

=====  
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700

Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>

Subject: December 1999 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 log9912.

Part 1/1, total size 470579 bytes:

----- Cut here -----

>From armso001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Wed Dec 1 12:10:15 1999

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu (IDENT:0@mhub2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.42])

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

id MAA03901 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Wed, 1 Dec 1999 12:10:14 -0800

(PST)

Received: from amethyst.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu with ESMTP for

AAPORNET@USC.EDU; Wed, 1 Dec 1999 14:10:12 -0600

Received: from [207.58.17.230] by amethyst.tc.umn.edu for AAPORNET@USC.EDU;

Wed, 1 Dec 1999 14:10:11 -0600

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

From: "Rossana Armson" <armso001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

Subject: Voc Rehab Needs Assessment Surveys

Date: Wed, 1 Dec 1999 14:10:44

X-Tick-Nemesis: Chairface Chippendale

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Message-Id: <iss.65b2.384580a3.7d7a5.1@amethyst.tc.umn.edu>

I have a client at the Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Vocational Services Branch, who is interested in finding out about vocational rehabilitation needs assessments that have been conducted or are in the planning stages. If you know of anyone conducting such surveys, please reply directly to him at [steve.scholl@state.mn.us](mailto:steve.scholl@state.mn.us) or call him at (651) 296-5642. Thanks for any help you can provide.

Rossana Armson

Minnesota Center for Survey Research

University of Minnesota

2331 University Avenue SE, Suite 141

Minneapolis, MN 55414

(612) 627-4282

(612) 627-4288 FAX

armso001@tc.umn.edu

>From JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org Thu Dec 2 12:16:35 1999

Received: from horeb.pcusa.org (horeb.pcusa.org [206.115.64.20])

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

id MAA12652 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:16:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from outbound.ecunet.org ([206.115.64.2]) by horeb.pcusa.org

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.2 release 221 ID# 0-0U10L2S100V35)

with SMTP id org for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 2 Dec 1999 15:16:30 -0500

Sender: JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 1999 15:16:09 -0500 (EST)

Subject: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN MARCUM)

Message-ID: <9912021516.aa12109@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an individual's knowledge of the rules of probability or of relative risk. Does anyone have examples of such questions? I'd appreciate any suggestions.

\*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <jackm@ctr.pcusa.org> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church  
(U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396; 502-569-5161;  
502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>From LCook@FGINC.com Thu Dec 2 12:27:42 1999

Received: from exchange.fginc.com (mail.fginc.com [199.72.128.4])

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

id MAA20687 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:27:41 -0800

(PST)

Received: by EXCHANGE with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <4WRJN87P>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 15:26:58 -0500

Message-ID: <60E6FEAC9464D3118D1800805F6509F91F8A11@EXCHANGE>

From: Lou Cook <LCook@FGINC.com>

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

Subject: RE: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 1999 15:26:51 -0500

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

You can try contacting Dr. Thomas Wallsten, a decision theorist, at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He has done research on decision theory as it relates to gambling.

Generally UNC's email addresses use first name underscore last name at unc.edu.

Louis Cook  
Account Manager  
FGI Research  
(919) 932-8871  
lcook@fginc.com

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

From: JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org [mailto:JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org]  
Sent: Thursday, December 02, 1999 3:16 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

To: aapornet@usc.edu

I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an individual's knowledge of the rules of probability or of relative risk. Does anyone have examples of such questions? I'd appreciate any suggestions.

\*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <jackm@ctr.pcusa.org> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church  
(U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396; 502-569-5161;  
502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>From JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Dec 2 12:29:41 1999

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])

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

id MAA22440 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:29:41 -0800

(PST)

From: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu

Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <YDA5XGCM>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:29:30 -0800

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2130124BF14@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:29:28 -0800

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Content-Type: text/plain

Suggest communicating with Neil Weinstein at Rutgers this is his area. jc

> -----

> From: JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org

> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Sent: Thursday, December 2, 1999 1:16 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm

> thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an

> individual's knowledge

> of the rules of probability or of relative risk. Does anyone have

> examples

> of such questions? I'd appreciate any suggestions.

>

> \*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <jackm@ctr.pcusa.org> Please use it in

> future.\*\*\*

> John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church

> (U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396;

> 502-569-5161; 502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Dec 2 12:32:53 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id MAA25455 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:32:51 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp3.vgernet.net [205.219.186.103])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id QAA00865

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 16:43:09 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3846D755.625BC01A@jwdp.com>

Date: Thu, 02 Dec 1999 15:32:21 -0500

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

References: <9912021516.aa12109@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There is a whole literature on the perception of risk from Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. It may not be quite what you have in mind, but you might find it useful to take a look anyway.

Jan Werner

---

JOHN MARCUM wrote:

>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm

> thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an

> individual's knowledge of the rules of probability or of relative

> risk. Does anyone have examples of such questions? I'd appreciate

> any suggestions.

>

> \*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <jackm@ctr.pcusa.org> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

> John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church

>(U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396;

>502-569-5161; 502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999 From

>mark@bisconti.com Thu Dec 2 12:46:38 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id MAA05704 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 12:46:37 -0800

(PST)

Received: from markbri (ip133.washington11.dc.pub-ip.PSI.NET [38.30.47.133])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service



Version 5.5.2232.9)

id WZP52FVF; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 15:46:40 -0500

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: RE: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 1999 15:45:45 -0500

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEEMEPJCLAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <3846D755.625BC01A@jwdp.com>

Perhaps not directly related, FYI: There is at least one book on the cultural history of gaming in the American Indian community, might be good background if you plan to interview members of that group (have it and can dig it up if you need reference). Mark Richards

JOHN MARCUM wrote:

>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm

> thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an

> individual's

knowledge

> of the rules of probability or of relative risk. Does anyone have  
examples

> of such questions? I'd appreciate any suggestions.

>

> \*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <jackm@ctr.pcusa.org> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

> John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church

> (U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396;

> 502-569-5161; 502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Thu Dec 2 13:30:15 1999

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])

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

id NAA09393 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 13:30:15 -0800

(PST)

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (sph76-133.harvard.edu [128.103.76.133])

by hsph.harvard.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id QAA24789

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 16:29:12 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3846E57D.C354D380@hsph.harvard.edu>

Date: Thu, 02 Dec 1999 16:32:45 -0500

From: Karen Donelan <kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: SUPPER WITH NEAAPOR AND RICH MORIN 12/8/99

References: <fc.000f7cf7001e70b5000f7cf7001e70b5.1e70b8@cclgroup.ca>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The New England Chapter of AAPOR is sponsoring a mid-year meeting next week.  
All are invited.

Our guest will be Rich Morin, Director of Polling and Staff Writer of the Washington Post (and AAPOR/WAPOR member). Rich will be leading an informal discussion of his work. To see some examples, check out the Poll Vault section at the Post website.

The details:

Wednesday, December 8, 1999

6-8 pm

Taubman 275

John F. Kennedy School of Government

Eliot Street, Cambridge (next to the Charles Hotel Plaza)

The best bet for parking is the Eliot Street garage on the corner of Eliot and JFK Streets.

Light supper (sandwiches, salads) will be served at 6 pm and the discussion will begin at 6:30.

PLEASE CONFIRM YOUR ATTENDANCE BY REPLYING TO

[kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu) (and not to the list)

RESERVATIONS ARE NEEDED BY 12/3/99.

Price for NEAAPOR members: \$10

For non members: \$12

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Thu Dec 2 13:57:02 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

id NAA27716 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 13:57:01 -0800

(PST)

Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3-fi.acns.fsu.edu

[192.168.197.3])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id QAA21296

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 16:56:58 -0500

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial153.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.153])

by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id QAA83686

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Dec 1999 16:56:57 -0500

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 1999 16:56:57 -0500

Message-Id: <199912022156.QAA83686@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Start by asking Paul Slovic, who is at U Oregon (Psychology, I think) and also with Decision Research in Oregon. He has done a lot of work on risk. A lot of interesting and nonobvious stuff is in this field.

Also try Ronald Pavalko, who recently retired from U Wisconsin Parkside in Sociology. Ron published a book late last year on gambling.

Gallup has done a variety of surveys on gambling attitudes and behavior.

I work on how people pick lottery numbers and playing the lottery--so please forward to me whatever else you find out!

Dare I say: good luck?

Best regards,

Susan

At 03:16 PM 12/2/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

>I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm

>thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an

>individual's knowledge of the rules of probability or of relative risk.

>Does anyone have examples of such questions? I'd appreciate any

>suggestions.

>

>\*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <g> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

>John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church

>(U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396;

>502-569-5161; 502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>

>

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh, PhD.  
Department of Sociology  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Dec 3 05:59:40 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])

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

id FAA08417 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Dec 1999 05:59:39 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mindspring.com (user-38lcimr.dialup.mindspring.com

[209.86.74.219])

by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id IAA27678;

Fri, 3 Dec 1999 08:59:33 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3847CB01.65E671F1@mindspring.com>

Date: Fri, 03 Dec 1999 08:52:01 -0500

From: rshalpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Globalization and the Wage Gap

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="-----446D7D62115A8CF335D404D5"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----446D7D62115A8CF335D404D5

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Andy Kohut has done it again, this time with a most interesting piece on the OpEd page of the NY Times re the meaning of the recent protests at the WTO meeting in Seattle.

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html>

-----446D7D62115A8CF335D404D5

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

name="03kohu.html"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline;

filename="03kohu.html"

Content-Base: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/

03kohu.html"

Content-Location: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/

03kohu.html"

<html>

<head>

<!--PLS\_META-->

<meta name="NYT\_HEADLINE" content="Globalization and the Wage Gap "> <meta

```
name="BY_LINE" content="By ANDREW KOHUT ">
<meta name="FIRSTPAR" content=" Clearly the worst of what we have seen in
Seattle is thuggery for its own sake, but the support for the broader
peaceful protest and the backing from unions and well-established
special-interest
groups show that there are pockets of deep disquiet amid the general
contentment. "> <meta name="DISPLAYDATE" content="December 03, 1999"> <meta
name="NYT_SORTDATE" content="19991203">
<!--
1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234
56789123456789123456789 -->
<!--
1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234
56789123456789123456789 -->
<!--
1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234
56789123456789123456789 -->
<!--
1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234
56789123456789123456789 -->
<!--ELEMENT TITLE -->
<TITLE>Globalization and the Wage Gap
</TITLE>
<!-- ELEMENT META-->
<META NAME="Filingmethod" CONTENT= "Atex">
<META NAME="UnixSlug" CONTENT=" ../backfield/savekeep/03KOHU.W01">
<META NAME="Date" CONTENT="99/12/03">
<META NAME="Type" CONTENT= "story">
```



<META NAME="AtexNotes" CONTENT="kohut bi ">  
<META NAME="AtexSlug" CONTENT="03kohu ">  
<META NAME="AtexHJ" CONTENT="y016.20/0122">  
<META NAME="AtexFrom" CONTENT="launch-edt;12/02,21:13 ">  
<META NAME="AtexOp" CONTENT="tohars;12/02,21:12">  
<META NAME="AtexBy" CONTENT="tohars;12/02,10:04">  
<META NAME="section" CONTENT="">  
<META NAME="subsection" CONTENT="">  
<META NAME="End of header" CONTENT="">

</head>

<!--plsfield:TEXT-->

<NYT\_HEADER version="1.0" type="main">

<body bgcolor="#ffffff" vlink=#444464 link=#000066  
background=http://graphics.nytimes.com/images/back.c.gif>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<tr><td align=left width=600 valign=top>



<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=left valign=top width=480>

<NYT\_BANNER version="1.0" type="main">



</NYT\_BANNER>

<br clear=all>

<NYT\_TOOLBARMAP version="1.0" type="main">

<map name="maintoolbar2">

<area shape="rect" coords="0,0,75,16" href="/yr/mo/day/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to go to the Home Page';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="76,0,154,16" href="/info/contents/siteindex.html"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to see site contents';return true"> <area

shape="rect" coords="155,0,233,16" href="/search/daily/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the current site';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="234,0,312,16" href="/comment/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click for discussion in the Forums';return

true"> <area shape="rect" coords="313,0,391,16" href="/archives/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the archives';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="392,0,468,16" href="/marketplace/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to visit the Marketplace';return true">

</map>

</NYT\_TOOLBARMAP>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">

<a href="/images/maintoolbar2.map">

</a>

</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<br><NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="top">

<A

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html/0/Top/OPED0003/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961" target="\_top"><IMG SRC="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html/0/Top/OPED0003/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961" border=0 ALT="" ></A>

</NYT\_AD>

</td></table>

</NYT\_HEADER>

<BLOCKQUOTE><BLOCKQUOTE>

<NYT\_DATE version="1.0" type=" ">

<!--ELEMENT DATE-->

<H5>December 3, 1999</H5><br>

</NYT\_DATE>

<NYT\_HEADLINE version="1.0" type=" ">

<!--ELEMENT HEADLINE-->

<H2>Globalization and the Wage Gap

</H2>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE version="1.0" type="main">

<H5>By ANDREW KOHUT </H5>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<p>ASHINGTON -- It's difficult to decide how seriously to take the protests in Seattle against the World Trade Organization. We learned in the 1960's that unruly people taking to the streets can foreshadow broader changes in public opinion. Yet these protests are mostly about economics, and we also know that Americans are more financially satisfied than they have been in years and that consumer confidence is near record levels.

<p> Clearly the worst of what we have seen in Seattle is thuggery for its own sake, but the support for the broader peaceful protest and the backing from unions and well-established special-interest groups show that there are pockets of deep disquiet amid the general contentment.

<p>Americans do not speak with one voice about globalization, and while most people are enjoying the boom years, it is a very top-heavy celebration.

<p> In a Pew Research Center nationwide survey in April, 43 percent of respondents said that in the future a global economy would help average Americans, while 52 percent said it would hurt them. But these overall results mask a yawning gap.

<p> Among Americans in families earning \$75,000 or more, 63 percent see globalization as positive. That falls to 48 percent for those with household income of \$50,000 to \$74,999. And among the half of American adults in families earning less than \$50,000, the positive view of globalism is held by just 37 percent.

<p> Surveys in 1998 by Pew and Gallup found small pluralities favoring globalization overall, but both polls also showed the same strong socioeconomic skew.

<p>Pew surveys of long-term trends, updated each year, have found that on average, Americans rate their financial situation better now than they did from 1994 through 1996. But financial satisfaction is significantly higher only among people with family incomes of \$50,000 and higher. Those in lower-earning families rated their situation no better this year than they did in 1994. The

improvement they have reported is a decrease in financial pressure: fewer said this year that they "often did not have enough money to make ends meet" than did so in 1994.

<p> Wages continue to be a source of concern. Just 39 percent of Americans say they earn enough money to lead the life they want. There has been a significant decline in satisfaction with wages among those earning less than \$50,000: only 27 percent now say they earn enough, down from 33 percent in 1994. According to a nationwide survey in October by The Washington Post, 67 percent of Americans worry that good jobs will move overseas and that workers will be left with jobs that don't pay enough.

<p> Until this week, Americans had not heard much about the W.T.O. The public continues to be of two minds about free trade, however, generally supporting the concept but expressing criticism of specific policies and agreements. The North American Free Trade Agreement gets, at best, a mixed review, and there is still little support for giving the president increased authority to negotiate

trade agreements.

<p> Americans' concern about trade agreements does not appear to be rooted in a general worry about the loss of American sovereignty: surveys show their concerns are more specific.

<p>We found strong public backing for internationally mandated environmental standards, for example, which weaken nations' sovereign powers, in the same surveys in which Nafta, which also weakens sovereignty, received significant opposition.

<p> Broad opposition to the W.T.O. could develop around specific concerns about wages and environmental and human rights issues.

<p> For now, the dissatisfaction showing in Seattle is less important than a more widespread public optimism about future economic gains. But there is also a simmering concern about the most fundamental of economic issues: wages. And if the overall economic climate becomes less favorable, that disquiet could grow into something far more serious.<br>

<P><I>

Andrew Kohut is the director of the Pew Research Center for People and the Press. </I>

<p> <!--plsfield:NYT\_FOOTER-->

<NYT\_FOOTER version="1.0">

</BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE>

<br>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=center valign=top width=468>

<NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="bottom">

<A

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/  
yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html/0/Bottom/OPED0003/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"

target="\_top"><IMG

src="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.co  
m/yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html/0/Bottom/OPED0003/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"

border=0 alt="" ></A>

</NYT\_AD>

<hr size=1>

<p>

<font size=-1>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">

<a href="/"><b>Home</b></a> |

<a href="/info/contents/siteindex.html"><b>Site Index</b></a> |

<a href="/search/daily/"><b>Site Search</b></a> |

<a href="/comment/"><b>Forums</b></a> |

<a href="/archives/"><b>Archives</b></a> |

<a href="/marketplace/"><b>Marketplace</b></a>

<p>



[Quick News](/yr/mo/day/late/) |  
[Page One Plus](/yr/mo/day/front/) |  
[International](/yr/mo/day/world/) |  
[National/N.Y.](/yr/mo/day/national/) |  
[Business](/yr/mo/day/business/) |  
[Technology](/yr/mo/day/tech/) |  
[Science](/yr/mo/day/science/) |  
[Sports](/yr/mo/day/sports/) |  
[Weather](/weather/) |  
[Editorial](/yr/mo/day/editorial/) |  
[Op-Ed](/yr/mo/day/oped/) |  
[Arts](/yr/mo/day/artleisure/) |  
[Automobiles](/yr/mo/day/auto/) |  
[Books](/books/yr/mo/day/home/) |  
[Diversions](/diversions/) |  
[Job Market](/yr/mo/day/jobmarket/) |  
[Real Estate](/yr/mo/day/realestate/) |  
[Travel](/yr/mo/day/travel/)  
<P>  
[Help/Feedback](/subscribe/help/) |  
[Classifieds](/classified/) |  
[Services](/info/contents/services.html) |  
[New York Today](http://www.nytoday.com)</A>

</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<NYT\_COPYRIGHT version="1.0" type="main">

<P>

[<B>Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company</B></A>](/subscribe/help/copyright.html) <P>

</NYT\_COPYRIGHT>

</font>

</td></table>

</td>

<td align=left width=14 valign=top>

</td> <td align=center width=140 valign=top> 

<A

HREF="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/  
yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html/0/Right3/OPED0005/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"

target="\_top"><IMG

SRC="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.co  
m/yr/mo/day/oped/03kohu.html/0/Right3/OPED0005/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"

border=0 ALT="" ></A>

</td></tr></table>

</NYT\_FOOTER>

</body>

</html>

-----446D7D62115A8CF335D404D5--

>From jlemert@ballmer.uoregon.edu Sat Dec 4 10:35:48 1999

Received: from ballmer.uoregon.edu (ballmer.uoregon.edu [128.223.58.86])

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

id KAA20655 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 4 Dec 1999 10:35:47 -0800

(PST)

Received: by ballmer.uoregon.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

id <YHFWPQJP>; Sat, 4 Dec 1999 10:37:33 -0800

Message-ID: <377529F94F85D111AE2F0000F801164C5AC771@ballmer.uoregon.edu>

From: Jim Lemert <jlemert@ballmer.uoregon.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Date: Sat, 4 Dec 1999 10:37:33 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

You may also be able to reach Paul Slovic at the Oregon Research Institute  
in Eugene. His e-mail address is: pslovic@oregon.uoregon.edu Jim Lemert

Professor emeritus

Journalism and Communication, Univ. of Oregon (not in residence) Mailing

address: P.O. Box 2224, Waldport, OR 97394

email: JLemert@Oregon,UOregon.edu

phone: (541) 563-2984

FAX: (541) 563-7101

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

From: Susan Losh [mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]

Sent: Thursday, December 02, 1999 1:57 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Start by asking Paul Slovic, who is at U Oregon (Psychology, I think) and also with Decision Research in Oregon. He has done a lot of work on risk. A lot of interesting and nonobvious stuff is in this field.

Also try Ronald Pavalko, who recently retired from U Wisconsin Parkside in Sociology. Ron published a book late last year on gambling.

Gallup has done a variety of surveys on gambling attitudes and behavior.

I work on how people pick lottery numbers and playing the lottery--so please forward to me whatever else you find out!

Dare I say: good luck?

Best regards,

Susan

At 03:16 PM 12/2/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

>I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm  
>thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an  
>individual's knowledge of the rules of probability or of relative risk.  
>Does anyone have examples of such questions? I'd appreciate any  
>suggestions.

>

>\*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <g> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

>John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church

>(U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396;

>502-569-5161; 502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>

>

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From jlemert@ballmer.uoregon.edu Sat Dec 4 10:41:44 1999

Received: from ballmer.uoregon.edu (ballmer.uoregon.edu [128.223.58.86])

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

id KAA23944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 4 Dec 1999 10:41:44 -0800

(PST)

Received: by ballmer.uoregon.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

id <YHFWPQJS>; Sat, 4 Dec 1999 10:43:30 -0800

Message-ID: <377529F94F85D111AE2F0000F801164C5AC772@ballmer.uoregon.edu>

From: Jim Lemert <jlemert@ballmer.uoregon.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

Date: Sat, 4 Dec 1999 10:43:30 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

There's a study cited in Robert Entmann's article on Framing (POQ some years ago) where respondents had to choose which of two medical treatments to administer to imaginary groups, and the choices were radically reversed depending on whether risks or benefits were emphasized in the frame. Jim Lemert

Professor emeritus

Journalism and Communication, Univ. of Oregon (not in residence) Mailing

address: P.O. Box 2224, Waldport, OR 97394

email: JLemert@Oregon,UOregon.edu

phone: (541) 563-2984

FAX: (541) 563-7101

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

From: JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org

[mailto:JOHN\_MARCUM.parti@ecunet.org]

Sent: Thursday, December 02, 1999 12:16 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: GAMBLING AND RISK SURVEY

To: aapornet@usc.edu

I am developing a survey on gambling opinions and behavior. I'm thinking about asking a question or two that try to get at an individual's knowledge of the rules of probability or of relative risk. Does anyone have examples of such questions? I'd appreciate any suggestions.

\*\*\*NOTE NEW E-MAIL: <jackm@ctr.pcusa.org> Please use it in future.\*\*\*

John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D., Research Services, Presbyterian Church  
(U.S.A.), 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville KY 40202-1396; 502-569-5161;  
502-569-5501 (fax); 2:44 pm Thu, Dec 2, 1999

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Sat Dec 4 19:28:51 1999

Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net  
[207.69.200.246])

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

id TAA23031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 4 Dec 1999 19:28:50 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from default (user-38lcikh.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.74.145])

by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id WAA32216;

Sat, 4 Dec 1999 22:28:32 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991204220516.00962870@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Sat, 04 Dec 1999 22:13:18 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: New Media site

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

For those interested in issues surrounding global media I recommend your taking a peek at a new web site: (covers a wide variety of concerns ranging from freedom of the press, reporting issues in various countries and the like plus a fascinating piece about current problems facing Russian media.).

<http://www.mediachannel.org/>

<http://www.mediachannel.org/about/editor/index.html> will give you a better idea of what they are about. The Pew Center has two articles of interest

Dick Halpern

-----

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

-----



>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Mon Dec 6 09:01:50 1999

Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])

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

id JAA23984 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 6 Dec 1999 09:01:49 -0800

(PST)

Received: from SRBI\_NEW\_YORK-Message\_Server by srbi.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 06 Dec 1999 11:56:30 -0500

Message-Id: <s84ba46e.052@srbi.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Mon, 06 Dec 1999 11:55:34 -0500

From: "MARK Schulman" <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: =?ISO-8859-7?Q?Reminder:20AAPOR=202000=20=AF=20Call=20for=20Pap?=

=?ISO-8859-7?Q?ers?=?

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id JAA24004

REMINDER: DEADLINE APPROACHING, December 9, 1999

CALL FOR PAPERS AND PARTICIPATION, AAPOR 2000 CONFERENCE

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its 55th annual conference in Portland, Oregon in May 2000. AAPOR's Conference Committee seeks proposals for papers, panels, and round tables that will illuminate important research questions, increase the skills of AAPOR's membership, and promote the development of our profession. Deadline for

submission is December 9, 1999.

Papers, panels, and round table ideas on any topic in public opinion and survey research are welcomed for consideration for next May's conference.

We encourage participants to form sessions with common themes and to submit their papers together. These papers will, of course, be considered individually if for some reason the session is not used.

#### CONFERENCE THEME

Since this will be our first conference of the 21st century, we especially encourage thoughtful papers and panels that focus on the challenges ahead.

This would include the following:

- Impact of technology on public opinion/communications research
- New insights from data mining
- Internet surveys: where do we stand?
- Cross-national research: opportunities and pitfalls
- The 2000 Census: a methodological assessment
- Understanding the voter in the 2000 elections
- Consumer and lifestyle trends
- Legislative/political threats to public opinion research
- Retaining customers/customer loyalty
- Generations "X" and "Y"/generational analyses
- Sources of response bias/measurement error

#### AAPOR/WAPOR CONFERENCE

This conference is a joint AAPOR/WAPOR conference year. We encourage

submissions on topics of interest to WAPOR's world-wide membership.

#### SUBMISSIONS FROM COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS

We particularly encourage the submission of panel, round table and paper presentations that will appeal to those working in the commercial sector.

Please feel free to contact the conference chair with ideas that may depart from the normal conference paper format.

#### ABSTRACT SUBMISSION

Please submit your proposal or abstract (of no more than 300 words):

INCLUDING TWO OR THREE KEY WORDS DESCRIBING THE TOPIC, by December 9, 1999.

Please fit your proposal onto one page and include the name, mailing address, telephone number(s) and email address of the principal author. Use an additional page if necessary for the same information about the other authors. You will receive confirmation that your proposal has been received. Final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January 1999 and you will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

Our preference is to receive abstracts electronically through the AAPOR web site: [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org). This feature will be ready shortly. Please click on "Conferences" for submission instructions. If you do not have Internet access, submit three copies of your abstract directly to this year's Conference Chair:

Mark A. Schulman

Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.

145 E. 32nd Street, Suite 500

New York, NY 10016

Email: m.schulman@srbi.com

Voice: 212-779-7700

We look forward to seeing you in Portland!

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Mon Dec 6 10:06:35 1999

Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])

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

id KAA09399 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 6 Dec 1999 10:06:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from SRBI\_NEW\_YORK-Message\_Server by srbi.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 06 Dec 1999 13:02:30 -0500

Message-Id: <s84bb3e6.090@srbi.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Mon, 06 Dec 1999 13:01:06 -0500

From: "MARK Schulman" <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Reminder: AAPOR Student Paper Competition

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id KAA09420

DEADLINE REMINDER: December 9, 1999

## ANNUAL AAPOR STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

Open to Current Students and Recent Degree Recipients

55th Annual Conference

American Association for Public Opinion Research

Doubletree Hotel, Portland Oregon

May 18-21, 2000

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will award its 34th Annual Student Paper Prize this year. The prize is open both to current students (graduate or undergraduate) and to those who graduated during calendar year 1999. The research must have been substantially completed while the author(s) was enrolled in a degree program. AAPOR will consider papers in any field related to the study of public opinion, broadly defined, or to the theory and methods of survey and market research, including statistical techniques used in such research. Past winners have come from many fields, including political science, communication, psychology, sociology, and survey methods.

Paper topics might include methodological issues in survey, public opinion, or market research, theoretical issues in the formation and change of public opinion, or substantive findings about public opinion. Entries should be roughly 15 to 25 pages in length and may have multiple authors. All authors on an entry must meet the eligibility requirements for the prize.

A prize of \$500 will be awarded to the winning paper; in addition, one or more papers may receive an Honorable Mention and be listed in the 2000 Conference Program. The entries will be judged by a panel of survey researchers selected from AAPOR's membership, including researchers drawn from the academic, government, and commercial sectors. The winning paper and any Honorable Mentions will be invited to present their papers at AAPOR's 55th Annual Conference, to be held in Portland, Oregon, May 18-21, 1999.

Please mail FIVE COPIES OF EACH ENTRY, TO ARRIVE BY DECEMBER 9, 1999, to this year's Chair of the Student Paper Competition:

Dr. Dianne Rucinski  
Chair, AAPOR Student Paper Competition  
Health Research and Policy Centers (MC/275)  
University of Illinois  
850 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 400  
Chicago, IL 60607-3025

Voice: 312-996-7222

E-Mail: [drucin@uic.edu](mailto:drucin@uic.edu)

Please include your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and, if possible, an e-mail address. You will receive confirmation that your paper has been received. Final decisions about the winner and the inclusion of papers in the program will be made by early February. You will be notified about the status of your paper shortly thereafter.

>From jlemert@ballmer.uoregon.edu Mon Dec 6 16:12:56 1999

Received: from ballmer.uoregon.edu (ballmer.uoregon.edu [128.223.58.86])

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

id QAA25585 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 6 Dec 1999 16:12:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: by ballmer.uoregon.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

id <YK2MN4AC>; Mon, 6 Dec 1999 16:14:45 -0800

Message-ID: <377529F94F85D111AE2F0000F801164C5AC776@ballmer.uoregon.edu>

From: Jim Lemert <jlemert@ballmer.uoregon.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Correction on Paul Slovic's address

Date: Mon, 6 Dec 1999 16:14:44 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

In a reply concerning a query about measuring attitudes toward gambling and risk taking, I volunteered Paul Slovic's non-UO address as the Oregon Research Institute. Actually his address (when not at the Univ. of Oregon psych department) is at Decision Research in Eugene. Also, I think the Entmann article on framing appeared in the Journal of Communication, I believe, not POQ. My thanks to a colleague who corrected me on Paul's address. Jim Lemert

Professor emeritus

Journalism and Communication, Univ. of Oregon (not in residence) Mailing

address: P.O. Box 2224, Waldport, OR 97394

email: JLemert@Oregon,UOregon.edu

phone: (541) 563-2984

FAX: (541) 563-7101

>From kwang@ui.urban.org Tue Dec 7 06:22:25 1999

Received: from ALPHA1 (alpha1.urban.org [192.188.252.10])

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

id GAA01781 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 06:22:06 -0800

(PST)

Received: by alpha1.urban.org (UCX V4.1-12E, OpenVMS V6.2-1H3 Alpha);

Tue, 7 Dec 1999 09:21:19 -0500

Received: from UINET2/SpoolDir by ui.urban.org (Mercury 1.44);

7 Dec 99 09:19:11 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by UINET2 (Mercury 1.44); 7 Dec 99 09:18:43 -0500

Received: from 12680\_W9x (192.188.252.245) by ui.urban.org (Mercury 1.44);

7 Dec 99 09:18:40 -0500

From: "Kevin Wang" <kwang@ui.urban.org>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Tue, 7 Dec 1999 09:20:10 -0500

Subject: Response rates for low-income populations

Reply-to: KWANG@ui.urban.org

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.54)

Message-ID: <A6DAC31E72@ui.urban.org>

Can anyone think of papers, articles or results that can be used to support the following statement?

"For almost all surveys, response rates are lower for minorities, the poor, the poorly educated and young adults,...".



I have reviewed quite a few studies of differences between respondents and nonrespondents and my own reading is that there isn't a whole lot of evidence to support such a characterization of nonrespondents to "almost all surveys". The context here is primarily government sponsored surveys that try to gather factual information (about health insurance, employment, family income, etc.). What is the best evidence out there in support of the above statement?

Kevin Wang

The Urban Institute

TEL: 202-261-5732

FAX: 202-293-1918

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 7 08:02:20 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id IAA02256 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 08:02:20 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA12680 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 08:02:20 -0800

(PST)

Date: Tue, 7 Dec 1999 08:02:20 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: POSITION: European Public Opinion Analyst

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912070800170.12077-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

\*\*\*\*\*

> VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENT FOR European Public Opinion Analyst

> SALARY: \$ 40,714 TO \$ 63,436, ANNUAL depending upon experience.

> GS-0101-11/12

> With the U.S. Department of State in Washington, DC

> ANNOUNCEMENT NUMBER: AR0244

>

> All applicants must be U.S. citizens.

> >

> OPEN DATE: December 1, 1999    CLOSING DATE: January 12, 2000

>

> \*\* You MUST request application materials, or apply on-line, by the

> > closing date 01/12/00. You then have until 01/19/00 for your

> > completed application to be received in the Raleigh Service Center.

> > \*\*

>

> ABOUT THIS POSITION: The incumbent serves as a Research Specialist in

> the European Branch of the Office of Research. He or she initiates,

> plans, and oversees public opinion research studies in Europe, and

> analyzes relationships between public opinion and political, economic,

> and social issues in the region. The work includes (1) planning and

> overseeing public opinion surveys; (2) reporting results from such

- > polls and others acquired in the region by writing clear, concise,
- > interpretative briefing papers and memoranda for top-level officials
- > in the United States Government foreign policy community; and (3)
- > keeping up with activities and developments in Europe. Applicants
- > must be able to obtain a special sensitive security clearance. This position has promotion potential to
- > GS-13.
- >
- > All applicants must have in-depth knowledge of survey research
- > methodology and quantitative data analysis with regard to European and EU political
- > and social issues.
- >
- > Other job responsibilities include identifying and employing new
- > techniques and methods to analyze public opinion; assessing the
- > validity, accuracy, reliability, and relevance of information and
- > polling results received, giving briefings on issues related to public
- > opinion, and the potential to write articles about European political,
- > economic, and social issues for professional publications or journals.
- >
- > See for more information:
- > <http://www.usajobs.opm.gov/wfjic/jobs/AR0244.HTM>

\*\*\*\*\*

>From hoeyd@sunynassau.edu Tue Dec 7 09:06:22 1999

Received: from lib.acs.sunynassau.edu (LIB.ACS.SUNYNASSAU.EDU [198.38.8.2])

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

id JAA04852 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 09:06:06 -0800

(PST)

Received: from nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu ([198.38.9.253])

by lib.acs.sunynassau.edu with ESMTP for aapornet@usc.edu;

Tue, 7 Dec 1999 12:03:38 -0500

Received: from NCC\_VOL2/SpoolDir by nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu (Mercury 1.40);

7 Dec 99 12:03:00 -500

Received: from SpoolDir by NCC\_VOL2 (Mercury 1.31); 7 Dec 99 12:02:37 -500

Received: from sunynassau.edu by nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu (Mercury 1.31) with ESMTP;

7 Dec 99 12:02:32 -500

Date: Tue, 7 Dec 1999 12:01:21 -0500

Sender: DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu>

From: DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

X-EXP32-SerialNo: 00002181

Subject: Help A Student With A Research Project

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: WebMail (Hydra) SMTP v3.51

Message-ID: <9A4ADE97A08@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>

I am mentoring an HS student who is competing in a National Science Foundation

program. He is conducting a research project among college students about their political attitudes and vote choices.

We have already completed a sample of northern students and are now looking for additional southern schools that might be able to participate.

We are looking for about 100 completed interviews in a 4 year college -  
social  
sciences classes are ok, probably preferred since these were in our northern  
school sample. (Southern school = any state of the former confederacy.)

If you can help us out, please E-mail me at [HOEYD@SUNYNASSAU.EDU](mailto:HOEYD@SUNYNASSAU.EDU).

Thank You.

Patrick Hoey

>From [cporter@hp.ufl.edu](mailto:cporter@hp.ufl.edu) Tue Dec 7 18:29:06 1999

Received: from [makalu.hp.ufl.edu](mailto:makalu.hp.ufl.edu) (IDENT:root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu  
[128.227.11.150])

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

id SAA25902 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 18:29:06 -0800

(PST)

Received: from [hp.ufl.edu](mailto:hp.ufl.edu) ([hp.ufl.edu](mailto:hp.ufl.edu) [128.227.11.149])

by [makalu.hp.ufl.edu](mailto:makalu.hp.ufl.edu) (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id WAA19687

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 22:29:22 -0500

Received: from K2/SpoolDir by [hp.ufl.edu](mailto:hp.ufl.edu) (Mercury 1.44);

7 Dec 99 21:28:54 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 7 Dec 99 21:28:36 -0500

Received: from [hp.ufl.edu](mailto:hp.ufl.edu) (128.227.127.33) by [hp.ufl.edu](mailto:hp.ufl.edu) (Mercury 1.44) with  
ESMTP;

7 Dec 99 21:28:34 -0500

Message-ID: <384DC583.59225C97@hp.ufl.edu>

Date: Tue, 07 Dec 1999 22:42:12 -0400

From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am wondering if anyone has experience with long-term studies that manage to do re-contacts later while still protecting a subject's anonymity?

Of course there is a whole body of literature about sensitive issues and the impact of offering anonymity, particularly the studies on drug use, and behaviors associated with HIV.

But it's the follow-ups that seem to throw in a new wrinkle, and I can't seem to find much on systems that would allow both recontacts and assurances of anonymity. (Well, not surprising. This is a real challenge!)

Any recommendations, references, or anecdotes?

Thanks bunches,

Colleen K. Porter

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu

Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

UF Department of Health Services Administration

Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>From JonRicht@aol.com Tue Dec 7 19:16:14 1999

Received: from imo-d02.mx.aol.com (imo-d02.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.34])

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

id TAA25430 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 19:16:10 -0800

(PST)

From: JonRicht@aol.com

Received: from JonRicht@aol.com

by imo-d02.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v24.6.) id 5.0.9bc6a995 (3889)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Dec 1999 22:14:10 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <0.9bc6a995.257f2702@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 7 Dec 1999 22:14:10 EST

Subject: Data Search - Youth

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38

I am looking for any publicly released survey/poll data on the topic of broadening the term "youth" to include kids ages 18 to 24. Many government studies on "youth" now go beyond 18 year olds and include kids up to the age of 24 - formerly considered young adults.

Ultimately, I am looking for survey data on whether the public has an opinion on whether or not 18-24 year olds should be classified as "youth"

and/or under what circumstances is this necessary or not. Not exactly a common public opinion polling topic, but survey/poll results could also include

such ancillary topics as whether the public support/oppose legislation to "protect" this age group by supporting/opposing raising the minimum age for drinking/smoking/driving etc.

Part of the context is this:

Recent push to try 12 and 13 year olds as "adults" is out of sync with efforts to classify 18-24 yr olds as "youth." What does public opinion data show, what issues make the public draw the line...

Please send any responses directly to me at [jon.richter@pmmc.com](mailto:jon.richter@pmmc.com). Thank you.

-Jon Richter

>From [lavrakas.1@osu.edu](mailto:lavrakas.1@osu.edu) Wed Dec 8 04:44:04 1999

Received: from [mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu) ([mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu) [128.146.214.32])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id EAA13868 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 04:44:03 -0800

(PST)

Received: from [pjl1 \(pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu \[128.146.93.67\]\)](mailto:pjl1 (pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.93.67]))

by [mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu) (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id HAA11072

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 07:44:04 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19991208124148.008d0318@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: [lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu](mailto:lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu)

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0



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

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 07:41:48 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Data Search - Youth

Jon,

I can't help myself from making a personal "value-laden" comment about what I consider to be a very ill-advised way of thinking vis-a-vis public policy formulation to label adults who happen to be 18-24 years old as "kids" or "youth." In saying this I am not suggesting that you necessarily think this way, as I have heard of this perspective before.

But I agree that it's good to seek information about how pervasive this way of thinking is among the public and elites.

At 10:14 PM 12/7/99 EST, you wrote:

>I am looking for any publicly released survey/poll data on the topic of  
>broadening the term "youth" to include kids ages 18 to 24. Many government

>studies on "youth" now go beyond 18 year olds and include kids up to the  
age

>of 24 - formerly considered young adults.

>

>Ultimately, I am looking for survey data on whether the public has an

>opinion on whether or not 18-24 year olds should be classified as

>"youth" and/or under what circumstances is this necessary or not. Not

>exactly a common public opinion polling topic, but survey/poll results  
>could also include such ancillary topics as whether the public  
>support/oppose legislation to "protect" this age group by  
>supporting/opposing raising the minimum age for  
>drinking/smoking/driving etc.

>

>Part of the context is this:

>Recent push to try 12 and 13 year olds as "adults" is out of sync with  
>efforts to classify 18-24 yr olds as "youth." What does public opinion  
>data show, what issues make the public draw the line...

>

>Please send any responses directly to me at [jon.richter@pmmc.com](mailto:jon.richter@pmmc.com).

>Thank you.

>

> -Jon Richter

>

>

>From [ande271@attglobal.net](mailto:ande271@attglobal.net) Wed Dec 8 06:26:07 1999

Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [165.87.194.229])

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

id GAA08365 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 06:26:06 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default ([129.37.112.95]) by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP

id <199912081426042290288g05e>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 14:26:04 +0000

Message-ID: <384E95C2.7157@attglobal.net>

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 09:30:42 -0800

From: Jeanne Anderson <[ande271@attglobal.net](mailto:ande271@attglobal.net)>

Reply-To: [ande271@ibm.net](mailto:ande271@ibm.net)

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

References: <384DC583.59225C97@hp.ufl.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Colleen K. Porter wrote:

>

> I am wondering if anyone has experience with long-term studies that  
> manage to do re-contacts later while still protecting a subject's  
> anonymity?

>

> Of course there is a whole body of literature about sensitive issues  
> and the impact of offering anonymity, particularly the studies on drug  
> use, and behaviors associated with HIV.

>

> But it's the follow-ups that seem to throw in a new wrinkle, and I  
> can't seem to find much on systems that would allow both recontacts  
> and assurances of anonymity. (Well, not surprising. This is a real  
> challenge!)

>

> Any recommendations, references, or anecdotes?

>

> Thanks bunches,

>

> Colleen K. Porter

> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu

- > Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
- > UF Department of Health Services Administration
- > Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
- > Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Are you referring to anonymity, or confidentiality? If the latter, would you consider mentioning the possibility of a follow up at the time you ask for participation? Or even asking whether follow up would be acceptable? The mention is preferable to the question, since the "no" answers may increase response bias at the follow up stage.

>From cwij@BATTELLE.ORG Wed Dec 8 07:00:01 1999

Received: from bclcl1.im.battelle.org (bclcl1.im.battelle.org [131.167.1.2])

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

id HAA17616 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 07:00:00 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ns-bco-mse1.im.battelle.org ([131.167.1.166])

by BCLCL1 (PMDf V5.1-10 #U2779) with ESMTP id <01JJ96U4KK56935N63@BCLCL1>

for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:59:34 EST

Received: by ns-bco-mse1.im.battelle.org with Internet Mail Service

(5.5.2448.0) id <XPM2HL9C>; Wed, 08 Dec 1999 09:59:13 -0500

Content-return: allowed

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 09:59:12 -0500

From: "Cwi, Joan S" <cwi@BATTELLE.ORG>

Subject: RE: Anonymity/sensitive topics/follow-ups?

