: it depends on which market research, doesn't it? It

would be all right to encourage review of the Census Bureau's sampling plan by statistical consultants, though.

Everything else that Lance says is quite to the point. And we should be sure to state our dismay at the fact that a respected statistical procedure has become entangled in political controversy, where it does not belong. I was not aware that there is legislation expressly forbidding sampling anywhere. Again, the intent would have to be to _increase_ accuracy for us to find it acceptable. I hope we all agree on that, too.

--------------58FB28A74AC0--

>From JHH@MPRNJ.COM Thu Dec 3 05:36:15 1998
Received: from mpr5.MATHINC (MPR5.mathinc.com [38.233.146.17])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id FAA06183 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 05:36:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: by mpr5.MATHINC with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail
Connector Version 4.0.994.63)
      id <01BE1E97.AAA86450@mpr5.MATHINC>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 08:33:56 -0500
Message-ID: <c=US%a=_%p=MATHINC%l=MPR5-981203133027Z-156477@mpr5.MATHINC>
From: John Hall <JHH@MPRNJ.COM>
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Sampling: What We Might Do
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 1998 08:30:27 -0500
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.0.994.63

>I am not sure that all of us in AAPOR agree about "sampling's essential intellectual core." I recall giving a presentation at a local chapter as part of a panel discussion on within household respondent selection. One member of long standing wondered why I was worried whether a particular respondent selection method was a probability sampling method, and compared my arguments to arguing about angels dancing on the head of a pin.

John
John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543
phone (609) 275-2357
fax (609) 799-0005
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

>----------
>From: James Beniger[SMTP:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
>Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 1998 1:56 PM

```
>To:   AAPORNET
>Subject:   Sampling:  What We Might Do
>
>
>
>AAPORibus Unum,
>
>On the next census and sampling:  One thing which we might all do to
>help would be to call or write the science editor or reporter on our
>local newspaper and suggest the timeliness of a piece on sampling as an
>applied science.  I suggest this because I think we suffer, more than
>anything else, from sheer and utter ignorance of what sampling is, why
>it works, and why it has value.  If the general public, even the
>educated public, even the supposedly educated political and media
>elite, could gain even a rudimentary sense of systematic and
>statistical sampling as a part of logic, inference and--might we
>hope--epistemology, all of our lives could only be better, or at least
>easier.  Response rates might even rise! And on what else but
>sampling's essential intellectual core, after all, could all of us in
>AAPOR ever really agree?
>
>                                                -- Jim
>*******
>
>
>
>From S.DIENSTFREY@srbi.com Thu Dec  3 07:44:26 1998
Received: from srbi.com ([12.14.34.4])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id HAA00034 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 07:44:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
      with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 03 Dec 1998 10:41:07 -0500
Message-Id: <s6666ac3.013@srbi.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 1998 10:40:32 -0500
From: "Stephen Dienstfrey" <S.DIENSTFREY@srbi.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:  Correction
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

I just re-read my posting from yesterday and found a typo that is fairly =
significant.

In my discussion with Tom Hoffeler when he said the president should come =
up with a plan that the Republicans will accept.  I said the president has =
a plan on the table and it is NOW (rather than not) the responsibility of =
```

the Republicans to put something forward that will improve the accuracy of =
the next census.

An interesting book that I forgot to mention is by Barbara Everitt Bryant =
(the Director of the Bureau of the Census during the 1990 Census) and =
William Dunn "Moving Power and money: The Politics of Census Taking" =
published by New Strategists Publications, Inc., Ithaca. It is a light =
read but none the less insightful.