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

Message-id:

<8D6D98F05334D1118BE600A0C96E9612027C989D@ns-bco-mse4.im.battelle.org>

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

I have a study that requires a similar approach to protect sensitive information, although it is with a professional population. The only solution I have come up with so far is to keep the returned data totally anonymous, but maintaining the subject address file. Although maintaining anonymity, there are several drawbacks to this approach.

First, there is no way to link an individual's data across waves. Second, I'm not certain that subjects who are re-contacted will feel as secure about the anonymity factor. Third, during follow-ups, we will be pursuing people who may not want to be pursued. We have partially resolved this dilemma by including a return postcard with a subject identifier that allows subjects to exclude themselves so we can eliminate them from our roster. The completed questionnaires can be returned separately without identifiers. If conducted by CATI, the subject file can indicate the subject disposition, but the data can be collected and not linked to a subject.

If others know of better ways to handle this, I'd like to know also!

Joan Cwi

Director of Survey Operations

Battelle

6115 Falls Road, Suite 200

Baltimore, MD 21209

410-372-2703

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

> From: Colleen K. Porter [SMTP:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]

> Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 1999 9:42 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

>

> I am wondering if anyone has experience with long-term studies that

> manage to do re-contacts later while still protecting a subject's

> anonymity?

>

> Of course there is a whole body of literature about sensitive issues

> and the impact of offering anonymity, particularly the studies on drug

> use, and behaviors associated with HIV.

>

> But it's the follow-ups that seem to throw in a new wrinkle, and I

> can't seem to find much on systems that would allow both recontacts

> and assurances of anonymity. (Well, not surprising. This is a real

> challenge!)

>

> Any recommendations, references, or anecdotes?

>

> Thanks bunches,

>

> Colleen K. Porter

> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

> cporter@hp.ufl.edu

> Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

> UF Department of Health Services Administration

> Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

> Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195 From

> arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu Wed Dec 8 07:24:29 1999

Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA26779 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 07:24:28 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)  
by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA04826  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 10:24:04 -0500 (EST)

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1999 10:24:03 -0500 (EST)

From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>

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

Subject: RE: Anonymity/sensitive topics/follow-ups?

In-Reply-To:

<8D6D98F05334D1118BE600A0C96E9612027C989D@ns-bco-mse4.im.battelle.org>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9912081015001.1366-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

This subject is getting a lot of attention, given the increasing number of longitudinal surveys, although work has been done on it for a long time. The NAS/Committee on National Statistics held a workshop in October on the subject. See below. Especially active have been the American Statistical Association Committee on Privacy and Confidentiality (see [www.amstat.org](http://www.amstat.org), I believe) and an Interagency Committee on Confidentiality and Data Access, which has developed a very useful checklist and, I believe, will be directly attention to the "longitudinal issue.". The ASA site has a list of very useful references that are invaluable.

I told Mark Shulman that I'd be willing to organize or chair a session on

this topic, if there is enough interest.

Alice Robbin/FSU

-----

Visit the cnstat web page: [www2.nas.edu/cnstat](http://www2.nas.edu/cnstat)

1. Click on "Projects"
2. Click on "Current Projects"
3. Click on "Workshop on Confidentiality of and Access to Data Research Files" The Workshop papers are posted on this page.

>> From: Colleen K. Porter [SMTP:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]

>> Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 1999 9:42 PM

>> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>> Subject: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

>>

>> I am wondering if anyone has experience with long-term studies that

>> manage to do re-contacts later while still protecting a subject's

>> anonymity?

>>

>> Of course there is a whole body of literature about sensitive issues

>> and the impact of offering anonymity, particularly the studies on

>> drug use, and behaviors associated with HIV.

>>

>> But it's the follow-ups that seem to throw in a new wrinkle, and I

>> can't seem to find much on systems that would allow both recontacts

>> and assurances of anonymity. (Well, not surprising. This is a

>> real



>> challenge!)

>>

>> Any recommendations, references, or anecdotes?

>>

>> Thanks bunches,

>>

>> Colleen K. Porter

>> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>> cporter@hp.ufl.edu

>> Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

>> UF Department of Health Services Administration

>> Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

>> Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Alice Robbin \*

\* School of Information Studies \*

\* Florida State University \*

\* 232 Louis Shores Building \*

\* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 \*

\* Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 \*

\* email: arobbin@mailier.fsu.edu \*

\*\*\*\*\*

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Dec 8 07:25:08 1999

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])

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

id HAA27258 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 07:25:08 -0800

(PST)

From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu

Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <YDA5X4JP>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 07:25:08 -0800

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A21301171EE4@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1999 07:25:07 -0800

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Our unit has performed several telephone interviews of national probability samples on topics related to HIV risk and prevention (i.e., sexual behavior, substance use, etc.) since the late 80s. As part of the "informed consent" section we guarantee confidentiality, not anonymity. The interviews, some of which were more than an hour long, always end with a question asking the respondent if they are willing to participate in a follow-up interview. In our last national probability sample, 73% of those who completed the interview said "yes" to this question. Our most recent study was a probability sample of men who have sex with men living in four U.S. cities (completed in 1998). Almost 89% of respondents who completed the interview agreed to a follow-up.

For re-contact information we ask for name, address, and date of birth so that we can confirm the person we are talking to is the respondent. We also ask for the name and telephone number of a contact person, someone who would

know where to reach the respondent in case we lose contact. All this information is of course optional. Respondents often give first names or nicknames or aliases only, and address is often refused. We try to recontact respondents every 6 months to update this information and relay information about the progress of the study (without influencing future responses).

This recontact information is kept in a separate file held by our data collection subcontractor. We hold the data file (answers to the baseline interview). The two can be linked by an ID number, but no one is allowed access to both files. This preserves the confidentiality of the respondents.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.

Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)

University of California, San Francisco

lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

From: Colleen K. Porter [SMTP:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 1999 6:42 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

I am wondering if anyone has experience with long-term studies that manage to do re-contacts later while still protecting a subject's anonymity?

Of course there is a whole body of literature about sensitive issues and

the impact of offering anonymity, particularly the studies on drug use, and behaviors associated with HIV.

But it's the follow-ups that seem to throw in a new wrinkle, and I can't

seem to find much on systems that would allow both recontacts and assurances of anonymity. (Well, not surprising. This is a real challenge!)

Any recommendations, references, or anecdotes?

Thanks bunches,

Colleen K. Porter

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

cporter@hp.ufl.edu

Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

UF Department of Health Services Administration

Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 8 09:03:23 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id JAA23226 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:03:22 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id JAA06704 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:03:21 -0800

(PST)

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:03:21 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: REQUEST: French public opinions data needed

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912080859490.2786-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

DO \*NOT\* REPLY TO AAPORNET--Please send all replies directly to Lu Chou at  
luchou@dpls.dacc.wisc.edu

-- Jim

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 10:44:59 -0600

From: Lu Chou <luchou@dpls.dacc.wisc.edu>

Subject: French public opinions data needed

Hi,

I am helping a library user to locate any current polls or surveys done in France about French people's attitudes toward the United States. French president, Jacques Chirac has criticized U.S. being a hyper power and my user like to know if any public opinions have been gathered in recent years (preferably after 97) in France about French people's view about U.S. Any lead to published data will be appreciated. Thank you for your help!

Lu Chou, Special Librarian

Data and Program Library Service  
3308 Social Science Building  
1180 Observatory Drive  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, WI 53706  
phone: 608-262-0750 fax: 608-262-9711

>From jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu Wed Dec 8 09:26:39 1999  
Received: from uclink4.berkeley.edu (uclink4.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.25.39])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id JAA08550 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:26:39 -0800  
(PST)  
Received: from Joel (uhall521-1.SPH.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.208.54])  
by uclink4.berkeley.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id JAA21570  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:26:37 -0800 (PST)  
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991208082742.015981e0@uclink4.berkeley.edu>  
X-Sender: jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58  
Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 09:25:54 -0800  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>  
Subject: Defending general population telephone survey  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Our Center has been asked by the State to oversee a statewide survey of  
HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. This general

population telephone survey will be fielded by a contractor that we selected. The Contractor has substantial experience conducting HIV/AIDS surveys in both the general population and in high risk groups.

Our problem is the State's Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must approve the study protocol prior to our fielding this survey. The original protocol we submitted was based upon two previous HIV/AIDS surveys conducted by the State in 1987-1988. The IRB trashed our protocol on the following grounds:

1) Concern about maintaining confidentiality of the data -- These concerns are easy to address as our Center and the Contractor have had considerable experience in this area.

2) Concern about informed consent -- We can address this concern by incorporating in the interview a lengthy introduction that discusses the potential costs and benefits for participating in the survey and by providing several opportunities for respondents to decline or postpone participation. We recognize that this will have a negative effect on our respondent cooperation rate but see little option other than to comply with the IRB's demands.

3) Concern about the utility of general population telephone surveys -- This is the issue for which we need the most help.

3a) The IRB is sophisticated enough to know that we are unlikely to achieve a high response rate. Even with 30 call attempts and highly trained and experienced interviewers, we will be lucky to achieve a 50% CASRO response rate due to our need to satisfy concern #2. (In recent

years other California general population telephone surveys have yielded 40-55% CASRO response rates.) We know that low response rates are problematic in estimating population parameters only if nonrespondents systematically differ from respondents on the key variables of interest. Several survey researchers have suggested to us that they believe that nonresponse bias is actually less in surveys with low response rates (i.e., less than 60% CASRO) than surveys with high response rates (i.e., greater than 70% CASRO). However, we have not been able to find any empirical evidence to back up this assertion and would appreciate receiving any papers or references to support this claim.

In the data analysis, we proposed to compare responses from those who required more call attempts (a proxy for nonresponders) to those who required fewer call attempts in order to estimate the potential response bias. We also plan to contrast sample demographics with updated Census estimates and weight the sample to the population as appropriate.

3b) The IRB is also concerned that many respondents will be unlikely to report honestly about behaviors that put themselves at risk for HIV infection (e.g. condom use, number of sexual partners, intravenous drug use). We share this concern and plan to take numerous precautions to enhance response validity (e.g., highly trained interviewers, carefully worded introduction and questions, cognitive interviewing, pilot testing, etc.). Besides, the assessment of high risk behaviors is a secondary aim of this study.

We have submitted a revised protocol that we believe adequately addresses the IRB's concerns with the exception of concern #3a. We get to defend the



revised protocol before the IRB on Friday morning and would greatly appreciate your suggestions on how to handle this concern.

=====

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Co-Director

Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

=====

>From asgoodin@unm.edu Wed Dec 8 09:44:11 1999

Received: from mlx6.unm.edu (qmailr@mlx6.unm.edu [129.24.8.206])

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

id JAA25073 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:44:10 -0800

(PST)

Received: (qmail 2826 invoked from network); 8 Dec 1999 17:44:04 -0000

Received: from bldg185-0032.unm.edu (HELO unm.edu) (129.24.51.20)

by mlx6.unm.edu with SMTP; 8 Dec 1999 17:44:04 -0000

Message-ID: <384E994D.1D95F538@unm.edu>

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 10:45:58 -0700

From: Amy Sue Goodin <asgoodin@unm.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 (Macintosh; U; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Anonymity/sensitive topics/followups?

References: <384DC583.59225C97@hp.ufl.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The key to this is to ask for permission to call back prior to completing an initial interview and then getting only the first name while continuing to assure the respondent that their answers will be kept confidential and not be contributed to them. In this manner, the respondent is still assured anonymity and confidentiality.

It has worked for us on numerous occasions.

Best of luck with your study.

Amy Goodin

\*\*\*\*\*

Amy Sue Goodin

Research Scientist &

Survey Research Center Manager

University of New Mexico

Institute for Public Policy

1805 Sigma Chi Rd NE

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

Phone: 505.277.1278 / Fax: 505.277.3115

\*\*\*\*\*

>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Wed Dec 8 10:53:08 1999

Received: from mtiwmhc09.worldnet.att.net (mtiwgwc03.worldnet.att.net  
[204.127.131.18])

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

id KAA12775 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 10:53:07 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from default ([12.75.196.105]) by mtiwmhc09.worldnet.att.net

(InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP

id <19991208185236.YALD10418@default>;

Wed, 8 Dec 1999 18:52:36 +0000

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19991208135404.006d9fcc@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 13:54:04 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

In-Reply-To: <4.2.0.58.19991208082742.015981e0@uclink4.berkeley.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 09:25 AM 12/8/99 -0800, Joel Moskowitz wrote:

>...

>Our problem is the State's Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must

>approve the study protocol prior to our fielding this survey. The original

>protocol we submitted was based upon two previous HIV/AIDS surveys

>conducted by the State in 1987-1988. The IRB trashed our protocol on the

>following grounds...

>

It appears to me that the California IRB is attacking the protocol on grounds of reliability and validity of the study design. While it is commendable that they are so carefully reviewing the study design, isn't this stepping outside their role? I will admit my ignorance on this issue, but I thought the role of an IRB was to ensure that rights of the human subjects are not in any way compromised. If this is true, then the IRB concerns can be acknowledged, but the study should be allowed to proceed.

I would appreciate comments from those who can clarify this.

=====

Jim Wolf          Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Wed Dec 8 11:13:03 1999

Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id LAA28404 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 11:13:02 -0800

(PST)

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com

Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])

by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA30478

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 11:12:30 -0800

Message-Id: <199912081912.LAA30478@web2.tdl.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1999 11:11:03 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

In-reply-to: <3.0.1.32.19991208135404.006d9fcc@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

References: <4.2.0.58.19991208082742.015981e0@uclink4.berkeley.edu>

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

That was my first reaction too, but I suspect it won't solve Joel's immediate problem. I think about all that can be done here is to try to educate the board on (1) the consequences of their ridiculous position on informed consent; and (2) the procedures that will be used to assess and analytically control for the impacts of non-response bias on survey parameter estimation.

I would not try to argue that high non-response equals low non-response bias for two reasons. First, the empirical evidence supporting this notion is extremely weak; and second advancing this position will only serve to reinforce the perception that you do not know how to deal with this problem.

Why not propose a small scale calibration study designed to quantify the impacts of non-response bias on the survey's estimates?

This appears to be a case of the State hobbling its own survey effort. You would think there would be somebody in the State government who could look down on this situation and declare either that the data is urgently needed and therefore the IRB will have to live with an informed consent statement that is no more than two sentences long or that the data is really not that

necessary and since the result is likely to be junk anyway given the IRB's requirement, the effort ought to be halted altogether.

Date sent: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 13:54:04 -0500

Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>

To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

At 09:25 AM 12/8/99 -0800, Joel Moskowitz wrote:

>...

>Our problem is the State's Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must  
>approve the study protocol prior to our fielding this survey. The original

>protocol we submitted was based upon two previous HIV/AIDS surveys  
>conducted by the State in 1987-1988. The IRB trashed our protocol on the  
>following grounds...

>

It appears to me that the California IRB is attacking the protocol on grounds of reliability and validity of the study design. While it is commendable that they are so carefully reviewing the study design, isn't this stepping outside their role? I will admit my ignorance on this issue, but I thought the role of an IRB was to ensure that rights of the human subjects are not in any way compromised. If this is true, then the IRB concerns can be acknowledged, but the study should be allowed to proceed.

I would appreciate comments from those who can clarify this.

=====

Jim Wolf          Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

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

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

>From abider@american.edu Wed Dec 8 11:33:53 1999

Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62])

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

id LAA13820 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 11:33:52 -0800

(PST)

Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-004varestP323.dialsprint.net [168.191.217.229])

by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA27304

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 11:33:50 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <384EB474.1C78C39D@american.edu>

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 14:41:40 -0500

From: Albert Biderman <abider@american.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

References: <3.0.1.32.19991208135404.006d9fcc@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jim Wolf wrote:

> At 09:25 AM 12/8/99 -0800, Joel Moskowitz wrote:

> >...

> >Our problem is the State's Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must

> >approve the study protocol prior to our fielding this survey. The

original

> >protocol we submitted was based upon two previous HIV/AIDS surveys

> >conducted by the State in 1987-1988. The IRB trashed our protocol on the

> >following grounds...

> >

>

> It appears to me that the California IRB is attacking the protocol on

> grounds of reliability and validity of the study design. While it is

> commendable that they are so carefully reviewing the study design, isn't

> this stepping outside their role? I will admit my ignorance on this

issue,

> but I thought the role of an IRB was to ensure that rights of the human

> subjects are not in any way compromised. If this is true, then the IRB

> concerns can be acknowledged, but the study should be allowed to proceed.

>



> I would appreciate comments from those who can clarify this.

>

> =====

> Jim Wolf            Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

Your point would be great except that the cost-benefit rationale of the review

process opens the door wide to scrutiny of reliability and validity.

Albert Biderman

abider@american.edu

>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Wed Dec 8 12:13:15 1999

Received: from mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.38])

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

id MAA13089 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 12:13:13 -0800 (PST)

Received: from default ([12.75.196.200]) by mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net

(InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP

id <19991208201241.YWAF14377@default>;

Wed, 8 Dec 1999 20:12:41 +0000

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19991208151400.006d7484@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 15:14:00 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

In-Reply-To: <384EB474.1C78C39D@american.edu>

References: <3.0.1.32.19991208135404.006d9fcc@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 02:41 PM 12/8/99 -0500, Albert Biderman wrote:

>

>Your point would be great except that the cost-benefit rationale of the review

>process opens the door wide to scrutiny of reliability and validity.

>

Point taken. But I will reiterate: is cost-benefit assessment the responsibility of the IRB? In this case the funding sponsor (the state of California) is also the institution coordinating the review board. To me, an ideal situation would be to have the IRB assess human subjects rights issues and have the sponsoring agency do the cost-benefit analysis.

=====  
-----

Jim Wolf            Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>From dmccallu@bama.ua.edu Wed Dec 8 13:10:15 1999

Received: from bama.ua.edu (bama.ua.edu [130.160.4.114])

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

id NAA27399 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 13:10:13 -0800

(PST)

Received: from bama.ua.edu ([130.160.214.129])

by bama.ua.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id PAA26202

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 15:09:59 -0600 (CST)

Message-ID: <384E7556.F554DB4C@bama.ua.edu>

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 15:12:22 +0000

From: Debra McCallum <dmccallu@bama.ua.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

References: <3.0.1.32.19991208135404.006d9fcc@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

<3.0.1.32.19991208151400.006d7484@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For an IRB the cost-benefit ratio, also known as the risk-benefit ratio, has little to do with money, but rather an assessment of the costs or risks to participants relative to the anticipated benefits and importance of the knowledge that might reasonably result from the research (this comes directly

from the federal regulations). Some IRB members feel it is unethical to waste

the time of subjects on research that is unlikely to yield usable knowledge (even if there are no other foreseeable risks). Consenting subjects are sacrificing their time and privacy to participate with the understanding that

it will make a meaningful contribution to science or society. Thus, the researcher must be able to convince the IRB that the research is worth doing using the proposed methodology. In this case, I feel sure you can do so (but

probably not by arguing that this concern is outside their realm of responsibility).

D. McCallum

Institute for Social Science Research

University of Alabama

Tuscaloosa, AL

Jim Wolf wrote:

> At 02:41 PM 12/8/99 -0500, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>

>>Your point would be great except that the cost-benefit rationale of the

> review

>>process opens the door wide to scrutiny of reliability and validity.

>>

>

> Point taken. But I will reiterate: is cost-benefit assessment the

> responsibility of the IRB? In this case the funding sponsor (the state of

> California) is also the institution coordinating the review board. To me,

> an ideal situation would be to have the IRB assess human subjects rights

> issues and have the sponsoring agency do the cost-benefit analysis.

>

> =====

> Jim Wolf            Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>From jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu Wed Dec 8 13:58:35 1999

Received: from uclink4.berkeley.edu (uclink4.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.25.39])

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

id NAA01478 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 13:58:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from Joel (uhall521-1.SPH.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.208.54])  
by uclink4.berkeley.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id NAA22686  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 13:58:33 -0800 (PST)  
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991208123242.015b8460@uclink4.berkeley.edu>  
X-Sender: jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58  
Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 13:57:48 -0800  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>  
Subject: Locating adolescents in a phone survey  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I would like to thank all who responded to my earlier message regarding  
defending phone surveys before an IRB. This is my week for problems so I  
would like to raise a major problem I have been having for the past year  
with another study.

We are trying to do a telephone survey methods study with adolescents  
(12-17 years of age) in California, but we've been having difficulty  
finding adolescents. According to the 1998 Current Population Survey, the  
incidence of households in California with adolescents is 18%. Given the  
study's budget in order to obtain enough interviews for the methods study,  
we need to obtain an 18% incidence of adolescents.

To date, we have conducted four pilot studies and the incidence of eligible  
youth was 16%, 9%, 12% and 11%, respectively. In the first three pilots we  
used a list-assisted (1+ working block) RDD design. The disproportionate  
stratified sample design included an oversample of areas that had greater

concentrations of African American households.

In the first pilot we completed a screener with an adult in the household in which we informed the adult we were doing a tobacco survey, enumerated the household, collected some proxy information on tobacco use, and then if there was an adolescent in the household, we asked for permission to interview the adolescent. The contractor felt that the screener took too long and that we were losing too many potential households, so for the second pilot we modified the screener introduction to simply state that we were doing an adolescent tobacco survey, asked whether there was an adolescent in the household, and then asked permission to interview the adolescent. (If there are multiple adolescents we select one at random.)

In the third pilot we cut the screener even more in an attempt to reduce refusals and break-offs.

In the fourth pilot we used the same introduction as the third pilot, but we modified the sample design in an attempt to improve incidence. A major sampling firm created a four strata design. The first stratum contained listed telephone households that had a score of 5-9 on an indicator created by Donnelly of the likelihood that the household contained an adolescent. The second stratum contained listed telephone households that had a score of 1-4 on this indicator. The third stratum contained listed telephone households with a score of 0. The fourth stratum contained unlisted telephone households that did not fall into any other stratum and came from a 1+ working block. For this pilot we sampled 150 phone numbers from stratum 1, 104 numbers from stratum 2, 0 numbers from stratum 3, and 107 numbers from stratum 4. The working rate was about 90% in strata 1 and 2 and 60% in stratum 4. The incidence of adolescents was 18% in stratum 1,

8% in stratum 2 and 0% in stratum 4 yielding an overall incidence of about 11%. Thus, we did not do any better in finding adolescents than our previous surveys. The Contractor and the Sampling Firm checked over the sample file to ensure that no mistakes were made.

Obviously, if we decided to confine our study to stratum 1, we could obtain the necessary incidence of adolescents; however the study would have little generalizability because this stratum represents about 3% of the sampling frame so we do not want to do this.

Although the sample sizes for these four pilot studies are rather small, the data suggest that the first pilot study had the best incidence. The first pilot study is the only one in which we introduced the survey as a general population tobacco survey and later informed the respondent that we wanted to interview an adolescent. In subsequent studies the survey was introduced as an adolescent tobacco survey. Several researchers we have talked to have hypothesized that our problem is that by introducing the survey as an adolescent tobacco survey it's too easy for adults to falsely claim that there are no youth in the household, and that this is why our incidence of adolescents has been so poor in the last three pilots. Is anyone aware of empirical evidence to support this hypothesis?

We would be most grateful to receive creative suggestions as we are wasting precious time and resources trying to resolve the problem of how to boost the incidence of adolescent interviews.

=====

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Co-Director

Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

=====

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed Dec 8 15:35:23 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

id PAA19200 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 15:35:22 -0800

(PST)

Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1-fi.acns.fsu.edu

[192.168.197.1])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id SAA45372

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 18:35:18 -0500

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial938.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.36.74])

by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA50962

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 18:35:15 -0500

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1999 18:35:15 -0500

Message-Id: <199912082335.SAA50962@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey



This is about the fourth time I have been appraised of something like this with IRBs in the last two months! I speak as a former IRB member and a survey researcher who has had some interesting times.

(1) most surveys of consenting adults are EXEMPT from IRB review; this means that the IRB chair simply looks over the proposal, introduction, etc. to be sure that it meets the Federal exemption guidelines. The proposal, etc. does not go to full IRB review. However, a survey on sensitive topics such as AIDS-related behaviors would go to full committee review.

(2) The "territory" of IRBs is the protection of human subjects. It is not research design although the PI may pick up some helpful hints. It does not matter whether someone on the state IRB got bothered by a survey researcher calling them at dinner. This is not a human protection problem. I have seen some farflung opposition to surveys (the phone rings and the autistic child loses control) that would invalidate telephone calls, period.

If the State IRB is imposing federal guidelines, demand to see a copy of the guidelines (or get your copy from Berkeley or the fed Office of Research Risks.) The Guidelines, in fact, are reasonable and are aimed with human protection in mind. The last thing they do is disparage surveys.

(3) I don't know what to tell you about the leennngthy informed consent intro. I have pointed out to our IRB that the place for many sensitive intros is directly before the questions involved. Otherwise, the respondent may have forgotten the intro within a couple of minutes. To have a droning, boring introduction may fill the letter but not the spirit of informed consent.

(4) Key elements are: reminding respondents their total participation is voluntary, the responses are confidential (or anonymous if that is true), noting there is a contact point if the respondent has further questions, noting the approximate time the survey takes, the sponsoring agency and the survey location. An adequate intro meeting all these points should not take more than 45-60 seconds.

GOOD LUCK!

Susan

Colleen, I haven't forgotten but have been swamped.

At 03:14 PM 12/8/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>At 02:41 PM 12/8/99 -0500, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>

>>Your point would be great except that the cost-benefit rationale of the

>review

>>process opens the door wide to scrutiny of reliability and validity.

>>

>

>Point taken. But I will reiterate: is cost-benefit assessment the

>responsibility of the IRB? In this case the funding sponsor (the state of

>California) is also the institution coordinating the review board. To me,

>an ideal situation would be to have the IRB assess human subjects rights

>issues and have the sponsoring agency do the cost-benefit analysis.

>

>

>=====

>Jim Wolf            Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>

>

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From ande271@attglobal.net Wed Dec 8 18:56:56 1999

Received: from prserv.net (out1.prserv.net [165.87.194.252])

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

id SAA23856 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 18:56:55 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default ([32.100.251.165]) by prserv.net (out1) with SMTP

id <1999120902563725201djis8e>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 02:56:38 +0000

Message-ID: <384F45AC.7EB5@attglobal.net>

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 22:01:16 -0800

From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>

Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

References: <4.2.0.58.19991208082742.015981e0@uclink4.berkeley.edu>

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----59BA1CED2527"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----59BA1CED2527

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Joel Moskowitz wrote:

>

> Our Center has been asked by the State to oversee a statewide survey of  
> HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. This general  
> population telephone survey will be fielded by a contractor that we  
> selected. The Contractor has substantial experience conducting HIV/AIDS  
> surveys in both the general population and in high risk groups.

>

> Our problem is the State's Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must  
> approve the study protocol prior to our fielding this survey. The  
original

> protocol we submitted was based upon two previous HIV/AIDS surveys  
> conducted by the State in 1987-1988. The IRB trashed our protocol on the  
> following grounds:

>

> 1) Concern about maintaining confidentiality of the data -- These concerns  
> are easy to address as our Center and the Contractor have had considerable

> experience in this area.

>

> 2) Concern about informed consent -- We can address this concern by  
> incorporating in the interview a lengthy introduction that discusses the  
> potential costs and benefits for participating in the survey and by  
> providing several opportunities for respondents to decline or postpone  
> participation. We recognize that this will have a negative effect on our  
> respondent cooperation rate but see little option other than to comply  
with  
> the IRB's demands.

>

> 3) Concern about the utility of general population telephone surveys --  
> This is the issue for which we need the most help.

>

> 3a) The IRB is sophisticated enough to know that we are unlikely  
to  
> achieve a high response rate. Even with 30 call attempts and highly  
> trained and experienced interviewers, we will be lucky to achieve a 50%  
> CASRO response rate due to our need to satisfy concern #2. (In recent  
> years other California general population telephone surveys have yielded  
> 40-55% CASRO response rates.) We know that low response rates are  
> problematic in estimating population parameters only if nonrespondents  
> systematically differ from respondents on the key variables of  
> interest. Several survey researchers have suggested to us that they  
> believe that nonresponse bias is actually less in surveys with low  
response  
> rates (i.e., less than 60% CASRO) than surveys with high response rates  
> (i.e., greater than 70% CASRO). However, we have not been able to find  
any

> empirical evidence to back up this assertion and would appreciate receiving

> any papers or references to support this claim.

>

> In the data analysis, we proposed to compare responses from those who  
> required more call attempts (a proxy for nonresponders) to those who  
> required fewer call attempts in order to estimate the potential response  
> bias. We also plan to contrast sample demographics with updated Census  
> estimates and weight the sample to the population as appropriate.

>

> 3b) The IRB is also concerned that many respondents will be unlikely to

> report honestly about behaviors that put themselves at risk for HIV  
> infection (e.g. condom use, number of sexual partners, intravenous drug  
> use). We share this concern and plan to take numerous precautions to  
> enhance response validity (e.g., highly trained interviewers, carefully  
> worded introduction and questions, cognitive interviewing, pilot testing,  
> etc.). Besides, the assessment of high risk behaviors is a secondary aim  
> of this study.

>

> We have submitted a revised protocol that we believe adequately addresses  
> the IRB's concerns with the exception of concern #3a. We get to defend  
the

> revised protocol before the IRB on Friday morning and would greatly  
> appreciate your suggestions on how to handle this concern.

> =====

> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

> Co-Director

> Center for Family and Community Health

> School of Public Health  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>  
> =====

-----59BA1CED2527

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="bias.txt"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline; filename="bias.txt"

Joel Moskowitz wrote:

>

> Our Center has been asked by the State to oversee a statewide survey of

> HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. This general

> population telephone survey will be fielded by a contractor that we

> selected. The Contractor has substantial experience conducting HIV/AIDS

> surveys in both the general population and in high risk groups.

>

> Our problem is the State's Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must

> approve the study protocol prior to our fielding this survey. The

original

> protocol we submitted was based upon two previous HIV/AIDS surveys

> conducted by the State in 1987-1988. The IRB trashed our protocol on the

> following grounds:

>

> 1) Concern about maintaining confidentiality of the data -- These concerns

> are easy to address as our Center and the Contractor have had considerable

> experience in this area.

>

> 2) Concern about informed consent -- We can address this concern by

> incorporating in the interview a lengthy introduction that discusses the

> potential costs and benefits for participating in the survey and by

> providing several opportunities for respondents to decline or postpone

> participation. We recognize that this will have a negative effect on our

> respondent cooperation rate but see little option other than to comply



with

> the IRB's demands.

>

> 3) Concern about the utility of general population telephone surveys --

> This is the issue for which we need the most help.

>

> 3a) The IRB is sophisticated enough to know that we are unlikely  
to

> achieve a high response rate. Even with 30 call attempts and highly

> trained and experienced interviewers, we will be lucky to achieve a 50%

> CASRO response rate due to our need to satisfy concern #2. (In recent

> years other California general population telephone surveys have yielded

> 40-55% CASRO response rates.) We know that low response rates are

> problematic in estimating population parameters only if nonrespondents

> systematically differ from respondents on the key variables of

> interest. Several survey researchers have suggested to us that they

> believe that nonresponse bias is actually less in surveys with low  
response

> rates (i.e., less than 60% CASRO) than surveys with high response rates

> (i.e., greater than 70% CASRO). However, we have not been able to find  
any

> empirical evidence to back up this assertion and would appreciate  
receiving

> any papers or references to support this claim.

>

> In the data analysis, we proposed to compare responses from those who

> required more call attempts (a proxy for nonresponders) to those who

> required fewer call attempts in order to estimate the potential response

> bias. We also plan to contrast sample demographics with updated Census

> estimates and weight the sample to the population as appropriate.

>

> 3b) The IRB is also concerned that many respondents will be unlikely to

> report honestly about behaviors that put themselves at risk for HIV

> infection (e.g. condom use, number of sexual partners, intravenous drug

> use). We share this concern and plan to take numerous precautions to

> enhance response validity (e.g., highly trained interviewers, carefully

> worded introduction and questions, cognitive interviewing, pilot testing,

> etc.). Besides, the assessment of high risk behaviors is a secondary aim

> of this study.

>

> We have submitted a revised protocol that we believe adequately addresses

> the IRB's concerns with the exception of concern #3a. We get to defend

the

> revised protocol before the IRB on Friday morning and would greatly

> appreciate your suggestions on how to handle this concern.

> =====

> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

> Co-Director

> Center for Family and Community Health

> School of Public Health

> University of California, Berkeley

> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

> =====

The value of the study to science/society is indeed something that an

IRB should take into consideration. It is considered unethical to waste

people's time, mislead them into thinking they are contributing, etc.

However, the IRB should be concerned with 1) "risk" to the participants

which in this case means mainly the risk of breach of confidentiality,

NOT risk that the questions will take too long, etc., and 2) that the

methodology proposed is accepted by the professional research community. Sample selection is quite definitely an accepted method of obtaining research "subjects." Multiple callbacks have also been found to be effective in increasing participation. If the methods are accepted and rigorously applied, you can point that out to the IRB.

Yes, do stress your plan to make comparisons within the data file to estimate response bias. I have not heard of the equivalent being done in medical research, although there has been some concern that women and members of minority populations are "underrepresented."

RDD is a much more effective way of minimizing bias in studies than is placing ads in various places and hoping that the volunteers show up give you in their composite an unbiased picture of the "universe" (what universe?) That holds true for random selection from a list.

-----59BA1CED2527--

>From shap.wolf@asu.edu Wed Dec 8 21:52:29 1999

Received: from post1.inre.asu.edu (post1.inre.asu.edu [129.219.13.100])

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

id VAA12371 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 21:52:29 -0800

(PST)

Received: from smtp.asu.edu (smtp.asu.edu [129.219.13.92])

by asu.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #31135) with ESMTP id <OFMG00D8ALNF98@asu.edu> for

aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 8 Dec 1999 22:52:27 -0700 (MST)

Received: from shaphome (as5100y-10.inre.asu.edu [129.219.105.11])

by smtp.asu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id WAA10893 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>;

Wed, 08 Dec 1999 22:54:07 -0700 (MST)

Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 22:07:43 -0700

From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <006401bf4203\$5401c340\$0b69db81@la.asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-priority: Normal

References: <4.2.0.58.19991208082742.015981e0@uclink4.berkeley.edu>

I disagree with both the notion that IRB's are in a position to judge whether or not a particular research protocol 'wastes' the subject's time, and that 'wasting time' is a 'risk.'

I believe that decisions about whether a project should be fielded are also the responsibility of all the other checks along the chain--at my institution each protocol must also be approved by a department chair (sometimes also a department committee), a college dean, and the office of the vice-president for research. Perhaps more significant is that large-scale research of the type being discussed must also pass review at the funding agency (as others have pointed out).

To me these are the agents more likely to be able to judge the merits of a research protocol. I have some experience on our IRB, including a year as chair, wherein I signed 1100 protocols. Yes, some were, to me, not very 'good' research. But it was clear to me that the IRB and I were not the only links in the chain from idea to interview.

The section on risks in relation to benefits that Debra McCallum cites is at 46.111 (a)(2) 'Criteria for IRB approval of research' ([link below](#)). My reading is that the 'risks' here are the very real risks of certain medical research. Some survey research can approach these risks, and must take commensurate precautions--e.g. the hiv seroprevalance study pilot tests and the extreme precautions taken to protect confidentiality and still provide respondents with their test results.

We might be trivializing these protections in extending them to the (voluntary) 'wasting' of time. Let's not forget the real horrors that led to

the adoption of these regulations.

Let everyone read for themselves: in case you don't have it bookmarked, the National Institutes of Health, Office of Protection from Research Risks is at

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oprr/oprr.htm>

The Human and Animal Subject library is at:

[http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oprr/library\\_human.htm](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oprr/library_human.htm)

Many interesting publications accessible from there, including the full Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 - 'Protection of Human Subjects' online at:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oprr/humansubjects/45cfr46.htm>

Shap Wolf

Survey Research Lab

Arizona State University

[shap.wolf@asu.edu](mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu)

(no longer on the board; my opinions only)

>From boyntonm@mail.wsu.edu Thu Dec 9 00:47:50 1999

Received: from cougar.it.wsu.edu (root@cougar.it.wsu.edu [134.121.1.10])

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

id AAA28947 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 00:47:31 -0800

(PST)

Received: from boynton.ir.wsu.edu (haggerty.french.wsu.edu [134.121.31.13])

by cougar.it.wsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id AAA06665

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 00:46:13 -0800 (PST)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19991209085351.006ef1b8@mail.wsu.edu>

X-Sender: boyntonm@mail.wsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)



Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 00:53:51 -0800

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Student Affairs Research, Mary Boynton" <boyntonm@mail.wsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

Yes, 'benefit assessment' is within their purview, since they are charged with determining if the potential gain of knowledge from the study is adequate to justify any possible risk to human subjects. MB

At 03:14 PM 12/8/99 -0500, you wrote:

>At 02:41 PM 12/8/99 -0500, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>

>>Your point would be great except that the cost-benefit rationale of the

>review

>>process opens the door wide to scrutiny of reliability and validity.

>>

>

>Point taken. But I will reiterate: is cost-benefit assessment the

>responsibility of the IRB? In this case the funding sponsor (the state of

>California) is also the institution coordinating the review board. To me,

>an ideal situation would be to have the IRB assess human subjects rights

>issues and have the sponsoring agency do the cost-benefit analysis.

>

>

>=====

>Jim Wolf            Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>

>

Mary Boynton

Student Affairs Research

Washington State University

Pullman, WA 99164-1066

(509) 335-4999

FAX: (509) 335-1208

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Thu Dec 9 04:37:05 1999

Received: from elf.soc.qc.edu (elf.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.198])

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

id EAA02309 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 04:37:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])

by elf.soc.qc.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id HAA19703

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 07:40:13 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)

by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id HAA03477

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 07:37:12 -0500 (EST)

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1999 07:37:12 -0500 (EST)

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19991209085351.006ef1b8@mail.wsu.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9912090733320.3453-100000@troll.soc.qc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Dear All:

I do not think that the IRB can assess surveys on the basis of risk benefit. The real risk from survey research is disclosure. There would be ancillary risk if the survey questions were "upsetting" to the subjects.

On the risk scale these are very low compared to medical experimentation, which is where this came from.

They should follow the Federal guidelines. Even surveys of "vulnerable" populations can be subject to merely expedited review.

IF the IRB is claiming that they can assess the value of the research they have gone way beyond their role.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge                      Home Office  
209 Kissena Hall                      50 Merriam Avenue  
Department of Sociology                      Bronxville, NY 10708  
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY                      Phone: 914-337-6237  
Flushing, NY 11367-1597                      Fax: 914-337-8210  
Phone: 718-997-2837                      E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu  
Fax: 718-997-2820                      Website: <http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps>

On Thu, 9 Dec 1999, Student Affairs Research, Mary Boynton wrote:

> Yes, 'benefit assessment' is within their purview, since they are charged

> with determining if the potential gain of knowledge from the study is  
> adequate to justify any possible risk to human subjects. MB

>

> At 03:14 PM 12/8/99 -0500, you wrote:

> >At 02:41 PM 12/8/99 -0500, Albert Biderman wrote:

> >>

> >>Your point would be great except that the cost-benefit rationale of the

> >review

> >>process opens the door wide to scrutiny of reliability and validity.

> >>

> >

> >Point taken. But I will reiterate: is cost-benefit assessment the

> >responsibility of the IRB? In this case the funding sponsor (the state  
of

> >California) is also the institution coordinating the review board. To  
me,

> >an ideal situation would be to have the IRB assess human subjects rights

> >issues and have the sponsoring agency do the cost-benefit analysis.

> >

> >

> >-----

> >Jim Wolf            Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

> >

> >

> Mary Boynton

> Student Affairs Research

> Washington State University

> Pullman, WA 99164-1066

> (509) 335-4999

> FAX: (509) 335-1208

>

>

>From arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu Thu Dec 9 05:08:40 1999

Received: from mailers.fsu.edu (mailers.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])

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

id FAA10122 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 05:08:20 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)

by mailers.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA05059

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:07:54 -0500 (EST)

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:07:54 -0500 (EST)

From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9912090733320.3453-100000@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9912090758230.3334-100000@mailers.fsu.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I daresay that most of the Nobel prize recipients were told one time or another by their colleagues that their work was useless. The history of science shows the impossibility of forecasting utility/benefit. I would respectfully suggest that the IRB keep its attention focused on the protection of human subjects.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Alice Robbin

\*

\* School of Information Studies \*  
\* Florida State University \*  
\* 232 Louis Shores Building \*  
\* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 \*  
\* Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 \*  
\* email: arobbin@mailier.fsu.edu \*

\*\*\*\*\*

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Thu Dec 9 05:53:00 1999

Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])

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

id FAA24155 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 05:52:59 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mailserver.Princeton.EDU (mailserver.Princeton.EDU

[128.112.129.65])

by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA20964

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:52:57 -0500 (EST)

Received: from princeton.edu (www-9nkmv.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.125])

by mailserver.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA17625

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:52:57 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <384FB36F.6A0E6A4F@princeton.edu>

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 08:49:35 -0500

From: Edward Freeland <efreelan@Princeton.EDU>

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

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

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: IRB Guidelines

References: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9912090758230.3334-100000@mailers.fsu.edu>

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----B869E0EA48216F5036E70982"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----B869E0EA48216F5036E70982

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Anyone interested in learning more about federal guidelines for IRBs can  
check

the website for the Office of Protection from Research Risks (OPRR):

[http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oprr/library\\_human.htm](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oprr/library_human.htm)

-----B869E0EA48216F5036E70982

Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;

name="efreelan.vcf"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: Card for Edward Freeland

Content-Disposition: attachment;

filename="efreelan.vcf"

begin:vcard

n:Freeland;Edward

tel;fax:609 258-1985

tel;work:609 258-1854

x-mozilla-html:FALSE

org:Princeton University;Survey Research Center  
version:2.1  
email;internet:efreelan@princeton.edu  
title:Associate Director  
adr;quoted-printable;;;202 Robertson Hall=0D=0APrinceton  
University=0D=0A;Princeton;NJ;08544-1013;  
x-mozilla-cpt:;0  
fn:Edward Freeland  
end:vcard

-----B869E0EA48216F5036E70982--

>From lois@opinion.isi.uconn.edu Thu Dec 9 08:01:07 1999

Received: from opinion (opinion.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.21])

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

id IAA06884 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:00:49 -0800

(PST)

Received: from LoisTF.isi.uconn.edu (d117h185.public.uconn.edu

[137.99.117.185]) by opinion (SMI-8.6/8.6.9) with SMTP id KAA23058 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 10:59:06 -0500

Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.19991209105908.0088d100@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

X-Sender: lois@opinion.isi.uconn.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 10:59:08 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Lois Timms-Ferrara <lois@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

Subject: Everett Carll Ladd 1937-1999

Mime-Version: 1.0

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



Everett Carll Ladd

(1937-1999)

Everett Carll Ladd Jr, a distinguished social scientist and nationally renowned polling expert died Wednesday morning at Windham Community Memorial Hospital after a brief illness. He was 62.

Ladd, a professor of political science at University of Connecticut since 1964 recently retired as director of the Institute for Social Inquiry and Executive Director of the Roper Center. One of the University's most prolific writers, Ladd wrote and edited more than 20 books, including a textbook, *The American Polity*, now in its sixth edition. Many of his articles appeared in the nation's leading newspapers including the *Wall Street Journal*, the *New York Times*, the *Chronicle for Higher Education*, the *Hartford Courant* and many others. He commented frequently on politics and was the most widely quoted of UConn's faculty.

"This is a loss not only to me personally and to the University of Connecticut but to the body politic. Everett's contributions to the public dialogue on issues of national policy, through the many books and dozens of commentary pieces he wrote, were often intriguing and always informative. His ability to analyze poll results, in all their intricacies, was beyond reproach. I will miss his friendship, and the community will be lessened by the loss of his scholarship and wit," UConn President Philip Austin said Wednesday.

"Many of our colleagues have had the privilege and pleasure to know leading figures in their disciplines. For those in the social sciences and, especially, political science, I know that Everett Ladd is looked upon as somewhat of a legend. The Roper Center is truly one of our centers of excellence and the University has Everett Ladd to thank for that, for his role in guiding its development for more than two decades," added Robert Smith, vice provost for research and dean of the graduate school.

Under Ladd's leadership, the Roper Center, founded in 1946 by Elmo Roper has become the premier archive of polling data in the world, with data from more than 14,000 major national and international surveys and the first ever online information retrieval system for public opinion data from the United States and abroad. He also expanded the Roper Center's mission with an ongoing publications program, including the bimonthly journal, *Public Perspective*, the biennial election analyses *America at the Polls*, and a series of issue-specific monographs.

Burns Roper, son of the founder of the Roper Center and long time chairman of its Board had this to say of Everett's passing, "the remarkable growth of the Center and the recognition it has achieved over the last 20 years is due almost entirely to Everett and the staff he assembled."

Along with his positions at UConn and the Roper Center, Professor Ladd served as adjunct scholar of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research in Washington. From 1987 through 1995, he was a columnist

for The Christian Science Monitor. He has been a Fellow of the Ford, Guggenheim, and Rockefeller Foundations, the Center for International Studies at Harvard, the Hoover Institution at Stanford, and the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Palo Alto, California). He was an internationally recognized authority on American public opinion and the role of survey research in democracy.

He served for a decade as senior editor of Public Opinion magazine and then for six years as "Opinion Pulse" editor for The American Enterprise magazine. Collaborator and co-author, Karlyn Bowman, resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute offered, "Everett was that rare person who could combine scholarly excellence with perceptive insights into the realities of the public policy world. He willingly shared that knowledge with decisionmakers, students and fellow researchers."

Ladd's recent work went beyond his traditional interests in American political thought, electoral politics and public opinion. The Ladd Report: The Surprising News of an Explosion of Voluntary Groups, Activities, and Charitable Donations That is Transforming Our Towns and Cities, analyzed volumes of data regarding how voluntary groups, activities and charitable donations were reshaping America's towns and cities.

Ladd leaves his wife, Cynthia Louise (Northway) Ladd; four children: Everett Carll Ladd III and his wife, Elizabeth; Corina Ladd and her husband David Kirocove of Connecticut; Melissa and Paul Teed of Michigan; Benjamin and Wendy Ladd of Georgia; five grandchildren: Ryan, Rachael, Kelley, Michelle, and Daniel; and a sister and brother-in-law, Mary and Stanley Tucker of Maine. Funeral services will be private, and there will be no calling hours. Interment will be in Storrs Ceremony. In lieu of flowers

donations may be made to the Everett Carll Ladd Fellowship at the Department of Political Science, University of Connecticut. A public memorial service will be scheduled at a later date. Potter Funeral Home, Storrs Road, Mansfield, CT is in charge of arrangements.

Lois Timms-Ferrara

Associate Director

Home:

The Roper Center

23 Settlers Way

University of Connecticut

Ellington, CT 06029

341 Mansfield Road, U-164

860-871-7086

Storrs, CT 06269-1164

(T) 860-486-0656

(F) 860-486-6308

>From mark@bisconti.com Thu Dec 9 08:13:40 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id IAA15173 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:13:39 -0800

(PST)

Received: from markbri (ip155.washington13.dc.pub-ip.PSI.NET

[38.30.214.155]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange

Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)

id YQ7H6V46; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:13:31 -0500

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Everett Carll Ladd 1937-1999

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:13:11 -0500

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCJKFIDCKOFNAEEMEEFCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <3.0.6.32.19991209105908.0088d100@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

This is very sad; a shock. Thank you Lois for the information. Our thoughts are with his family and you and his colleagues at The Roper Center.

Mark

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

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

Lois Timms-Ferrara

Sent: Thursday, December 09, 1999 10:59 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Everett Carll Ladd 1937-1999

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Thu Dec 9 08:21:12 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

id IAA19432 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:21:11 -0800

(PST)

Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3-fi.acns.fsu.edu  
[192.168.197.3])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA62184  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:21:09 -0500

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial790.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.35.180])

by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA79736  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:21:07 -0500

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:21:07 -0500

Message-Id: <199912091621.LAA79736@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Defending general population telephone survey

At the risk of stretching this one out...

Most people on University IRBs are NOT social scientists, let alone survey researchers. If you examine the Guidelines (thanks to Ed and Shap for the WEB site), you will see that they mandate a Philosopher in ethics, a medical doctor, a community representative--but there is no mandate for a social scientist! My IRB has one at a time.

Thus, I debate most members of an IRB judging the worth or benefits of research in another discipline--which is way outside the Guidelines anyway. As has been pointed out, departments and colleges assess this usually before

it comes to an IRB. This is a serious threat to academic freedom. To allow members from one discipline to decide whether research from another "wastes subject time" is a Pandora's Box that I hope we choose to remain closed. I am old enough to remember how federal Senate William Proxmire tried to gut funding for the highly useful research on physical attractiveness and Rubin, Peplau's etc. research on attraction saying that the American public did not want to know what made them fall in love (most of my undergraduate students have vociferously disagreed with Proxmire.)

Very often years go by before we give a discovery its due.

The IRB is there to assess risk to human subjects from medical, physical and social research. It is there to see that subjects are not coerced or otherwise defrauded into participating. It is there to see that research participations and their information are treated with dignity, research, and privacy. With some noteworthy objections, that is what most IRB members try to do.

Susan

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From exp12@psu.edu Thu Dec 9 08:33:15 1999

Received: from f04n05.cac.psu.edu (f04s05.cac.psu.edu [128.118.141.33])

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

id IAA25833 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:33:15 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ecuador.la.psu.edu (ecuador.la.psu.edu [128.118.17.50]) by

f04n05.cac.psu.edu (8.8.7/8.6.12) with ESMTP id LAA113890 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:33:11 -0500

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991209112607.00a8a100@mail.psu.edu>

X-Sender: exp12@mail.psu.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 11:32:03 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@psu.edu>

Subject: Instructional software for CATI

In-Reply-To: <199912090804.AAA21624@usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I'll be teaching an undergraduate public opinion class next spring for the first time in seven years. I would like to expose students to the mechanics of CATI but probably can't get the funds to license a full-blown professional system.



Years ago, some student-oriented analysis programs included a rudimentary component that functioned as a CATI system (or at least mimicked what it would be like to be an interviewer).

I would welcome suggestions that would be appropriate for teaching (35-50 students, I would guess) and conducting a brief telephone survey. I should have some funds but price is likely to be a major concern.

Thanks!!

-- Eric

~~~~~

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

Phone: (814) 865-6576 Fax: (814) 863-8979

Personal homepage: <http://www.la.psu.edu/~eplutzer/>

>From ande271@attglobal.net Thu Dec 9 08:56:36 1999

Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [165.87.194.229])

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

id IAA08126 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 08:56:35 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default ([32.100.111.115]) by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP

id <1999120916563122902qem40e>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 16:56:32 +0000

Message-ID: <38500A86.3037@attglobal.net>

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 12:01:10 -0800

From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>

Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: IRB Competence

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't think you can make a blanket statement about the competence of IRBs to assess the quality of research design. I am on an IRB that is composed of medical professionals, many of whom have been involved with research themselves. It would not be just or wise to question their competence, and they do sometimes have to decide whether the value of a proposed research project is worth the risk.

Some "funding agencies" have trained and good researchers on board, some do not. Some are "disinterested," and some may not be. Relying on them in every case to make sure a study design is adequate is risky.

Prejudices for and against different research methods do exist. Usually the prejudice is for the method one applies oneself. There is a sort of myth (oh, no -- I'm not prejudiced!) that survey research is not valid because "there is no control." IRB members who are not familiar with survey research know about the low response that surveys contend with, if nothing else. If an institution fields a lot of survey research, it should have a survey researcher on the IRB.

>From langley@pop.uky.edu Thu Dec 9 10:40:10 1999

Received: from smtp.uky.edu (smtp.uky.edu [128.163.2.17])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id KAA19596 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 10:40:09 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from pop.uky.edu (pop.uky.edu [128.163.2.16])  
by smtp.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA45995  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 13:40:07 -0500 (EST)

Received: from nc.gws.uky.edu (rgs51.gws.uky.edu [128.163.30.142])  
by pop.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA01351  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 13:40:07 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19991209133958.0071639c@pop.uky.edu>

X-Sender: langley@pop.uky.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 13:40:06 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@pop.uky.edu>

Subject: Re: Instructional software for CATI

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Have you tried QPL? I cannot vouch for it but know of centers that use it.

It is a fairly complete CATI system that I believe can be downloaded for  
free from the GAO website.

Good Luck.

At 11:32 AM 12/9/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>I'll be teaching an undergraduate public opinion class next spring for the  
>first time in seven years. I would like to expose students to the  
>mechanics of CATI but probably can't get the funds to license a full-blown  
>professional system.

>

>Years ago, some student-oriented analysis programs included a rudimentary  
>component that functioned as a CATI system (or at least mimicked what it  
>would be like to be an interviewer).

>

>I would welcome suggestions that would be appropriate for teaching (35-50  
>students, I would guess) and conducting a brief telephone survey. I should

>have some funds but price is likely to be a major concern.

>

>Thanks!!

>

>-- Eric

>~~~~~

>Eric Plutzer (plutzer@psu.edu)

>Department of Political Science

>The Pennsylvania State University

>107 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802

>

>Phone: (814) 865-6576 Fax: (814) 863-8979

>Personal homepage: <http://www.la.psu.edu/~eplutzer/>

>

>

>

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (606)257-4684

Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (606) 323-1972

University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771

403 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu

Lexington, KY 40506-0056

<http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srhome.htm>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Thu Dec 9 11:20:15 1999

Received: from hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (hejira.hunter.cuny.edu  
[146.95.128.97])

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

id LAA18185 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:20:14 -0800  
(PST)

From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

Received: from social54 (social54.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.12.54])

by hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA10531

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 14:22:43 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991209135032.00a27520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (Unverified)

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 14:11:28 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Instructional software for CATI

In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.19991209133958.0071639c@pop.uky.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 01:40 PM 12/9/99 -0500, Ronald E. Langley wrote:

>Have you tried QPL? I cannot vouch for it but know of centers that use it.

>It is a fairly complete CATI system that I believe can be downloaded for

>free from the GAO website.

>

>At 11:32 AM 12/9/1999 -0500, Eric Plutzer wrote:

> >I'll be teaching an undergraduate public opinion class next spring for  
the

> >first time in seven years. I would like to expose students to the

> >mechanics of CATI but probably can't get the funds to license a  
full-blown

> >professional system. ....

A new version of QPL (4.1) was released last month (Nov 99), but apart from  
Y2K fixes it is still the same version 4.0 released in 1996. It's a  
collection of MS/DOS programs (which run under Windows, but don't allow  
mouse input). It's still free, but writing the questionnaire in "qpl"  
language may not be everyone's preference. Check it out:

<http://www.gao.gov/qpl/qpl.htm>

Better than nothing, but certainly not state-of-the-art.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From dhaynes@UBmail.ubalt.edu Thu Dec 9 11:38:50 1999

Received: from UBMAIL.ubalt.edu (ubmail.ubalt.edu [198.202.0.25])

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

id LAA01848 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 11:38:47 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ubmail.ubalt.edu ([136.160.207.162])

by UBmail.ubalt.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #30377)

with ESMTP id <01JJAUVR33PU004TA0@UBmail.ubalt.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;

Thu,

9 Dec 1999 14:38:52 EDT

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 14:38:22 -0500

From: Don Haynes <dhaynes@UBmail.ubalt.edu>

Subject: Re: Instructional software for CATI

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <3850052D.606927A0@ubmail.ubalt.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; I)

Content-type: MULTIPART/MIXED;

BOUNDARY="Boundary\_(ID\_LAYmyHLWzxqhHpzhCpgd6A)"

References: <4.2.2.19991209135032.00a27520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--Boundary\_(ID\_LAYmyHLWzxqhHpzhCpgd6A)

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Do you really need CATI or is all you need the Ci3 (Sawtooth) questionnaire authoring side of the system. Ci3 can be set up to run outside of the CATI environment as a stand alone. If all you want to do is show how the interviewer sees the process this may be sufficient. If so, you may be able to get the owner of a CATI/Ci3 system to author a couple of questionnaires that students can run

from

a diskette. I believe Ci3 can be purchased alone as well,

mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu wrote:

> At 01:40 PM 12/9/99 -0500, Ronald E. Langley wrote:

>> Have you tried QPL? I cannot vouch for it but know of centers that use it.

>> It is a fairly complete CATI system that I believe can be downloaded for

>> free from the GAO website.

>>

>> At 11:32 AM 12/9/1999 -0500, Eric Plutzer wrote:

>>> I'll be teaching an undergraduate public opinion class next spring for the

>>> first time in seven years. I would like to expose students to the

>>> mechanics of CATI but probably can't get the funds to license a full-blown

>>> professional system. ....

>

> A new version of QPL (4.1) was released last month (Nov 99), but apart from

> Y2K fixes it is still the same version 4.0 released in 1996. It's a

> collection of MS/DOS programs (which run under Windows, but don't allow

> mouse input). It's still free, but writing the questionnaire in "qpl"

> language may not be everyone's preference. Check it out:



> <http://www.gao.gov/qpl/qpl.htm>  
> Better than nothing, but certainly not state-of-the-art.  
>  
> Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)  
> <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

--Boundary\_(ID\_LAYmyHLWzxqhHpzhCpgd6A)  
Content-type: text/x-vcard; name=vcard.vcf; charset=us-ascii  
Content-description: Card for Don Haynes  
Content-disposition: attachment; filename=vcard.vcf  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

begin: vcard  
fn: Don Haynes  
n: Haynes;Don  
org: Schaefer Center for Public Policy  
adr;dom: University of Baltimore;;1304 St. Paul  
St;Baltimore;MD;21202;  
email;internet: dhaynes@ubmail.ubalt.edu  
tel;work: 410-837-6196  
tel;fax: 410-837-6175  
x-mozilla-cpt: ;0  
x-mozilla-html: FALSE  
version: 2.1  
end: vcard

--Boundary\_(ID\_LAYmyHLWzxqhHpzhCpgd6A)--

>From wconstantine@home.com Thu Dec 9 13:04:06 1999

Received: from mail.rdc1.sfba.home.com (imail@ha1.rdc1.sfba.home.com  
[24.0.0.66])

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

id NAA00090 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 13:04:05 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from c954879-a.wntck1.sfba.home.com ([24.5.194.243])

by mail.rdc1.sfba.home.com (InterMail v4.01.01.00 201-229-111)

with SMTP

id

<19991209210404.MMVY14222.mail.rdc1.sfba.home.com@c954879-a.wntck1.sfba.home  
.com>

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 13:04:04 -0800

Message-ID: <008701bf4288\$69191460\$f3c20518@c954879-a.wntck1.sfba.home.com>

From: "Wendy Constantine" <wconstantine@home.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Locating adolescents in a phone survey

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1999 13:00:22 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3612.1700

X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3612.1700

Regarding Joel's question on RDD screening for adolescents, a paper on this

subject was presented at the 1999 AAPOR conference by John Tarnai, Marion Landry, and Rod Baxter of Washington State University.

I recall that they had a similar finding as Joel's, that is, that the incidence of households with adolescents was higher among samples that were enumerated prior to identifying the survey as targeting adolescents.

Wendy Constantine  
Research and Evaluation Systems  
Lafayette, CA

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

From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Date: Wednesday, December 08, 1999 1:58 PM  
Subject: Locating adolescents in a phone survey

>I would like to thank all who responded to my earlier message regarding  
>defending phone surveys before an IRB. This is my week for problems so I  
>would like to raise a major problem I have been having for the past year  
>with another study.

>

>We are trying to do a telephone survey methods study with adolescents  
>(12-17 years of age) in California, but we've been having difficulty  
>finding adolescents. According to the 1998 Current Population Survey, the  
>incidence of households in California with adolescents is 18%. Given the  
>study's budget in order to obtain enough interviews for the methods study,  
>we need to obtain an 18% incidence of adolescents.

>

>To date, we have conducted four pilot studies and the incidence of eligible  
>youth was 16%, 9%, 12% and 11%, respectively. In the first three pilots we  
>used a list-assisted (1+ working block) RDD design. The disproportionate  
>stratified sample design included an oversample of areas that had greater  
>concentrations of African American households.

>

>In the first pilot we completed a screener with an adult in the household  
>in which we informed the adult we were doing a tobacco survey, enumerated  
>the household, collected some proxy information on tobacco use, and then if  
>there was an adolescent in the household, we asked for permission to  
>interview the adolescent. The contractor felt that the screener took too  
>long and that we were losing too many potential households, so for the  
>second pilot we modified the screener introduction to simply state that we  
>were doing an adolescent tobacco survey, asked whether there was an  
>adolescent in the household, and then asked permission to interview the  
>adolescent. (If there are multiple adolescents we select one at random.)

>

>In the third pilot we cut the screener even more in an attempt to reduce  
>refusals and break-offs.

>

>In the fourth pilot we used the same introduction as the third pilot, but  
>we modified the sample design in an attempt to improve incidence. A major  
>sampling firm created a four strata design. The first stratum contained  
>listed telephone households that had a score of 5-9 on an indicator created  
>by Donnelly of the likelihood that the household contained an  
>adolescent. The second stratum contained listed telephone households that  
>had a score of 1-4 on this indicator. The third stratum contained listed  
>telephone households with a score of 0. The fourth stratum contained

>unlisted telephone households that did not fall into any other stratum and  
>came from a 1+ working block. For this pilot we sampled 150 phone numbers  
>from stratum 1, 104 numbers from stratum 2, 0 numbers from stratum 3, and  
>107 numbers from stratum 4. The working rate was about 90% in strata 1 and  
>2 and 60% in stratum 4. The incidence of adolescents was 18% in stratum 1,  
>8% in stratum 2 and 0% in stratum 4 yielding an overall incidence of about  
>11%. Thus, we did not do any better in finding adolescents than our  
>previous surveys. The Contractor and the Sampling Firm checked over the  
>sample file to ensure that no mistakes were made.

>

>Obviously, if we decided to confine our study to stratum 1, we could obtain  
>the necessary incidence of adolescents; however the study would have little  
>generalizability because this stratum represents about 3% of the sampling  
>frame so we do not want to do this.

>

>Although the sample sizes for these four pilot studies are rather small,  
>the data suggest that the first pilot study had the best incidence. The  
>first pilot study is the only one in which we introduced the survey as a  
>general population tobacco survey and later informed the respondent that we  
>wanted to interview an adolescent. In subsequent studies the survey was  
>introduced as an adolescent tobacco survey. Several researchers we have  
>talked to have hypothesized that our problem is that by introducing the  
>survey as an adolescent tobacco survey it's too easy for adults to falsely  
>claim that there are no youth in the household, and that this is why our  
>incidence of adolescents has been so poor in the last three pilots. Is  
>anyone aware of empirical evidence to support this hypothesis?

>

>We would be most grateful to receive creative suggestions as we are wasting  
>precious time and resources trying to resolve the problem of how to boost

>the incidence of adolescent interviews.

>

>

>

>=====

>Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

>Co-Director

>Center for Family and Community Health

>School of Public Health

>University of California, Berkeley

>WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

>=====

>From rrand@cfmc.com Thu Dec 9 14:09:35 1999

Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])

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

id OAA28366 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 14:09:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from rrand@cfmc.com (rand@cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])

by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA04100;

Thu, 9 Dec 1999 14:09:34 -0800

Message-Id: <4.1.19991209133234.00b03b30@cfmc.com>

X-Sender: rrand@cfmc.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 14:06:41 -0800

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Rands <rrand@cfmc.com>

Subject: Re: Instructional software for CATI

Cc: leg@cfmc.com

In-Reply-To: <4.2.0.58.19991209112607.00a8a100@mail.psu.edu>

References: <199912090804.AAA21624@usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 11:32 AM 12/9/99 -0500, you wrote:

>I'll be teaching an undergraduate public opinion class next spring for the  
>first time in seven years. I would like to expose students to the  
>mechanics of CATI but probably can't get the funds to license a full-blown  
>professional system.

Hello Eric,

We at CfMC have an active program of making our widely used CATI system available at little or no cost to academic institutions for the purpose of teaching students how to use a good CATI system. I am very interested in having you use SURVENT for teaching students because of the heavy demand in the industry for experienced SURVENT users.

SURVENT is the system used by more interviewers in the U.S. than any other system on the market. We have many clients who are desperately looking to hire people with experience in SURVENT. If you expose students to the system, it will greatly enhance their ability to find jobs in the MR industry.

If you are interested, please call me.

Richard Rands

President

Computers for Marketing Corp.

San Francisco, CA

415-777-0470

>

>Years ago, some student-oriented analysis programs included a rudimentary  
>component that functioned as a CATI system (or at least mimicked what it  
>would be like to be an interviewer).

>

>I would welcome suggestions that would be appropriate for teaching (35-50  
>students, I would guess) and conducting a brief telephone survey. I should

>have some funds but price is likely to be a major concern.

>

>Thanks!!

>

>-- Eric

>~~~~~

>Eric Plutzer (plutzer@psu.edu)

>Department of Political Science

>The Pennsylvania State University

>107 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802

>

>Phone: (814) 865-6576 Fax: (814) 863-8979

>Personal homepage: <http://www.la.psu.edu/~eplutzer/>



>From losch@csbr.csbs.uni.edu Thu Dec 9 14:10:56 1999

Received: from isc\_sun.uni.edu (isc\_sun.uni.edu [134.161.14.20])

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

id OAA29828 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 14:10:51 -0800

(PST)

Received: from csbr.csbs.uni.edu (csbr.csbs.uni.edu [134.161.220.3])

by isc\_sun.uni.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id QAA21094

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Dec 1999 16:10:46 -0600 (CST)

Received: from CSBR/SpoolDir by csbr.csbs.uni.edu (Mercury 1.44);

9 Dec 99 16:11:24 -0600

Received: from SpoolDir by CSBR (Mercury 1.44); 9 Dec 99 16:11:09 -0600

From: "Mary Losch" <losch@csbr.csbs.uni.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1999 16:11:02 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency and data  
quality

X-pmrc: 1

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.12b)

Message-ID: <3C0A7454933@csbr.csbs.uni.edu>

My colleagues and I are conducting a study of data collection efficiency and data quality as a function of the month that the data are collected. Much conventional wisdom argues that some times of the year (e.g., summer, holidays) are "worse" than others. We haven't found much data to support this notion. Does anyone have references for studies that support this notion?

Thanks.

Mary Losch

\*\*\*\*\*

Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.

Associate Professor and Assistant Director

Department of Psychology/Center for Social and Behavioral Research

221 Sabin Hall

Cedar Falls, IA 50614

(319) 273-2105

mary.losch@uni.edu

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Dec 10 05:18:18 1999

Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.33])

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

id FAA15785 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 05:18:18 -0800

(PST)

Received: from lavrakaslaptop (ts11-12.homenet.ohio-state.edu

[140.254.112.195])

by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA05908

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:14:21 -0500 (EST)

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:14:21 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199912101314.IAA05908@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency and  
data quality

Dear Mary (and to other who might respond),

I'd appreciate seeing answers organized by the types of errors that might correlate with seasonality.

That is, Mary's reference to "worse" data by time of year could mean more respondent-related measurement error (e.g., more item-nonresponse due to respondents being rushed), or more unit nonresponse problems (including possible NR error), or differential mode-related errors, or other errors.

The telephone survey units with which I have been associated for the past year years have regularly worked 12-months per year, seven days per week. Many of our projects have dealt with criminal justice issues, and the field knows that various crime-related behaviors and attitudes have a seasonal component. But this isn't measurement error per se.

While I have never done a sophisticated analysis of these issues as they apply to nonresponse, I have always found that unit nonresponse increases around holidays and also a bit in the summer. Whether this is associated with nonresponse error (thus lower data quality) is really the issue, and I too would like to learn what others might know about this.

At 04:11 PM 12/9/99 -0600, you wrote:

>My colleagues and I are conducting a study of data collection  
>efficiency and data quality as a function of the month that the data  
>are collected. Much conventional wisdom argues that some times  
>of the year (e.g., summer, holidays) are "worse" than others. We  
>haven't found much data to support this notion. Does anyone have  
>references for studies that support this notion?

>

>Thanks.

>

>Mary Losch

>\*\*\*\*\*

>Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.

>Associate Professor and Assistant Director

>Department of Psychology/Center for Social and Behavioral Research

>221 Sabin Hall

>Cedar Falls, IA 50614

>(319) 273-2105

>mary.losch@uni.edu

>

>

>From Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org Fri Dec 10 05:20:46 1999

Received: from mail02-ord.pilot.net (mail-ord-2.pilot.net [205.243.174.16])

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

id FAA16653 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 05:20:45 -0800

(PST)

Received: from unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org ([204.48.31.162]) by

mail02-ord.pilot.net with ESMTP id HAA17698 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10

Dec 1999 07:20:44 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gateway.ama-assn.org (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by  
unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org with ESMTP id HAA25349 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Fri, 10 Dec 1999 07:20:43 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gwise.ama-assn.org (ama\_smtp.ama-assn.org [198.20.10.248])  
by gateway.ama-assn.org (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id HAA02678  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 07:12:57 -0600 (CST)

Received: from HQDOM1-Message\_Server by gwise.ama-assn.org  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 07:20:43 -0600

Message-Id: <s850a9cb.020@gwise.ama-assn.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 07:20:13 -0600

From: "Erin Henke" <Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org>

Sender: Postmaster@ama-assn.org

Reply-To: Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency and data  
quality

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id FAA16655

I will be out of the office on Friday, December 10th. I will reply to your  
e-mail when I return to the office on Monday, December 13th.

>>> "aapornet@usc.edu" 12/10/99 07:14 >>>

Dear Mary (and to other who might respond),

I'd appreciate seeing answers organized by the types of errors that might correlate with seasonality.

That is, Mary's reference to "worse" data by time of year could mean more respondent-related measurement error (e.g., more item-nonresponse due to respondents being rushed), or more unit nonresponse problems (including possible NR error), or differential mode-related errors, or other errors.

The telephone survey units with which I have been associated for the past year years have regularly worked 12-months per year, seven days per week. Many of our projects have dealt with criminal justice issues, and the field knows that various crime-related behaviors and attitudes have a seasonal component. But this isn't measurement error per se.

While I have never done a sophisticated analysis of these issues as they apply to nonresponse, I have always found that unit nonresponse increases around holidays and also a bit in the summer. Whether this is associated with nonresponse error (thus lower data quality) is really the issue, and I too would like to learn what others might know about this.

At 04:11 PM 12/9/99 -0600, you wrote:

>My colleagues and I are conducting a study of data collection  
>efficiency and data quality as a function of the month that the data  
>are collected. Much conventional wisdom argues that some times  
>of the year (e.g., summer, holidays) are "worse" than others. We  
>haven't found much data to support this notion. Does anyone have

>references for studies that support this notion?

>

>Thanks.

>

>Mary Losch

>\*\*\*\*\*

>Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.

>Associate Professor and Assistant Director

>Department of Psychology/Center for Social and Behavioral Research

>221 Sabin Hall

>Cedar Falls, IA 50614

>(319) 273-2105

>mary.losch@uni.edu

>

>

>From daves@startribune.com Fri Dec 10 06:09:33 1999

Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com  
[132.148.80.211])

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

id GAA28463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 06:09:32 -0800  
(PST)

Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id IAA13831; Fri, 10 Dec 1999  
08:08:02 -0600

Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by  
firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V4.2)

id xma013764; Fri, 10 Dec 99 08:07:58 -0600

Received: from STAR-Message\_Server by mail.startribune.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:04:52 -0600

Message-Id: <s850b424.020@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:03:58 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: lavrakas.1@osu.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency and data  
quality

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id GAA28466

In newspaper research, there's a well-entrenched myth -- perhaps with some truth behind it -- that seasonality has an effect on readership measures.

Higher in the fall and winter, lower in the summer, especially late summer, the conventional wisdom says. I've been in the business now for several decades, and like Paul Lavrakas, I've had some time to observe that there appears to be some seasonality effect for a lot of such things.

Unfortunately, like Paul, I've never taken the time to conduct a formal study of those things.

>From Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org Fri Dec 10 06:13:38 1999

Received: from mail02-ord.pilot.net (mail-ord-2.pilot.net [205.243.174.16])

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

id GAA00076 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 06:13:37 -0800



(PST)

Received: from unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org ([204.48.31.162]) by mail02-ord.pilot.net with ESMTP id IAA29303 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:13:36 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gateway.ama-assn.org (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org with ESMTP id IAA26700 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:13:35 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gwise.ama-assn.org (ama\_smtp.ama-assn.org [198.20.10.248]) by gateway.ama-assn.org (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id IAA04128 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:05:33 -0600 (CST)

Received: from HQDOM1-Message\_Server by gwise.ama-assn.org with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:13:19 -0600

Message-Id: <s850b61f.042@gwise.ama-assn.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:12:44 -0600

From: "Erin Henke" <Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org>

Sender: Postmaster@ama-assn.org

Reply-To: Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency  
anddataquality

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id GAA00080

I will be out of the office on Friday, December 10th. I will reply to your e-mail when I return to the office on Monday, December 13th.

>>> "aapornet@usc.edu" 12/10/99 08:03 >>>

In newspaper research, there's a well-entrenched myth -- perhaps with some truth behind it -- that seasonality has an effect on readership measures.

Higher in the fall and winter, lower in the summer, especially late summer, the conventional wisdom says. I've been in the business now for several decades, and like Paul Lavrakas, I've had some time to observe that there appears to be some seasonality effect for a lot of such things.

Unfortunately, like Paul, I've never taken the time to conduct a formal study of those things.

>From PhilDavies1@compuserve.com Fri Dec 10 06:29:18 1999

Received: from spdmgaae.compuserve.com (ds-img-5.compuserve.com [149.174.206.138])

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

id GAA05778 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 06:29:17 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from mailgate@localhost)

by spdmgaae.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.7) id JAA02843

for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 09:28:46 -0500 (EST)

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 09:28:25 -0500

From: Phil Davies <PhilDavies1@compuserve.com>

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency and data quality

Sender: Phil Davies <PhilDavies1@compuserve.com>

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

Message-ID: <199912100928\_MC2-907E-389D@compuserve.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id GAA05780

You might also look at the interviewers you use -- more part-timers in the summer and around holidays? Older, more experienced interviewers taking vacations during the holidays...Phil Davies

>From Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org Fri Dec 10 06:32:05 1999

Received: from mail03-ord.pilot.net (mail-ord-3.pilot.net [205.243.174.17])

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

id GAA07333 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 06:32:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: from unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org ([204.48.31.162]) by

mail03-ord.pilot.net with ESMTP id IAA07641 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10

Dec 1999 08:32:03 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gateway.ama-assn.org (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by

unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org with ESMTP id IAA27635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:32:02 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gwise.ama-assn.org (ama\_smtp.ama-assn.org [198.20.10.248])

by gateway.ama-assn.org (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id IAA05154

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:24:16 -0600 (CST)

Received: from HQDOM1-Message\_Server by gwise.ama-assn.org

with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:32:02 -0600

Message-Id: <s850ba82.048@gwise.ama-assn.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 08:31:18 -0600

From: "Erin Henke" <Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org>

Sender: Postmaster@ama-assn.org

Reply-To: Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Effects of month of data collection on efficiency and data  
quality

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id GAA07339

I will be out of the office on Friday, December 10th. I will reply to your  
e-mail when I return to the office on Monday, December 13th.

>>> "aapornet@usc.edu" 12/10/99 08:28 >>>

You might also look at the interviewers you use -- more part-timers in the  
summer and around holidays? Older, more experienced interviewers taking  
vacations during the holidays...Phil Davies

>From rday@rdresearch.com Fri Dec 10 10:52:37 1999

Received: from mail.enteract.com (mail.enteract.com [207.229.143.33])

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

id KAA25694 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 10:52:36 -0800

(PST)

Received: from rday (216-80-54-50.d.enteract.com [216.80.54.50])

by mail.enteract.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA10403  
for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 12:52:34 -0600 (CST)  
(envelope-from rday@rdresearch.com)

Message-ID: <002101bf433e\$a82cb9c0\$323650d8@enteract.com>

Reply-To: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>

From: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>

To: <AAPORNET@usc.edu>

Subject: biased questions

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 12:44:56 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001E\_01BF430C.5CC13E20"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001E\_01BF430C.5CC13E20

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have been asked by a client to review a questionnaire that many AAPORITES would find offensive. In brief, every question that matters is phrased with the same point of view (isn't management wonderful).

I am wondering if anyone can direct me to research in which question

wording is slanted one way, then the other, and then value neutral.  
It would be very helpful to put them on the track of value neutral  
questions.

Thank you.

Richard Day

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001E\_01BF430C.5CC13E20

Content-Type: text/x-vcard;

name="Richard Day.vcf"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: attachment;

filename="Richard Day.vcf"

BEGIN:VCARD

VERSION:2.1

N:Day;Richard

FN:Richard Day

ORG:Richard Day Research

TEL;WORK;VOICE:(847)328-2329

ADR;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE;;;801 Davis Street=3D0D=3D0AThird =  
Floor;Evanston;Il;60201

LABEL;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE:801 Davis Street=3D0D=3D0AThird =  
Floor=3D0D=3D0AEvanston, Il 60201

URL:

URL:http://www.rdresearch.com

EMAIL;PREF;INTERNET:rday@rdresearch.com

REV:19991210T184456Z

END:VCARD

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001E\_01BF430C.5CC13E20--

>From bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com Fri Dec 10 12:10:26 1999

Received: from mail.haglerbailly.com (mail.haglerbailly.com  
[208.138.215.14])

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

id MAA23307 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 12:10:25 -0800

(PST)

Received: by arlmsg002.haglerbailly.com with Internet Mail Service

(5.5.2650.21)

id <YGLF0V14>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 15:08:56 -0500

Message-ID:

<713ED6F94609D211B5F200805F9FE8EE3DC4E0@madfps001.haglerbailly.com>

From: "Baumgartner, Bob" <bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com>

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

Subject: RE: Survey Research Companies in South Africa

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 15:08:51 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

I have been contacted by the major electric utility company in South Africa about replicating a study we did in the U.S. Does anyone have a recommendation for one or more survey research firms in South Africa that we could work with to implement a national survey of households and businesses?

Please reply directly to me at:

Bob Baumgartner

Hagler Bailly Services

bbaumgar@haglerbailly.com

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Fri Dec 10 12:47:06 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id MAA20709 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 12:47:05 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (mxusw5x54.chesco.com [209.195.228.54])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA20401;

Fri, 10 Dec 1999 15:47:01 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <001b01bf434f\$6d9c4b20\$36e4c3d1@default>

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

To: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>, <AAPORNET@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: biased questions

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 15:44:58 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Re: Biased Questions



Try Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording and Context by Howard Schuman and Stanley Presser (NY: Academic Press, 1981).

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Richard Day <rday@rdresearch.com>

To: AAPORNET@usc.edu <AAPORNET@usc.edu>

Date: Friday, December 10, 1999 1:54 PM

Subject: biased questions

> I have been asked by a client to review a questionnaire that many  
>AAPORITES would find offensive. In brief, every question that matters is  
>phrased with the same point of view (isn't management wonderful).

>

>I am wondering if anyone can direct me to research in which question  
>wording is slanted one way, then the other, and then value neutral.

>It would be very helpful to put them on the track of value neutral  
>questions.

>

>Thank you.

>Richard Day

>

>From JJanota@asha.org Fri Dec 10 13:29:23 1999

Received: from asha.org (external.asha.org [12.17.9.3])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP  
id NAA17024 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 13:29:17 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from ASHA-Message\_Server by asha.org  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 16:27:33 -0500

Message-Id: <s85129f5.037@asha.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 16:27:28 -0500

From: "Jeanette Janota" <JJanota@asha.org>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Telephone focus groups

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id NAA17079

We've done "in-person" focus groups; we've read that it's theoretically possible to conduct focus groups via conference call; and we've been asked to do some (topic: marketing of new products).

Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to recall about focus groups that were done via teleconferencing?

Jeanette Janota

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Fri Dec 10 13:46:17 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id NAA29486 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 13:46:15 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (mxusw5x54.chesco.com [209.195.228.54])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA02745

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 16:46:12 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <002e01bf4357\$b242c800\$36e4c3d1@default>

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

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Telephone focus groups

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 16:44:10 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Re: Telephone Focus Groups

See [www.mnav.com](http://www.mnav.com). George Silverman claims to have invented telephone focus groups. (No endorsement intended.)

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)

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

From: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@asha.org>

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

Date: Friday, December 10, 1999 4:31 PM

Subject: Telephone focus groups

>We've done "in-person" focus groups; we've read that it's theoretically possible to conduct focus groups via conference call; and we've been asked to do some (topic: marketing of new products).

>

>Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to recall about focus groups that were done via teleconferencing?

>

>Jeanette Janota

>

>

>From wendylanders@hotmail.com Fri Dec 10 14:20:01 1999

Received: from hotmail.com (law2-f181.hotmail.com [216.32.181.181])

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

id OAA21931 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 14:20:00 -0800

(PST)

Received: (qmail 86279 invoked by uid 0); 10 Dec 1999 22:19:14 -0000

Message-ID: <19991210221914.86278.qmail@hotmail.com>

Received: from 148.129.143.2 by www.hotmail.com with HTTP;

Fri, 10 Dec 1999 14:19:14 PST

X-Originating-IP: [148.129.143.2]

From: "Wendy Landers" <wendylanders@hotmail.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Telephone focus groups

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 17:19:14 EST

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

They are surreal.

Wendy Landers

>From: "Jeanette Janota" <JJanota@asha.org>

>Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Subject: Telephone focus groups

>Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 16:27:28 -0500

>

>We've done "in-person" focus groups; we've read that it's theoretically

>possible to conduct focus groups via conference call; and we've been asked

>to do some (topic: marketing of new products).

>

>Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to recall about

>focus groups that were done via teleconferencing?

>

>Jeanette Janota

>

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Fri Dec 10 15:49:34 1999

Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net  
[199.45.39.156])

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

id PAA23162 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 15:49:32 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net  
[151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA15877

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 18:47:38 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991210175138.00a58cd0@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 18:48:12 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Public Opinion Dynamics: A remarkable case

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Figures from the German Politbarometer poll released today  
[http://www.zdf.msnbc.de/news/NEWSPOLITBAROMETER\\_Front.asp](http://www.zdf.msnbc.de/news/NEWSPOLITBAROMETER_Front.asp)  
(for those who read a bit of German)

show a remarkable swing in public opinion over a period of just 4 weeks in  
the aftermath of a widening scandal about party financing:

Christian Democrats (formerly led by Ex-Chancellor Kohl): from 55% to 43%

Social Democrats (led by current Chancellor Schroeder): from 31% to 41%

in response to a question whom the respondent would vote for if there was

an election next Sunday (a standard question in Germany).

This is a swing of 22 percentage points from +24 to just +2 (in favor of the Christian Democrats) over just 4 weeks.

At the same time, the public has been and still is fairly cynical about parties in general. A solid majority believes that all parties violate the existing laws, take donations, hide them in slush funds, etc., and that, of course, money influences political decision making. What would cause such a change then?

In the US, no scandal seems to have much impact on public opinion -- be it arms deals, sex with interns, lying to the public, corruption, illegal contributions, or whatever. So, the next question is, are these poll results reliable -- given that it is 3-day telephone survey (we talked about this issue quite a bit lately)? Maybe, the conservative voters simply did not feel like participating in the survey this month?

However, there is little indication that most of the swing is caused by selective participation. Checking the recall question ("for which party did you vote in the 1998 elections") the marginals for the November and the December polls are very similar; a slight drop of the CDU share is offset by an increase in the "non-voter" share with a constant share for the SPD. The plausible explanation is that a small portion of CDU voters preferred to hide their previous vote; but no signs of selective participation.

And thus we are back to the more interesting, the substantive question: What moves public opinion? Can the public be cynical ("all parties do it") and morally disgusted ("you should abide the law") at the same time? And

maybe Reagan's and Clinton's ability to be able to get away with almost anything are exceptions rather than the rule? Are there lessons to be learnt for the campaign in the US?

MK.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Dec 10 20:52:11 1999

Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51])

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

id UAA03756 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 20:52:07 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (user-38lci0f.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.72.15])

by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id XAA13273

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Dec 1999 23:52:05 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991210224337.00aa9d60@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 1999 22:48:15 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Telephone focus groups

In-Reply-To: <s85129f5.037@asha.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="===== \_48834391== \_ .ALT"



-----\_48834391==\_.ALT

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

At 04:27 PM 12/10/1999 , you wrote:

>We've done "in-person" focus groups; we've read that it's theoretically  
>possible to conduct focus groups via conference call; and we've been asked  
>to do some (topic: marketing of new products).

>

>Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to recall  
>about focus groups that were done via teleconferencing?

>

>Jeanette Janota

Theory is one thing. Reality is something else. Even business meetings where everyone knows everyone else, more or less, are difficult with conference calls. Even teleconferencing, while theoretically/technically feasible, can never take the place of face to face meetings....which is what a focus group is really all about.

Dick Halpern

-----

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

-----

--===== \_48834391== \_ .ALT

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

<html>

<font size=3>At 04:27 PM 12/10/1999 , you wrote:<br>

<blockquote type=cite cite>We've done "in-person" focus groups;

we've read that it's theoretically possible to conduct focus groups via

conference call; and we've been asked to do some (topic: marketing

of new products).&nbsp;<br>

<br>

Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to

recall about focus groups that were done via teleconferencing? <br>

<br>

Jeanette Janota </font></blockquote><br>

<br>

Theory is one thing. Reality is something else. Even business meetings

where everyone knows everyone else, more or less, are difficult with

conference calls. Even teleconferencing, while theoretically/technically

feasible, can never take the place of face to face meetings....which is

what a focus group is really all about. <br>

<br>

Dick Halpern<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<hr>

<font size=1 color="#0000FF">Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. <br>

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research <br>

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology <br>

3837 Courtyard Drive <br>

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248 <br>

rshalpern@mindspring.com <br>

phone/fax 770 434 4121 <br>

<hr>

</font></html>

-----\_48834391==\_.ALT--

>From rday@rdresearch.com Sat Dec 11 07:52:56 1999

Received: from mail.enteract.com (mail.enteract.com [207.229.143.33])

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

id HAA09833 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 11 Dec 1999 07:52:55 -0800

(PST)

Received: from rday (216-80-54-245.d.enteract.com [216.80.54.245])

by mail.enteract.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA84634

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 11 Dec 1999 09:52:38 -0600 (CST)

(envelope-from rday@rdresearch.com)

Message-ID: <001e01bf43ee\$af1f3a40\$f53650d8@enteract.com>

Reply-To: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>  
From: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <002e01bf4357\$b242c800\$36e4c3d1@default>  
Subject: Re: Telephone focus groups  
Date: Sat, 11 Dec 1999 09:44:58 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

didn't he also invent the internet?

Seriously, My firm and I'm certain many others have been conducting focus groups by telephone for a long time. In fact we think they are particularly useful as a check against regular, in person, focus groups. When interviewing physicians for example we find more candor when they are speaking directly by phone (one-on-one) than when they are in a group, especially if one or more of the physicians in the group practice in an academic setting.

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

From: James P. Murphy <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Friday, December 10, 1999 3:44 PM  
Subject: Re: Telephone focus groups

> Re: Telephone Focus Groups

>

> See [www.mnav.com](http://www.mnav.com). George Silverman claims to have invented telephone focus

> groups. (No endorsement intended.)

>

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

> Voice (610) 408-8800

> Fax (610) 408-8802

> [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)

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

> From: Jeanette Janota <[JJanota@asha.org](mailto:JJanota@asha.org)>

> To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu) <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>

> Date: Friday, December 10, 1999 4:31 PM

> Subject: Telephone focus groups

>

>

>> We've done "in-person" focus groups; we've read that it's theoretically possible to conduct focus groups via conference call; and we've been asked to do some (topic: marketing of new products).

>>

>> Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to recall about

> focus groups that were done via teleconferencing?

>>

>> Jeanette Janota

>>

>>

>

>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Sat Dec 11 08:30:20 1999

Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net  
[199.45.39.157])

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

id IAA25714 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 11 Dec 1999 08:30:19 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net  
[151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA25211;

Sat, 11 Dec 1999 11:36:01 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991211111751.00a44e90@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Sat, 11 Dec 1999 11:28:47 -0500

To: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Telephone focus groups

In-Reply-To: <001e01bf43ee\$af1f3a40\$f53650d8@enteract.com>

References: <002e01bf4357\$b242c800\$36e4c3d1@default>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 09:44 AM 12/11/99 -0600, Richard Day wrote:

>....

>Seriously, My firm and I'm certain many others have been conducting focus

>groups by telephone for a long time. In fact we think they are

particularly

- >useful as a check against regular, in person, focus groups. When
- >interviewing physicians for example we find more candor when they are
- >speaking directly by phone (one-on-one) than when they are in a group,
- >especially if one or more of the physicians in the group practice in an
- >academic setting. ....

I am a bit confused: "Telephone focus groups" a la Richard Day are conducted "one-on-one" -- because people are more honest this way than in a group? I had been under the impression that the very essence of a "focus group" is to have a \*group\* discussion -- be it in person, via telephone, via video conferencing, or some hybrid thereof (like a phone conference call with additional one-way video/audio feed via the Web -- as described by Silverman).

While there may be doubts about the claim that Silverman is the sole inventor of "telephone focus groups", I think Richard Day has undisputed claim to "one-on-one focus groups". There are no limits to creativity ....  
MK.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Dec 13 07:20:18 1999

Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51])

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

id HAA19849 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 07:20:17 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mindspring.com (user-37ka7mi.dialup.mindspring.com  
[207.69.30.210])

by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA10385;

Mon, 13 Dec 1999 10:20:12 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <38550E7F.E721E739@mindspring.com>

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 10:19:28 -0500

From: rshalpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: G.A.O. Issues Warning on Census Accuracy

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----B1A16E66DC12581B83B52707"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----B1A16E66DC12581B83B52707

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Forcast of Census problems....should this be a surprise?

Dick Halpern

rshalpern@mindspring.com

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/washpol/census-gao.html>

-----B1A16E66DC12581B83B52707



Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii;  
name="census-gao.html"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline;  
filename="census-gao.html"  
Content-Base: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/  
washpol/census-gao.html"  
Content-Location: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/  
washpol/census-gao.html"

<html>

<head>

<!--PLS\_META-->

<meta name="NYT\_HEADLINE" content="G.A.O. Issues Warning on Census  
Accuracy">

<meta name="BY\_LINE" content="By STEVEN A. HOLMES">

<meta name="FIRSTPAR" content="WASHINGTON -- Less than four months from  
the start of the 2000 census on April 1, a General Accounting Office report  
is warning that the Census Bureau's current plans may produce a count  
that is less accurate than that of 1990. ">

<meta name="DISPLAYDATE" content="December 12, 1999">

<meta name="NYT\_SORTDATE" content="19991212">

<!--

1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234  
56789123456789123456789123456789 -->

<!--

1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234  
56789123456789123456789123456789 -->

<!--

1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234

56789123456789123456789123456789 -->

<!--

1234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234567891234

56789123456789123456789123456789 -->

<!--ELEMENT TITLE-->

<title>G.A.O. Issues Warning on Census Accuracy</title>

<meta name="slug" content="BC-CENSUS-GAO-400&ADD-NYT">

<meta name="date" content="19991212">

<meta name="length" content="0894">

<meta name="byline" content="By STEVEN A. HOLMES">

<meta name="headline" content="Gao Issues Warning on Census Accuracy">

</head>

<!--plsfield:TEXT-->

<NYT\_HEADER version="1.0" type="main">

<body bgcolor="#ffffff" vlink=#444464 link=#000066

background=http://graphics.nytimes.com/images/back.c.gif>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<tr><td align=left width=600 valign=top>



<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=left valign=top width=480>

<NYT\_BANNER version="1.0" type="main">



</NYT\_BANNER>

<br clear=all>

<NYT\_TOOLBARMAP version="1.0" type="main">

<map name="maintoolbar2">

<area shape="rect" coords="0,0,75,16" href="/yr/mo/day/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to go to the Home Page';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="76,0,154,16" href="/info/contents/siteindex.html"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to see site contents';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="155,0,233,16" href="/search/daily/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the current site';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="234,0,312,16" href="/comment/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click for discussion in the Forums';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="313,0,391,16" href="/archives/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the archives';return true">

<area shape="rect" coords="392,0,468,16" href="/marketplace/"

onMouseOver="window.status='Click to visit the Marketplace';return true">

</map>

</NYT\_TOOLBARMAP>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">

<a href="/images/maintoolbar2.map">

</a>

</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<br><NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="top">