Steve Dienstfrey

>From mwolford@hers.com Thu Dec 3 08:53:52 1998
Received: from mail.his.com (root@mail.his.com [205.177.25.9])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id IAA19193 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 08:53:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from macawii (pm10-171.his.com [206.161.108.171])
      by mail.his.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA19162
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 11:52:58 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3666C183.36E6@hers.com>
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 1998 11:51:15 -0500
From: Monica Wolford <mwolford@hers.com>
Reply-To: mwolford@hers.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KIT (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Polls and Policy Decisions
References: <v0213050ab28994f6a621@[204.134.5.30]>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,
I don't have an example of where polls may have been used inappropriately,
but there's an excellent book by Richard Sobel that's a case study on
ignoring polls: Public opinion in U.S. foreign policy : the controversy over
Contra aid
Published: Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield, c1993

I'd be very interested to hear what other references you might have,

Monica Wolford
Program on International Policy Attitudes
Univ. of Maryland
Scott Goold wrote:
>
> Hello George,
> I would greatly appreciate any information you recieve on this issue.
> I am working on my dissertation in an area linked to this topic.
>
> Thanks in advance.

> Scott
>
>From exp12@psu.edu Thu Dec 3 08:59:36 1998
Received: from f04n01.cac.psu.edu (f04s01.cac.psu.edu [128.118.141.31])
        by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
        id IAA21916 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 08:59:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ecuador.la.psu.edu (ecuador.la.psu.edu [128.118.17.50]) by
f04n01.cac.psu.edu (8.8.7/8.6.12) with SMTP id LAA128724 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 11:59:31 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19981203115929.00e8a404@mail.psu.edu>
X-Sender: exp12@mail.psu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 1998 11:59:29 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@psu.edu>
Subject: Sampling
In-Reply-To: <199812030805.AAA15086@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Some quick observations re sampling:

1. As Steve Dienstfrey noted, sampling might well result in gains in some
apportionment gains in states controlled by Republicans. As a result, it is
unwise to assume that sampling will benefit Denmocrats solely, or even on
balance.

2. We should also stop repeating the false assertion/implication that the
Census was ever a simple "head count." Even in the manuscript era, the head
of household acted as a proxy for other family members. Thus, the Census
has always attempted to cover the POPULATION OF HOUSEHOLDS, but has also
always used a CONVENIENCE SAMPLE within households. In many cases,
neighbors have been employed as proxies as well (creating the possibility
for people to be counted twice if they have a second home).

-- Eric Plutzer ~~~~~~
Eric Plutzer (exp12@psu.edu)
Department of Political Science
The Pennsylvania State University
107 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802

Phone: (814) 863-8978   Fax: (814) 863-8979
Personal homepage: http://www.la.psu.edu/~eplutzer/
Graduate programs: http://www.la.psu.edu/polisci/grad/
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 3 13:15:08 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
        by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
        id NAA18818 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 13:15:05 -0800
(PST)

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 1998 06:04:55 -0600
From: Partha Lahiri <plahiri@MATHSTAT.UNL.EDU>

SYMPOSIUM ON
MODEL SELECTION, EMPIRICAL BAYES AND RELATED TOPICS
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

March 24-26, 1999

The United States Postal Service, The Gallup Organization, Inc., the
National Center for Health Statistics, the Department of Mathematics and
Statistics and the Gallup Research Center of the University of
Nebraska-Lincoln will sponsor a symposium on Model Selection, Empirical
Bayes and Related Topics on March 24-26,

1999, in Lincoln, Nebraska. The symposium will start in the afternoon of
March 24, 1999 (Wednesday) and end around noon on March 26, 1999 (Friday).

The following researchers have agreed to present papers in the invited
sessions:

      Susie Bayarri (Universitat de Valencia, Spain)
      James Berger (Duke Univ.)
      Ferry Butar Butar (Sam Houston Univ.)
      Gauri Datta (Univ. of Georgia)
      Bradley Efron (Stanford Univ.)
      John Eltinge (Texas A & M Univ.)
      Edward George (Univ. of Texas at Austin)
      Malay Ghosh (Univ. of Florida)
      Elizabeth Halloran (Emory Univ.)
      Jiming Jiang (Case Western Univ.)
      Michael Larsen (Harvard Univ.)
      Carl Morris (Harvard Univ.)
      Donna Pauler (Harvard Univ.)