```
<a href="#"
onClick=window.open('http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/w
ww.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/washpol/census-gao.html/0/Top/rocket03/roc3-he
ad.html/616e6e616c69766961','one','toolbar=0,location=0,directories=0,status
=0,menubar=0,scrollbars=0,resizable=0,width=500,height=150')>
<IMG
SRC="http://www.nytimes.com/partners/microsites/email-test/rocketebook.gif"
border=0 Alt="eRocket"></A>
```

```
</NYT_AD>
</td></table>
```

```
</NYT_HEADER>
<BLOCKQUOTE><BLOCKQUOTE>
<NYT_DATE version="1.0" type=" ">
<!--ELEMENT DATE-->
<H5>December 13, 1999</H5><br>
```

```
</NYT_DATE>
<NYT_HEADLINE version="1.0" type=" ">
<!--ELEMENT HEADLINE-->
<H2>G.A.O. Issues Warning on Census Accuracy</H2>
```

```
</NYT_HEADLINE>
<NYT_BYLINE version="1.0" type=" ">
<!--ELEMENT BYLINE-->
<h5>By STEVEN A. HOLMES</h5>
```

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<p>

<p> ASHINGTON -- Less than four months from the start of the 2000 census on April 1, a General Accounting Office report is warning that the Census Bureau's current plans may produce a count that is less accurate than that of 1990.

<p> The accounting office, the investigative arm of Congress, singled out the Census Bureau's decision not to send a second questionnaire to households that do not respond to the first form that the agency mails as a reason for its finding. The agency also expressed concern that the tight labor market might make it difficult for the Census Bureau to hire the large number of temporary workers it will need.

<p> In a draft report, the agency says that the bureau "faces some significant risks, that, taken together, continue to jeopardize the success of the 2000 census."

<p> The report said the census next year would cost \$6.2 billion, almost twice as much as the \$3.2 billion spent on the 1990 census, which was by far the most expensive in history.

<p> And yet, the report suggested, the 2000 census may not be as accurate as the one in 1990, which was estimated to have missed 8 million people and counted another 4 million twice, for an undercount of about 4 million people.

<p> "It raises concerns," George Walker, communications director for the House Subcommittee on the Census, said of the accounting office report. "Many of these concerns, like doing a second mailing, are ones that we've raised before in hearings, or in

specific legislation."

<p> Investigators for the accounting office said that the Census Bureau might "be optimistic" when it estimated that 61 percent of households would complete and return the census forms that were sent to them. The report said the agency's decision not to mail a second form to households that had not returned the first could hold down the response rate.

<p> Census Bureau officials took issue with the report, noting that last September the accounting office issued another report declaring the bureau's estimates of the form-return rate were conservative.

<p> Kenneth Prewitt, director of the Census Bureau, said, "We're a little surprised that the same agency says we are too conservative and then turns around after a few months and says we are too optimistic."

<p> Census officials opted not to do a second mailing out of concern that it would lead to households' being counted twice.

<p>

<p>

<p>

<p> The issue of the response rate is a critical one. Estimates are that each percentage point below 61 percent will add another \$25 million to the cost of the census, mainly from sending census takers to the unresponding homes to get the information. Lower census-return rates also increase the possibility of error, since mailed responses tend to be more accurate.

<p> Prewitt had already said that if the mail-response rate fell below 61 percent, "we will have a real hard time conducting the census."

<p> The accounting office report also suggested that the Census Bureau's efforts to count and question those who failed to return their forms might be hampered by difficulties in hiring enough census-takers.

<p> The report noted that the Census Bureau would need about 860,000 temporary workers, known as enumerators, next year. High turnover rates in these positions means that to maintain a work force that large, the Census Bureau will have to recruit nearly 3.5 million people, which is about the population of South Carolina, for jobs that do not offer benefits like insurance or child care.

<p> The report recommended that the Census Bureau and Congress develop contingency plans to avert potential problems for the next census. Some of the specific recommendations included passing legislation to lift the ban on hiring noncitizens and federal employees, including active-duty military personnel, for work as part-time enumerators and allowing people to work in the job without losing Social Security, veterans, Medicaid and welfare benefits.

<p> Yet, the report makes no mention of the most contentious issues that has swirled around the census: statistical sampling, the method whose opponents say is illegal and supporters contend could address the very concerns raised by the accounting office report.

<p> Officials of the accounting office declined to comment on the report beyond calling it a draft document whose main findings might change, depending on the response from the Census Bureau.

<p> Senior officials at the Census Bureau say their estimates of the response rate were made prior to the development of the \$102 million advertising campaign developed by Young & Rubicam to get people to respond to the census forms. As a result, they say, the

form-return rate may exceed 61 percent.

<p> Census Bureau officials said they had no difficulty in hiring enough people in 1998 for the dress rehearsals of the 2000 census, indicating that if a sufficient wage is offered, the Census Bureau will not have a problem hiring temporary staff members.

<p> Rep. Carolyn Maloney, D-N.Y., said she would sponsor legislation that would create a \$100 million contingency fund that could be used for such emergencies as increasing salaries to attract more census workers.

<p>

<!--plsfield:NYT\_FOOTER-->

<NYT\_FOOTER version="1.0">

</BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE>

<br>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=center valign=top width=468>

<NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="bottom">

<a href="#"

onClick=window.open('http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/washpol/census-gao.html/0/Bottom/rocket03/ROC3-3TAL.html/616e6e616c69766961','one','toolbar=0,location=0,directories=0,status=0,menubar=0,scrollbars=0,resizable=0,width=500,height=150')>

<IMG

SRC="http://www.nytimes.com/partners/microsites/email-test/rocketebook.gif"

border=0 Alt="eRocket"></A>



</NYT\_AD>

<hr size=1>

<P>

<font size=-1>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">

<A HREF="/"><B>Home</B></A> |

<A HREF="/info/contents/siteindex.html"><B>Site Index</B></A> |

<A HREF="/search/daily/"><B>Site Search</B></A> |

<A HREF="/comment/"><B>Forums</B></A> |

<A HREF="/archives/"><B>Archives</B></A> |

<A HREF="/marketplace/"><B>Marketplace</B></A>

<P>

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/late/">Quick News</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/front/">Page One Plus</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/world/">International</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/national/">National/N.Y.</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/business/">Business</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/tech/">Technology</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/science/">Science</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/sports/">Sports</A> |

<A HREF="/weather/">Weather</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/editorial/">Editorial</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/oped/">Op-Ed</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/artleisure/">Arts</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/auto/">Automobiles</A> |

<A HREF="/books/yr/mo/day/home/">Books</A> |

<A HREF="/diversions/">Diversions</A> |

[Job Market](/yr/mo/day/jobmarket/) |

[Real Estate](/yr/mo/day/realestate/) |

[Travel](/yr/mo/day/travel/)

<P>

[Help/Feedback](/subscribe/help/) |

[Classifieds](/classified/) |

[Services](/info/contents/services.html) |

[New York Today](http://www.nytoday.com)

</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<NYT\_COPYRIGHT version="1.0" type="main">

<P>

[<B>Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company</B>](/subscribe/help/copyright.html)

<P>

</NYT\_COPYRIGHT>

</font>

</td></table>

</td>

<td align=left width=14 valign=top>

</td>

<td align=center width=140 valign=top>



<A

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/

yr/mo/day/news/washpol/census-gao.html/0/Right3/dljdir06/dld6-rtsd.gif/616e6  
e616c69766961" target="\_top"><IMG  
SRC="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.co  
m/yr/mo/day/news/washpol/census-gao.html/0/Right3/dljdir06/dld6-rtsd.gif/616  
e6e616c69766961" border=0 ALT="" ></A>

</td></tr></table>

</NYT\_FOOTER>

</body>

</html>

-----B1A16E66DC12581B83B52707--

>From DUC@dshs.wa.gov Mon Dec 13 07:23:56 1999

Received: from dshsmg1.dshs.wa.gov (dshsmg1.dshs.wa.gov [147.56.131.20])

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

id HAA21754 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 07:23:55 -0800

(PST)

Received: from dshs.wa.gov (mailgw.dshs.wa.gov [147.56.222.6]) by

dshsmg1.dshs.wa.gov with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service

Version 5.5.2448.0)

id Y4ZR5GFL; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 07:26:28 -0800

Received: from DSHSMAIL-Message\_Server by dshs.wa.gov

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 07:27:47 -0800

Message-Id: <s8549ff3.068@dshs.wa.gov>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 07:22:40 -0800

From: "Can Du" <DUC@dshs.wa.gov>

Sender: Postmaster@dshs.wa.gov

Reply-To: DUC@dshs.wa.gov

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: G.A.O. Issues Warning on Census Accuracy -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id HAA21758

I am out of the office from December 13 through December 17. I'll be checking my voice mail messages periodically. If you need assistance right away, please contact Marie Dixon at (360) 725-1618.

>From johnl@BATTELLE.ORG Mon Dec 13 08:48:18 1999

Received: from bclcl1.im.battelle.org (bclcl1.im.battelle.org [131.167.1.2])

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

id IAA21739 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 08:48:10 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ns-bco-mse1.im.battelle.org ([131.167.1.166])

by BCLCL1 (PMDF V5.1-10 #U2779) with ESMTP id <01JJGA291VNM935PU5@BCLCL1>

for

aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:47:10 EST

Received: by ns-bco-mse1.im.battelle.org with Internet Mail Service

(5.5.2448.0) id <XPM2KKYK>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:46:24 -0500

Content-return: allowed

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:46:01 -0500

From: "John, Lisa V" <johnl@BATTELLE.ORG>

Subject: RE: Telephone focus groups

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

Message-id:

<CAD5FA6C4518D311B14800A0C98439DF36D69B@ns-bco-mse5.im.battelle.org>

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

To offer another perspective: we have conducted quite a few focus groups via teleconference on health research topics over the past few years and have been pleased with the results. Teleconference groups have several advantages, including reduced time commitment by participants (because there is no travel involved); ability to include people from all over the country in each group without excess cost; and a stronger sense of confidentiality. We have found that people seem comfortable interacting this way, and react and respond to each other quite freely. Clearly you miss out on the non-verbal communication, but we have not found this disadvantage to outweigh the positive factors. I'd say give it a try and let us know how it goes!

Lisa V. John, MSW

Senior Study Leader

Battelle Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation

1101 Olivette Executive Pkwy, Suite 200

St. Louis, MO 63132-3205

Phone: 314-993-5234 ext. 141

Fax: 314-993-5163

E-mail: johnl@battelle.org

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

From: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@asha.org>

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

Date: Friday, December 10, 1999 4:31 PM

Subject: Telephone focus groups

>We've done "in-person" focus groups; we've read that it's theoretically possible to conduct focus groups via conference call; and we've been asked to do some (topic: marketing of new products).

>

>Question for aaporites: does anyone have any experience(s) to recall about focus groups that were done via teleconferencing?

>

>Jeanette Janota

>

>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 13 09:11:40 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id JAA11992 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:11:38 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA00478 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:11:38 -0800

(PST)

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:11:38 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912130820270.22784-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

AAPORNETters,

This message contains the latest word on the possibility that you might suffer from a crippling computer virus sent to you via E-mail.

Several years ago, the question arose among us whether one might contract such a virus via AAPORNET. The answer then was that this is *\*not\** possible because viruses cannot be sent via E-mail.

And this remains true today. In recent months, however, a so-called "Y2K" virus has appeared which is spread via a macro contained in *\*attachments\** to E-mail.

I forward below news of such a virus, one that has already spread on the Net under the name of Professor Irving Louis Horowitz, without any question an unwitting bystander in this most cruel prank. As the second of the two messages below attests, that virus has already wiped out much of at least one person's life's work stored entirely on computer.

I myself have noticed, in only the past few weeks, that my own virus protection has begun to flag \*all\* E-mail with attachments with macros as likely to contain viruses. As a result, I have adopted the policy--as announced to all my students--that I will no longer open any submitted course work sent to me as an attachment to E-mail. I suggest that each one of you consider adopting the same policy.

As for AAPORNET, I think the safest policy is that we all agree not to post any more attachments to our messages sent here (this was a bad idea anyway, since not all members of our list might be able to open such attachments, and because these are not automatically archived online like other messages, and hence are lost to AAPOR's history).

We need not submit this proposal to a Council vote, however, because we all would remain in any case powerless to prevent any member of AAPORNET from posting whatever she or he wishes to our list--including attachments (and I doubt that many of us would want this to be otherwise). It's also possible that any one of us might post an attachment to AAPORNET in error.

Therefore, I think that the safest policy, to prevent AAPORNET from being the innocent vehicle of considerable hardship for one or more people among our ranks, is that we each one of us resolve \*not to open any attachment\* posted to AAPORNET, regardless of how well you know the person who posted it. If we cannot trust E-mail from Irving Louis Horowitz, after all, whose messages might we trust?

Will viruses ever come to spread via regular E-mail (plain ol' ASCII text), so that AAPORNET itself might one day become a threat to each of our computer files? No, that's physically impossible, as we discussed



here some years ago. If you wish to know why, just ask the youngest child you can find to explain the computer science to you. I'd tell you here myself, but my own two favorite computer consultants are still asleep at the moment.

My best wishes for the new year, and for 2K--not the virus, of course, but the millennium.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 10:19:30 -0500 (EST)

From: James Cassell <cassell@irss.unc.edu>

Subject: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message purportedly from Irving Louis Horowitz (fwd)

I'm passing this along from a colleague. Don't know exactly what was in the attachment, but it appears to be very destructive.

If anyone get one of these, (a) DON'T OPEN THE ATTACHMENT and (b) please forward it to me. I'd like to see what's in the file and maybe get a clue as to where it came from.

Since this appears to be targeted at sociologists (given the "author" and the topic of the attachment), please share this note with your colleagues.

Thanks,

James

~~~~~

~~

James Cassell

cassell@irss.unc.edu

Odum Institute for Research in Social Science

<http://www.irss.unc.edu/cassell/>

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Phone: 919/962-0782

~~~~~

~~

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:43:55 -0500 (EST)

From:

Subject: virus

Beware of a message from Irving Louis Horowitz containing an attachment called "Rushton Pamphlet". I received it, downloaded it, opened the attachment, and it DELETED virtually all the files from my harddrive (all Microsoft files for sure; nothing else seems to work either).

I fear that there may be more of these kinds of things as we approach Y2K.

\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 13 09:23:32 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id JAA22243 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:23:31 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id JAA01652 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:23:31 -0800  
(PST)

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:23:31 -0800 (PST)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Fwd: Research Fellow [2 year fixed term contract]  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912130918500.22784-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:14:29 +0000  
From: Craig Duncan <duncanc@geog.port.ac.uk>  
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu  
Subject: Fwd: Research Fellow [2 year fixed term contract]

\*\*\*\*\*

UNIVERSITY OF PORTSMOUTH  
FACULTY OF THE ENVIRONMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

Research Fellow [2 year fixed term contract]

The Department of Geography at the University of Portsmouth is seeking to employ a Research Fellow on a 2 year fixed term contract in order to work on a project funded by the Wellcome Trust examining changing mental well-being using the British Household Panel Survey.

We are looking for someone who has experience of managing and analysing large and complex datasets, especially those based on longitudinal designs. The successful applicant should also, ideally, be familiar with debates surrounding social investigations of health and well-being.

If you would like to discuss the post informally, please contact Dr Craig Duncan, Department of Geography, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, PO1 3HE, tel: 01705 842507; email: [craig.duncan@port.ac.uk](mailto:craig.duncan@port.ac.uk).

For details and an application form, please contact Personnel, University of Portsmouth, University House, Winston Churchill Avenue, Portsmouth, Hants, PO1 2UP, tel: 01705 843421; email: [jobs@pers.port.ac.uk](mailto:jobs@pers.port.ac.uk).

=====

Craig Duncan  
Department of Geography  
University of Portsmouth  
Portsmouth  
PO1 3HE

Tel: 01705 842495

E-mail: duncanc@geog.port.ac.uk

=====

\*\*\*\*\*

>From surveys@wco.com Mon Dec 13 10:02:21 1999

Received: from e4500a.callatg.com (qmailr@e4500a.callatg.com  
[206.58.250.60])

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

id KAA28244 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 10:02:21 -0800  
(PST)

Received: (qmail 17423 invoked from network); 13 Dec 1999 18:02:16 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO surveys) (216.174.193.68)

by e4500a.callatg.com with SMTP; 13 Dec 1999 18:02:16 -0000

Message-ID: <00ab01bf4593\$fedd7aa0\$02c8a8c0@dummy.net>

From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912130820270.22784-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:59:47 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Hi,

I just want to add a note to Jim's message. BACKUP ALL IMPORTANT FILES.  
Update your backups at the end of any day you make significant changes.  
Keep at least two, better three, generations of backups. That way if a  
problem damages the current file and you back it up before you realize it,  
you still have the next to latest version. If you do this the sad case  
described below won't be repeated.

> As the second  
> of the two messages below attests, that virus has already wiped out much  
> of at least one person's life's work stored entirely on computer.

Hank Zucker  
Creative Research Systems  
makers of The Survey System - Survey Software that Makes You Look Good  
[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)

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

From: James Beniger <[beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu](mailto:beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu)>  
To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 9:11 AM  
Subject: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

>

>

>

> AAPORNETters,

>

> This message contains the latest word on the possibility that you might

> suffer from a crippling computer virus sent to you via E-mail.

>

> Several years ago, the question arose among us whether one might contract

> such a virus via AAPORNET. The answer then was that this is *\*not\**

> possible because viruses cannot be sent via E-mail.

>

> And this remains true today. In recent months, however, a so-called

> "Y2K" virus has appeared which is spread via a macro contained in

> *\*attachments\** to E-mail.

>

> I forward below news of such a virus, one that has already spread on the

> Net under the name of Professor Irving Louis Horowitz, without any

> question an unwitting bystander in this most cruel prank. As the second

> of the two messages below attests, that virus has already wiped out much

> of at least one person's life's work stored entirely on computer.

>

> I myself have noticed, in only the past few weeks, that my own virus

> protection has begun to flag *\*all\** E-mail with attachments with macros as

> likely to contain viruses. As a result, I have adopted the policy--as

> announced to all my students--that I will no longer open any submitted

> course work sent to me as an attachment to E-mail. I suggest that each

one

> of you consider adopting the same policy.

>

> As for AAPORNET, I think the safest policy is that we all agree not to  
> post any more attachments to our messages sent here (this was a bad idea  
> anyway, since not all members of our list might be able to open such  
> attachments, and because these are not automatically archived online like  
> other messages, and hence are lost to AAPOR's history).

>

> We need not submit this proposal to a Council vote, however, because we  
> all would remain in any case powerless to prevent any member of AAPORNET  
> from posting whatever she or he wishes to our list--including attachments  
> (and I doubt that many of us would want this to be otherwise). It's also  
> possible that any one of us might post an attachment to AAPORNET in error.

>

> Therefore, I think that the safest policy, to prevent AAPORNET from being  
> the innocent vehicle of considerable hardship for one or more people among  
> our ranks, is that we each one of us resolve \*not to open any attachment\*  
> posted to AAPORNET, regardless of how well you know the person who posted  
> it. If we cannot trust E-mail from Irving Louis Horowitz, after all,  
> whose messages might we trust?

>

> Will viruses ever come to spread via regular E-mail (plain ol' ASCII  
> text), so that AAPORNET itself might one day become a threat to each of  
> our computer files? No, that's physically impossible, as we discussed  
> here some years ago. If you wish to know why, just ask the youngest child  
> you can find to explain the computer science to you. I'd tell you here  
> myself, but my own two favorite computer consultants are still asleep at  
> the moment.

>

> My best wishes for the new year, and for 2K--not the virus, of course, but  
> the millennium.





<http://www.irss.unc.edu/cassell/>

> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Phone: 919/962-0782

>

~~~~~

~~

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:43:55 -0500 (EST)

> From:

> Subject: virus

>

>

> Beware of a message from Irving Louis Horowitz containing an attachment

> called "Rushton Pamphlet". I received it, downloaded it, opened the

> attachment, and it DELETED virtually all the files from my harddrive (all

> Microsoft files for sure; nothing else seems to work either).

>

> I fear that there may be more of these kinds of things as we approach Y2K.

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Mon Dec 13 11:13:48 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

id LAA08241 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:13:42 -0800

(PST)

Received: from garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (garnet2-fi.acns.fsu.edu

[192.168.197.2])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA22374

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 14:12:19 -0500

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial911.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.36.47])

by garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA95690

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 14:12:17 -0500

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 14:12:17 -0500

Message-Id: <199912131912.OAA95690@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

I am going to go further. In recent weeks I have noticed that I sometimes get email from people I do not recognize with basically anonymous addresses (e.g., susan123@aol.com) or sometimes with the return address blanked out. I have now adopted the practice of deleting these messages unread.

A lot of nasty sorts out there.

Susan

At 09:59 AM 12/13/1999 -0800, you wrote:

>Hi,

>

>I just want to add a note to Jim's message. BACKUP ALL IMPORTANT FILES.

>Update your backups at the end of any day you make significant changes.  
>Keep at least two, better three, generations of backups. That way if a  
>problem damages the current file and you back it up before you realize it,  
>you still have the next to latest version. If you do this the sad case  
>described below won't be repeated.

>

>> As the second

>> of the two messages below attests, that virus has already wiped out much

>> of at least one person's life's work stored entirely on computer.

>

>Hank Zucker

>Creative Research Systems

>makers of The Survey System - Survey Software that Makes You Look Good

>[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)

>

>

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

>From: James Beniger <[beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu](mailto:beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu)>

>To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>

>Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 9:11 AM

>Subject: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

>

>

>>

>>

>>

>> AAPORNETters,

>>

>> This message contains the latest word on the possibility that you might

>> suffer from a crippling computer virus sent to you via E-mail.

>>

>> Several years ago, the question arose among us whether one might contract

>> such a virus via AAPORNET. The answer then was that this is *\*not\**

>> possible because viruses cannot be sent via E-mail.

>>

>> And this remains true today. In recent months, however, a so-called

>> "Y2K" virus has appeared which is spread via a macro contained in

>> *\*attachments\** to E-mail.

>>

>> I forward below news of such a virus, one that has already spread on the

>> Net under the name of Professor Irving Louis Horowitz, without any

>> question an unwitting bystander in this most cruel prank. As the second

>> of the two messages below attests, that virus has already wiped out much

>> of at least one person's life's work stored entirely on computer.

>>

>> I myself have noticed, in only the past few weeks, that my own virus

>> protection has begun to flag *\*all\** E-mail with attachments with macros as

>> likely to contain viruses. As a result, I have adopted the policy--as

>> announced to all my students--that I will no longer open any submitted

>> course work sent to me as an attachment to E-mail. I suggest that each

>one

>> of you consider adopting the same policy.

>>

>> As for AAPORNET, I think the safest policy is that we all agree not to

>> post any more attachments to our messages sent here (this was a bad idea

>> anyway, since not all members of our list might be able to open such

>> attachments, and because these are not automatically archived online like

>> other messages, and hence are lost to AAPOR's history).

>>

>> We need not submit this proposal to a Council vote, however, because we  
>> all would remain in any case powerless to prevent any member of AAPORNET  
>> from posting whatever she or he wishes to our list--including attachments  
>> (and I doubt that many of us would want this to be otherwise). It's also  
>> possible that any one of us might post an attachment to AAPORNET in  
error.

>>

>> Therefore, I think that the safest policy, to prevent AAPORNET from being  
>> the innocent vehicle of considerable hardship for one or more people  
among  
>> our ranks, is that we each one of us resolve \*not to open any attachment\*  
>> posted to AAPORNET, regardless of how well you know the person who posted  
>> it. If we cannot trust E-mail from Irving Louis Horowitz, after all,  
>> whose messages might we trust?

>>

>> Will viruses ever come to spread via regular E-mail (plain ol' ASCII  
>> text), so that AAPORNET itself might one day become a threat to each of  
>> our computer files? No, that's physically impossible, as we discussed  
>> here some years ago. If you wish to know why, just ask the youngest  
child  
>> you can find to explain the computer science to you. I'd tell you here  
>> myself, but my own two favorite computer consultants are still asleep at  
>> the moment.

>>

>> My best wishes for the new year, and for 2K--not the virus, of course,  
but  
>> the millennium.

>>

>> -- Jim

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>

>> ----- Forwarded message -----

>> Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 10:19:30 -0500 (EST)

>> From: James Cassell <cassell@irss.unc.edu>

>> Subject: Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message purportedly

>> from Irving Louis Horowitz (fwd)

>>

>> I'm passing this along from a colleague. Don't know exactly what was in

>> the attachment, but it appears to be very destructive.

>>

>> If anyone get one of these, (a) DON'T OPEN THE ATTACHMENT and (b) please

>> forward it to me. I'd like to see what's in the file and maybe get a clue

>> as to where it came from.

>>

>> Since this appears to be targeted at sociologists (given the "author" and

>> the topic of the attachment), please share this note with your

colleagues.

>>

>> Thanks,

>> James

>>

> ~~~~~

~

> ~

>> James Cassell

cassell@irss.unc.edu

>> Odum Institute for Research in Social Science

><http://www.irss.unc.edu/cassell/>

>> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Phone: 919/962-0782

>>

>~~~~~

~

>~

>> ----- Forwarded message -----

>> Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 09:43:55 -0500 (EST)

>> From:

>> Subject: virus

>>

>>

>> Beware of a message from Irving Louis Horowitz containing an attachment

>> called "Rushton Pamphlet". I received it, downloaded it, opened the

>> attachment, and it DELETED virtually all the files from my hardrive (all

>> Microsoft files for sure; nothing else seems to work either).

>>

>> I fear that there may be more of these kinds of things as we approach

Y2K.

>>

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>

>

>

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.



Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 13 11:17:58 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id LAA13737 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:17:57 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id LAA27662 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:17:57 -0800

(PST)

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 11:17:57 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: UPDATE on Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912131057470.5257-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

AAPORNETters,

Here's the latest on the Horowitz Worm/Virus attachment. Although I cannot personally attest to the wisdom of the advice given here (perhaps others on our list can), I can say that James Cassell almost always knows what he is talking about.

I myself am not willing to trust documents sent in rich text format (.rtf files), not because I think Cassell is very likely to be wrong, but because there is simply too much at stake to gamble.

You have all the information I now have, and can contribute your own opinions here, make your own decisions, and live with the consequences.

Oh, brave new world! (no, not Aldous Huxley--The Tempest, Act V)

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 13:24:36 -0500 (EST)

From: James Cassell <cassell@vance.irss.unc.edu>

To: James R. Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

Subject: UPDATE on Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message purportedly from Irving Louis Horowitz (fwd)

On Mon, 13 Dec 1999, James Cassell wrote:

> I'm passing this along from a colleague. Don't know exactly what was in  
> the attachment, but it appears to be very destructive.  
>  
> If anyone get one of these, (a) DON'T OPEN THE ATTACHMENT and (b) please  
> forward it to me. I'd like to see what's in the file and maybe get a clue  
> as to where it came from.  
>  
> Since this appears to be targeted at sociologists (given the "author" and  
> the topic of the attachment), please share this note with your colleagues.  
>  
> Thanks,  
> James

Lara Miller and Nancy Kutner forwarded me copies of the note in question.  
According to Norton Antivirus 2000, the attachment, a Microsoft Word  
document, is infected with the W97M.Thus.A virus.

The document, which I've included below as plain text, sounds legitimate.

My

guess is that the author unknowingly produced the document on an infected  
machine. This just seems too narrowly targeted to be a deliberate attempt to  
spread a virus.

Best,

James

PS: documents in rich text format (.rtf files) maintain all those lovely

formatting features, but (to the best of my knowledge) can't carry viruses.  
All word processors will read and write documents in this format. I suggest  
using .rtf files instead of .doc files if you must send documents as  
attachments.

~~~~~

~~

James Cassell                      cassell@irss.unc.edu

Odum Institute for Research in Social Science

<http://www.irss.unc.edu/cassell/>

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill    Phone: 919/962-0782

~~~~~

~~

To Our Friends, Readers, and Subscribers:

It has recently come to my attention that a "special abridged edition" of  
Race, Evolution and Behavior by J. Philippe Rushton has been forwarded to  
you. I can well understand the consternation of scholars with this  
unsolicited pamphlet. Indeed, I enclose several rounds of correspondence  
held  
between Professor Rushton and myself indicating my own strongly critical  
feelings about his linkage of intelligence and race. It was my hope; forlorn  
as it turned out, that he would modify if not entirely re-examine his  
previous line of research. Alas, such expectations have proven to be  
unrealistic and did not come to fruition. The author was intent on moving  
ahead with this "special abridged edition" in the firm belief in his thesis  
and his felt need for an additional public airing of his views.

We are indeed publishers of the full sized, 1995 unabridged edition - a scholarly work that received more affirmative reviews and referee reports from impeccable sources than any other of our 4275 Transaction titles. Transaction provided a publishing outlet, not an endorsement for the author's views. However, we most emphatically are not even the publishers of this pamphlet, which, unlike the original work, was not subject to peer review or editorial discussion. The pamphlet makes an incorrect reference to

Transaction as publisher. We want to emphasize this to be a quite distinct and different independent venture of the author. The author requested access to our Paine-Whitman advertising agency to assist him in mailing his pamphlet. We agreed, but forbid using any university or publishing identification in this mailing to distance ourselves from what is essentially a promotional effort by the author to promote his ideas. In this regard it also needs to be emphatically stated that no fiscal support whatsoever was either tendered or extended by Transaction to the author or anyone else in support of publication of this pamphlet.

In our 38-year history - 32 of them at Rutgers - we have taken great pride in being in the vanguard of African and African-American Studies. Indeed, if you review Transaction's Website on the Internet (<http://www.transactionpub.com>) it will be apparent just how powerful a commitment we have in these and related areas. We have also taken great care to adhere to the highest standards of university life and values. Therefore, this strange episode is one that causes me professional as well as personal pain. We have taken

measures to see that nothing like this ever happens again. That said, I offer my sincere apologies to those of you who may have taken exception or offence at receiving this unsolicited pamphlet. We just have to work harder and smarter in the years ahead to merit your confidence.

Sincerely

Irving Louis Horowitz  
Chairman of the Board  
December 1999

\*\*\*\*\*

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Mon Dec 13 12:09:18 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id MAA06504 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 12:09:17 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <YVKRJ2BT>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 15:05:12 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206EEA@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: UPDATE on Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 15:05:10 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

For more information on the likely results of this

virus see

<http://www.symantec.com/avcenter/venc/data/w97m.thus.virus.html>

"It has a payload that triggers on December 13th which will try to

delete

all files and subdirectories from the root of the C: drive."

I would encourage anyone who uses the Internet extensively to use good anti-virus software.

. . . that has such people in 't.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

[simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:simonetta@artsci.com)

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

> From: James Beniger [<mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu>]

> Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 2:18 PM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: UPDATE on Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to message (fwd)

>

>

>

>  
> AAPORNETters,  
>  
> Here's the latest on the Horowitz Worm/Virus attachment. Although I  
> cannot personally attest to the wisdom of the advice given  
> here (perhaps  
> others on our list can), I can say that James Cassell almost  
> always knows  
> what he is talking about.  
>  
> I myself am not willing to trust documents sent in rich text  
> format (.rtf  
> files), not because I think Cassell is very likely to be wrong, but  
> because there is simply too much at stake to gamble.  
>  
> You have all the information I now have, and can contribute your own  
> opinions here, make your own decisions, and live with the  
> consequences.  
>  
> Oh, brave new world! (no, not Aldous Huxley--The Tempest, Act V)  
>  
> -- Jim  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>  
> ----- Forwarded message -----  
> Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 13:24:36 -0500 (EST)  
> From: James Cassell <cassell@vance.irss.unc.edu>  
> To: James R. Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
> Subject: UPDATE on Warning! Worm/Virus in attachment to



> message purportedly

> from Irving Louis Horowitz (fwd)

>

> On Mon, 13 Dec 1999, James Cassell wrote:

>

>> I'm passing this along from a colleague. Don't know exactly

> what was in

>> the attachment, but it appears to be very destructive.

>>

>> If anyone get one of these, (a) DON'T OPEN THE ATTACHMENT

> and (b) please

>> forward it to me. I'd like to see what's in the file and

> maybe get a clue

>> as to where it came from.

>>

>> Since this appears to be targeted at sociologists (given

> the "author" and

>> the topic of the attachment), please share this note with

> your colleagues.

>>

>> Thanks,

>> James

>

> Lara Miller and Nancy Kutner forwarded me copies of the note

> in question.

> According to Norton Antivirus 2000, the attachment, a Microsoft Word

> document, is infected with the W97M.Thus.A virus.

>

> The document, which I've included below as plain text, sounds

> legitimate. My  
> guess is that the author unknowingly produced the document on  
> an infected  
> machine. This just seems too narrowly targeted to be a  
> deliberate attempt to  
> spread a virus.

>

> Best,  
> James

>

> PS: documents in rich text format (.rtf files) maintain all  
> those lovely  
> formatting features, but (to the best of my knowledge) can't  
> carry viruses.

> All word processors will read and write documents in this  
> format. I suggest  
> using .rtf files instead of .doc files if you must send documents as  
> attachments.

>

> ~~~~~

> ~~~~~

> James Cassell

> cassell@irss.unc.edu

> Odum Institute for Research in Social Science

<http://www.irss.unc.edu/cassell/>

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Phone: 919/962-0782

~~~~~

~~~~~

To Our Friends, Readers, and Subscribers:

It has recently come to my attention that a "special abridged edition" of Race, Evolution and Behavior by J. Philippe Rushton has been forwarded to you. I can well understand the consternation of scholars with this unsolicited pamphlet. Indeed, I enclose several rounds of correspondence held between Professor Rushton and myself indicating my own strongly critical feelings about his linkage of intelligence and race. It was my hope; forlorn as it turned out, that he would modify if not entirely re-examine his previous line of research. Alas, such expectations have proven to be unrealistic and did not come to fruition. The author was intent on moving ahead with this "special abridged edition" in the firm belief in his thesis and his felt need for an additional public airing of his views.

We are indeed publishers of the full sized, 1995 unabridged edition - a scholarly work that received more affirmative reviews and referee reports from impeccable sources than any other of our 4275 Transaction titles. Transaction provided a publishing outlet, not an endorsement for the author's views. However, we most emphatically are not even the publishers of this pamphlet, which, unlike the original work, was not subject to peer review or editorial discussion. The pamphlet makes an incorrect

reference to

Transaction as publisher. We want to emphasize this to be a quite

distinct

and different independent venture of the author. The author requested

access

to our Paine-Whitman advertising agency to assist him in mailing his

pamphlet. We agreed, but forbid using any university or publishing

identification in this mailing to distance ourselves from what is

essentially

a promotional effort by the author to promote his ideas. In this regard

it

also needs to be emphatically stated that no fiscal support whatsoever

was

either tendered or extended by Transaction to the author or anyone else

in

support of publication of this pamphlet.

In our 38-year history - 32 of them at Rutgers - we have taken great

pride in

being in the vanguard of African and African-American Studies. Indeed,

if you

review Transaction's Website on the Internet

(<http://www.transactionpub.com>)

it will be apparent just how powerful a commitment we have in these and

related areas. We have also taken great care to adhere to the highest

standards of university life and values. Therefore, this strange episode

is

one that causes me professional as well as personal pain. We have taken

measures to see that nothing like this ever happens again. That said, I

offer

my sincere apologies to those of you who may have taken exception or  
offence

at receiving this unsolicited pamphlet. We just have to work harder and  
smarter in the years ahead to merit your confidence.

Sincerely

Irving Louis Horowitz  
Chairman of the Board  
December 1999

\*\*\*\*\*

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Mon Dec 13 12:59:40 1999

Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net  
[199.45.39.157])

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

id MAA11890 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 12:59:36 -0800

(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net  
[151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA14031

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 16:05:10 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991213145528.00a8af00@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 15:57:58 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: How to deal with Worm/Virus attacks

In-Reply-To: <199912131912.OAA95690@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 02:12 PM 12/13/99 -0500, Susan Losh wrote:

>... I am going to go further. In recent weeks I have noticed that I  
sometimes

>get email from people I do not recognize with basically anonymous addresses

>(e.g., susan123@aol.com) or sometimes with the return address blanked out.

I

>have now adopted the practice of deleting these messages unread. ....

At 11:17 AM 12/13/99 -0800, James Beniger wrote:

>... I myself am not willing to trust documents sent in rich text format

(.rtf

>files), not because I think Cassell is very likely to be wrong, but

>because there is simply too much at stake to gamble. ....

1. Not all of my students (and colleagues) know how to use e-mail properly (yet) like including a real name in the 'from:' field and specifying a "subject". So, simply ignoring all such messages seems a bit drastic -- though safe.

2. The problem with Jim Cassell's advice is that e-mail programs do not check whether the extension of a file actually matches the format. So, you may receive an attachment called "manuscript.rtf" which matter of fact is an MS Word file containing some nasty macros. And chances are that your computer is set up to open .rtf files with MS Word (Office). I advocate the

use of rtf, but only to avoid access difficulties on the recipient's side who may have an older version or different word processing software altogether. This is by no means a safeguard against virus/worms.

3. Short of not accepting any e-mail with attachments any more (a fine rule for a list like AAPORNET, but a serious limitation of e-mail usage)

consider the following advice:

A. Install a leading anti-virus product (Norton and McAfee (NAI) are the two leaders in the field). Make sure that you install additional modules for "e-mail" and "download scan" and check on the default settings as to which type of files are scanned. Typically, you will scan "program files" only, but the list of extensions to be considered "program files" should be rather extensive. McAfee's default list includes "rtf"!

B. More importantly, keep your anti-virus software current. Given the increase in attacks, this may mean a *\*weekly\** update. Some of it can be automated, e.g. McAfee includes a "Viruscan Scheduler".

C. Set up you mail client (Eudora, Netscape, MS Outlook, etc.) "conservatively". E.g., in Eudora, don't use the MS viewer, don't allow executables in html, etc. The more you integrate your mail client with the rest of your applications the higher the risk of damage.

D. As Microsoft seems to be a favorite target of virus/worm authors, not using MS applications (MS Outlook, MS Office) reduces your risk; but this is not a sufficient strategy in itself.

For those of you using or having access to McAfee Viruscan, here are some more detailed hints:

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/anti-virus.htm>

(some stuff is Hunter specific, but a lot is not)

And if you are using Eudora as your e-mail client, you may want to have a look at:

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/email.htm#sec>

Bottom line:

Don't get paranoid, but be vigilant about keeping your anti-virus software up-to-date and run your e-mail client conservatively.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From surveys@wco.com Mon Dec 13 14:21:32 1999

Received: from e4500b.callatg.com (qmailr@e4500b.callatg.com [206.58.250.61])

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

id OAA28039 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 14:21:13 -0800

(PST)

Received: (qmail 10577 invoked from network); 13 Dec 1999 22:19:49 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO surveys) (216.174.193.68)

by e4500b.callatg.com with SMTP; 13 Dec 1999 22:19:49 -0000

Message-ID: <000a01bf45b75f9dff900502c8a8c0@dummy.net>

From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

References: <4.2.0.58.19991124194804.00999650@pop.mindspring.com>

Subject: AAPOR Award

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 13:54:39 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3



X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Hi Warren,

I did not notice that you received the 1999 AAPOR Award until now. So on the better-late-than-never principle, congrats!

Best wishes for a fine holiday,

Hank

Hank Zucker

Creative Research Systems

makers of The Survey System - Survey Software that Makes You Look Good

[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Dec 13 14:23:15 1999

Received: from elf.soc.qc.edu (elf.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.198])

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

id OAA00213 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 14:23:14 -0800

(PST)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])

by elf.soc.qc.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA27396

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 17:26:25 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)

by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA17559

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 17:23:23 -0500 (EST)

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 17:23:23 -0500 (EST)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Slate Explains Margins of Error and Confidence Intervals

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9912131722410.17544-100000@troll.soc.qc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

explainer

Are Bush and McCain Really Neck and Neck?

By Matt Alsdorf

A recent poll found that John McCain leads George W. Bush among New Hampshire Republicans by 3 percentage points, with a 5 percent margin of error. Does this mean they are really in a dead heat? Possibly. You actually need two numbers to understand a poll. One is the margin of error--an estimate of how large a discrepancy might exist between a survey's results and the true value. (It's unlikely, for instance, that 1,000 people polled in some national survey will speak accurately for all 260 million Americans. The margin of error measures just how wrong those 1,000 people could be.) The margin of error is typically 3 to 5 percent and is almost always cited alongside the results. The other important number is the degree of confidence, which is the likelihood that the real value falls within the margin of error. Most polls use a 95 percent degree of confidence, so it's usually omitted from news reports.

Here's an example of how the two numbers work together. This week, a Reuters/WHDH-TV poll showed McCain leading Bush 35 percent to 32 percent with a 5 percent margin of error. This means that there is a 95 percent chance (there's the degree of confidence) that between 30 and 40 percent of the population supports McCain (that's McCain's 35 percent plus or minus the margin of error), and a 95 percent chance that between 27 and 37 percent supports Bush.

So, based on this poll, how sure can we be that McCain is truly ahead of Bush? The answer is, Less than 95 percent sure. The reported margin of error relates to each candidate's individual score. But the margin of error on the spread (i.e., the difference between their scores) is much larger, since it incorporates the potential variations in both scores. As a rule of thumb, you can multiply the reported margin of error by 1.7 to get the margin of error for the spread. Since 1.7 times 5 is 8.5, the Reuters/WHDH-TV survey would need to show McCain with at least an 8.5 percent advantage over Bush for his lead to be 95 percent certain. Since his lead is only three percentage points, it's being called a dead heat. But the small lead is not meaningless; although it is less than 95 percent certain that McCain leads Bush, it is still more likely than not that he is really ahead.

(Visit the American Statistical Association's Web site for extensive information on common methods--and errors--in measuring public opinion.)

The Explainer thanks many Slate readers for suggesting this topic.

Next question?

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said: <http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-explainer/index.asp>

---

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

Bush and Bradley at a Crossroads?

<http://www.slate.com/Code/PunditCentral/PunditCentral.asp?Show=12/13/99&idMessage=4161>

Nothing Like a Dane

<http://www.slate.com/Code/TodaysPapers/TodaysPapers.asp?Show=12/13/99&idMessage=4160>

Chatterbox: Present at the Creation

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=12/13/99&idMessage=4162>

---

>From KAF@cbsnews.com Mon Dec 13 16:01:02 1999

Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])

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

id PAA15534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 15:57:40 -0800

(PST)

Received: from CBSNY-Message\_Server by cbsnews.com  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 18:06:13 -0500

Message-Id: <s8553595.042@cbsnews.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 18:05:12 -0500

From: Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: AAPOR Award -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Disposition: inline

Thanks!

However, I should correct something. I was given the NEW YORK Chapter's achievement award last year --- it's a little different. They promised me it wasn't meant to be a "lifetime" award!!!! Those I'm still (I think) too young for!

Best,

Kathy

>>> "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com> 12/13/99 04:54pm >>>

Hi Warren,

I did not notice that you received the 1999 AAPOR Award until now. So

on

the better-late-than-never principle, congrats!

Best wishes for a fine holiday,

Hank

Hank Zucker

Creative Research Systems

makers of The Survey System - Survey Software that Makes You Look

Good

[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)

>From murray.edelman@vnsusa.org Mon Dec 13 17:14:44 1999

Received: from libra.vnsusa.com (libra.vnsusa.com [205.183.239.99] (may be forged))

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

id RAA12614 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 17:14:43 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mail.vnsusa.org by libra.vnsusa.com

via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) with SMTP; 14 Dec 1999

01:14:15 UT

Received: by nts\_1.vnsusa.org with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <X9DHB3AJ>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 20:13:08 -0500

Message-ID: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE48C5C0@nts\_1.vnsusa.org>

From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>

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

Subject: RE: AAPOR Award -Reply -Reply

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 20:13:07 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

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

This is a good opportunity to direct your attention to the announcement of the AAPOR INNOVATORS AWARD in our latest mailing.

Unlike the AAPOR Award which recognizes a lifetime of achievement, the Innovators Award is directed toward highlighting a specific contribution to our field.

You don't have to wait. Perhaps next year, you will enjoy messages of congratulations from your peers.

I will be sending the announcement of the award over AAPORNET. Note that your nomination should be sent to Nancy Belden( [nancybelden@brspoll.com](mailto:nancybelden@brspoll.com)). However, either of us can answer questions.

Our committee will keep your nomination confidential, but unless you are careful, you may find yourself joining the legions of us that mistakenly broadcast over AAPORNET.

Murray Edelman  
AAPOR Vice President

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

From: Kathy Frankovic [<mailto:KAF@cbsnews.com>]

Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 6:05 PM

To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

Subject: AAPOR Award -Reply

Thanks!

However, I should correct something. I was given the NEW YORK Chapter's achievement award last year --- it's a little different. They promised me it wasn't meant to be a "lifetime" award!!!! Those I'm still (I think) too young for!

Best,

Kathy

>>> "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com> 12/13/99 04:54pm >>>

Hi Warren,

I did not notice that you received the 1999 AAPOR Award until now. So

on

the better-late-than-never principle, congrats!

Best wishes for a fine holiday,

Hank

Hank Zucker

Creative Research Systems

makers of The Survey System - Survey Software that Makes You Look

Good

[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)



>From murray.edelman@vnsusa.org Mon Dec 13 17:17:22 1999

Received: from libra.vnsusa.com (libra.vnsusa.com [205.183.239.99] (may be forged))

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

id RAA16536 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 17:17:20 -0800 (PST)

Received: from mail.vnsusa.org by libra.vnsusa.com

via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) with SMTP; 14 Dec 1999 01:16:52 UT

Received: by nts\_1.vnsusa.org with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <X9DHB3AN>; Mon, 13 Dec 1999 20:17:41 -0500

Message-ID: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE48C5C1@nts\_1.vnsusa.org>

From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>

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

Subject: AAPOR INNOVATORS AWARD

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 20:17:40 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

2000 AAPOR INNOVATORS AWARD

FOR SIGNIFICANT INNOVATION OR CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF PUBLIC OPINION

AAPOR has established the Innovator's Award to highlight important contributions in the field of public opinion research. The award may be made for research studies and new research techniques that improve the understanding of public opinion. We hope that the award will help expand AAPOR's role as a forum for ideas about public opinion research and lead to recognition of the value of this research FOR the development of good public

policy, governance and private enterprise.

The award is to be made to individuals or teams for work that has been made publicly available, either by virtue of publication or wide circulation of books, reports, articles or other methods for disseminating information. It is not necessary to be a member of AAPOR either to make nominations or to receive the award.

To be eligible, a contribution (or some aspect of it) must have been made public within the last five years.

Use this form, a separate letter, or email to nominate a candidate. You need not sign the nomination. Please include a statement in support of your nomination as well as a copy of the work for which the nominee is being honored. Also include supporting documentation-for example, book reviews, press releases, and news stories-anything that will make it easier to evaluate the contribution. Please feel free to nominate yourself.

Nominations must be received by February 1st in order to be considered for the Year 2000 Award.

If you have questions please contact Nancy Belden [nancybelden@brspoll.com; (202) 822-6090] or Murray Edelman [murray.edelman@vnsusa.org; (212) 947-0983] Nominations should be made by February 1, 1999 and sent to:

Nancy Belden

AAPOR Councilor at Large

c/o Belden Russonello & Stewart

1320 19th Street NW Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

---

Nominee:

---

STATEMENT:

>From PSRA2@aol.com Tue Dec 14 06:40:49 1999

Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.4])

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

id GAA02910 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 06:40:49 -0800

(PST)

From: PSRA2@aol.com

Received: from PSRA2@aol.com

by imo14.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v24.6.) id 5.0.bdae4fc7 (3847)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 09:40:16 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <0.bdae4fc7.2587b0cf@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 09:40:15 EST

Subject: Opening: Survey Methodologist/Statistician

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 39

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id GAA02917

Princeton Survey Research Associates (PSRA) announces an opening for a full-

or part-time survey methodologist/statistician.

Responsibilities include designing telephone interview samples, monitoring data quality, analyzing large government datasets, developing weights from

population parameters, documenting and reporting survey methods and serving as a survey methods resource for PSRA's diverse team of researchers.

Candidates must have a strong knowledge of applied sampling, sample weighting and statistical analysis.

PSRA is a leading survey research firm specializing in policy and social research with offices in Washington, DC, Princeton, NJ, and Fredericksburg, VA. This position may be filled in any of our three offices.

PSRA offers a competitive salary and benefits and a comfortable work environment. Our Washington, DC, office is located downtown close to the Metro.

Please fax resume and cover letter to 202.293.4757. Or email to Research.DC@psra.com or psra2@aol.com.

>From losch@csbr.csbs.uni.edu Tue Dec 14 08:42:05 1999

Received: from isc\_sun.uni.edu (isc\_sun.uni.edu [134.161.14.20])

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

id IAA24685 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 08:42:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: from csbr.csbs.uni.edu (csbr.csbs.uni.edu [134.161.220.3])

by isc\_sun.uni.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA02098

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 10:41:49 -0600 (CST)

Received: from CSBR/SpoolDir by csbr.csbs.uni.edu (Mercury 1.44);

14 Dec 99 10:42:36 -0600

Received: from SpoolDir by CSBR (Mercury 1.44); 14 Dec 99 10:42:21 -0600

From: "Mary Losch" <losch@csbr.csbs.uni.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 10:42:17 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: Effects of Time of Data Collection

X-pmrc: 1

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.12b)

Message-ID: <4332F5D1D39@csbr.csbs.uni.edu>

Dear Colleagues,

Thanks for your thoughtful responses to my query last week regarding published reports of the effects of time of data collection.

What I've learned thus far is that there is indeed much conventional wisdom but no one knew of any published studies.

As Paul Lavrakas indicated, the possible consequences of time of data collection are important for both nonresponse error which impacts overall data quality as well as for specific

attitudes/behaviors. My guess is that the potential for

"time of data collection" error may also vary somewhat

depending on the content of the survey. We have begun

to systematically look at several of these factors and

have submitted an abstract for the next AAPOR

meeting. Hopefully we'll have an opportunity to discuss

this issue further in Portland.

Thanks again for your feedback.

Mary Losch

\*\*\*\*\*

Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.

Associate Professor and Assistant Director

Department of Psychology/Center for Social and Behavioral Research

221 Sabin Hall

Cedar Falls, IA 50614

(319) 273-2105

mary.losch@uni.edu

>From cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu Tue Dec 14 10:48:24 1999

Received: from ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.5.9])

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

id KAA24602 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 10:48:00 -0800

(PST)

Received: (from cswhite@localhost)

by ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id MAA00765

for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 12:47:40 -0600 (CST)

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 12:47:40 -0600 (CST)

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

Message-Id: <199912141847.MAA00765@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

Subject: error rate per character/numeric entry - need reference

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-MD5: JnpTBpViZDP/N4SCGEfkuw==

Hi,

Can anyone offer a reference for this graduate student who has her defense next week?

Carolyn White  
University of Illinois  
cswhite@uiuc.edu

I am a graduate student at the University of Minnesota working on finishing my dissertation. I'm looking for a reference for a standard, acceptable data entry error rate (e.g., that the census might use). I want to be able to justify re-entering 5% of the data and my error rate. I was told that the census standard is 5 errors per 1000 keystrokes (.5% error rate), but I don't have a citation to back that up. Any help on this would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks very much,

Katherine

>From Silberstein\_A@bls.gov Tue Dec 14 11:10:50 1999

Received: from dcgate.bls.gov (dcbgate.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])

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

id LAA20408 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 11:10:49 -0800

(PST)

Received: from psbmail3.psb.bls.gov (psbmail3.psb.bls.gov [146.142.42.25])

by dcgate.bls.gov (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id OAA20198

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:10:19 -0500 (EST)

Received: by PSBMAIL3 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <Y605Q5F6>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:10:15 -0500

Message-ID: <308A68716B76D211A7910008C74C12E386AE9A@PSBMAIL2>

From: Silberstein\_A <Silberstein\_A@bls.gov>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Teenager Spending Behavior

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:10:12 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain

I am looking for surveys on teenagers' spending patterns. I would like to know individuals or outfits that do such studies, especially the methods used to interview teenagers.

Please reply to me only: Silberstein\_A@bls.gov

---

Adriana R. Silberstein

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Room 3650

2 Massachusetts Ave. NE

Washington, DC 20212

Tel: (202) 691-6877

---



>From Jennifer.M.Rothgeb@ccmail.census.gov Tue Dec 14 11:22:54 1999

Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])

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

id LAA07238 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 11:22:52 -0800

(PST)

From: Jennifer.M.Rothgeb@ccmail.census.gov

Received: from it-relay1.census.gov (inet-gw.census.gov [148.129.143.2])

by info.census.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA17080

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:22:18 -0500 (EST)

Received: from it008nthqIn.tco.census.gov (it008nthqIn.tco.census.gov  
[148.129.123.82])

by it-relay1.census.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3/v3.4) with SMTP id OAA22095

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:22:18 -0500 (EST)

Received: by it008nthqIn.tco.census.gov(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2  
5-20-1999)) id 85256847.006A4F95 ; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:21:11 -0500

X-Lotus-FromDomain: BOC

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc: Manuel.de.la.Puente@ccmail.census.gov

Message-ID: <85256847.006A4E08.00@it008nthqIn.tco.census.gov>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 14:21:44 -0500

Subject: New Senior Level Job Opening - Census Bureau

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

Boundary="0\_\_=ohUUdL0pXQACghAXaChXjj7q2x2YNpniNbfbyZT7VaPF4CWTwBmWDjv7"

Content-Disposition: inline

--0\_\_=ohUUdL0pXQACghAXaChXjj7q2x2YNpniNbfbyZT7VaPF4CWTwBmWDjv7

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

Content-Disposition: inline

CONTACT Dr. Manuel de la Puente, Assistant Division Chief for Survey

Methodology

if you would like more information about this position. (301-457-4997 or  
through email at: [mdelapue@census.gov](mailto:mdelapue@census.gov))

(Embedded image moved to file: pic32062.pcx)

#### RECRUITING BULLETIN

Opening Date: December 09, 1999      Bulletin Number: ASF-99-315

Closing Date: February 25, 2000

Department of Commerce

Position: Social Science Analyst/Research Psychologist/      Bureau of  
the

Census

Survey Statistician      Statistical Research Division

GS-0101/0180/1530-14,(\$68,570 - \$89,142 per year)      ADC (Survey

Methodology)

Suitland, Maryland

DUTIES: The incumbent serves as the group leader (Questionnaire Design and  
Measurement Research group) who oversees multiple related projects managed

by

others, and who also may serve as project manager for his/her own projects conducting research and development on data collection methods and other methodological topics. Responsible for developing budgets, formulating work plans, directing and carrying out research projects aimed at improving data collection and questionnaires, including establishment surveys. Coordinates project activities and work assignments with other group leaders and with other areas of the Census Bureau, and implement the research results by informing project sponsors of its value and advising others on how to incorporate the research results.

Promotion Potential: NONE

BASIS OF RATING: Applicants will be evaluated on the basis of the quality and

extent of their total experience, education and accomplishments. Ranking of candidates will measure the degree of which a candidate

--0\_\_=ohUUdL0pXQACghAXaChXjj7q2x2YNpniNbfbyZT7VaPF4CWTwBmWDjv7

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

?s background matches the

Quality Ranking

Factors for this position. TO BE CONSIDERED, APPLICANTS MUST SUBMIT A=

SEPARATE, INDIVIDUAL STATEMENT ADDRESSING EACH OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS=

:

QUALITY RANKING FACTORS:

1. Demonstrated knowledge of qualitative and/or quantitative survey research methods.
2. Demonstrated experience contributing to the literature in survey methodology and/or social or behavioral sciences.
3. Demonstrated ability in technical leadership.
4. Demonstrated experience with applying questionnaire design techniques and other techniques to improve data quality and coverage obtained from censuses and /or surveys such as, household surveys, economic surveys, population and housing census, and establishment surveys.

QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED: Social Science Analyst: A bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in one or more of the behavioral or social sciences appropriate to the position OR four years of appropriate experience which demonstrates that applicants have acquired knowledge of one or more of the behavioral or social science equivalent to a major in the field OR a combination of experience and education which provides

applicants with the knowledge of one or more of the behavioral or social sciences equivalent to a major in the field. In addition, applicants must have one year of specialized experience equivalent to the next lower grade in the Federal service. This is experience that has equipped the applicant with the particular knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to successfully perform the duties of the position and that is typically in or related to the work of the position to be filled.

Research Psychologist: Applicants must have a bachelor's degree from an accredited college/university with a major or equivalent in psychology. In addition, applicants must have one year of specialized experience equivalent to the next lower grade level in the Federal service. Specialized experience is experience that has equipped the applicant with the particular knowledge, skills, and ability to perform successfully the duties of the position and that is typically in or related to the work of the position to be filled.

Survey Statistician: Applicants must have a bachelor's degree OR a combination of education and experience equivalent to the completion of a bachelor's

s degree.

Studies must have included at least 15 semester hours of mathematics and

statistics, of which at least 6 semester hours are in statistics. In addition,

applicants must have one year of specialized experience equivalent to the next

lower grade level in the Federal service. This is experience that equipped the

applicant with the particular knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to

perform successfully the duties of the position and that is typically inherent or

related to the work of the position to be filled. Applicants MUST submit a copy

of their college transcripts or a listing of college courses showing course

number, title, grade, type (semester/quarter), and number or credit hours.

Applicants selected for position will be required to supply original transcripts.

#### COMPETITIVE SERVICE (CAREER/CAREER CONDITIONAL APPOINTMENT)

AREA OF CONSIDERATION: ALL SOURCES (To receive priority consideration, surplus

and displaced Commerce employees and displaced Federal employees must provide a

copy of their RIF notice or written notice of their expected separation=  
, and a  
current performance rating, and be rated well qualified for this positi=  
on. To  
be considered well qualified, applicants must meet the basic qualificat=  
ion  
standards and eligibility requirements satisfying all medical, physical=  
,  
suitability, education, experience, selective factors, and quality rank=  
ing  
factors for the vacant position.)

Status applicants (current and former Federal competitive employees) mu=  
st submit  
two applications if applying for both merit promotion procedures and co=  
mpetitive  
procedures. To verify competitive status, an SF-50 must be included in=  
the  
application for merit promotion. If only one application is received a=  
nd it  
does not include an SF-50, it will be considered under competitive proc=  
edures.

An SF-50 is not required from Census Bureau employees since we are able=  
to  
confirm their status. When only one application is received from a Cen=  
sus  
Bureau employee, it will be considered under the merit promotion progra=  
m. For  
consideration under the merit promotion program, all status applicants =

must meet  
all eligibility and time-in-grade requirements by the closing date of the  
announcement.

Veterans who are preference eligibles or who have been separated from the armed  
forces under honorable conditions after 3 years or more of continuous active  
service may apply under merit promotion procedures.

Complete application package for each grade level of interest must be received  
by the close of business (5:00 p.m. EST) on the closing date of this  
announcement.

Payment of relocation expenses is NOT authorized.

#### HOW TO APPLY - SEE BELOW

HOW TO APPLY: You must send a resume, Optional Application for Federal  
Employment (OF-612), or SF-171 plus any additional required material for each  
grade level of the vacancy for which you wish consideration. The following  
information is needed to evaluate your qualifications and determine if you meet  
legal requirements for Federal employment. Failure to provide this information



may result in loss of consideration.

- Bulletin number, title, and lowest grade acceptable. If you do not indicate a grade level on your application, you will be considered for the lowest grade advertised.

- Full name, mailing address (including zip code) and day and evening phone numbers (with area code)

- Social security number

- Country of citizenship (this Federal job requires U.S. citizenship)

- Veterans' Preference. Applicants claiming 10-point veteran's preference MUST submit the SF-15, Application for 10-Point Veteran Preference, with the required proof (i.e., statement from the Department of Veterans Affairs) and the latest copy of the DD-214, Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty.

Applicants claiming 10-point preference who do not submit the required documentation will receive 5-point veteran's preference. Applicants claiming

5-point veteran's preference and applying with either a resume or the OF-612

MUST attach the DD-214 to receive preference. Applicants who submit the SF-171 and properly complete blocks 17-22 may be awarded tentative preference without the DD-214, but MUST provide verification if selected.

Veterans who meet the criteria to be considered under merit promotion must submit two applications if applying for both merit promotion and competitive procedures. If only one application is received it will be considered through competitive procedures.

- Highest Federal civilian grade held (if applicable)

- Highest education level achieved. Specify: name, city, state, zip code (if known); date or expected date (month/year) of completion of degree requirements type of degree received; and graduate of foreign universities must include proof of foreign education equivalency to an accredited U.S. college/university

- Copy of college transcripts or list of college courses

- Paid and non paid work experience related to the position. For each work

experience include: Job title; Series/grade (if Federal employment); Duties and accomplishments; Employer's name and address; Supervisor's name and address; Starting and ending dates; Hours per week; Salary; and Indicate if we may contact your current supervisor/employer

- Job-related: training courses (title and year); skills (e.g., other languages, typing speed, computer software/hardware, tools, etc.); certificates/licenses (current); and honors, awards, and special accomplishments (e.g., publications, memberships in professional societies, etc.)

- Status applicants (current and former Federal competitive employees) must submit two applications if applying for both merit promotion procedures and competitive procedures. To verify competitive status, an SF-50 must be included in the application for merit promotion. If only one application is received and it does not include an SF-50, it will be considered under competitive procedures. An SF-50 is not required from Census Bureau employees since we are able to confirm their status. When only one application is received from a

Census Bureau employee, it will be considered under the merit promotion program.

For consideration under the merit promotion program, all status applicants must meet all eligibility and time-in-grade requirements by the closing date of the announcement.

- Complete application package for each grade level of interest must be received by the close of business (5:00 pm EST) on the closing date of the announcement.

If using regular mail, send to: Bureau of the Census, Human Resources Division, Merit Assignment Office, Room 1412, FB 3, Washington, D.C. 20233. If using

an overnight delivery service, send to: Bureau of the Census, Human Resources

Division, 4700 Silver Hill Road, Merit Assignment Office, Room 1412, FB 3,

Suitland, Maryland 20746. CAUTION - If using regular mail to send your

application, do not use the overnight delivery address - it may not be delivered. For more information call the vacancy information line at 301-457-4499.

**OTHER IMPORTANT INFORMATION:**

- You will be required to complete a Declaration for Federal Employment

(OF-306)

to determine your suitability for Federal employment and to authorize a

background investigation. You will also be required to sign and certify the

accuracy of all the information in your application. If you make a false

statement in any part of your application, you may not be hired; or you may be

fired after you begin work; or you may be fined or jailed.

- If you are a male over age 18 who was born after December 31, 1959, you must

have registered with the Selective Service System (or have an exemption) to be

eligible for a Federal job.

- Use of any Government agency envelopes to file job applications is a violation

of Federal laws and regulations. Applications submitted in Government envelopes

or via Government FAX machines will not be accepted.

- Disabled applicants, disabled veterans, or any other applicants eligible for

non-competitive appointment not requiring competitive status, should specify

their special eligibility on the application. Individuals with a disability may

request reasonable accommodations by calling the Human Resources Division on 301-457-3274.

- Applicants appointed through this authority are subject to a probationary period. If a vacancy is for a supervisory or managerial position, the selectee may have to serve a supervisory/managerial probationary period.

THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (DOC) DOES NOT CONDONE OR TOLERATE DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, NATIONAL ORIGIN, AGE, PHYSICAL OR MENTAL DISABILITY, OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SURPLUS OR DISPLACED EMPLOYEES  
REQUESTING SPECIAL SELECTION PRIORITY CONSIDERATION

If you are currently a Department of Commerce employee who has received a Reduction in Force (RIF) separation notice or a Certificate of Expected Separation you may be entitled to special priority selection under Department of Commerce's Agency Career Transition Assistance Program (CTAP). To receive this priority consideration you must:

1. Be a current Department of Commerce career or career-conditional

I (tenure group I or II) competitive service employee who has received a RIF separation notice or a Certificate of expected Separation (CES) and, the date of the RIF separation has not passed and you are still on the rolls of Department of Commerce. You must submit a copy of the RIF separation notice or CES along with your application.

2. Be applying for a position at or below the grade level of the position from which you have been separated. The position must not have a greater promotion potential than the position from which you were separated.

3. Have a current (or last) performance rating of record of at least fully successful or equivalent. This must be submitted with your application package.

4. File your application by the vacancy announcement closing date and meet all the application criteria (e.g., submit all required documentation, etc.).

5. Be rated well-qualified for the position. To be considered well qualified, applicants must meet the basic qualification standards and eligibility requirements satisfying all medical, physical, suitability, education,

experience, selective factors and quality ranking factors for the vacant position.

## DISPLACED EMPLOYEES REQUESTING SPECIAL SELECTION PRIORITY CONSIDERATION

UNDER THE INTERAGENCY CAREER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (ICTAP)

If you are a displaced Federal employee you may be entitled to receive special priority selection under the ICTAP. To receive this priority consideration you must:

1. Be a displaced Federal employee. You MUST submit a copy of the appropriate documentation such as a RIF separation notice, a letter from OPM or your agency documenting your priority consideration status with your application package.

The following categories of candidates are considered displaced employees.

- A. Current or former career or career-conditional (tenure group I or II) competitive service employees who:



1. Received a specific RIF separation notice; or
2. Separated because of a compensable injury, whose compensation has been terminated, and whose former agency certifies that it is unable to place; or
3. Retired with a disability and whose disability annuity has been or is being terminated; or
4. Upon receipt of a RIF separation notice retired on the effective date of the RIF and submits a Standard Form 50 that indicates "Retirement in lieu of RIF"; or
5. Retired under the discontinued service retirement option; or
6. Was separated because he/she declined a transfer of function or directed reassignment to another commuting area.

OR

B. Former Military Reserve or National Guard Technicians who are receiving a special Office of Personnel Management (OPM) disability retirement annuity under section 8337 (h) or 8456 of title 5 United States Code.

2. Be applying for a position at or below the grade level of the position from which you have been separated. The position must not have a greater pr-

omotion

potential than the position from which you were separated.

3. Have a current (or last) performance rating of record of at least =  
fully

successful or equivalent. This must be submitted with your application=  
package.

(This requirement does not apply to candidates who are eligible due to  
compensable injury or disability retirement.)

4. Occupy or be displaced from a position in the same local commuting=  
area of

the position for which you are requesting priority consideration.

5. File your application by the vacancy announcement closing date and=  
meet all

the application criteria (e.g., submit all required documentation, etc.=  
).

6. Be rated well-qualified for the position. To be considered well q=  
ualified,

applicants must meet the basic qualification standards and eligibility  
requirements satisfying all medical, physical, suitability, education,

experience, selective factors and quality ranking factors for the vacan=  
t

position.

=

--0\_\_=ohUUdL0pXQACghAXaChXjj7q2x2YNpniNbfbyZT7VaPF4CWTwBmWDjv7

Content-type: application/octet-stream;

name="pic32062.pcx"

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="pic32062.pcx"

Content-transfer-encoding: base64

CgUBCAAAAADIAXMAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAByQEBAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F  
/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////  
//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o  
/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/  
wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////  
/////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/  
yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//  
/+n/SEr//////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C////6f9ISf//////////8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L////p/0hJ  
//////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv///+n/wkn//////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C////6f9ISf/////

///8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L////p/0BR//////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/2/8H28f9ASf//////////  
8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L/9f/B7Zvx/0hJ//////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/u/6TCSch/wfbB/1FJUQDB  
/8JASchT6/9ISf//////////8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L/7P9IkKhAxP9Iwv9IwfZAweTB9sT/Uknm/0hJ  
//////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/p/0Ilf9AwfYJQMT/AMH2wf9JweRAwkjD/0iaknl/0hK////  
/////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/m/5tICEIBQACbwf9AxP+aQEIAwe1IxP8HSML/UsH/SUHi/0hJ////  
/////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/l/0IAmknB/wDB9cJAwf9Rwv/B9sz/SMH/pcH/QML/SeH/SEn/////

/////L/2f/N/8b/w//C/+P/QQDB7UBIwfbB/0AJwf8H0f+awkiaSML/SMH/AJve/0hJ//////////  
///y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/h/8H3wf9JSMH/w0hs2f9ICFLCSUCa3v9ASf//////////8v/Z/83/xv/D  
/8L/4P9JAEBIQEjB5EgH2P/B9sH/wfXCSJtASMhtwknc/0hJ//////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/e  
/8HtQMH/SMNA+m/D/SZrCQAAJwfeb2v/CSP//////////5v/B9s7/wfbD/8H2x//B9tH/wv/C9sf/  
w//C/93/weRIQML/QMH1o9//wvbB/8H1wkhAUkBI2v9ISf//////////yf8HyP/B7Zukxf/B9sMH  
w/8IwfekwffD/6TB9wfB9sP/wpucpMP/wqScpJwHwf/B9sHtU5yknMH3xv/B98JSB8T/wffEpMHT  
xv/D/8L/3f+Sfw+SSch/Cch2x/+k0v8Jwe3J/1EJAEDB98H/wffY/0hJ0f/B9un/wfbQ/wfB9wfZ  
/8L2BwjB9sH/wfbB/8H2wgfB9gjB9sT/m0qbB8f/w/ekwffF/5tSwpvCUsP/UsNKnMH2xf8JwknB  
98T/mwBIAMJIUsP/SEFJw0FJB8H/QEhBScHuuv9JwgBlwe3C/0jCAEgAQcL/B0EASMH3wv9IScl/

SMMAQQBBScb/UslAQABJw/9JQQBASMJJxf/B90jDQEkHw/9SxEbBm8L/B8RAw//CQABAww9KSMNA  
ww/B7UAAwkDC/1IAxEBlwv9IAEHDQADE/wDCSMJAScL/CcZAxv/D/8L/2//B7UIAww9IpMn/we1A  
we3P/1FApMf/wfbC/OiRw0BI2P9ISdD/m8JJw/9JQErC/8NIScL/SUibwv/CSUrB/0hJxUgAwf+k  
QUjCAEAww8AwkHCQEhJx/8JSQBAQUmbwf/B90BixEBlwfbD/0nCQEnE/8JAQciASEBJwf9JwkAA  
wkAAww+bxUBBxf8JQEhASEBIScP/AEBIw0AHww9ASMJASEBSxP9IwkBixP9JAMVAScL/SEBlw0BI  
o8H/xEBIww9Bw0Cbww9IwkDDSMML/pEDDAML/wkDC/0hAAEjCQMJIxf9IAEhASEAAm8L/SMNAw0Jf  
/wBIQEjCQEjC/0pASEBlwkBlwe7B/wfEQAnB/6RIwkAAww9SxEDC/OIAAEBlwv9KwkDDSJLC/OjC  
QMJIw0DC/wDCQEjDQErB/wgAwkDDSMb/w//C/9v/QMH1QEGbzP9ASEkHwf/B9sX/wfbD/8HkUcJI  
zP/CSEIw9K1/9ISdD/kkBlw//CQEjC/0BBAEGkwf9IQEnB/wIAQUb/0nCSMJAw0jB/6RAAEDD  
SML/w0DCSMNAweTF/8JASAIRwkDB/wmRUUAAQFGaxP/DQEGbw/+jmsJASFGbwezB/8JIQMKawevB  
5MH/CUAAQMH/SMJAwTE/8H2wkDB7AllwkBlwv/CQEjCCcT/SEDB7MH/mkBixP8AwkBlpcP/SUBI  
ww9IwkDE/0jCQMT/w0DCAMH/pABAAEibww9IQJvF/6RAwgBASsH/wkDE/5rCQJLG/5vCQMH1ww/C  
SADB/8H2SEBIyP9JQEgJww/CSJvB/8NAww8JQABAwf8HwkBIQEnB/0jEQML/UgBAAEBSwf9IxEDC  
/5LCQMb/SMJAwv9IQEjB/5JIQMHswv/CSJHB/8H2AEAJyP/E/8L/1//B9sH/wfbB/8JAUglRzP9J  
SEBIUsb/wfbC/0IIQJplzf/B5EjB/0IASdb/wkjQ/5rCQMP/SEBlwv/EQEjB/0AAScL/wkBJxP9I  
QJrD/5tAAMHtxf/DQML/wfXCQEHF/0EAScL/iJHB/8H2wv9AAEDF/8H2w0DCAMX/SMJAcCP/ScJA  
xf/B98JAAML/wevB7MH/wfbD/wnCQMP/w0DC/8JAScb/wkDB9cH/we3CQAnC/0jEQEjD/1FAAAjB  
/0hASMT/w0DE/0jEQMH/ScJAAECbww9IQEnCm6XC/6TEQEjB/8JAxP+aQACbxv9IwkDD/wIAQQnB  
/0jCQJuTpcX/QEFlx/9IQEjD/0gAQMH/wfVAwkjCQAnFQML/SQBASMJApMVAww9SAMNAQZvC/0gA  
wkAAAwkAJwf9IAEDI/wBAQcIAQcb/w//C/9z/SEDO/wLIQJnB7MIJww8Hww/B7QmakUDB/0nP/0DC  
SjPjwf/B9tP/wkjQ/5tIQMP/QABAww/FQMH/wkBJwv/CQEnE/8JAm8P/pMJAw0ISww9IQADD/8NA  
xf9IwkBIUqTF/0hASMx/SUDCSMJAx9IwkAJw/9RQMJIwkFJww9Iw0BIUsb/wfbCQMP/SABAB8H/  
w0AAwkjD/8JAQUndQMP/SEBlweRAAMP/UcNASMJAcCT/QABAxP/CSJLCQEKAQEgASJLC/OAAQCNA  
ww+kwkCSAECSwkDE/5piQJvG/wDCQMT/QACbwf9Iw0BIQFLE/8JASch/wfbF/8JISch/wfbB/0AA  
QMH/wffCQMHsxEBIwePCQML/ScJAMsVAMsJAwv9SAMRAUcL/SADFQML/w0DI/wDEQEnG/8P/ww/Y  
/wnCSZsJms//SQIjwf9Swv/CSMHtwf/B7EjB/6NASM7/wfbB/0AJSNf/wkjQ/5rCQMP/QABIww/C  
QMHkwkBJQABJwv/CQEnE/8JAm8P/wffCQEjCQEnC/0hAAMP/w0DF/wNEQABBxP/DQMX/wkDB98H1  
wkAixP9IwkAJw/9KSADDQEjC/wLIQEjCQADF/8H2wkDD/0nCQAFB/8VASMP/QABAwwgBAwevC/6TC  
QJIJwkBJww9RxBsP9IAEDE/0hAmknEQAKAQJPC/8NAw4jC/8H3AEDB/0BIQABAww//B9IFIQJvG