Sunil Rao (Case Western Univ.)
        Hal Stern (Iowa State Univ.)
        Marina Vannucci (Texas A & M Univ.)

On March 25, 1999 (Thursday) Professor Bradley Efron will deliver the
departmental annual Rawlee lecture for a general audience.

We plan to have a poster session of selected papers. If you wish to present
a paper (on any topic of interest), please send the title and an abstract
(less than 200 words) to P.Lahiri at the following address by January 31,
1999.

If you are interested in attending the symposium or presenting a paper in
the poster session, please send the following completed form and the
required registration fee by January 31, 1999 to P.Lahiri , Dept. of
Math./Stat., 922 Oldfather Hall, Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE
68588-0323, USA (email: plahiri@math.unl.edu; FAX: 402 472-8466). The
registration fee is $100 ($30 for students). Please make your check payable
to the UNL Dept. of Math./Stat. We regret that we cannot accept payments by
any other methods.

Limited space is available so we may not be able to accept your registration
even if you send your completed registration by January 31, 1999. In that
case your check will be returned.

Latest information about the symposium will be available from the following
web page:

   http://www.math.unl.edu/Stat

If you have any question about the symposium, please contact Ms. Joyce
Zach, Symposium Coordinator, at (402) 472-3731 (email: jzach@math.unl.edu).

Thank you for your attention.

Partha Lahiri
Organizer

_____
                            REGISTRATION FORM

1. Name:

Last:_____

First:_____

M.I.:_____

2. Affiliation:_____

```
    3. Position:_____

    4. Mailing Address:_____

       _____

    5. Phone Number:_____

    6. Email Address:_____

    7. FAX Number:_____

    8. Please check one of the following:

       (a) Will attend but will not present a paper in the poster
       session:_____

       (b) Will present a paper in the poster session:_____
        (please send the title and the abstract of your presentation by
         January 31, 1999)

    9. Registration Fee: $100 (Students: $30)
       Please make your check payable to the UNL Dept. of Math./Stat.
       We regret that we cannot accept payments by any other methods.
       Please send the registration fee by January 31, 1999 to

               P. Lahiri
               922 Oldfather Hall
               Department of Math./Stat.
               University of Nebraska-Lincoln
               Lincoln, NE 68588-0323
               U.S.A.

*******
```

s
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 1998 15:22:57 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

The other day I saw that Tom Guterbock suggested a panel for the AAPOR
conference on Citizen
Satisfaction Surveys (a great idea!).

Which has given me the push to ask if anyone else might be interested in
joining a panel on Latino voting issues (and other social indicators among
Latinos).

If you have interest / data, please contact me (soon!) and perhaps we can
organize an interesting discussion!

Thanks,

Ana Maria Arumi
Public Policy Institute of California
500 Washington, Suite 800
San Francisco CA 94111
415 291-4438 Direct
415 291-4401 Fax

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Dec 3 17:45:42 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id RAA06191 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 17:45:41 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp31.vgernet.net [205.219.186.131])
      by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA15985
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 21:10:39 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36673ED6.AD979C6B@jwdp.com>
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 1998 20:45:58 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Sampling in the Census
References: <s6653f26.057@srbi.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The report of the Panel on Census Requirements in the Year 2000 and Beyond
is available from the National Academy Press under the title: Modernizing

the U.S.Census. It appears to promote the use of sampling more as a means to address the escalating costs and difficulties in conducting the Census than as a means to solve the undercount question explicitly.

Nonetheless, the undercount question is the one that dominates, because of the perceived political implications.

A good source of information on the undercount problem and the political fracas surrounding it in the 1990 Census is "Looking for the Last Percent" by Harvey M. Choldin (1994, Rutgers U. Press), currently available in paperback.

Harvey Choldin, Stephen Fienberg and NY Time correspondent Stephen Holmes appeared on the NPR program "Talk of the Nation" on August 18, 1998 to discuss the sampling issue in the 2000 Census. The program may be heard via Real Audio at:
http://www.npr.org/programs/totn/archives/1998/980828.totn.html

_____

Stephen Dienstfrey wrote:
>
> The issue of sampling in the Census has been kicking around for two or
> three years but is now getting a lot more attention in the media.
>
> The history of this issue can be traced back to the 1990 Census.
> After the results were released Cong. Sawyer, who chaired the census
> subcommittee, and Cong. Rodgers, who then was the ranking member and
> is now the chair of the appropriations subcommittee which census falls
> under, made statements that indicated support for new and better ways
> to conduct the census. The National Research Council (the principal
> operating agency of the National Academy of Sciences) came out with a
> report in November 1994, which suggested the use of sampling.
>
> By this time the GOP now controlled the House. A consultant suggested
> something to the effect that as many as 25 House seats could be
> effected if sampling were used. This was interpreted as "the GOP
> would loose 25 seats" if sampling were used.
>
> About two years ago, a consortium of organizations coordinated by
> TerriAnn Lowenthal <terriann2k@aol.com> a former staff member for the
> Sawyer subcommittee, keeping organizations up to date on the issues
> related to sampling and Census 2000.
>
> At the moment, the alternative to the sampling methodology is a
> reworking of the methodology that was used in 1990. In truth, this
> methodology was first used in 1970 and then reworked around the edges
> in 1980 and 1990. I was recently at a conference where Tom Hofeller,
> the staff director for the census subcommittee, said that sampling was
> not going to happen. I asked what methodology he proposed instead.

> He said it was not his place, but the Presidents to propose something
> that the Republicans would accept. I suggested that the President had
> his proposal on the table and it was not the Republican's turn to come
> up with something that would produce a more accurate census that 1990.
>
> What people overlook is there is no relationship between being counted
> in the census and voting. The relationship is not with who votes, but
> the block counts that are available to the people who draw the
> district lines. It might be wiser, and a little more devious, if the
> GOP let sampling go through and put all of their effort into capturing
> as many state legislatures as possible.
>
> Three other tidbits:
>
> Realizing that census results also impact on funds that are sent to
> the states, Republicans are supporting a two-number census - - one for
> apportionment (unadjusted) and one for the distribution of funds
> (adjusted).
>
> A good comprehensive history of the census can be found in a book by
> Prof. Margo Anderson: "The American Census: A Social History."
>
> In 1990, when there was an effort to adjust the results of the census,
> Newt Gingrich wrote a letter supporting adjustment since Georgia would
> have gotten one more seat.
>
> Steve Dienstfrey
>From acep@sprintmail.com Thu Dec 3 18:55:41 1998
Received: from crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net (crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[209.178.63.7])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id SAA23090 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 18:55:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from a.parker (1Cust199.tnt4.tco2.da.uu.net [153.35.88.199])
      by crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA02561
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Dec 1998 18:55:37 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <000501be1f31$c201a9a0$c7582399@a.parker>
From: "Albert Parker" <acep@sprintmail.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: History question
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 1998 21:53:58 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
      charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