/8NIwf/C9sH/SECjwf9lwkBIUEjB7MT/w0DC/8P2wv9IQEnD/0jCQMH/wfVIQAlIwkDCSAnCQML/  
ScJAwf/EQEijwkDC/5pASAnF/0jCQMHRUcJAUcH/SUBIxp/B9sP/AEDB5MH/Ccf/w//C/9n/QEjC  
QNH/mpvB9sH1wv8Jwf8JwfUJSMH/wknR/wllwv+bSdT/SEnQ/5tASMP/w0DC/8JAwfVJw0AASML/  
wkBJxP/CQJLD/8H3wkBlwpqjwv9IQADD/0jCQMb/CcH0kcNAwffD/8NAXP8HQEJDQABJxP9JwkDB  
9cP/ScJAwgnF/wfB/8Hjw0BSxP8JwkDD/0BIQML/wkBixv9AwkjB6wnE/0jEQADCSML/UsJAwfXB  
/8NAXP9IwkDE/0hAUcH1xEDB/0hAksL/QEiaxf/B90hAwf+RwkAAQAnD/5JAAJLG/0hASMh2wv9R  
wkDC/0gASMj/wkhAw//CSEnB/0hASML/B8NAwf8HSEDB9aPDQJrB/8Jlww9RQEjB/0gAQAAJweTC  
QML/mwBAxv9IQEjC/0AASMH/wexIQFLC/wDCSML/wkDB98j/xP/C/9f/UknB7UDB7dL/m5Jlwf9J  
wf+Sww9lwkllkZnT/0IASMHjSdP/SUjQ/wIAAAnC/8JASML/wkAJwf/CSABAScL/wkBixP/CQFHD  
/8HsQACcxf9lwkAJwf9JwkBJxP/B7cJBwe3B/wnCQJvD/8NAXP9IwkDCSMNAXP9JAEAlw/+RQAAH  
wf/B9sL/o8JAScH/m8Jlxv9AAFJTAEBIScL/wgBBw6QHwv9ASJvG/8JASMKaSMJAm8H/SUAACcH/  
SEBBxP9IwkDE/8JAUsH/SMJAm8H/QEhSwv9IwgbJQQDB98H2B0Blwv9ASMJACcP/msJAUsf/SMNA  
QUDCSML/SMJAyf/CSEBBQMJlwfB/8HswhASABASAnB/wdASAnB/8NAwf/B9sJICcH/UkhAwv/C  
QEjB/6NIQML/o8NAAMJAww9IQEjC/0jCQML/SMNAAEBIwezC/wDDQEhAxv/D/8L/1f/B9qRASUgJ  
m9P/SMKawexlw//CSEDCSNT/msH/SElI0//CSNH/wkAASUHCQJvC/8JACMH/m8NAScL/wkBixP9I  
QFLD/8H1wkaAEEACMH/SEAAQEjCQEjG/0jGQMT/wkBixP9IQAnD/0hASMP/ScJACcP/msNASEBB  
wv/CQEjEQMb/SMRAwkjD/0jEQEhJwv9IAJvG/8JlxP9IQEnB/0IASML/msJAo8P/w0JE/8JlUsH/  
o8Jlww/CQFHC/8JlW0BlpMH/wfXCSML/weNIwkDE/5vCSJLI/0DCAEjCQMP/SMJAyf+aSEBIQEjB  
5MP/weRIw0Blw/8JwkgJwf/CSInC/8JICcH/m8Jlww/CSMHjwf8JwkjC/wnCSljDSML/mYiQwv+j  
iFDD/1FlwkBlweTD/8JliMNIxv/D/8L/1v9ISUhr1v+aCcJlw/9ImUjB7EjV/8H3wkgH0//CSNH/  
SMVASMP/QEglwv9IQEhJwv/DSMT/wkiRw/8JxEjCQAnB/8NIQEjB9ZLI/0hASEBICcT/w0jD/5LC  
SMT/UcJlw/+awkjE/8HkxkjD/0jCQMJIx//ESJkJwv/B9sH/UUhRkcJRwezC/8Kax//B68HtxP/B  
9cHsCcl/wgnD/8Jlx8Jxf/CCcz/CcL/wwnc/wnB68H00//DCdv/wfbE/8H2x//C9sf/wvbE/8L2  
wv/C9s7/x//E/8L/1v/B5EhASdb/we0JSEnD/0iamchSb9X/SMHtSUFK0v/CSNP/o5IR2v/B9v//  
/////n/3f/O/8f/xP/C/9X/SsP/mtf/m0BJwfbC/1LCSNj/SZrB/8HsSNH/SED//9H/wfbT/8H2  
/////n/wfbC/8H24P/Q/8j/xP/C/8H/1f9ASVGkktj/wfVAo8L/UknZ/0jC/5tJ0f9ASP//z//B  
9v/////r/1f/L/8X/w//B/9T/we3CQMHTQNr/UcH1wv+kmtN/mkjB/8H30v/CSP//zf8HwfbK  
/wfU/whSU8H3/////n/3P/O/8f/xP/C/9X/weTDSNr/we1IScJAm9r/wwISwffQ/8Jl0f9Jw0gA  
SfT/SEIAwezI/wlJQNL/SgDCQMJBwfb/////P/c/87/x//D/8L/1P/B98JlwwJ1//B9cH3ScNA

UUBIKsJI1/9SwkDCSDd/wkjR/8VAAEDv/8H2w//CQEnF/5tAm8H/CcJA0f9KwkBIUcJASM3/wfbC  
/8H2wf/B9v/////u/9f/zP/G/8P/wf/T/wdJwf/B40DV/8H2wf9RmIHDSJmQwkiQmkjX/8HkSUGJ  
SND/wkjR/8JACcH/m8JIwv8Hwe7C/wikwfbB/wfb7sH/pML/CMJJUsP/B0kASZzC/8HtSZvC/1JJ  
xv9Sw0klwf8HSEBIAMT/SMNAScHtQABSwkmcw/9JwgBJwv/B9sP/wkCZwv/B7FBIfw/B9qTCQQBJ  
wv9BSVJJAEnD/8NBScL/wgBJwf9KwgDB/8H3ScJAAKXB9v/////k/9L/yf/F/8L/wf/T/1IAwffB  
/ODN/8H27v9ICcH/CND/wkjR/8JAo8H3SEBIwv/CQML/SEBIwf9IAEhJCcHtSEBIQEHB9sH/xEAA  
ScH/SMJAww/CQMP/wfbB/wDCQEhASQmbSMNACcP/SUHASEAJxkDC/OnEQEjE/wnCQMhtxv8JwkBI  
QABJwf/CAEBIwkbIwf9JQEnCQEnB/8JASMH/SEAAwf9IwkJQEn/////5f/S/8n/xf/C/8H/0/8J  
kUHASc3/pEjCSrISc5IQMJISUHqxEji/0hJ0f9IwAAwkJwv/CQML/SEBIwf/DQEjB9clAmgll  
QEjB/0hAweSkQEjB/1FASML/SEDE/8H2wkDB5MH/wkBIwf/B9cJAxv/CQJrB/wfCQAFB/8JAmwfC  
QJqbwkDE/8H1wkgJxv9SQACSw0DB/0gASMH/wkBIwf9ASEDCSMH1wf/CQEjB/0jCQMH/SEDDSP//  
///l/9P/yf/F/8L/wf/l/8H3QN3/wLi/8JI0f8AQEhrSEAAwv9ASML/SEBJwf9IAEnC/8JASMNA  
AMH/SMVAwf9IAEjC/8JAXP+bQEnC/OAASML/QADG/wBAm8H/CcJAww9ASKSbxUBIwffe/0BIpMP/  
wvbB/0gASMRAwf9AAErB/8NAwf/B9cNAAJvB/OAASMH/SUBIwf/B9cJAw0j/////5f/S/8n/xf/C  
/8H/5v8HQMv/SjvC/0jL/0jB7OP/wkjR/wBACcH/wfbCQJvB/8JACMH/SEBIwf9IQMH1wv9IQMHs  
wf+bUptlwkDCCcJAwf9JAEDB/8HtwkDE/wdASMh3wf/CQADC/OAAxv9IQErB/wnCQML/SECbCUAA  
wglASAnE/0jCQMhtBwBIQMh/UcJlwf+awkDB/0hASsH/SEFIwf9JQMhtkQBIwf9IwgAlw0DB/wBA  
ScHtQEh/////5f/S/8n/xf/C/8H/5/+bpMn/SKPB/6SSiMP/mkjG/0jk/0I0f9IwkJQBICcH/  
wKAAScJAScH/wkAJwv+rSEmSQUBISUBISQDCQMH/wezCQMIAwkDF/0hAAFIaQFLC/OAAxv9JwkBJ  
wf/CQML/SUibwf9AwgDDQMX/CUBIQUncQJHC/0hASUHAScH/wkhJwf9IwkbDB/0kAwkAASMH/UcVA  
SMH/SMJASEBI/////x/0v/J/8X/wv/B/+f/wfWbxf/B9sL/ScL/SJLC/8Hkwf+SSZvG/0jk/0I  
0f9IxUCkww+jSMRAScH/wkjE/0hASEBIwv/FSEDC/OnCQEnCSMb/w0hAmsP/QEjB/8H2xf/DSMH/  
wkjC/8JlpML/iMNIx/8IwkhASKPE/1HCSJnC/1FQpMH/mVFIwv/DSFHD/5pImgnCmsL/msJlmf//  
///l/9P/yf/F/8L/wf/S/8L2wf/B9tH/CZvG/5qSSEmkSsNICZrJ/0nS/8JJCc//wkjc/wnE/8H2  
///J/8H21P/B9v/////x/9n/zP/G/8P/wv/T/OpASNH/CVLE/8HtiQmZm8L/SMP/wezESMb/SNL/  
wkjQ/8JI//////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/U/8JI0f/B9prD/5Kbwf9Swf+RSQIwe1BnMHkwe3D  
/wnF/0jV/8H2zv/CSd3/wfb//////////+P/0v/J/8T/wv/B/+j/UgibwfaSw/+aCchsmkBRwkjB  
5MHsmkjB7AnB9sT/SOT/SUD//////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C/+j/ksH/SUHAnMb/SMb/SML/m8T/  
SOT/wkjm/8H29P/B9sH3wfbK/8H2wffF/8H3CMX/pMX/m6TE/8HtU8H3x/8HUsH2xP9Sm8L/wfbB

/6NSwe3F/6T/////4P/Q/8j/xP/C/8H/6P9Swv8JSEBBUcKbUcH/QMb/SMHtUptSw/9J5P/CSND/  
SsP/SUrD/OrL/5tSxP/CUuT/SsRIB8H/wfbB90IiEnJ/6RAwkikwv9IwklKwv9SQEhJwe3C/8NI  
AML/wkiaSZvF/OIkUgHwv9Aw0jB/8H2SECawkjC/8Htwkj/////4P/Q/8j/xP/C/8H/6P9Rwf/B  
9sP/QMIAwkBIQMRIQEhAAMJAweTD/0nk/OIIOp/Cm8L/SEDC/OISwf/B9sn/UkjR/8H2wf9Iucn/  
wfbL/1JlWv8JSAAnB/OnE/1LI/0nC/5pAwf9ApML/QKXB/1JWf+RSMH/wgnC/0CSwf+bw/9IxP/B  
90jC/wlAwf9IucL/SEDB/0jD/0jC/wfB/0j/////4P/Q/8j/xP/C/8H/6P9Rwv+bCMH/mkjDQJLC  
SMH/we2aSEBlwkDCSMP/SdL/CKTQ/8JI0f9Iwf/B90hJwv9JwfbB/0pJQjvB/8HtSMJJwf+bwkBI  
UsH/mwDB/0hJwkDC/0lIwkDB90hASjvB/wDCSjvB/6TCSMJJwf/B9sf/UkjD/0hJwf9IOP/CSMH/  
ScP/SEnE/OiSw/8HSUDE/1JIm8T/UkjB/8H2wf9IcUjB9cL/pEjB7EjD/0jE/0j/////4P/Q/8j/  
xP/C/8H/1/8IOP9Jwf+bkUhJwf+akkhAweTckHsiZtSmsJASMHjSMH1wv9Jz//B9sJASEnQ/8JI  
0f9Iwf9JmsH1UsH/QML/SML/SMH/SjR/0jB/5pAwv9Iwf+bSch/SML/kUkJAML/SMH3wf/CSMH/  
UgDC/0jB/1JAwv9Iyf9SSMP/SUjB/0jB/8H2zf9TSML/SMP/wknD/1JWf/B9sL/ksJlWfbD/5FA  
UsH/we4Hwf/CSCP/QMHtSAfC/8HtSMH1SMP/SMH/wfbC/0j/////4P/Q/8j/xP/C/8H/1f9JwkjQ  
/0jB/8H2SjRb5MJAKgnB7UiJweTB7ZtASzrCQEHjSEBIUJQ/0hJQNH/wkjR/0ikSML/SJtlwv+b  
SEIAwf9RQEmbWf+bSML/QMH/m0nB/0jC/8H3SKNBwv/B48H3wf9IucH/SFLC/0jB95tlwv9Ayf+a  
SMH/wfbB/0BJwf9Awv/B9sn/wvaTQMP/ScH2wv/CSCL/B0DH/0lIwv/B9sL/QMH/mknB7Jtlw/8A  
wf9lmsL/UUjB/0jD/0jE/0j/////4P/Q/8j/xP/C/8H/1P9IwfXS/0jCCcHrWgnH/5rB68z/SNH/  
CUjB99D/SUjR/5rCSML/wkgJwv9Awv9Awfakwv9ACKNIwv9Awf+aSMH/QML/wexICUjC/0ibwf9J  
UsH/mUjC/0jB/6RIwv9Awv8Hxv+aQML/SUjC/0hJwv+jScj/UkDC9sL/SUjB/wdlwv9IQAnC9sH/  
pEnC/OiSwf9Im8H/m0DF/0hJwfZlich/CUgHm0DC/0BJwe3CSMT/SP/////g/9D/yP/E/8L/wf/U  
/0mbwklz/9Ixf/B7JFUUpvB7sH1wf9Iwe1KQUb7cH/wvbE/0jO/6RAB8H/CdH/wkjS/0iZwv/C  
SMP/QFLCSMH/wkCaSMH/wfdJwv9Iwf+aSMH/ScL/CUjB/OnDSKTB/5tlUsH/wkhJmsH/wfdIwv9I  
wv9Axv/B7cRixP/CSEBIyf9IQMJlQML/ksJACcL/xEhAwv+lwkHJwv8Jw0jD/8H2w/9IQJrD/wnC  
SAnD/5KIkCX/mv/////g/9D/yP/E/8L/wf/v/8JICcH1z/9Ixf8JweubwkDCAMH/QMIAwkjB48f/  
Sc7/SML/wfdIOf/CSNL/CcT/CcT/ownD/8H0weMJwv8Jzf9Iwv+RCMn/wfbH/0jn/8H2zv/B9t3/  
wfb/////4f/R/8j/xP/C/8H/1v/B5MJlUs7/SMX/BwnB40jCQJKaSJHCQEiSCcb/SM7/SFHB/8Ht  
SdH/SUjU/8H2wv/B9s7/wfbG/8H2xv9IwklzP/B9v7/wvbl/8H2yv/B9sL/wfb/////4//S/8n/  
xP/C/8H/1f/B98JAAM//SMT/wfbB/wmbwkjD/0jC/0iRmch/B8X/SM3/BwlAwkjs/OIA/////////  
///y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/X/0hAwkjB9sz/SMf/mcT/CUDE/8HkwezB/8H2xP9Jzf+SQEib0/9JSP//

////////8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L/1v9JQEijks3/SMz/CUDG/8H3xf9IzP/CSAmaSNP/SUj////////  
//L/2f/N/8b/w//C/9f/CZtIQAfM/0jN/0jM/0jM/8NIUdT/SUj////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C  
/9f/UUijwf9IwfxL/OnN/0jF/8H2xv9Iy//CSUCSiNT/SUj////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C/9v/  
wkAJyv9Szf+SB8r/ksHjyv9Jwf+aQEnV/0I////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/Z/8H2SJsJScv/  
Scz/msHtyf/B7UjK/OpIm8L/UdX/SUj////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C/9n/msHtwv9RSMr/wexl  
wffl/wnB/6ObyP9Smcr/wfUASUjB/0nW/0I////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/c/8NJQMv/kUnB  
98b/wfXB/0CbW//B9sL/SkgJyv/B90maQMJIwe3W/0I////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/b/8NI  
kZrN/5tJCMH/B5tRCcHrSAnB/5sHwf+kSAnM/0hASQIIdf/SUj////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C  
/9v/wfVACcHtwf9ASc7/SEDB7MNJwkhJwfvIUc3/UkHB90DCSNn/UUj////////L/2f/N/8b/  
w//C/9n/wfbC/8H3SMH/SMHjwetlz/9JSAIlo5rCSM3/wfbB/8Htw0Clidn/UUD////////L/  
2f/N/8b/w//C/97/SUDB/8HkScz/wfbD/8H1xEjP/0Ikwf+bQEII2v9RQP////////8v/Z/83/  
xv/D/8L/3v8JSVJlwfXT/wnD/8H2zP9JQADB90ik2/9JQP////////8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L/5f9J  
wkja/8H2ScP/m0BIUCt/wfbY/1FI////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/l/0BRw0mcfw/C9tP/SEDB  
48T/SN//SUD////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C/+T/SAIAmsH/SABJwf/B98P/wfbM/0nCSEIASEnD  
/1Hf/0I////////y/9n/zf/G/8P/wv/k/5tIQEnB/0DB5MH/m0AJSEBJwe3CCML/wfZKwfXD  
/1Jlwf9IkUCj5P9JSP////////8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L/6f9Iwf/B90Blwv9ACcH/SJrB5MH/QAIJ  
w//CScl/SMJJ5P+aSP////////8v/Z/83/xv/D/8L/4//B9sX/wezB/0nCQAnB/0DC/8NAwf9I  
QEjE/0ibSQfn/wn////////L/2f/N/8b/w//C/+v/CMH/m8IHQML/AMH2wv9RCUCkwfbC/wll  
o////////n/9T/yv/F/8L/wf/w/6TC/8NIwf/DSP////////r/9X/y//F/8P/wf//  
////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////  
//o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F  
/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////  
////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o  
/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/  
wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////  
/////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/  
yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf//  
////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////  
//o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf////////o/9T/yv/F/8P/wf8MAAAAgAAAAIAAgIAAAACAgACA



AICAwMDAwNzApsrwQCAAYCAAqCAAoCAAwCAA4CAAEEAAIEAAQEAAAYEAAgEAAoEAAwEAA4EAAAGAA  
IGAAQGAAYGAAgGAAoGAAwGAA4GAAAIAAIIAAQIAAYIAAgIAAoIAAwIAA4IAAAKAAIKAAQKAAYKAA  
gKAAoKAAwKAA4KAAAMAAIMAAQMAAYMAAgMAAoMAAwMAA4MAAAOAAIOAAQOAAyOAAgOAAoOA  
AwOAA  
4OAAAABAIABAQABAYABAgABAoABAwABA4ABAACBAICBAQCBAyCBAgCBAoCBAwCBA4CBAAEBAIEBA  
QEBAYEBAgEBAoEBAwEBA4EBAAGBAIGBAQGBAYGBAgGBAoGBAwGBA4GBAAIBAIIBAQIBAYIBAgIBA  
oIBAwIBA4IBAAKBAIKBAQKBAYKBAgKBAoKBAwKBA4KBAAMBAMBAQMBAYMBAgMBAoMBAwMBA4MBA  
A  
AOBAIOBAQOBAYOBAGOBaoOBawOBA4OBAAACAIACAQACAYACAgACAoACAwACA4ACAACCAICCAQCCA  
YCCAgCCAoCCAwCCA4CCAAECAIECAQECAYECAgECAoECAwECA4ECAAGCAIGCAQGCAYGCAgGCAoGCA  
wGCA4GCAAICAIICAQICAYICAgICAoICAwICA4ICAAKCAIKCAQKCAyKCAgKCAoKCAwKCA4KCAAMCA  
IMCAQMCAyMCAgMCAoMCAwMCA4MCAAOCaIOCAQOCAYOCAgOCAoOCAwOCA4OCAAADAIADAQADA  
YADA  
gADAoADAwADA4ADAACDAICDAQCDAYCDAGCDAoCDAwCDA4CDAAEDAIEDAQEDAYEDAgEDAoEDAwEDA  
4EDAAGDAIGDAQGDAYGDAgGDAoGDawGDA4GDAAIDAIIIDAQIDAYIDAgIDAoIDAwIDA4IDAAKDAIKDA  
QKDAYKDAgKDAoKDAwKDA4KDAAMDAlMDAQMDAYMDAgMDAoMDA//vwoKCKgICA/wAAAP8A//8AAAD  
/  
/wD/AP/////

--0\_\_=ohUUdL0pXQACghAXaChXjj7q2x2YNpniNbfbyZT7VaPF4CWTwBmWDjv7--

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 14 11:27:04 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA12960 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 11:27:03 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA09101 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 11:27:05 -0800  
(PST)

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 11:27:04 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912141059470.16649-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Folks,

Yesterday I received the following message, which the sender suggested that I might post to AAPORNET, but which could only be done anonymously.

Because the soul inside me does not much like anonymous postings to a free and open discussion, I shall take full responsibility myself for this message. So if you share my own dislike for anonymous postings, please accept this as something that comes from me, and respond with that in mind.

How could you ever be certain, after all, that I am *\*not\** the author?

The true author will also see what you post, and can be reached via me--either publicly or privately--if you have any questions to ask, or private messages to convey.

And I state here my own strong hope that the author will eventually come forth to join publicly in the discussion.

-- Jim

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 22:59:04

To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu

Subject: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Hi Jim,

I just received the solicitation below -- from Harris to participate in one of their on-line polls. After responding to one several months ago out of sheer curiosity about the method, I have received similar messages on roughly a biweekly basis.

My first thought was about the representativeness of their sampling -- and the frequency of their polling -- since I get asked so frequently. But my doubts about the methodology of on-line polling aside, one thing's certain: the sheer prolificacy of the mail has forced me to treat the Harris Polls the same way I treat all other spam: by hitting <delete>!

The reason why I forward this one to you, in particular, is because I have noticed an increasing use of provocative (and, arguably, shameless) efforts by Harris to improve their response. A few months ago, there was a "personal" appeal by "Gordon Black, CEO" to respond to a medically oriented survey because Gordon, himself, apparently suffered from the condition. Now, they are resorting to subject lines with sexual and subversive overtones in order to get the "respondent" to open the mail.

I am curious to know what your views are on this -- and if AAPORites find practices like this acceptable.

I would have posted this to the list, but I really don't want to cause a ruckus or be a thorn in the side of Harris. Perhaps such criticism would be taboo to such titans as Harris/Black; you would know better than I would.

If you feel like this is good material for discussion on AAPORnet, please do forward it along. But, if I could ask, please do so anonymously. Many thanks.

Take care and best for the holiday.

Yours,

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

From: Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsbc.com [mailto:Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsbc.com]

Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 9:02 PM

To:

Subject: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Hello! Harris Poll Online is currently conducting a survey regarding recent activities and would like to include your opinions. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes.

After all of the results are in, we will send you the URL for a private web site where the results of the survey will be posted... and you can discover what your neighbors are doing!

To participate in this survey, please proceed to:

<http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?>

When prompted, please enter the password below.

Password:

AOL users, we encourage you to minimize the AOL window and opt to use a browser such as Netscape or Internet Explorer when taking Harris Poll Online surveys. These browsers connect directly to our surveys resulting in a quicker connection and overall better survey experience.

Or, if you cannot use another browser, please use the following link:

<A

[HREF="http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?"](http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?)>Harris Poll Online Recent Activities Survey</A>

We thank you for your time and look forward to your participation.

\*\*\*\*\*

You have received this invitation from the Harris Poll Online because your e-mail address was selected at random from the Harris Poll Online's registry of members. You (or someone using your e-mail address) may have become a member of the Harris Poll Online in one of several ways:

- (a) Registering directly with us;
- (b) Entering a sweepstakes sponsored by MatchLogic (which includes DeliverE and Preferences.com) and, in doing so, opting in to participate in the Harris Poll Online; or
- (c) Signing up for free products and services from Excite or Netscape and, in doing so, opting in to participate in the Harris Poll Online.

If you wish to be excluded from Harris Poll Online mailings, please reply to this message with "unsubscribe" written in the subject heading.

If you have any other concerns or questions, please email our webmaster at [webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com](mailto:webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com).

\*\*\*\*\*

>From HOneill536@aol.com Tue Dec 14 12:07:07 1999

Received: from imo-d09.mx.aol.com (imo-d09.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.41])

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

id MAA27189 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 12:07:04 -0800

(PST)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

by imo-d09.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v24.6.) id 5.0.73994a81 (3871)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 15:06:24 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <0.73994a81.2587fd40@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 15:06:24 EST

Subject: Re: Slate Explains Margins of Error and Confidence Intervals

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38

nice explanation of margin or error - but margin of error is expressed in terms of percentage points NOT as a percent. there is a difference.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Dec 14 13:07:38 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id NAA06718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 13:07:31 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp3.vgernet.net [205.219.186.103])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id RAA25377;

Tue, 14 Dec 1999 17:30:21 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3856B0B3.CBE87E27@jwdp.com>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:03:47 -0500

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Harry O'Neill" <HOneill536@aol.com>, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Slate Explains Margins of Error and Confidence Intervals

References: <0.73994a81.2587fd40@aol.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Even though the article was useful in terms of the ideas presented and the example given, I found the actual explanation to be so garbled as to be useless in terms of understanding what the "margin of error" represents.

My impression was that the author clearly did not understand the concept of sampling error in the first place. He appears to have asked a statistician and reported the answer he got with no more comprehension afterward than before.

This is too bad, because there are a number of good books that explain sampling error in terms that even a journalist should be able to understand.

My favorite is "The Opinion Connection" by Albert Cantril (CQ Press, 1991), because it not only presents extremely clear explanations of the concepts in the context of political polls, but also has excellent discussions by knowledgeable practitioners of the issues involved and how they are reported in the press.

Jan Werner

---

HOneill536@aol.com wrote:

>

> nice explanation of margin or error - but margin of error is expressed in

> terms of percentage points NOT as a percent. there is a difference.



>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Dec 14 13:18:32 1999

Received: from elf.soc.qc.edu (elf.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.198])

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

id NAA18733 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 13:18:26 -0800

(PST)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])

by elf.soc.qc.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA29220;

Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:21:18 -0500 (EST)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (andy2000 [149.4.9.188])

by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA21723;

Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:18:16 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3856B411.910F344F@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:18:09 -0500

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: error rate per character/numeric entry - need reference

References: <199912141847.MAA00765@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Carolyn:

Tell your graduate student to call the people at the IPUMS project and ask them about error rates for data entry. They have investigated it a great

deal since they are entering early CENSUS data.

They are at Minnesota!

They are at [www.ipums.umn.edu](http://www.ipums.umn.edu).

Andy Beveridge

Carolyn White wrote:

> Hi,

>

> Can anyone offer a reference for this graduate student who has her defense  
> next week?

>

> Carolyn White

> University of Illinois

> [cwhite@uiuc.edu](mailto:cwhite@uiuc.edu)

>

> I am a graduate student at the

> University of Minnesota working on finishing my dissertation. I'm looking

> for a reference for a standard,

> acceptable data entry error rate (e.g., that the census might use). I

want

> to be able to justify re-entering 5% of the data and my error rate. I

was

> told that the census standard is 5 errors per 1000 keystrokes (.5% error

> rate), but I don't have a citation to back that up. Any help on this

would

> be greatly appreciated.

>

> Thanks very much,

>

> Katherine

>From pricard@CAM.ORG Tue Dec 14 13:21:59 1999

Received: from Hydro.CAM.ORG (Hydro.CAM.ORG [198.168.100.7])

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

id NAA22463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 13:21:58 -0800

(PST)

Received: from phil1 (Dialup-978.HIP.CAM.ORG [205.205.139.30])

by Hydro.CAM.ORG (8.8.8/8.8.4) with SMTP

id QAA02065 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:21:16 -0500

(EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19991214162639.0083d8b0@pop.hip.cam.org>

X-Sender: pricard@pop.hip.cam.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:26:39 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Philippe Ricard <pricard@CAM.ORG>

Subject: Re: Teenager Spending Behavior

In-Reply-To: <308A68716B76D211A7910008C74C12E386AE9A@PSBMAIL2>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Hi Adriana,

In 1996, I conducted a survey on the economic living conditions of  
community college students in the province of Quebec (n=3000). I did a

detailed analysis of their budget and their spending habits, and the impact of these conditions on their academic performance. I used a self-administered questionnaire (around 300 questions in English and French). I can give you more detailed information at a later time.

Philippe Ricard

At 14:10 14/12/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>

>I am looking for surveys on teenagers' spending patterns. I would like to know individuals or outfits that do such studies, especially the methods used to interview teenagers.

>

>Please reply to me only: Silberstein\_A@bls.gov

>\_\_\_\_\_

>

>Adriana R. Silberstein

>Bureau of Labor Statistics

>Room 3650

>2 Massachusetts Ave. NE

>Washington, DC 20212

>Tel: (202) 691-6877

>\_\_\_\_\_

>

>

>

>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Tue Dec 14 13:39:56 1999

Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156])

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

id NAA12470 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 13:39:55 -0800 (PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA28258

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:37:58 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991214154817.00a3ef00@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 16:36:14 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912141059470.16649-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 11:27 AM 12/14/99 -0800, James Beniger wrote:

> .... Yesterday I received the following message, which the sender suggested

>that I might post to AAPORNET, but which could only be done anonymously.

>.....

First of all, I see no reason at all to post this anonymously. If someone wants to criticize Harris, then he/she should do it out in the open and put his/her name to it. The only acceptable exception would be a "whistle

blowing" case, someone inside an organization revealing dubious practices, but fearing for his/her job. What we have here is just plain cowardice -- or worse, a sneaky way trying to hurt a competitor. There should be no room for this on AAPORNET.

As to substance, I think one needs a vivid imagination to characterize this sales pitch as "sexual and subversive". ("Now, they are resorting to subject lines with sexual and subversive overtones in order to get the "respondent" to open the mail.") Maybe, they even have satanic images hidden on the questionnaire screens?

Seriously, it may *\*not\** be a wise decision to use a bit of humor in a cover letter, as what some people find funny others may find offensive. And there may be considerable regional differences. See, e.g., the hilarious story in the NYT of Nov 7, 1999 on "combat pay" for telephone interviewers for calling people in NYC. (If you have access to Lexis-Nexis, you can get the story there for free, use "telemarketing" and "Zogby" as search terms along with the date -- or pay \$2.50 to get it from the NYT's own archive.)

Several months ago, I posted some critical comments about Harris's online questionnaires and their respondent selection procedures myself (it may have been on POR rather than AAPORNET). And I (i.e., any of my online personalities) have not received another invitation to a Harris online poll in a while, but my guess is that their system still needs some fine tuning rather than that Harris engages in dark practices.

Do you know what other survey organizations (and their interviewers) are doing to get people to participate in their surveys? :-)

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Tue Dec 14 15:17:34 1999

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])

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

id PAA03385 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 15:17:32 -0800

(PST)

Received: from fgsdfg.harvard.edu (sph76-224.harvard.edu [128.103.76.224])

by hsph.harvard.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA25593

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 18:17:04 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991214180413.0095cb70@hsph.harvard.edu>

X-Sender: jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 18:15:41 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "John T. Young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>

Subject: Re: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912141059470.16649-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Jim,

i have to agree with the thrust of manfred's first paragraph, which

follows. "First of all, I see no reason at all to post this anonymously.

If someone wants to criticize Harris, then he/she should do it out in the

open and put his/her name to it. The only acceptable exception would be a

"whistle blowing" case, someone inside an organization revealing dubious

practices, but fearing for his/her job. What we have here is just plain cowardice -- or worse, a sneaky way trying to hurt a competitor.

There should be no room for this on AAPORNET."

john young

At 11:27 AM 12/14/99 -0800, you wrote:

>Folks,

>

>Yesterday I received the following message, which the sender suggested  
>that I might post to AAPORNET, but which could only be done anonymously.

>

>Because the soul inside me does not much like anonymous postings to a  
>free and open discussion, I shall take full responsibility myself for this  
>message. So if you share my own dislike for anonymous postings, please  
>accept this as something that comes from me, and respond with that in  
>mind.

>

>How could you ever be certain, after all, that I am \*not\* the author?

>

>The true author will also see what you post, and can be reached via  
>me--either publicly or privately--if you have any questions to ask, or  
>private messages to convey.

>

>And I state here my own strong hope that the author will eventually come  
>forth to join publicly in the discussion.

>



> -- Jim

>

>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 22:59:04

>To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu

>Subject: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

>

>Hi Jim,

>

>I just received the solicitation below -- from Harris to participate in one  
>of their on-line polls. After responding to one several months ago out of  
>sheer curiosity about the method, I have received similar messages on  
>roughly a biweekly basis.

>

>My first thought was about the representativeness of their sampling -- and  
>the frequency of their polling -- since I get asked so frequently. But my  
>doubts about the methodology of on-line polling aside, one thing's certain:  
>the sheer prolificacy of the mail has forced me to treat the Harris Polls  
>the same way I treat all other spam: by hitting <delete>!

>

>The reason why I forward this one to you, in particular, is because I have  
>noticed an increasing use of provocative (and, arguably, shameless) efforts  
>by Harris to improve their response. A few months ago, there was a  
>"personal" appeal by "Gordon Black, CEO" to respond to a medically oriented  
>survey because Gordon, himself, apparently suffered from the condition.  
>Now, they are resorting to subject lines with sexual and subversive  
>overtones in order to get the "respondent" to open the mail.

>

>I am curious to know what your views are on this -- and if AAPORites find

>practices like this acceptable.

>

>I would have posted this to the list, but I really don't want to cause a

>ruckus or be a thorn in the side of Harris. Perhaps such criticism would  
be

>taboo to such titans as Harris/Black; you would know better than I would.

>

>If you feel like this is good material for discussion on AAPORnet, please  
do

>forward it along. But, if I could ask, please do so anonymously. Many

>thanks.

>

>Take care and best for the holiday.

>

>Yours,

>

>

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

>From: Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsbc.com [mailto:Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsbc.com]

>Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 9:02 PM

>To:

>Subject: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

>

>

>Hello! Harris Poll Online is currently conducting a survey

>regarding recent activities and would like to include your

>opinions. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes.

>After all of the results are in, we will send you the URL for

>a private web site where the results of the survey will be

>posted... and you can discover what your neighbors are doing!

>

>To participate in this survey, please proceed to:

>

><http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?>

>

>When prompted, please enter the password below.

>

>Password:

>

>AOL users, we encourage you to minimize the AOL window

>and opt to use a browser such as Netscape or Internet

>Explorer when taking Harris Poll Online surveys. These browsers

>connect directly to our surveys resulting in a quicker connection

>and overall better survey experience.

>

>Or, if you cannot use another browser, please use the following link:

><A

>HREF="http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?">Harri

>s Poll Online Recent Activities Survey</A>

>

>We thank you for your time and look forward to your participation.

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>You have received this invitation from the Harris

>Poll Online because your e-mail address was selected at

>random from the Harris Poll Online's registry of members.

>You (or someone using your e-mail address) may have become

>a member of the Harris Poll Online in one of several ways:

>

>(a) Registering directly with us;

>(b) Entering a sweepstakes sponsored by MatchLogic (which

>includes DeliverE and Preferences.com) and, in doing so,

>opting in to participate in the Harris Poll Online; or

>(c) Signing up for free products and services from Excite or

>Netscape and, in doing so, opting in to participate in the

>Harris Poll Online.

>

>If you wish to be excluded from Harris Poll Online mailings,

>please reply to this message with "unsubscribe" written in

>the subject heading.

>

>If you have any other concerns or questions, please email

>our webmaster at [webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com](mailto:webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com).

>

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>From [ande271@attglobal.net](mailto:ande271@attglobal.net) Tue Dec 14 19:34:16 1999

Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [165.87.194.229])

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

id TAA22335 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 14 Dec 1999 19:34:15 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default ([32.100.112.50]) by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP

id <1999121503340722903no8k0e>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 03:34:09 +0000

Message-ID: <38573777.1D80@attglobal.net>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 22:38:47 -0800

From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>

Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912141059470.16649-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

James Beniger wrote:

>

> Folks,

>

> Yesterday I received the following message, which the sender suggested

> that I might post to AAPORNET, but which could only be done anonymously.

>

> Because the soul inside me does not much like anonymous postings to a

> free and open discussion, I shall take full responsibility myself for this

> message. So if you share my own dislike for anonymous postings, please

> accept this as something that comes from me, and respond with that in

> mind.

>

> How could you ever be certain, after all, that I am *\*not\** the author?

>

> The true author will also see what you post, and can be reached via

> me--either publicly or privately--if you have any questions to ask, or

> private messages to convey.

>

> And I state here my own strong hope that the author will eventually come  
> forth to join publicly in the discussion.

>

> -- Jim

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 22:59:04

> To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu

> Subject: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

>

> Hi Jim,

>

> I just received the solicitation below -- from Harris to participate in  
one

> of their on-line polls. After responding to one several months ago out  
of

> sheer curiosity about the method, I have received similar messages on

> roughly a biweekly basis.

>

> My first thought was about the representativeness of their sampling -- and

> the frequency of their polling -- since I get asked so frequently. But my

> doubts about the methodology of on-line polling aside, one thing's

certain:

> the sheer prolificacy of the mail has forced me to treat the Harris Polls

> the same way I treat all other spam: by hitting <delete>!

>

> The reason why I forward this one to you, in particular, is because I have

> noticed an increasing use of provocative (and, arguably, shameless)

efforts

> by Harris to improve their response. A few months ago, there was a  
> "personal" appeal by "Gordon Black, CEO" to respond to a medically  
oriented  
> survey because Gordon, himself, apparently suffered from the condition.  
> Now, they are resorting to subject lines with sexual and subversive  
> overtones in order to get the "respondent" to open the mail.  
>  
> I am curious to know what your views are on this -- and if AAPORites find  
> practices like this acceptable.  
>  
> I would have posted this to the list, but I really don't want to cause a  
> ruckus or be a thorn in the side of Harris. Perhaps such criticism would  
be  
> taboo to such titans as Harris/Black; you would know better than I would.  
>  
> If you feel like this is good material for discussion on AAPORnet, please  
do  
> forward it along. But, if I could ask, please do so anonymously. Many  
> thanks.  
>  
> Take care and best for the holiday.  
>  
> Yours,  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsb.com [mailto:Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsb.com]  
> Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 9:02 PM  
> To:  
> Subject: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

>

> Hello! Harris Poll Online is currently conducting a survey  
> regarding recent activities and would like to include your  
> opinions. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes.  
> After all of the results are in, we will send you the URL for  
> a private web site where the results of the survey will be  
> posted... and you can discover what your neighbors are doing!

>

> To participate in this survey, please proceed to:

>

> <http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?>

>

> When prompted, please enter the password below.

>

> Password:

>

> AOL users, we encourage you to minimize the AOL window  
> and opt to use a browser such as Netscape or Internet  
> Explorer when taking Harris Poll Online surveys. These browsers  
> connect directly to our surveys resulting in a quicker connection  
> and overall better survey experience.

>

> Or, if you cannot use another browser, please use the following link:

> <A

> HREF="http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?">Harri  
> s Poll Online Recent Activities Survey</A>

>

> We thank you for your time and look forward to your participation.

>



> \*\*\*\*\*

>

> You have received this invitation from the Harris

> Poll Online because your e-mail address was selected at

> random from the Harris Poll Online's registry of members.

> You (or someone using your e-mail address) may have become

> a member of the Harris Poll Online in one of several ways:

>

> (a) Registering directly with us;

> (b) Entering a sweepstakes sponsored by MatchLogic (which

> includes DeliverE and Preferences.com) and, in doing so,

> opting in to participate in the Harris Poll Online; or

> (c) Signing up for free products and services from Excite or

> Netscape and, in doing so, opting in to participate in the

> Harris Poll Online.

>

> If you wish to be excluded from Harris Poll Online mailings,

> please reply to this message with "unsubscribe" written in

> the subject heading.

>

> If you have any other concerns or questions, please email

> our webmaster at [webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com](mailto:webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com).

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

A discussion of methods used to secure wider participation in on-line surveys might be inviting and worthwhile for AAPOR members if there were no reference to Harris/Black specifically (but only to a research firm) but the (anonymous) author identified himself or herself. Under those circumstances the author would be behaving more ethically as well.

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 15 06:43:53 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id GAA18802 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 06:43:52 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <Y8SLLBB7>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 09:39:14 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206F0A@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Date: Wed, 15 Dec 1999 09:39:12 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

> A discussion of methods used to secure wider participation in on-line  
> surveys might be inviting and worthwhile for AAPOR members if  
> there were  
> no reference to Harris/Black specifically (but only to a  
> research firm)  
> but the (anonymous) author identified himself or herself. Under those  
> circumstances the author would be behaving more ethically as well.

While I tend dislike the concept of anonymous postings in general I  
think

impugning the ethic of someone who does so is precipitous. It is

difficult to

discern an anonymous posters motives and what may look like a campaign

to

tarnish an individual company may actually be a methodological concern.

Of course, your mileage may vary.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Wed Dec 15 08:37:28 1999

Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])

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

id IAA24684 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 08:37:25 -0800

(PST)

Received: from SRBI\_NEW\_YORK-Message\_Server by srbi.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 11:33:19 -0500

Message-Id: <s8577c7f.046@srbi.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Wed, 15 Dec 1999 11:32:26 -0500

From: "MARK Schulman" <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Internet Polling to be Major Topic at AAPOR 2000 Conference

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id IAA24697

Just a reminder, the Portland AAPOR Conference will present perhaps the most comprehensive review thus far of internet polling, its pros and cons. The AAPOR Conference Committee is making a special effort to encourage papers and panels to examine internet polling issues. We expect to have multiple panels on this subject. Representatives of internet polling firms and academic researchers will be presenting. The Friday evening Plenary will also be centered on the impact of the Internet.

Please mark off May 18-21 (May 17 if you plan to attend the WAPOR conference) on your calendars. We will be providing more detailed information about panels, presentations, etc. in early February.

>>> James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 12/14/99 02:27PM >>>

Folks,

Yesterday I received the following message, which the sender suggested that I might post to AAPORNET, but which could only be done anonymously.

Because the soul inside me does not much like anonymous postings to a free and open discussion, I shall take full responsibility myself for this message. So if you share my own dislike for anonymous postings, please accept this as something that comes from me, and respond with that in mind.

How could you ever be certain, after all, that I am \*not\* the author?

The true author will also see what you post, and can be reached via me--either publicly or privately--if you have any questions to ask, or private messages to convey.

And I state here my own strong hope that the author will eventually come forth to join publicly in the discussion.

-- Jim

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 22:59:04

To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu

Subject: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Hi Jim,

I just received the solicitation below -- from Harris to participate in one of their on-line polls. After responding to one several months ago out of sheer curiosity about the method, I have received similar messages on roughly a biweekly basis.

My first thought was about the representativeness of their sampling -- and the frequency of their polling -- since I get asked so frequently. But my doubts about the methodology of on-line polling aside, one thing's certain: the sheer prolificacy of the mail has forced me to treat the Harris Polls the same way I treat all other spam: by hitting <delete>!

The reason why I forward this one to you, in particular, is because I have

noticed an increasing use of provocative (and, arguably, shameless) efforts by Harris to improve their response. A few months ago, there was a "personal" appeal by "Gordon Black, CEO" to respond to a medically oriented survey because Gordon, himself, apparently suffered from the condition. Now, they are resorting to subject lines with sexual and subversive overtones in order to get the "respondent" to open the mail.

I am curious to know what your views are on this -- and if AAPORites find practices like this acceptable.

I would have posted this to the list, but I really don't want to cause a ruckus or be a thorn in the side of Harris. Perhaps such criticism would be taboo to such titans as Harris/Black; you would know better than I would.

If you feel like this is good material for discussion on AAPORnet, please do forward it along. But, if I could ask, please do so anonymously. Many thanks.

Take care and best for the holiday.

Yours,

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

From: Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsbc.com [mailto:Harris\_Poll@hpol.gsbc.com]

Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 9:02 PM

To:

Subject: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Hello! Harris Poll Online is currently conducting a survey regarding recent activities and would like to include your opinions. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes. After all of the results are in, we will send you the URL for a private web site where the results of the survey will be posted... and you can discover what your neighbors are doing!

To participate in this survey, please proceed to:

<http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?>

When prompted, please enter the password below.

Password:

AOL users, we encourage you to minimize the AOL window and opt to use a browser such as Netscape or Internet Explorer when taking Harris Poll Online surveys. These browsers connect directly to our surveys resulting in a quicker connection and overall better survey experience.

Or, if you cannot use another browser, please use the following link:

<A

href="http://www.harrispollonline.com/surveys/ipdec13j.htm?">Harris Poll Online Recent Activities Survey</A>

We thank you for your time and look forward to your participation.

\*\*\*\*\*

You have received this invitation from the Harris Poll Online because your e-mail address was selected at random from the Harris Poll Online's registry of members. You (or someone using your e-mail address) may have become a member of the Harris Poll Online in one of several ways:

- (a) Registering directly with us;
- (b) Entering a sweepstakes sponsored by MatchLogic (which includes DeliverE and Preferences.com) and, in doing so, opting in to participate in the Harris Poll Online; or
- (c) Signing up for free products and services from Excite or Netscape and, in doing so, opting in to participate in the Harris Poll Online.

If you wish to be excluded from Harris Poll Online mailings, please reply to this message with "unsubscribe" written in the subject heading.

If you have any other concerns or questions, please email our webmaster at [webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com](mailto:webmaster@hpol.gsbc.com).

\*\*\*\*\*

>From RobFarbman@aol.com Wed Dec 15 08:40:29 1999

Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.6])

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



id IAA26966 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 08:40:28 -0800

(PST)

From: RobFarbman@aol.com

Received: from RobFarbman@aol.com

by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v24.6.) id 5.0.fb384232 (3976)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 11:39:51 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <0.fb384232.25891e56@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 15 Dec 1999 11:39:50 EST

Subject: Job Posting - Market Research Analyst

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 228

Market Research Analyst

Edison Media Research, a small, rapidly growing market research company located in Central New Jersey is seeking candidates with one to five years experience in a market or media research environment. In this position you will be responsible for coordinating research projects from questionnaire development through data analysis and presentation.

The ideal candidate should be detail-oriented and self-motivated, with the ability to handle multiple tasks in a fast-paced environment. An interest in media, music and pop culture is a plus. Computer skills essential.

We offer excellent salary with bonus potential. Benefits package includes

401(k) with employer match and employer-paid health insurance.

Edison Media Research conducts survey research and provides strategic information to radio stations, television stations, newspapers, cable networks, record labels and other media organizations.

Edison Media Research has been recognized by Advertising Age as one of the fastest growing research companies in America. Our clients include CBS News, CNN, The Country Music Association, Maverick Records, The New York Times, The Cleveland Cavs, Sony Music, Time-Life Music, The Washington Post and over 200 radio stations.

Please mail, fax or email resume, which must include salary requirements to:

Edison Media Research  
6 West Cliff Street  
Somerville, NJ 08876  
Fax: 908-707-4740  
rfarbman@edisonresearch.com

[www.edisonresearch.com](http://www.edisonresearch.com)

>From ande271@attglobal.net Wed Dec 15 12:46:28 1999

Received: from prserv.net (out5.prserv.net [165.87.194.243])

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

id MAA01688 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 12:46:27 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default ([32.100.252.53]) by prserv.net (out5) with SMTP  
id <1999121520462324303brc15e>; Wed, 15 Dec 1999 20:46:24 +0000  
Message-ID: <38582968.3A02@attglobal.net>  
Date: Wed, 15 Dec 1999 15:51:04 -0800  
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>  
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?  
References: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206F0A@AS\_SERVER>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>  
>> A discussion of methods used to secure wider participation in on-line  
>> surveys might be inviting and worthwhile for AAPOR members if  
>> there were  
>> no reference to Harris/Black specifically (but only to a  
>> research firm)  
>> but the (anonymous) author identified himself or herself. Under those  
>> circumstances the author would be behaving more ethically as well.  
>  
> While I tend dislike the concept of anonymous postings in general I  
> think  
> impugning the ethic of someone who does so is precipitous. It is  
> difficult to  
> discern an anonymous posters motives and what may look like a campaign

> to

> tarnish an individual company may actually be a methodological concern.

>

> Of course, your mileage may vary.

>

> --

> Leo G. Simonetta

> Art & Science Group, Inc.

> simonetta@artsci.com

I see your point. Actually, AAPOR is not very good at enforcing either methodological correctness or professional ethics. I will probably be ostracized for saying so!

>From mtrau@umich.edu Thu Dec 16 05:18:49 1999

Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35])

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

id FAA10058 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 05:18:49 -0800

(PST)

Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])

by vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.9.1/3.1r) with ESMTP id IAA28076

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 08:18:51 -0500 (EST)

Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <TX6H3GCB>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 08:21:33 -0500

Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E03210775@isr.umich.edu>

From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

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

Subject: RE: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 08:21:31 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Is there any interest in this thread in the solicitation proposal as opposed to the etiquette of anonymous postings?

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 16 10:39:48 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id KAA22555 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 10:39:47 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA27154 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 10:39:47 -0800

(PST)

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 10:39:47 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Traugott on Interest in Thread

In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E03210775@isr.umich.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912160917110.16950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Thu, 16 Dec 1999, Michael Traugott wrote:

> Is there any interest in this thread in the solicitation proposal as  
opposed  
> to the etiquette of anonymous postings?

-----

Thank you, Mike, for bringing us back to this substantive issue.

I have no knowledge of the truth of what has been described or alleged, other than my respect for the source of the information--an AAPOR member in good standing with more than the AAPOR average number of years of formal education, who works at an organization of more than average prominence in our collective activities.

No one could be happier than I would be were the allegations to turn out to be entirely false. I posted them because I have some reason to believe that they may not be entirely false, and I think AAPORNET is much better than I would be alone at getting to the bottom of all this.

My own feelings: Any business that does not take seriously the opinions and complaints of its customers is doomed to failure; any researchers who do not take serious interest in the experiences of their volunteer human subjects and survey respondents are also doomed to failure. Public opinion about all social researchers--including all survey, public opinion, and market researchers--ultimately depends on the public's perceptions of the most often experienced and best-reported or publicized cases, both good and bad.

In short, we all of us--whether we conduct research, contribute to its methodology, write academic or client reports on its findings, or report these to mass audiences--rise or fall in the eyes of the public, and therefore in our own abilities to do our best work, together, as a whole. So I'm afraid we are stuck with one another, the best and the worst among us, for good or for bad, because that is how the general public--our subject and respondent and client pool, after all--will inevitably see us.

That said, AAPOR's mission seems to me obvious: On the one hand, we must give regular and well-publicized awards and other recognition to the best of every aspect of our collective field of interest (as we do, for example, by disseminating information about new findings, methods, theories, analyses and publications via Public Opinion Quarterly). At the same time, however, we must also identify and attempt to end or improve the worse examples of our collective work, whether these bad apples should turn up in textbooks, teaching, research practices, protection of respondents, relationships with clients, or behavior on the Internet.

So, in the case of this particular "thread in the solicitation proposal," as Mike puts it, I think we owe it to all AAPOR has stood for, for now more than a half-century, first to share whatever we collectively know about this case on AAPORNET and then--should there be some collective feeling among us that one or more bad apples are in hand--to proceed with discussions about how we might alter those practices that reflect poorly upon, or threaten possible damage to, whatever it is we all do, or care about, or wish to preserve.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Thu Dec 16 12:38:22 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id MAA15671 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 12:38:21 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <Y04JD38T>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 15:34:01 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E61E@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: Traugott on Interest in Thread

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 15:33:59 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

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

> From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]

> Sent: Thursday, December 16, 1999 1:40 PM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: Re: Traugott on Interest in Thread

> On Thu, 16 Dec 1999, Michael Traugott wrote:

>



>> Is there any interest in this thread in the solicitation  
>> proposal as opposed  
>> to the etiquette of anonymous postings?

SNIP

> So, in the case of this particular "thread in the  
> solicitation proposal,"  
> as Mike puts it, I think we owe it to all AAPOR has stood for, for now  
> more than a half-century, first to share whatever we collectively know  
> about this case on AAPORNET and then--should there be some collective  
> feeling among us that one or more bad apples are in hand--to  
> proceed with  
> discussions about how we might alter those practices that  
> reflect poorly  
> upon, or threaten possible damage to, whatever it is we all  
> do, or care  
> about, or wish to preserve.

I suspect that I am not alone in the feeling somewhat uncomfortable about the "solicitation proposal" that we saw. I am not sure that it is in any particular way unethical but it certainly seems unprofessional.

A lot depends on what you would see once you went to the specified website and entered your password.

This discomfort about that appeal without an ethical hook upon which to hang it upon is one of the reasons I had not commented on this

previously.

Leo Simonetta

>From georget@harrisinteractive.com Thu Dec 16 13:27:57 1999

Received: from vserver1.gsbc.com ([216.42.116.4])

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

id NAA01120 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 13:27:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: by vserver1.gsbc.com with VINES-ISMTP; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 16:27:14

-0500

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 16:27:12 -0500

Message-ID: <vines.U1eD+CxIKsA@vserver1.gsbc.com>

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

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

From: "George Terhanian" <georget@harrisinteractive.com>

Reply-To: <georget@harrisinteractive.com>

Subject: RE: Traugott on Interest in Thread

X-Incognito-SN: 788

X-Incognito-Version: 5.1.0.43

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Hello,

I'm new to AAPORNET and have found the conversation regarding a questionable

Harris Poll Online invitation quite intriguing, but certainly not alarming.

I hope I can inform the discussion. Some background: As you may know, we

(Harris Interactive) are not surveying cross-sections of adults whom we

Speak

to but once via phone. For this reason, we possess a vital interest in building a community of cooperative respondents who enjoy expressing their opinions. The \*last\* thing that we want to do is manipulate, exploit, or otherwise annoy our respondents. If we do so, we risk defection. And if our

respondents defect en masse, we are out of business---not a very pleasant thought. I have received more than 50 email invitations to participate in Harris Poll Online surveys this week (as I should because I or my staff review all invitations and surveys). The quality and character of these invitations varies, but not by much. The invitation in question is no better

or worse than most of our invitations. That is, it has produced a response rate quite similar to our mean response rate for all surveys. It has also performed similarly in terms of number of complaints, compliments, and so forth to our other surveys. Most important, the information that we have elicited through this survey (and with this invitation) compares quite favorably to that which we have elicited through a parallel phone survey.

We

are not perfect, but we are learning.

-----

George Terhanian

Vice President, Internet Research & Methodology

Harris Interactive

135 Corporate Woods

Rochester, NY 14623

716-272-9020 x 507

716-272-8680 -fax

<http://www.harrisinteractive.com>

----- Original Text -----

From: "Leo Simonetta" <Simonetta@artsci.com>, on 12/16/99 3:33 PM:

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

> From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]

> Sent: Thursday, December 16, 1999 1:40 PM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: Re: Traugott on Interest in Thread

> On Thu, 16 Dec 1999, Michael Traugott wrote:

>

>> Is there any interest in this thread in the solicitation

>> proposal as opposed

>> to the etiquette of anonymous postings?

SNIP

> So, in the case of this particular "thread in the

> solicitation proposal,"

> as Mike puts it, I think we owe it to all AAPOR has stood for, for now

> more than a half-century, first to share whatever we collectively know

> about this case on AAPORNET and then--should there be some collective

> feeling among us that one or more bad apples are in hand--to

> proceed with

> discussions about how we might alter those practices that

> reflect poorly

> upon, or threaten possible damage to, whatever it is we all

> do, or care

> about, or wish to preserve.

I suspect that I am not alone in the feeling somewhat uncomfortable about the "solicitation proposal" that we saw. I am not sure that it is in any particular way unethical but it certainly seems unprofessional.

A lot depends on what you would see once you went to the specified website and entered your password.

This discomfort about that appeal without an ethical hook upon which to hang it upon is one of the reasons I had not commented on this previously.

Leo Simonetta

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 16 14:57:44 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id OAA23096 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 14:57:43 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA25114 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 14:57:42 -0800

(PST)

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 14:57:42 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: The Vanishing Voter Project (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912161455280.16950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 14:39:00 -0500

From: Tami\_Buhr/FS/KSG@ksg.harvard.edu

To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu

Subject: The Vanishing Voter Project

Dear Colleague,

We write to inform you about a Campaign 2000 research project that is underway at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. We invite you to make use of the study's findings in your teaching and research. We encourage you to visit the project web site (<http://www.vanishingvoter.org>) and subscribe to the free weekly releases that are part of the study.

Funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, the project includes weekly national polls (n=1000) of the American electorate that are designed to measure the public's interest and involvement in the presidential campaign. We seek to understand

the factors that encourage and discourage public engagement. We began our weekly surveys a month ago, and our findings thus far include, for instance, a belief among most Americans that the campaign is too long and has begun too early. Our surveys have also uncovered more week-to-week variation in voter engagement (paying attention to election news and talking and thinking about the campaign) than might be expected. Between now and the November election, we will closely examine the impact of the key primaries, the conventions, the general election debates, and other events on the public's campaign interest and involvement. These findings will be the basis of recommendations for structural changes in the presidential selection process.

We welcome recommendations you might have that would strengthen the study.

Our only restriction on suggestions is that they fall within the general area of public interest and engagement and not, for instance, the horserace.

Our web site (<http://www.vanishingvoter.org>) has additional information on the study and contains results from the first five weekly surveys.

Thank you.

Thomas E. Patterson

Tami Buhr

Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press                      Research

Coordinator

Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy

Shorenstein Center

Kennedy School of Government                      Kennedy School of

Government

Harvard University                      Harvard University

Cambridge, MA 02138                      Cambridge, MA 02138

(617 496-9761)

(617 495-0478)

thomas\_patterson@harvard.edu

tami\_buhr@harvard.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

>From mark@bisconti.com Thu Dec 16 16:31:11 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id QAA04771 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 16:31:09 -0800

(PST)

Received: from markbri (ip47.washington13.dc.pub-ip.PSI.NET [38.30.214.47])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service

Version 5.5.2232.9)

id YQ7H6XPY; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 19:31:01 -0500

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Looking for mailing/E-mail lists

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 19:30:27 -0500

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCJKFIDCKOFNAEEMEJCCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>



MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

I am looking for sources of up-to-date, clean, targeted mailing lists in U.S. and Canada (with E-mail addresses, if possible) of people with a likely interest in energy or electricity issues... in the following groups:

- Industrial institutes and associations
- Environmental groups
- Labor groups
- Consumer groups
- Business associations
- National and state/Provincial elected officials
- Wall St./investors
- Insurance industry executives
- Lawyers
- Think tanks and research institutions
- Media/reporters
- Libraries

I am aware of the Yellow Books/Leadership Directories for U.S.

If you have suggestions, please E-mail me directly at [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com).

THANK YOU. Mark Richards

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Dec 16 21:44:49 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id VAA24714 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 16 Dec 1999 21:44:45 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp18.vgernet.net [205.219.186.118])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id CAA24137;

Fri, 17 Dec 1999 02:13:52 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3859CDBA.D4EF668E@jwdp.com>

Date: Fri, 17 Dec 1999 00:44:26 -0500

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: ande271@ibm.net

CC: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

References: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206F0A@AS\_SERVER>

<38582968.3A02@attglobal.net>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jeanne Anderson wrote:

>

> I see your point. Actually, AAPOR is not very good at enforcing either

> methodological correctness or professional ethics. I will probably be

> ostracized for saying so!

Rather, you should be praised for saying so.

I don't think AAPOR (or any professional organization, for that matter) should ever attempt to enforce methodological correctness, but AAPOR would gain a lot more credibility if it showed some spine with respect to professional ethics.

The AAPOR code doesn't even prohibit conflicts of interest that would land members of recognized professions in jail, such as the scam perpetrated by Dick Morris and Penn & Schoen during the 1996 elections, conducting polling to assess the effect of DNC advertising while they were secretly getting a cut of the ad placement fees. Until AAPOR does address this kind of thing, it really can't claim any kind of authority.

Jan Werner

>From tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu Fri Dec 17 11:00:21 1999

Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])

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

id LAA19182 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Dec 1999 11:00:20 -0800

(PST)

Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa22815;

17 Dec 99 14:00 EST

Received: from tmg1p95.virginia.edu (bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU [128.143.140.192])

by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA12134

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Dec 1999 14:00:17 -0500 (EST)

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>

To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: FW: Do you want to know what your neighbors are doing?

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912141059470.16649-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Message-ID: <SIMEON.9912171421.J@tmg1p95.virginia.edu>

Date: Fri, 17 Dec 1999 14:01:21 -0500 (EST)

X-Mailer: Simeon for Windows Version 4.1.4 Build (40)

X-Authentication: IMSP

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

To Jim and AAPORnet:

I took another look at the Harris solicitation message after Mike Traugott's message properly re-directed us to the main issue at hand.

The writer's first issue is that Harris looks pretty hungry for respondents and that leads to questions about the quality of their sampling. That's an issue that goes to survey quality but not really to ethics. Researchers on high quality surveys are often led to use either very urgent-sounding or quite informally-toned appeals in an attempt to achieve high rates of response.

The anonymous writer characterizes the Harris solicitation messages as having "sexual and subversive overtones." It really is not clear that the appeal to "find out what your neighbors are doing" necessarily appeals to either sexual or subversive motives. It probably appears more to peoples' generalized curiosity about others. It appears that Harris is promising respondents an exclusive, advance look at a summary of results. This has always been considered to be a legitimate, relatively non-biasing incentive for respondents (cf. Dillman's TDM book) and it's one of the few incentives that researchers are easily able to provide. The wording does have a "come-on" or titillating tone that puts me off. I also grant that some

potential respondents might imagine that the survey reveals sexual goings-on, or think initially that the results site would have individual identifiers on it. An academic survey center such as the one I direct would not use a solicitation with this sort of tone. But we'd abjure it more because we think it unseemly than because it is unethical.

In short, I don't think this solicitation misleads in any clear, concrete way that would violate norms of informed consent. My main criticism of it is the faint suggestion that privacy of other respondents would not be respected in reporting results. This is an implication that Harris ought to avoid as such a suggestion could lead to serious mis-impressions in the public about how survey organizations treat confidentiality of collected data. Maybe that's what Jim and his correspondent are so bothered by.

I note with approval that Harris includes information on where they got the individual's e-mail address and how to stop the solicitations.

My 2 cents. . .

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock ..... Voice:(804) 924-6516  
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028  
University of Virginia .....  
539 Cabell Hall .....  
Charlottesville, VA 22903 ..... e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Fri Dec 17 14:11:40 1999

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])

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

id OAA17595 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Dec 1999 14:11:40 -0800

(PST)

Received: from fgsdfg.harvard.edu (sph76-224.harvard.edu [128.103.76.224])

by hsph.harvard.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA23709

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Dec 1999 17:11:11 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991217170848.0095d570@hsph.harvard.edu>

X-Sender: jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Fri, 17 Dec 1999 17:09:33 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "John T. Young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>

Subject: RE: Traugott on Interest in Thread

In-Reply-To: <4.2.0.58.19991217114239.0095e9e0@hsph.harvard.edu>

References: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E61E@AS\_SERVER>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 01:44 PM 12/17/99 -0500, you wrote:

>i am somewhat apprehensive that responding on this topic will continue  
>something that should be allowed to die because of its own weightlessness.  
>i'm having a hard time understanding why some people have found, "Do you  
>want to know what your neighbors are doing?" solicitation so  
>problematic. i can't see anything unethical or unprofessional about  
>it. references to "this case" are also puzzling, what is the  
>case? perhaps, if people who think that it deserves either of those  
>labels, also would specify exactly what it is that is unethical or  
>unprofessional and why, then there would be something to actually talk  
>about. if they can't or wont do that, than what is all about? clearly,  
>the inference that this solicitation was somehow sexual and subversive,  
>was just that an inference drawn by the unknown and known originators of

>this whole brouhaha, and others could easily draw other inferences. even  
>in the unlikely event that the intention was to convey a sexual  
>connotation, what exactly is subversive about that? to me, it seems  
>obvious that the survey firm was offering respondents the survey results,  
>not information about the person next door, nor any other indiscrete  
>information.

>

>it is my understanding that if one participates in a harris interactive on  
>line poll--and i assume other reputable internet polling efforts--that one  
>can simply opt out at any point and the solicitations will stop.

>

>moreover, the neither originator nor her/his accomplice have offered any  
>reason for the anonymity other than to suggest that unknown person has  
>something to fear by putting their name to the posting. this smacks of a  
>tabloidization, and indictment by innuendo, which should not happen on a  
>professional list. hopefully we can get back to talking about the effects  
>of interviewing at the end of the month, or other threads that might  
>effect our professional lives.

>

>john t. young  
>jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu

>

>At 03:33 PM 12/16/99 -0500, you wrote:

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

>> > From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]

>> > Sent: Thursday, December 16, 1999 1:40 PM

>> > To: AAPORNET

>> > Subject: Re: Simonetta on Interest in Thread

>> > On Thu, 16 Dec 1999, Michael Traugott wrote:

>>>

>>>> Is there any interest in this thread in the solicitation

>>>> proposal as opposed

>>>> to the etiquette of anonymous postings?

>>

>>SNIP

>>

>>> So, in the case of this particular "thread in the

>>> solicitation proposal,"

>>> as Mike puts it, I think we owe it to all AAPOR has stood for, for now

>>> more than a half-century, first to share whatever we collectively know

>>> about this case on AAPORNET and then--should there be some collective

>>> feeling among us that one or more bad apples are in hand--to

>>> proceed with

>>> discussions about how we might alter those practices that

>>> reflect poorly

>>> upon, or threaten possible damage to, whatever it is we all

>>> do, or care

>>> about, or wish to preserve.

>>

>>I suspect that I am not alone in the feeling somewhat uncomfortable

>>about the "solicitation proposal" that we saw. I am not sure that it

>>is in any particular way unethical but it certainly seems

>>unprofessional.

>>A lot depends on what you would see once you went to the specified

>>website

>>and entered your password.

>>

>>This discomfort about that appeal without an ethical hook upon which to



>>hang it upon is one of the reasons I had not commented on this

>>previously.

>>

>>Leo Simonetta

>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Sat Dec 18 13:52:35 1999

Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])

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

id NAA12724 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 18 Dec 1999 13:52:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net

[151.202.23.5])

by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id QAA08110

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 18 Dec 1999 16:57:38 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991218165058.00a5df00@mailbox.bellatlantic.net>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (Unverified)

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Sat, 18 Dec 1999 16:51:21 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: KAB (knowledge, attitudes, beliefs) about polls

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Someone (Andy Beveridge?) mentioned the explanation of confidence intervals

in "Slate" (Microsoft's free online political magazine) the other day, the

following pursues this thread further.

The Annenberg/CPB instructional multimedia collection contains a number of shorter "exhibits" -- including one on the statistical foundations of political polls. It starts off with a short questionnaire asking the web site visitor about their prior experience with polls, their confidence in their accuracy, and their belief about the effect of reported polls on the vote (obviously a \*convenience\* sample of currently over 11,000 visitors). In a nutshell: 50% have participated, 60% believe polls are usually accurate (but 40% do not), 90% believe reported polls influence the vote. Quite plausible that people suspicious of polls are more likely to visit this site than others, still .... The exhibit can be accessed at <http://www.learner.org/exhibits/statistics/>

I think it is rather nicely done and the explanations offered are quite good. And for each concept or term there are additional links providing more depth. Not all of those I found on target, but -- by and large -- a great effort to educate the public about an important and often insufficiently understood topic.

The exhibit is based on parts of the well-received statistics video course "Against all odds" (produced some 10 years ago, but still available). And one of the guys involved in putting this exhibit together, Robert Niles, runs his own "Statistics Every Writer Should Know" website at <http://nilesonline.com/stats/>

I am aware that AAPOR has its own little brochure, but the "didactic packaging" on these sites is a major advantage. So, for those AAPOR members involved in teaching, I highly recommend to take your students to the Annenberg exhibit -- and the primary season during the spring semester is the perfect time.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Dec 18 14:15:22 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id OAA20578 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 18 Dec 1999 14:15:19 -0800

(PST)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-5.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.214])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id RAA11715;

Sat, 18 Dec 1999 17:15:16 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <385C076F.183C4D7D@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Sat, 18 Dec 1999 17:15:11 -0500

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: KAB (knowledge, attitudes, beliefs) about polls

References: <4.2.2.19991218165058.00a5df00@mailbox.bellatlantic.net>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Manfred Kuechler wrote:

>

>

> The Annenberg/CPB instructional multimedia collection contains a number of

> shorter "exhibits" -- including one on the statistical foundations of

> political polls. It starts off with a short questionnaire asking the web

> site visitor about their prior experience with polls, their confidence in

> their accuracy, and their belief about the effect of reported polls on the

> vote (obviously a \*convenience\* sample of currently over 11,000 visitors).

> In a nutshell: 50% have participated, 60% believe polls are usually

> accurate (but 40% do not), 90% believe reported polls influence the vote.

> Quite plausible that people suspicious of polls are more likely to visit

> this site than others, still .... The exhibit can be accessed at

> <http://www.learner.org/exhibits/statistics/>

>

>

>

> The exhibit is based on parts of the well-received statistics video course

> "Against all odds" (produced some 10 years ago, but still available). And

>

I would offer a unsolicited plug for the videos in Against All Odds. The

Textbook

that they were originally designed for Introduction to the Practice of

Statistic

by McCabe and Moore is quite excellent. Its focus is on exploratory data

analysis and

data analysis more generally. It is completely computer intergrated, and is

far better than most of the so-called "Social Statistics" texts that are

available.

I think it is has sold over 1 million copies. The videos make the practice of statistics and data analysis real and include: the General Social Survey; the Census; the controversey around the Coleman report; comparable worth; whether smoking causes cancer. They spent a lot of money on this and it shows. Many of the half-hours, have two our three little movies within them.

Andy Beveridge

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sat Dec 18 15:38:41 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id PAA17149 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 18 Dec 1999 15:38:40 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp38.vgernet.net [205.219.186.138])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id UAA23403

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 18 Dec 1999 20:10:07 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <385C1AF4.BEEA1F06@jwdp.com>

Date: Sat, 18 Dec 1999 18:38:28 -0500

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: KAB (knowledge, attitudes, beliefs) about polls

References: <4.2.2.19991218165058.00a5df00@mailbox.bellatlantic.net>

<385C076F.183C4D7D@troll.soc.qc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

While I am not familiar with the video mentioned, the McCabe & Moore textbook is the one I usually recommend to my clients who want to understand statistical significance and confidence intervals.

David S. Moore, one of the authors of that text, also has a very nice book called "Statistics - Concepts and Controversies" containing a variety of informal and very illuminating discussions of practical uses of statistics in real world situations. I believe it is now in its 4th or 5th edition. It sounds like it may consist of much of the same material as the videos.

Jan Werner

---

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

>

> Manfred Kuechler wrote:

>>

>>

>> The Annenberg/CPB instructional multimedia collection contains a number of

>> shorter "exhibits" -- including one on the statistical foundations of

>> political polls. It starts off with a short questionnaire asking the web

>> site visitor about their prior experience with polls, their confidence in

>> their accuracy, and their belief about the effect of reported polls on

the

>> vote (obviously a \*convenience\* sample of currently over 11,000 visitors).

>> In a nutshell: 50% have participated, 60% believe polls are usually  
>> accurate (but 40% do not), 90% believe reported polls influence the vote.

>> Quite plausible that people suspicious of polls are more likely to visit

>> this site than others, still .... The exhibit can be accessed at

>> <http://www.learner.org/exhibits/statistics/>

>>

>>

>>

>> The exhibit is based on parts of the well-received statistics video course

>> "Against all odds" (produced some 10 years ago, but still available).

And

>>

> I would offer a unsolicited plug for the videos in Against All Odds. The

Textbook

> that they were originally designed for Introduction to the Practice of  
Statistic

> by McCabe and Moore is quite excellent. Its focus is on exploratory data  
analysis and

> data analysis more generally. It is completely computer intergrated, and  
is

> far better than most of the so-called "Social Statistics" texts that are  
available.

>

> I think it is has sold over 1 million copies. The videos make the

practice of

> statistics and data analysis real and include: the General Social Survey;  
> the Census; the controversy around the Coleman report; comparable worth;  
> whether smoking causes cancer. They spent a lot of money on this and it  
> shows. Many of the half-hours, have two or three little movies within  
them.

>

> Andy Beveridge

>From seymours@SRL.UIC.EDU Mon Dec 20 07:41:40 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

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

id HAA05118 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 07:41:39 -0800

(PST)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA06139

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 09:39:10 -0600 (CST)

Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 09:29:11 -0600

Message-Id: <s85df6e6.015@SRL.UIC.EDU>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 08:28:47 -0600

From: SEYMOUR SUDMAN <seymours@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: The Vanishing Voter Project (fwd) -Reply

This is an extremely valuable project. It might be even richer if you  
consider making some portion of the sample into a panel as with the  
Michigan election studies.



>From maj1@is2.nyu.edu Mon Dec 20 11:48:03 1999

Received: from is2.nyu.edu (root@IS2.NYU.EDU [128.122.253.135])

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

id LAA21944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 11:47:47 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jonesm.ssw.nyu.edu (SSWEN01.SSW.NYU.EDU [128.122.225.117])

by is2.nyu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA19095

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 14:46:39 -0500 (EST)

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 14:46:39 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199912201946.OAA19095@is2.nyu.edu>

X-Sender: maj1@is2.nyu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Mary Ann Jones <maj1@is2.nyu.edu>

Subject: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above heading came to me from two different colleagues this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to "21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108, in NYC. The small print informs one that "Calls to these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price for greater democracy. Calls take approx 1 or 2 minutes. Your views are important. We make sure that decision makers are hearing them!" In larger type: "Your votes will be presented to the Senate, the Dept of Social

Services" etc. A call to the 800 phone number listed was answered by, what a surprise, an answering machine. There was also a 646 area code number and a website where one could view the poll results: [www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk).

A memory trace from aapornet postings of some time ago screamed "scam" at me. I have a few questions for fellow-aapornetters about this:

1. Is this illegal or just unethical?
2. Is there anything to be done about it? This kind of baloney can't be good for the reputation and credibility of public opinion polling.
3. Does anyone have any idea how successful these things are? The colleagues who gave me the flyer did not detect that it was a scam, which made me worry that either: a) the public is really poorly informed as to what a legitimate survey should look like; b) I need to find brighter colleagues; or c) 21st Century Fax is making a hell of a lot more money out polling than I will in my lifetime.
4. Is there a name for this kind of scam, e.g. something akin to the FRUG acronym? If the baby has not yet been named, I offer MMUGPOP: Money Making Under the Guise of Public Opinion Polling. It could be pronounced either MUGPOP with the first M silent, or M-MUGPOP as a sort of stammer.

Mary Ann Jones

Mary Ann Jones, DSW

Associate Professor

Ehrenkranz School of Social Work

New York University

1 Washington Square North, G02

New York, N. Y. 10003

212-998-5972

>From rrand@cfmc.com Mon Dec 20 12:10:53 1999

Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])

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

id MAA07351 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 12:10:52 -0800

(PST)

Received: from rrand@w98 (rand@w95.cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])

by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id MAA06119

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 12:10:45 -0800

Message-Id: <4.1.19991220120030.009c12e0@cfmc.com>

X-Sender: rrand@cfmc.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 12:07:42 -0800

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Rands <rrand@cfmc.com>

Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

In-Reply-To: <199912201946.OAA19095@is2.nyu.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Mary Ann Jones posted...

>A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above  
>heading came to me from two different colleagues  
>this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two  
>big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to  
>"21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108,  
>in NYC. The small print informs one that "Calls to  
>these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price for  
>greater democracy.

Last week I received a similar fax that appeared very official from an organization called "Survey Information Service" with URGENT REQUEST in a prominent box at the top. It made the following claim: "As an URGENT assessment of the status your organization with RESPECT to Year 2000 Readiness on behalf of and for our Supplier and Customers, We request you verify infomration, sign & fax back to us within seventy two (72) hours of receipt, this SIS report:

The extremely fine print indicated that a charge of \$8.43 will be applied to cover the cost of the classification.

While this is not MR as the poll mentioned by Mary Ann, it is sure a sleazy effort to dupe people into paying over \$8 for questionable service.

Richard Rands

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Mon Dec 20 12:59:47 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id MAA15033 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 12:59:46 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <ZD835LQ2>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 15:43:18 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E625@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 15:43:18 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

> A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above  
> heading came to me from two different colleagues  
> this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two  
> big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to  
> "21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108,  
> in NYC. The small print informs one that "Calls to  
> these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price for  
> greater democracy. Calls take approx 1 or 2 minutes.  
> Your views are important. We make sure that decision  
> makers are hearing them!" In larger type: "Your votes  
> will be presented to the Senate, the Dept of Social  
> Services" etc. A call to the 800 phone number listed was  
> answered by, what a surprise, an answering machine. There

> was also a 646 area code number and a website where one  
> could view the poll results: [www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk).

>

> A memory trace from aapornet postings of some time  
> ago screamed "scam" at me. I have a few questions for  
> fellow-aapornetters about this:

>

> 1. Is this illegal or just unethical?

According to a number of reports the 21st Century Fax Ltd.  
people are being investigated by a number of US organizations  
for violations of the unsolicited FAX law.

<http://www.channel6000.com/news/stories/news-19991105-030244.html>

<http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3730b35613da.htm>

> 2. Is there anything to be done about it? This kind of  
> baloney can't be good for the reputation and credibility  
> of public opinion polling.

I think that the AAPOR ought to do a press release denouncing this  
type of survey.

> 3. Does anyone have any idea how successful these things are?  
> The colleagues who gave me the flyer did not detect that  
> it was a scam, which made me worry that either: a) the public  
> is really poorly informed as to what a legitimate survey

- > should look like; b) I need to find brighter colleagues; or
- > c) 21st Century Fax is making a hell of a lot more money out
- > polling than I will in my lifetime.

a) Generally, yes.

b) Probably not.

c) Good possibility.

- > 4. Is there a name for this kind of scam, e.g. something akin
- > to the FRUG acronym? If the baby has not yet been named,
- > I offer MMUGPOP: Money Making Under the Guise of
- > Public Opinion Polling. It could be pronounced either
- > MUGPOP with the first M silent, or M-MUGPOP as a sort of
- > stammer.

I like MUGPOP!

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Mon Dec 20 13:13:02 1999

Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net  
[199.45.39.156])

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

id NAA22309 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 13:13:00 -0800

(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA09687

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 16:11:01 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991220152006.00a3c7d0@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 16:11:40 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

In-Reply-To: <199912201946.OAA19095@is2.nyu.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 02:46 PM 12/20/99 -0500, Mary Ann Jones wrote:

>A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above  
>heading came to me from two different colleagues  
>this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two  
>big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to  
>"21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108,  
>in NYC. ....

An earlier poll by the same organization (on "Gun Control") has led to an

BBB (Better Business Bureau) alert in May 99, see:

<http://www.bbb.org/alerts/gunpatrol052699.html>

This alert states in part:

"The fax has led to consumer complaints made to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC)



and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), where regulators are studying whether the survey violates

U.S. laws. FCC rules prohibit sending unsolicited commercial faxes to businesses and residences.

The agency is also investigating whether the faxes violate rules for 900 numbers, which require clear

disclosure that consumers must pay for the calls."

From Mary Ann's description it appears that they fixed the two legal problems: sending unsolicited faxes (now distributing flyers) and not stating the cost of the fax-back call. As I could not find anything more recent, I assume they now operate within the limits of the law.

So, the answer to Mary Ann first question seems to be: it is legal. As to "ethics", there are plenty of "phone-in" polls around and most of them charge (though typically more like \$.50). All this is *\*not\** survey research as most of us understand it, but there is nothing that would violate HSC or IRB standards.

Second question: Can anything be done about it? I don't think so, at least not legally. Of course, AAPOR could 'censor' them which is particularly effective with respect to non-members.

Third question: Yes, brighter colleagues would be a start, but this won't help with keeping the Century Fax from making more money than a lot of us. If truly over 120,000 people responded by fax -- thus paying between \$3 and \$6 each -- to just the gun control survey they made about half a million there. Not bad. Unless they did get fined by the FCC, but I found no trace on the FCC web site.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Mon Dec 20 15:16:11 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id PAA13936 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 15:16:10 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <ZD835P2F>; Mon, 20 Dec 1999 17:56:01 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E627@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 17:55:58 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

I decided to poke around a little more on the Internet  
looking for information on 21st Century Fax Ltd. In addition  
to the stuff that Manfred found I found the following:

As for how effective these polls are (as a money maker) see

<http://www.mwt.com/may97art.html>

page down to "Massive UK fax Poll Returns 70,000 votes"

I was particularly fond of Gordon Ritchie's (apparently the CEO of

Top 20 Ltd., 20th Century Fax Ltd., 21st Century Fax Ltd., and FAX  
Polling Associates) quote;

"One day it may be possible to conduct a similar poll via the Internet,  
but until most people have access to the Internet, it is not yet a  
viable method of collecting a large amount of unbiased data. I hope that  
many professionals in market research will now sit up and take note of  
what we have achieved."

I think we ought to take note.

--

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

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

> From: Manfred Kuechler [mailto:mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu]

> Sent: Monday, December 20, 1999 4:12 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

>

>

> At 02:46 PM 12/20/99 -0500, Mary Ann Jones wrote:

> >A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above

> >heading came to me from two different colleagues

> >this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two

> >big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to

> >"21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108,

> >in NYC. ....

>

> An earlier poll by the same organization (on "Gun Control")

> has led to an

> BBB (Better Business Bureau) alert in May 99, see:

> <http://www.bbb.org/alerts/gunpatrol052699.html>

> This alert states in part:

> "The fax has led to consumer complaints made to the Federal

> Communications

> Commission (FCC)

> and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), where regulators

> are studying

> whether the survey violates

> U.S. laws. FCC rules prohibit sending unsolicited

> commercial faxes to

> businesses and residences.

> The agency is also investigating whether the faxes violate

> rules for 900

> numbers, which require clear

> disclosure that consumers must pay for the calls."

>

> From Mary Ann's description it appears that they fixed the two legal

> problems: sending unsolicited faxes (now distributing flyers) and not

> stating the cost of the fax-back call. As I could not find

> anything more

> recent, I assume they now operate within the limits of the law.

> So, the answer to Mary Ann first question seems to be: it is

> legal. As to

> "ethics", there are plenty of "phone-in" polls around and

- > most of them
- > charge (though typically more like \$.50). All this is \*not\*
- > survey research
- > as most of us understand it, but there is nothing that would
- > violate HSC or
- > IRB standards.
- > Second question: Can anything be done about it? I don't think
- > so, at least
- > not legally. Of course, AAPOR could 'censor' them which is
- > particularly
- > effective with respect to non-members.
- > Third question: Yes, brighter colleagues would be a start,
- > but this won't
- > help with keeping the Century Fax from making more money than
- > a lot of us.
- > If truly over 120,000 people responded by fax -- thus paying
- > between \$3 and
- > \$6 each -- to just the gun control survey they made about
- > half a million
- > there. Not bad. Unless they did get fined by the FCC, but I
- > found no trace
- > on the FCC web site.
- >
- >
- >
- > Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
- > <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>
- >
- >From mark@bisconti.com Tue Dec 21 15:02:54 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id PAA13102 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 15:02:53 -0800

(PST)

Received: from markbri (ip39.washington11.dc.pub-ip.PSI.NET [38.30.47.39])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service  
Version 5.5.2232.9)

id YQ7H6YLQ; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 18:02:44 -0500

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

Date: Tue, 21 Dec 1999 18:01:46 -0500

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCJKFIDCKOFNAEEAELOCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E625@AS\_SERVER>

AAPOR should do a press release or something after the holidays. I received the same FAX "poll" (gays adopting kids) last week. In fact, would get attention if it were a collaborative press release: This is a consumer issue--should issue a joint statement with a public interest consumer group. And, include the Human Rights Campaign (gay/lesbian/bi political group) and Nat. Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Maybe even the religious right. Both

groups are more susceptible to this type of fraud. Think of story line: gay/lesbian groups and religious right unite to fight consumer fraud... that ought to assure TV time. Use event to inform about various forms of fraudulent polling. MUG-Popping back... nice.

Months ago, I sent them an E-mail about my displeasure with the last one they Faxed on "gun control." Obviously, they pick polarizing topics to increase their response and profits.

The part that angers me is the statement they put next to the small print telling the cost of calling: "this is a small price to pay for democracy."