>When the federal Constitution was adopted in 1788 (and we in the
>District
of Columbia lost our right to be represented in the federal legislature),
many people who lived in this country were not considered "people" by the
founding fathers, but were considered property (slaves). Others were
thought to be too emotional/unstable to vote (women). Others were
considered to be separate or outside the federal system (natives). These
people could not vote even if they wanted to.
>
>I don't know much about the history of the census--was everyone
>counted, or
just those who were considered worthy of the 1 person, 1 vote concept? If
everyone was counted, was the data segmented into "worthy" versus "not
worthy" for reasons of representation/apportionment? How does it work today
for those who are still not represented, like people of the District of
Columbia and Puerto Rico?
>
As an historian, I am not sure whether to smile or despair at the presentism
of this communication. The franchise and the population basis for
representation were separate issues. The Constitution provided, and still
provides, that members of the House of Representatives "shall be apportioned
among the several States . . . according to their respective numbers, which
shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including
those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed,
three-fifths of all other persons." Most of the people mentioned as the
basis for apportionment were not qualified to vote, most notably women and
children, and including free Negroes in most but not quite all states. Note
that indentured servants ("bound to Service for a Term of Years"), who could
not vote, were explicitly fully included in the basis of the apportionment,
and that tax-paying Indians were included by implication. My studies of the
history of the franchise were too long ago for me to remember, if I ever saw
the issue addressed, whether tax-paying Indians were admitted to the
franchise in any state. All that were left for "all other persons" were
slaves, who counted as three-fifths for purposes of apportionment of the
House of Representatives until the Census of 1870; published ante bellum
tabulations list a "Federal population" for the states, which included the
60% adjustment for slaves. Note that free Negroes in the slaves states
would be counted at 100%. Supposing that South Carolina in 1790 included a
negligible number of free Negroes, we can calculate its "Federal population"
as follows (date in thousands from Historical Statistics of the United
States):
    White: 140 x 100% = 140

```
Negro (Slave):  109 x 60% = 65
Federal Population:  205
Total Population:  249
```

The franchise was a separate matter entirely. Voting for public officials
was considered to be a responsible act, and the franchise was deliberately
limited to those thought to be able to resist bribery or intimidation. The
focus of the franchise was on the representation of households, not persons.
Therefore, it was limited to persons who owned property or paid enough rent
to indicate substantial economic independence. Most heads of household were
able to vote because the property requirements were low enough that anyone
who owned a farm or business that would support a family, or rented a house
that would accommodate a family, qualified. Not qualified were those
without economic independence: hired laborers, indentured servants, adult
sons of the householder who had not yet set up their own farms or
businesses, and, in most cases, women. In at least one state in the early
national period, New Jersey, women who owned sufficient property on their
own account were allowed to vote, but they had to be mostly widows who had
not remarried: the property of married women reverted to their husbands,
and women who had never married would not usually have property of their
own. In some areas, such as Virginia in the colonial era at least, a person
could vote once each in as many counties as he owned property, and a
vigorous and wealthy landowner such as the young George Washington could
spend election day dashing across country from one county seat to another to
cast his multiple votes. A minimum age of 21 was, as far as I know,
universal.

The franchise in the colonial and early national periods was definitely not
limited to immigrants. Although official immigration statistics do not
begin until 1820 and the Census did not collect information on country of
birth until 1850, it is generally accepted that the immigration rate of the
Revolutionary and early national period was lower than it had been before
the imperial crisis and than it became after the European economic and
political dislocations of the 1840s, so most voters would in fact have been
native-born. Although the Federalist Congress attempted to restrict
naturalizations in the late 1790's, whether resident aliens were allowed to
vote was a state matter, as were all franchise qualifications until the
ratification of the 15th Amendment in 1870. (The Constitution specified
that for the House of Representatives, "the Electors in each State shall
have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous branch
of the State Legislature," whatever they might be. Some states had a more
restrictive franchise for the state senate, usually in the form of a higher
property qualification.)

Although the Constitution, when ratified in 1789, authorized the Congress to
create a Federal district, it took time to agree on a site and pass the
required legislation. The population of the area was quite small-around
8,000 when the Federal government was transferred in 1800. Except during
the few years between ratification and creation of the district, residents

of the District never had any right to be represented in Congress to lose, since the bicameral Congress with a popularly-elected lower house did not exist before 1789.

Feminist paranoia and political correctness were still a half dozen or so generations to come.

I can't expect anyone else on AAPORNet to have any sympathy for the Republican fears about the use of sampling in the Census, but I can explain them. There is apparently an assumption among AAPOR members that the alternative to an "actual enumeration" is a nonpartisan, scientific estimation process that will provide the most "objective" numbers possible for apportionment of the House of Representives among the states and of Congressional and other electoral districts within the states. This is not the alternative that a Republican who is aware of the history of Congressional districting in the United States would see.

The Republican Party has been on the losing end of too many clever Democratic gerrymanders (the infamous Burton laws in California being only the most celebrated), including those imposed by "nonpartisan" panels of judges, not to have suspicions about an "estimation" process that is going to be controlled by a perjurer whose congential unwillingness to use the English language in an honest manner is approaching legendary proportions. If the man can't give a straight answer to a question about whether he thinks he is the country's "chief law enforcement officer," he certainly can not be trusted with arcane statistical procedures that the attorneys in the

Congress have no background to understand or evaluate. Perhaps Bureau of
the Census staff can and will develop absolutely scientific and objective
estimation procedures that are not to the partisan benefit of either party.
But their work will be reviewed and approved by a Director appointed by
Clinton and then by a Secretary of Commerce appointed by Clinton. They are
career civil servants whose continued employment and future pensions depend
on the Director, not on the majority party in the Congress. Any estimation
is going to depend on some set of assumptions. If the political appointees
accept or impose the assumptions that will most benefit the Democratic
party, Census staff will not be in a position to refuse or object.
Republicans in Congress would have to be even greater fools than Clinton
imagines them to be to accept any assurances from such people that any
estimation would be, or had been, carried out in a nonpartisan manner. The
purity of the intentions of AAPOR members or the National Academy of
Sciences if THEY were doing the estimation can be of no assurance to
Republicans who have finally achieved near parity in control of the
Congressional redistricting process (which still could be lost on
President-elect Gore's coattails, if there are any), only to confront a new
and unknown bag of Democratic Party tricks. The English have a phrase for
it: the Democrats in general and Mr. Clinton in particular have been "too
clever by half" for the Republicans to fall for "Trust us, we just want the
most accurate count that science can provide."

The "two-number" census is hazardous for Republicans as well. However plain
to non-lawyersthe language of the Census Act may appear to be, once separate
numbers are known, it will bedifficult for Federal courts not to find a word
or two somewhere in the Constitution to justify imposing use of the
estimates in redistricting; perhaps the all-purpose "equal protection"
clause of the 14th Amendment will suffice.

After reading Albert Parker's recent note trying to explain the Republican =

concerns about the use of sampling in the census, I feel compelled to come =
to the defense of our colleagues who work at the Census Bureau.

During my career I have both worked for the Bureau and used them as a =
contractor when I was employed by another federal agency. I have also =
dealt with them at professional associations. =20

They are scrupulous to a fault. They follow both the spirit and the =
letter of the law. I was once in a knock down, drag out fight to save the =
data from about 200 respondents to a survey they conducted for my agency =
because they felt these individuals could be identified if someone had =
access to seven files held by my agency and two by another.

I find it hard to believe that they would succumb to any political =
pressure to falsify results no more than we would cook the numbers in one =
of our reports to make our clients happy. In addition to this, there is =
what might be called the "bureaucratic reality ethic" of doing what is =
right regardless of who is in charge. Bureaucrats know that in a few =
years there will be political appointees from the other party running the =
show, and the only way they (the career civil servants) have any credibilit=
y is to play it streight.

Lastly, there is the fact that there are very few secrets in Washington. =
If someone wanted to cook the results I am convinced it would hit the =
papers. There are people of every political persuasion working at Census.

Parker's point about the Republicans being out done in the line drawing =
wars in the various states is not a function of sampling. And while this =
may have happened in the days of Phil Burton, Phil is dead and there are a =
host of firms on both sides which specialize in drawing district lines.

I apologize if I gave the impression that I am arguing with Parker. =
Rather I am arguing with the Republican position that he is putting =
forward.

Steve Dienstfrey
Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.

>From dhenwood@panix.com Fri Dec 4 09:49:03 1998
Received: from mail1.panix.com (mail1.panix.com [166.84.0.212])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id JAA15002 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 09:49:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])
      by mail1.panix.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/PanixM1.3) with ESMTP id MAA16978
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 12:48:59 -0500 (EST)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com
Message-Id: <v04011707b28dd055adf3@[166.84.250.86]>

In-Reply-To: <s667984d.075@srbi.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 12:49:10 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: Re: Republican Concerns

Stephen Dienstfrey wrote:

>After reading Albert Parker's recent note trying to explain the
>Republican concerns about the use of sampling in the census, I feel
>compelled to come to the defense of our colleagues who work at the
>Census Bureau.

Me too. As a journalist, I talk frequently with Census people, and I've
always been very impressed by their seriousness, fairness, openness, and
dedication. Truly admirable civil servants - and I'd say the same for
statisticians in other government agencies that I also talk with, like the
BEA and BLS. And from what I know of other national statistical agencies,
this is one area where the U.S. government really shines.

Doug

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
250 W 85 St
New York NY 10024-3217 USA
+1-212-874-4020 voice +1-212-874-3137 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
>From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Fri Dec 4 09:55:23 1998
Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
     by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
     id JAA17563 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 09:55:21 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)
     by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id MAA19066
     for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 12:55:20 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 12:55:20 -0500 (EST)
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Republican Concerns
In-Reply-To: <v04011707b28dd055adf3@[166.84.250.86]>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9812041254060.18235-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Ditto. As someone who teaches about the federal statistical system,
including in comparative perspective, we have much to be proud of. Alice

Robbin FSU

On Fri, 4 Dec 1998, Doug Henwood wrote:

> Stephen Dienstfrey wrote:
>
> >After reading Albert Parker's recent note trying to explain the
> >Republican concerns about the use of sampling in the census, I feel
> >compelled to come to the defense of our colleagues who work at the
> >Census Bureau.
>
> Me too. As a journalist, I talk frequently with Census people, and
> I've always been very impressed by their seriousness, fairness,
> openness, and dedication. Truly admirable civil servants - and I'd say
> the same for statisticians in other government agencies that I also
> talk with, like the BEA and BLS. And from what I know of other
> national statistical agencies, this is one area where the U.S.
> government really shines.
>
> Doug
>
> --
>
> Doug Henwood
> Left Business Observer
> 250 W 85 St
> New York NY 10024-3217 USA
> +1-212-874-4020 voice +1-212-874-3137 fax
> email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
> web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
>

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

>From JOHNNY@CATI.UMD.EDU Fri Dec 4 09:55:45 1998
Received: from umailsrv1.umd.edu (umailsrv1.umd.edu [128.8.10.53])
      by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id JAA17811 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 09:55:42 -0800
(PST)
From: JOHNNY@CATI.UMD.EDU

                    National Omnibus Survey

                       January 1999

The University of Maryland Survey Research Center will be conducting its
next national CATI omnibus survey in January.

The objective is to provide a vehicle for researchers interested in
collecting data on a small number of variables or who want to experimentally
compare alternative versions of questions on a large sample.

Survey Design: 1,000 interviews [48 states], using a dual frame
(list-assisted/Mitofsky-Waksberg) sample, with random selection of
one adult respondent within each sample household. Up to 20 callbacks;
refusal conversion; assistance with questionnaire design and two pretests.

Deliverables: Ascii data set and SPSS Windows systems file with researcher's
items and standard SRC demographics (sex, age, race, income, education,
marital status, household size), sample household and poststratification
weights, and a brief methods report, including sampling errors (computed
using jackknife procedures).

Schedule:
            Questions due: January 11
            Pretesting: mid-January
            Data collection: February-March
            Data delivered: April 12

Cost: $850 per single response item. More complex questions, split ballot
experiments, rotated items or response categories will be budgeted on an
individual basis.

Space is limited and cannot be reserved without contract completion.

We have been able to do this survey annually and hope to increase it to

twice a year.

Respond to: src@cati.umd.edu
          phone 301 314 7831
          fax   301 314 9070

General Information about SRC: http://www.bsos.umd.edu/src

This message has been cross-posted to the POR List.

                    Assistant Director