Mark Richards

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

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

Sent: Monday, December 20, 1999 3:43 PM

To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

> A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above  
> heading came to me from two different colleagues  
> this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two  
> big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to  
> "21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108,  
> in NYC. The small print informs one that "Calls to

> these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price for  
> greater democracy. Calls take approx 1 or 2 minutes.  
> Your views are important. We make sure that decision  
> makers are hearing them!" In larger type: "Your votes  
> will be presented to the Senate, the Dept of Social  
> Services" etc. A call to the 800 phone number listed was  
> answered by, what a surprise, an answering machine. There  
> was also a 646 area code number and a website where one  
> could view the poll results: [www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk).

>

> A memory trace from aapornet postings of some time  
> ago screamed "scam" at me. I have a few questions for  
> fellow-aapornetters about this:

>

> 1. Is this illegal or just unethical?

According to a number of reports the 21st Century Fax Ltd.  
people are being investigated by a number of US organizations  
for violations of the unsolicited FAX law.

<http://www.channel6000.com/news/stories/news-19991105-030244.html>

<http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3730b35613da.htm>

> 2. Is there anything to be done about it? This kind of  
> baloney can't be good for the reputation and credibility  
> of public opinion polling.



I think that the AAPOR ought to do a press release denouncing this type of survey.

> 3. Does anyone have any idea how successful these things are?

- > The colleagues who gave me the flyer did not detect that
- > it was a scam, which made me worry that either: a) the public
- > is really poorly informed as to what a legitimate survey
- > should look like; b) I need to find brighter colleagues; or
- > c) 21st Century Fax is making a hell of a lot more money out
- > polling than I will in my lifetime.

a) Generally, yes.

b) Probably not.

c) Good possibility.

- > 4. Is there a name for this kind of scam, e.g. something akin
- > to the FRUG acronym? If the baby has not yet been named,
  - > I offer MMUGPOP: Money Making Under the Guise of
  - > Public Opinion Polling. It could be pronounced either
  - > MUGPOP with the first M silent, or M-MUGPOP as a sort of
  - > stammer.

I like MUGPOP!

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>From mkshares@mcs.net Tue Dec 21 15:11:55 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.net (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id PAA20811 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 15:11:49 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mcs.net (P51-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.115]) by

Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.8.2) with ESMTP id RAA62339 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Tue, 21 Dec 1999 17:11:42 -0600 (CST)

Message-ID: <385FB4CC.B0446891@mcs.net>

Date: Tue, 21 Dec 1999 17:11:44 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

References: <NCBBKJCKJFIDCKOFNAEEAELOCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I received the gun control question. Mark is right. They choose provocative questions to encourage higher response and profits.

Since results of these "polls" are never published (I believe), isn't this really a

case of consumer fraud. Does anyone know how to inform the FCC of this for further action?

Mark Richards wrote:

- > AAPOR should do a press release or something after the holidays.
- I
- > received the same FAX "poll" (gays adopting kids) last week. In fact, would
- > get attention if it were a collaborative press release: This is a consumer
- > issue--should issue a joint statement with a public interest consumer group.
- > And, include the Human Rights Campaign (gay/lesbian/bi political group) and
- > Nat. Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Maybe even the religious right. Both
- > groups are more susceptible to this type of fraud. Think of story line:
- > gay/lesbian groups and religious right unite to fight consumer fraud... that
- > ought to assure TV time. Use event to inform about various forms of
- > fraudulent polling. MUG-Popping back... nice.
- > Months ago, I sent them an E-mail about my displeasure with the last one
- > they Faxed on "gun control." Obviously, they pick polarizing topics to
- > increase their response and profits.
- > The part that angers me is the statement they put next to the small print
- > telling the cost of calling: "this is a small price to pay for

democracy."

> Mark Richards

>

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

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

> Leo Simonetta

> Sent: Monday, December 20, 1999 3:43 PM

> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

> Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

>

>> A self-styled "nationwide opinion poll" with the above

>> heading came to me from two different colleagues

>> this past week. The flyer invites one to check one of two

>> big boxes--YES or NO--and fax it back to

>> "21st Century Fax Ltd." 1204 Third Avenue, Suite 108,

>> in NYC. The small print informs one that "Calls to

>> these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price for

>> greater democracy. Calls take approx 1 or 2 minutes.

>> Your views are important. We make sure that decision

>> makers are hearing them!" In larger type: "Your votes

>> will be presented to the Senate, the Dept of Social

>> Services" etc. A call to the 800 phone number listed was

>> answered by, what a surprise, an answering machine. There

>> was also a 646 area code number and a website where one

>> could view the poll results: [www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk).

>>

>> A memory trace from aapornet postings of some time

>> ago screamed "scam" at me. I have a few questions for

>> fellow-aapornetters about this:

>>

>> 1. Is this illegal or just unethical?

>

> According to a number of reports the 21st Century Fax Ltd.

> people are being investigated by a number of US organizations

> for violations of the unsolicited FAX law.

>

> <http://www.channel6000.com/news/stories/news-19991105-030244.html>

>

> <http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3730b35613da.htm>

>

>> 2. Is there anything to be done about it? This kind of

>> baloney can't be good for the reputation and credibility

>> of public opinion polling.

>

> I think that the AAPOR ought to do a press release denouncing this

> type of survey.

>

>> 3. Does anyone have any idea how successful these things are?

>> The colleagues who gave me the flyer did not detect that

>> it was a scam, which made me worry that either: a) the public

>> is really poorly informed as to what a legitimate survey

>> should look like; b) I need to find brighter colleagues; or

>> c) 21st Century Fax is making a hell of a lot more money out

>> polling than I will in my lifetime.

>

> a) Generally, yes.

>

> b) Probably not.

>

> c) Good possibility.

>

>> 4. Is there a name for this kind of scam, e.g. something akin

>> to the FRUG acronym? If the baby has not yet been named,

>> I offer MMUGPOP: Money Making Under the Guise of

>> Public Opinion Polling. It could be pronounced either

>> MUGPOP with the first M silent, or M-MUGPOP as a sort of

>> stammer.

>

> I like MUGPOP!

>

> --

> Leo G. Simonetta

> Art & Science Group, Inc.

> simonetta@artsci.com

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Tue Dec 21 15:59:25 1999

Received: from hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (hejira.hunter.cuny.edu

[146.95.128.97])

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

id PAA24628 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 15:59:23 -0800

(PST)

From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

Received: from social54 (social54.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.12.54])

by hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id TAA27833

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 19:01:14 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991221183700.00a2b650@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (Unverified)

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Tue, 21 Dec 1999 18:50:03 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

In-Reply-To: <385FB4CC.B0446891@mcs.net>

References: <NCBBKJCKJFKIDCKOFNAEEAELOCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 05:11 PM 12/21/99 +0000, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>I received the gun control question. Mark is right. They choose provocative  
>questions to encourage higher response and profits.

>

>Since results of these "polls" are never published (I believe), isn't this

>really a

>case of consumer fraud. Does anyone know how to inform the FCC of this for

>further

>action?

If you read all messages relating to this thread, you will see

- a. an URL for the web site where these results are published plus the names of the politicians that have been sent the results
- b. that complaints with the FCC have already been filed (as with BBB)

However, Mark said that he received the "fax poll". I wonder, Nick, Mark, did you (or anyone else) receive the "questionnaire" as an unsolicited fax?

This would make it illegal -- at least in some states -- and would provide grounds for legal action.

Otherwise, as said before, it's a free country and if some people do not mind to pay \$3-6 (or just don't pay attention) for registering their opinion, so what? Is AAPOR supposed to take on CNN, ESPN, or whatever news organization that runs the next "phone-in" poll over a 900 line? These "polls" are a nuisance, but so are zillions of "frugs" and "sugs" and AAPOR could issue a press release at least every week.

>From mark@bisconti.com Tue Dec 21 16:11:19 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id QAA03139 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 16:11:18 -0800

(PST)

Received: from markbri (ip39.washington11.dc.pub-ip.PSI.NET [38.30.47.39])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)

id YQ7H6YMA; Tue, 21 Dec 1999 19:09:52 -0500

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

Date: Tue, 21 Dec 1999 19:08:55 -0500

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEEIELPCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300



In-Reply-To: <4.2.2.19991221183700.00a2b650@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

I received it as an unsolicited FAX "poll," at my place of work. It was not addressed to anyone. They list their website and a tel. number you can call to prevent them from sending again. I sent an E-mail. It didn't work--when I received the second FAX, I threw it out and forgot about it until it was mentioned on AAPORNET. mark

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 1999 6:50 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

At 05:11 PM 12/21/99 +0000, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>I received the gun control question. Mark is right. They choose provocative  
>questions to encourage higher response and profits.

>

>Since results of these "polls" are never published (I believe), isn't this

>really a

>case of consumer fraud. Does anyone know how to inform the FCC of this for

>further

>action?

If you read all messages relating to this thread, you will see

a. an URL for the web site where these results are published plus the names of the politicians that have been sent the results

b. that complaints with the FCC have already been filed (as with BBB)

However, Mark said that he received the "fax poll". I wonder, Nick, Mark, did you (or anyone else) receive the "questionnaire" as an unsolicited fax? This would make it illegal -- at least in some states -- and would provide grounds for legal action.

Otherwise, as said before, it's a free country and if some people do not mind to pay \$3-6 (or just don't pay attention) for registering their opinion, so what? Is AAPOR supposed to take on CNN, ESPN, or whatever news organization that runs the next "phone-in" poll over a 900 line? These "polls" are a nuisance, but so are zillions of "frugs" and "sugs" and AAPOR could issue a press release at least every week.

>From David.Sylvia@PMMC.com Wed Dec 22 07:16:28 1999

Received: from dmzryems1.PM.com ([63.80.251.13])

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

id HAA25199 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 07:16:27 -0800

(PST)

From: David.Sylvia@PMMC.com

Received: from 10.235.242.66 by dmzryems1.PM.com (InterScan E-Mail VirusWall NT); Wed, 22 Dec 1999 10:08:15 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)

Received: from ENTRYEXSM2 by fwinternetdmz.pmmc.com

via smtpd (for [10.235.242.13]) with SMTP; 22 Dec 1999 15:10:40 UT

Received: by entryexsm2.pmmc.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.18)

id <ZG49CKPC>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 10:16:29 -0500

Message-ID: <D848E1411870D2118DA600A024B339A105E08CF3@PMCNYSMSG03>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: How Americans Get Their Info and How They Make Decisions?

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1999 10:15:08 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.18)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

I'm searching for studies/articles/analysis that investigated where Americans get information, how they process that information and if/how it forms the basis of decisions they reach on public policy issues.

I've searched the Pew database and found some helpful information, but need more.

You can reply directly to me at [david.sylvia@pmmc.com](mailto:david.sylvia@pmmc.com)

Thanks

David Sylvia

Director Public Policy & Research

Philip Morris Management Corporation

120 Park Ave.

New York, NY 10017

ph- 917.663.2175

fx- 917.663.5379

pager - 888.578.7415

[David.Sylvia@PMMC.com](mailto:David.Sylvia@PMMC.com)

~~~~~  
"The information in this email, and in any attachments,  
may contain confidential information and is intended  
solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s).  
It must not be disclosed to any person without authorization.  
If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for  
delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized  
to, and must not, disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this  
message or any part of it."  
~~~~~

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 22 07:49:18 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id HAA14001 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 07:49:17 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <ZMFRPGG7>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 10:09:32 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E62D@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1999 10:09:31 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

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

> From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

> [mailto:mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu]  
> Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 1999 6:50 PM  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: "Should Gays Adopt Kids?"-- A MMUGPOP?

Snip

> Otherwise, as said before, it's a free country and if some  
> people do not mind to pay \$3-6 (or just don't pay attention)  
> for registering their opinion, so what? Is AAPOR supposed to  
> take on CNN, ESPN, or whatever news organization that runs  
> the next "phone- in" poll over a 900 line? These "polls"  
> are a nuisance, but so are zillions of "frugs" and "sugs"  
> and AAPOR could issue a press release at least every week.

While these are similar in nature to phone-in polls using a 900 number one of the big differences (in my humble opinion) is that most phone-in polls are presented with caveats. The fact that this organization is presenting these as "Fax Poll" results and that a number of organizations are using them and their methodology as a club to beat legitimate pollsters leads me to think that AAPOR ought to at least issue a press release/statement/public paper commenting on the methodology just as it has about push polling.

Of course, as always, your mileage may vary.

Happy holidays all!

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 22 08:55:47 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id IAA28568 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 08:55:44 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <ZMFRPGJM>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 11:49:54 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E62E@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

To: "aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Another MMUGPOP

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1999 11:49:53 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

And they are using an open server in China  
at Shandong Normal University to email this  
to probably hundreds of thousands of people.

They claim 5 million but I am dubious that  
any decent list of 5 million American email  
addresses exist.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>>From Surveyor2@sdnu.edu.cn Wed Dec 22 03:01:11 1999  
>>Return-Path: <Surveyor2@sdnu.edu.cn>  
>>Received: from sdnu.edu.cn (unknown [210.44.8.88])  
>> by mail1.panix.com (Postfix) with SMTP id EB10530FD3  
>> for <DELETED@panix.com>; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 03:00:34 -0500 (EST)  
>>Received: from q952366D6 by sdnu.edu.cn (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)  
>> id PAA03689; Wed, 22 Dec 1999 15:51:30 +0800  
>>DATE: 22 Dec 99 2:53:02 AM  
>>From: Surveyor2@sdnu.edu.cn  
>>Message-ID: <IQg0dJb3OT5k15iZWdb>  
>>To: Americans@sdnu.edu.cn  
>>SUBJECT: Gun Control Survey  
>>Status: RO  
>>  
>>Please help us with this survey.  
>>  
>>It is one of the most ambitious surveys ever  
>>undertaken on the subject of GUN CONTROL IN  
>>THE US, and we apologize up front for this  
>>method of delivery, however we want to contact  
>>5,000,000 Americans BEFORE Congress returns from  
>>its break so that the President and Members of  
>>Congress will have current information to help  
>>them in their impending work.  
>>  
>>To have your voice heard on the issue of GUN

>>CONTROL IN THE US, you must be at least 18 years  
>>old and do/understand the following:

>>

>>Please print this message, circle your responses,  
>>and FAX your survey to 1-900-420-2021. A charge  
>>of \$9.95 for the first minute or fraction thereof,  
>>and \$3.95 for each additional minute or fraction  
>>thereof will appear on your local phone bill to  
>>pay for the survey. The first 10 to 12 seconds of  
>>the call will NOT BE BILLED TO YOU, and your fax  
>>will not start until the message that plays during  
>>that 10 to 12 seconds has ended. Your billing will  
>>begin when your call connects to our fax facility.

>>

>>(Circle your response)

>>

>>1. Should HAND GUN possession be limited to law  
>>enforcement officers?

>>

>>Yes No

>>

>>2. The second amendment states, "A well regulated  
>>militia being necessary to the security of a free  
>>state, the right of the people to keep and bear  
>>arms shall not be infringed". Do you think this  
>>is being properly interpreted by our  
>>representative lawmakers?

>>

>>Yes No



>>

>>3. Do we need more laws contolling GUNS in the US?

>>

>>Yes No

>>

>>If YES; these are my suggestions:

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>>I am a citizen of the State of: \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>>THE FOLLOWING ARE TOTALLY OPTIONAL

>>RESPONSES

>>

>>My Name is:

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>>My e-mail address is:

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>(We will e-mail the results to those who

>>choose to include their e-mail address)

>>

>>YOUR OPINION IS NEEDED TO ENLIGHTEN OUR

>>LAWMAKERS!

>>

>>SPEAK NOW, BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!

>>

>>FAX YOUR RESPONSE TO 1-900-420-2021 NOW!

>>

>>Feel free to copy this message and pass it along

>>to others who want their voices heard on the

>>issue of HAND GUN CONTROL IN THE US.

>>

>>Copyright, 1999. American Tabulation & Tracking

>>Co-op, surveying the American public on current

>>issues and sending the results to the President

>>and Members of Congress of the United States who

>>have traditional e-mail service so that they will

>>understand the true feelings of the American

>>People.

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Thu Dec 23 09:07:01 1999

Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id JAA07177 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 09:07:00 -0800

(PST)

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com

Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])

by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA26829

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 09:05:48 -0800

Message-Id: <199912231705.JAA26829@web2.tdl.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1999 09:04:29 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: (Fwd) Fwd: Nonresponse Conference Paper Available

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

The paper cited below is an excellent discussion of the the changes that have taken place in the RDD sample frame over the past 10 years or so. Most of us have the sense that it has gotten significantly harder to achieve acceptable response rates in RDD sampling. This paper shows how the structure and composition of the RDD sample frame has changed making achievement of formerly acceptable response rates much more difficult. Now, if we only knew what to do about it.

>From: Chris DeAngelis <chirs\_deangelis@surveysampling.com>

>To: disogra@fsc-research.com

>Subject: Nonresponse Conference Paper Available

>Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 10:27:27 -0500

>

>At the recent International Survey Nonresponse Conference in Portland,  
>Oregon, Linda Piekarski, Research Manager at Survey Sampling, Inc.,  
>addressed some key challenges to telephone sampling in her presentation,  
>"Telephony and Telephone Sampling: The Dynamics of Change." Piekarski  
>demonstrated, in concrete terms, the impact of telephony on the market

>research industry. She documented changes in sampling frames that are  
>creating problems in the industry, and conducted an in-depth discussion of  
>the sources and impacts of these problems. Piekarski challenged all of us  
>in the market research industry to think about new sampling methods as a  
>way to meet the ever-changing telephone sampling environment.

>

>If you missed her presentation, it is available at WorldOpinion, a Web site  
>sponsored by Survey Sampling  
>(http://www.worldopinion.com/latenews.taf?f=d&news=3966). If you would like  
>a printed copy of the presentation, please e-mail your request to  
>info@surveysampling.com.

>

>If I can be of further assistance, feel free to contact me directly at  
>1-203-255-4200, extension 330 or by e-mail at  
>chris\_deangelis@surveysampling.com.

>

>Best regards,

>Chris De Angelis

>National Client Service Manager

>

>

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

If you have received this communication in error,  
please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by  
e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this

communication and all copies thereof, including  
attachments.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 23 09:15:28 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id JAA12298 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 09:15:28 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA05139 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 09:15:27 -0800

(PST)

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1999 09:15:27 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Sites That Measure Candidates' Views Against Your Own

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912230906200.4274-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

Folks,

This information should be of interest to all who study public opinion,  
campaign tactics and voting behavior.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

December 23, 1999

Sites That Measure

Candidates' Views

Against Your Own

By REBECCA FAIRLEY RANEY

Candidates seeking a presidential nomination are already campaigning heavily, and voters are trying to determine, by viewing debates and political advertisements, whom they support. This political season, they have an alternative online.

You can register your opinions on various issues, hit a button and see which candidate's views match yours.

Curt Anderson of Ashland, Ore., who set up a candidate selector at [www.selectsmart.com](http://www.selectsmart.com), said he took on the task to "cut through negative ads and the hyperbole of presidential Web sites."

Since his candidate selector went online in September, up to 30,000 individuals have visited the site each day.

Mr. Anderson, a marketing director for Darex, an industrial tools manufacturer, built his first online selector in 1996 to help clients choose industrial tools. Then, on his own, he created a selector on the Web for dog breeds that he licenses to an online pet supply company.

For the candidate selector, Mr. Anderson scoured news reports to collect candidates' positions on issues like free trade and campaign finance reform. He said he tried to keep the language of the questions neutral, and although some users have accused him of left-wing or right-wing biases, many have been satisfied.

"If I were still in the classroom," wrote a visitor to the site's message board, "I definitely would have my students access this page."

One of the prevailing topics of discussion on the site's bulletin board is whether a vote for a third-party candidate would be a wasted vote; many users have been surprised to find that they have selected third-party candidates.

The more extreme position a user states, the more likely the selector is to choose a third-party candidate.

"His test is structured so that they kick you to extremes," said Michael Cornfield, a research professor at George Washington University who studies online politics. "If you choose one of the stronger positions, it weights it three times as much."

Mr. Anderson's system does not hide its methods. The site discloses the scoring system and the methodology by which candidates are selected. Experts in political uses of the Internet say that disclosure is a critical component of candidate selectors online. They warn that if the concept catches on, it could be manipulated by campaigns and interest groups to favor specific candidates.

Kathleen deLaski, director of political and government programming for America Online, helped develop a selector for AOL called President Match. Developed with CBS News, President Match is expected to be completed in January, but a test version at [www.presidentmatch.com](http://www.presidentmatch.com) is available to anyone.



Ms. deLaski and Professor Cornfield recommended that voters watch for several factors to identify credible selectors online: neutral wording of the questions, a listing of all the candidates, full disclosure of the group or individual behind the selector, a privacy policy and an explanation of the computation process.

With those considerations in mind, Ms. deLaski said she hoped that President Match would enhance the way voters make decisions. Selectors, she said, help a voter "to step away from your preconceived notions."

"It stacks the candidates up on your la carte issue positions," she added.

"We're not recommending that people use this as their only tool for voting, but it might help people cut through the sound bites."

Harry Browne, who was the Libertarian Party's candidate for president in 1996 and is seeking the nomination for 2000, learned about the SelectSmart site from a steady stream of e-mail from voters who discovered his campaign through the site.

But when Mr. Browne took the test himself, he found that he came up with only an 83 percent match to his actual views. So Mr. Browne, submitted position statements to the site, as did three other candidates. It was worth his time, he said, because the site is spreading awareness of the Libertarian Party.

"These were people who were ideological strangers, who said, 'I didn't know anything about the Libertarian Party,' " Mr. Browne said. With this sort of selection method, he added, "I would think that over time, we would get a lot of new people. The Internet is very, very good for us."

-----

#### Related Sites

These sites are not part of The New York Times on the Web, and The Times has no control over their content or availability.

- o [www.selectsmart.com](http://www.selectsmart.com)

- o [www.presidentmatch.com](http://www.presidentmatch.com)

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 23 10:15:10 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])

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

id KAA20749 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:15:09 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA09942 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:15:08 -0800

(PST)

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:15:07 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: More on Sites That Measure Candidates' Views

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912230953220.4274-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

Several AAPORNETters have already E-mailed me personally to express doubts

or fears about the implications of my earlier posting, Rebecca Raney's article in this morning's New York Times, "Sites That Measure Candidates' Views Against Your Own." I answer here, not only to save time, but also with the hope of moving the discussion onto AAPORNET:

First of all, I think Raney's article illustrates how a hardly complex bit of software can empower individual consumers (qua potential voters, in this particular case) by providing them with a simple and convenient means to manage information (might we dare call it knowledge?) as it enters their homes, whether via the mass media or off the Web.

I think it's also clear that we are now seeing just the beginning of what will be a rapid spread of knowledge management technologies to households, to be applied mostly via the Internet and Web. The result will be, in effect, to increase the intellectual capacity of The Consumer Brain (unless, of course, you can already trade off dozens of ordinal marginal utility curves in your own head when choosing a sport utility vehicle to purchase or the political candidate to support--me, I cannot).

In short, the crude assumptions of classical economic models of consumer choices among a variety of different commodities can now be made to be true by the very software the consumer uses to make those choices.

And--but of course--the possibilities here for chicanery and corruption are boundless (unless you care to read through countless lines of code to check to see that your new software does as advertised). But, then, I do tend to be suspicious by nature (as do several of you who have just written to me).

But isn't it fun just to happen to be alive at this particular moment in human history? I wouldn't have wanted to miss this for anything...

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

December 23, 1999

Sites That Measure

Candidates' Views

Against Your Own

By REBECCA FAIRLEY RANEY

Candidates seeking a presidential nomination are already campaigning heavily, and voters are trying to determine, by viewing debates and political advertisements, whom they support. This political season, they have an alternative online.

You can register your opinions on various issues,

hit a button and see which candidate's views match yours.

Curt Anderson of Ashland, Ore., who set up a candidate selector at [www.selectsmart.com](http://www.selectsmart.com), said he took on the task to "cut through negative ads and the hyperbole of presidential Web sites." Since his candidate selector went online in September, up to 30,000 individuals have visited the site each day.

Mr. Anderson, a marketing director for Darex, an industrial tools manufacturer, built his first online selector in 1996 to help clients choose industrial tools. Then, on his own, he created a selector on the Web for dog breeds that he licenses to an online pet supply company.

For the candidate selector, Mr. Anderson scoured news reports to collect candidates' positions on issues like free trade and campaign finance reform. He said he tried to keep the language of the questions neutral, and although some users have accused him of left-wing or right-wing biases, many have been satisfied.

"If I were still in the classroom," wrote a visitor to the site's message board, "I definitely would have my students access this

page."

One of the prevailing topics of discussion on the site's bulletin board is whether a vote for a third-party candidate would be a wasted vote; many users have been surprised to find that they have selected third-party candidates.

The more extreme position a user states, the more likely the selector is to choose a third-party candidate.

"His test is structured so that they kick you to extremes," said Michael Cornfield, a research professor at George Washington University who studies online politics. "If you choose one of the stronger positions, it weights it three times as much."

Mr. Anderson's system does not hide its methods. The site discloses the scoring system and the methodology by which candidates are selected. Experts in political uses of the Internet say that disclosure is a critical component of candidate selectors online. They warn that if the concept catches on, it could be manipulated by campaigns and interest groups to favor specific candidates.

Kathleen deLaski, director of political and government programming for America Online, helped develop a selector for AOL called President Match. Developed with CBS News, President Match is expected to be completed in January, but a test version at [www.presidentmatch.com](http://www.presidentmatch.com) is available to anyone.

Ms. deLaski and Professor Cornfield recommended that voters watch for several factors to identify credible selectors online: neutral wording of the questions, a listing of all the candidates, full disclosure of the group or individual behind the selector, a privacy policy and an explanation of the computation process.

With those considerations in mind, Ms. deLaski said she hoped that President Match would enhance the way voters make decisions. Selectors, she said, help a voter "to step away from your preconceived notions."

"It stacks the candidates up on your la carte issue positions," she added.

"We're not recommending that people use this as their only tool for voting, but it might help people cut through the sound bites."



Harry Browne, who was the Libertarian Party's candidate for president in 1996 and is seeking the nomination for 2000, learned about the SelectSmart site from a steady stream of e-mail from voters who discovered his campaign through the site.

But when Mr. Browne took the test himself, he found that he came up with only an 83 percent match to his actual views. So Mr. Browne, submitted position statements to the site, as did three other candidates. It was worth his time, he said, because the site is spreading awareness of the Libertarian Party.

"These were people who were ideological strangers, who said, 'I didn't know anything about the Libertarian Party,'" Mr. Browne said. With this sort of selection method, he added, "I would think that over time, we would get a lot of new people. The Internet is very, very good for us."

-----

#### Related Sites

These sites are not part of The New York Times on the Web, and The Times has no control over their

content or availability.

o [www.selectsmart.com](http://www.selectsmart.com)

o [www.presidentmatch.com](http://www.presidentmatch.com)

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From [sullivan@fsc-research.com](mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com) Thu Dec 23 10:28:38 1999

Received: from [web2.tdl.com](http://web2.tdl.com) ([root@web2.tdl.com](mailto:root@web2.tdl.com) [206.180.230.2])

by [usc.edu](http://usc.edu) (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA29428 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:28:37 -0800

(PST)

From: [sullivan@fsc-research.com](mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com)

Received: from [6b7va \(fscnt1.fsc-research.com](http://6b7va.fscnt1.fsc-research.com) [206.180.228.75])

by [web2.tdl.com](http://web2.tdl.com) (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA27573

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:27:19 -0800

Message-Id: <199912231827.KAA27573@web2.tdl.com>

To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:25:49 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Subject: Re: More on Sites That Measure Candidates' Views

In-reply-to: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912230953220.4274-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from Quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id KAA29435

Only a Luddite could disagree with your eventual conclusion.

However, when I was a boy, I regularly jumped out of rather large airplanes. Sometimes, when the door to the plane was opened, the sound and fury of the world outside in combination with the specter of what was possible filled me with dread. Thinking about having these kinds of tools in the hands of people who are trying to market things like political ideas and candidates makes me feel much the same way. On the other hand, nothing really bad ever happened when I jumped. Happy holidays everyone.

Date sent: Thu, 23 Dec 1999 10:15:07 -0800 (PST)

Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: More on Sites That Measure Candidates' Views

Several AAPORNETters have already E-mailed me personally to express doubts or fears about the implications of my earlier posting, Rebecca Raney's

article in this morning's New York Times, "Sites That Measure Candidates' Views Against Your Own." I answer here, not only to save time, but also with the hope of moving the discussion onto AAPORNET:

First of all, I think Raney's article illustrates how a hardly complex bit of software can empower individual consumers (qua potential voters, in this particular case) by providing them with a simple and convenient means to manage information (might we dare call it knowledge?) as it enters their homes, whether via the mass media or off the Web.

I think it's also clear that we are now seeing just the beginning of what will be a rapid spread of knowledge management technologies to households, to be applied mostly via the Internet and Web. The result will be, in effect, to increase the intellectual capacity of The Consumer Brain (unless, of course, you can already trade off dozens of ordinal marginal utility curves in your own head when choosing a sport utility vehicle to purchase or the political candidate to support--me, I cannot).

In short, the crude assumptions of classical economic models of consumer choices among a variety of different commodities can now be made to be true by the very software the consumer uses to make those choices.

And--but of course--the possibilities here for chicanery and corruption are boundless (unless you care to read through countless lines of code to check to see that your new software does as advertised). But, then, I do tend to be suspicious by nature (as do several of you who have just written to me).

But isn't it fun just to happen to be alive at this particular moment in human history? I wouldn't have wanted to miss this for anything...

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

December 23, 1999

Sites That Measure  
Candidates' Views  
Against Your Own

By REBECCA FAIRLEY RANEY

Candidates seeking a presidential nomination are already campaigning heavily, and voters are trying to determine, by viewing debates and political advertisements, whom they support. This political season, they have an alternative online.

You can register your opinions on various issues, hit a button and see which candidate's views

match yours.

Curt Anderson of Ashland, Ore., who set up a candidate selector at [www.selectsmart.com](http://www.selectsmart.com), said he took on the task to "cut through negative ads and the hyperbole of presidential Web sites." Since his candidate selector went online in September, up to 30,000 individuals have visited the site each day.

Mr. Anderson, a marketing director for Darex, an industrial tools manufacturer, built his first online selector in 1996 to help clients choose industrial tools. Then, on his own, he created a selector on the Web for dog breeds that he licenses to an online pet supply company.

For the candidate selector, Mr. Anderson scoured news reports to collect candidates' positions on issues like free trade and campaign finance reform. He said he tried to keep the language of the questions neutral, and although some users have accused him of left-wing or right-wing biases, many have been satisfied.

"If I were still in the classroom," wrote a visitor to the site's message board, "I definitely would have my students access this page."

One of the prevailing topics of discussion on the site's bulletin board is whether a vote for a third-party candidate would be a wasted vote; many users have been surprised to find that they have selected third-party candidates.

The more extreme position a user states, the more likely the selector is to choose a third-party candidate.

"His test is structured so that they kick you to extremes," said Michael Cornfield, a research professor at George Washington University who studies online politics. "If you choose one of the stronger positions, it weights it three times as much."

Mr. Anderson's system does not hide its methods. The site discloses the scoring system and the methodology by which candidates are selected. Experts in political uses of the Internet say that disclosure is a critical component of candidate selectors online. They warn that if the concept catches on, it could be manipulated by campaigns and interest groups to favor specific candidates.

Kathleen deLaski, director of political and

government programming for America Online, helped develop a selector for AOL called President Match. Developed with CBS News, President Match is expected to be completed in January, but a test version at [www.presidentmatch.com](http://www.presidentmatch.com) is available to anyone.

Ms. deLaski and Professor Cornfield recommended that voters watch for several factors to identify credible selectors online: neutral wording of the questions, a listing of all the candidates, full disclosure of the group or individual behind the selector, a privacy policy and an explanation of the computation process.

With those considerations in mind, Ms. deLaski said she hoped that President Match would enhance the way voters make decisions. Selectors, she said, help a voter "to step away from your preconceived notions."

"It stacks the candidates up on your la carte issue positions," she added.

"We're not recommending that people use this as their only tool for voting, but it might help people cut through the sound bites."

Harry Browne, who was the Libertarian Party's



candidate for president in 1996 and is seeking the nomination for 2000, learned about the SelectSmart site from a steady stream of e-mail from voters who discovered his campaign through the site.

But when Mr. Browne took the test himself, he found that he came up with only an 83 percent match to his actual views. So Mr. Browne, submitted position statements to the site, as did three other candidates. It was worth his time, he said, because the site is spreading awareness of the Libertarian Party.

"These were people who were ideological strangers, who said, 'I didn't know anything about the Libertarian Party,' " Mr. Browne said. With this sort of selection method, he added, "I would think that over time, we would get a lot of new people. The Internet is very, very good for us."

-----

#### Related Sites

These sites are not part of The New York Times on the Web, and The Times has no control over their content or availability.

o [www.selectsmart.com](http://www.selectsmart.com)

o [www.presidentmatch.com](http://www.presidentmatch.com)

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

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

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sat Dec 25 08:50:45 1999

Received: from imo18.mx.aol.com (imo18.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.8])

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

id IAA09032; Sat, 25 Dec 1999 08:50:38 -0800 (PST)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com

Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com

by imo18.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v24.6.) id v.0.bca4dee2 (4556);

Sat, 25 Dec 1999 11:49:57 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <0.bca4dee2.25964fb5@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1999 11:49:57 EST

Subject: Re: Measuring Time

To: audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu,  
aapornet@usc.edu

CC: kelly.thomas@us.pwcglobal.com, karen.piskurich@us.pwcglobal.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 11/29/99 1:23:08 PM, audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com  
wrote:

<<I am interested in learning about any literature regarding the most  
accurate way to measure time.

I would appreciate any references anyone could provide.

>>

Care to share that with others, once you gather what you can? Thanks.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Research Statistician

U. S. Dept. of Justice

miltgold@aol.com

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Sat Dec 25 15:02:43 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])

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

id PAA29638 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 25 Dec 1999 15:02:42 -0800

(PST)

Received: from w5y0s9 (user-38ld36p.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.140.217])

by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id SAA26643

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 25 Dec 1999 18:02:40 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991225175441.00953ee0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1999 18:00:26 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: How to Measure Time

In-Reply-To: <0.bca4dee2.25964fb5@aol.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="===== \_2238397== \_ .ALT"

--===== \_2238397== \_ .ALT

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

How to measure time?

Wouldn't the National Bureau of Standards be able to answer this question?

If they don't know, we're all in deep, deep trouble. Or, any of the science magazines (Scientific American, Science, etc.) Alternatively, Peter Pan might know since he lives in Never Land where time sort of stands still.

(Sorry, I couldn't resist that)

Dick Halpern

At 11:49 AM 12/25/99 , you wrote:

>In a message dated 11/29/99 1:23:08 PM, [audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com](mailto:audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com) wrote:

>

><<I am interested in learning about any literature regarding the most accurate way to measure time.

>

>I would appreciate any references anyone could provide.

> >>

>

>Care to share that with others, once you gather what you can? Thanks.

>

>Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

>Research Statistician

>U. S. Dept. of Justice

>[miltgold@aol.com](mailto:miltgold@aol.com)

-----\_2238397==\_.ALT

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

<html>

<font size=3>How to measure time?<br>

<br>

Wouldn't the National Bureau of Standards be able to answer this question? If they don't know, we're all in deep, deep trouble. Or, any of the science magazines (Scientific American, Science, etc.) Alternatively, Peter Pan might know since he lives in Never Land where time sort of stands still. (Sorry, I couldn't resist that)<br>

<br>

Dick Halpern<br>

<br>

At 11:49 AM 12/25/99 , you wrote:<br>

<br>

<blockquote type=cite cite>In a message dated 11/29/99 1:23:08 PM, audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com wrote:<br>

<br>

&lt;&lt;I am interested in learning about any literature regarding the most<br>

accurate way to measure time.<br>

<br>

I would appreciate any references anyone could provide.<br>

&gt;&gt;<br>

<br>

Care to share that with others, once you gather what you can?&nbsp;

Thanks.<br>

<br>

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.<br>

Research Statistician<br>

U. S. Dept. of Justice<br>

miltgold@aol.com </font></blockquote></html>

-----\_2238397==\_.ALT--

>From albright@field.com Mon Dec 27 09:20:46 1999

Received: from mail.brainstorm.net (root@ns.brainstorm.net [205.178.112.2])

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

id JAA25248 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 27 Dec 1999 09:20:45 -0800

(PST)

Received: from PC52 ([205.178.66.44])

by mail.brainstorm.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id JAA09314

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 27 Dec 1999 09:20:43 -0800 (PST)

Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.19991227091822.007cddb0@pop.field.com>

X-Sender: albright@pop.field.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1999 09:18:22 -0800

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Victoria Albright <albright@field.com>

Subject: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

In-Reply-To: <199912231705.JAA26829@web2.tdl.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Hi!

I would like to start a discussion thread on the matter of Census 2000 approach to collecting race/ethnicity data. As I understand it the decision has been made to allow respondents to check as many race/ethnicity categories as they feel are appropriate. The decision on how to report population counts by race/ethnicity is still under discussion. Does anyone know what the issues or tentative decisions are vis a vis data base and

table generation?

Best, -Vicky

Victoria Albright

Research Director

Field Research Corporation

San Francisco

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Dec 27 09:45:52 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id JAA12316 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 27 Dec 1999 09:45:51 -0800

(PST)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-3.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.212])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id MAA29738;

Mon, 27 Dec 1999 12:45:44 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3867A5BC.6918CBD1@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1999 12:45:32 -0500

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

References: <3.0.6.32.19991227091822.007cddb0@pop.field.com>

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



Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear All:

Below are some Q and A's from the Census WEB Site. [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)

According to Ken Prewitt, at the American Sociological Association Meeting,

all iterations of race/Hispanic status will be produced for the

reapportionment

files (PL94-174), which include counts to the block. There will be two sets

of

such files: 1) One with raw counts; 2) One with counts using the

coverage and

enumeration improvement program. The second count will be marked official.

In one

tract in Sacramento, apparently, almost 30% gave a two race answer. I think

this

will be also true in CA, NY, FLA, TX, other parts of the West and industrial

areas. The SC test had no such problems.

There is no definite answer about the tabulations in the Summary Files to

follow: these are the successors to STF1, STF3, STF2 and STF4. What

constitutes

any given race/Hispanic status is not yet firmed up. Furthermore, the new

classification will make it very difficult to "bridge back" to older

censuses.

Personally, I think the end of the one-drop rule is long overdue, but this

will cause serious problems for many of the uses of Census data.

Andy Beveridge

> G. Will people of mixed racial or ethnic heritage be able to identify themselves on the form?

>

> Yes. In October 1997 the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued revised federal

> standards for collecting and presenting data on race and ethnicity. Among other changes, the

> standards allow respondents when answering the race question option to "mark or select one or

> more races." The OMB made this modification after considering recommendations from its

> Interagency Committee for the Review of Racial and Ethnic Standards, information obtained

> through public hearings and other sources of public opinion, and test results from the Census

> Bureau and other federal agencies.

>

> H. If respondents are allowed to mark more than one racial category, how will that

> response and reporting of race?

>

> In the 1996 Census Survey, the Census Bureau tested revisions to the questionnaire that would

> allow multiple responses to the race question. There was no evidence that any of these

> experimental treatments had a negative effect on the final mail response rates. Also, we do not

> expect the instruction "mark one or more" to significantly affect reporting of race, because fewer

> than two percent of respondents in recent tests used this option.

>

> I. How do I Answer the question on Race?

>

> Each respondent decides his or her racial identity. For the first time ever, people with mixed

> racial heritage may select more than one racial category. The groups shown in the census race

> question can be collapsed into the minimum race categories needed by the federal government:

> "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Native," "Asian," and

> "Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander." People who mark the American Indian or Alaska

> Native category are asked to provide the name of their principal or enrolled tribe. People who

> select the "Other Asian," "Other Pacific Islander," or "Some other race" are asked to write-in

> their specific race.

>

> J. How Should Hispanics Answer the Race question?

>

> People of Hispanic origin may be of any race and should answer the

question on race by marking

> one or more race categories

> shown on the questionnaire, including White, Black or African American, American Indian and

> Alaska Native, Asian, Native

> Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Some Other Race. Hispanics should indicate their

> origin in the Hispanic origin

> question, not in the race question because in federal statistical systems ethnic origin is

> considered to be a separate concept from race.

>

> K. Does Everyone Need to Answer the Question on Hispanic Origin?

>

> Yes, the Hispanic origin question must be answered by EVERYONE. Those who are not of

> Hispanic origin are asked to mark the box "NO, not

Spanish/Hispanic/Latino." People who are

> of Hispanic origin are asked to indicate the specific group they belong to: Cuban, Mexican,

> Puerto Rican, or other groups, such as Spanish, Honduran, or Venezuelan.

Victoria Albright wrote:

>

> Hi!

>

> I would like to start a discussion thread on the matter of Census 2000

> approach to collecting race/ethnicity data. As I understand it the

> decision has been made to allow respondents to check as many  
race/ethnicity  
> categories as they feel are appropriate. The decision on how to report  
> population counts by race/ethnicity is still under discussion. Does  
anyone  
> know what the issues or tentative decisions are vis a vis data base and  
> table generation?  
>  
> Best, -Vicky  
>  
> Victoria Albright  
> Research Director  
> Field Research Corporation  
> San Francisco

--

Andrew A. Beveridge      Home Office  
209 Kissena Hall      50 Merriam Avenue  
Department of Sociology      Bronxville, NY 10708  
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237  
Flushing, NY 11367-1597      Fax: 914-337-8210  
Phone: 718-997-2837      E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu  
Fax: 718-997-2820      Website: <http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps>

>From hoeyd@sunynassau.edu Tue Dec 28 13:41:01 1999

Received: from lib.acs.sunynassau.edu (LIB.ACS.SUNYNASSAU.EDU [198.38.8.2])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP

id NAA02359 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Dec 1999 13:41:00 -0800

(PST)

Received: from nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu ([198.38.9.253])

by lib.acs.sunynassau.edu with ESMTP for aapornet@usc.edu;

Tue, 28 Dec 1999 16:39:39 -0500

Received: from NCC\_VOL2/SpoolDir by nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu (Mercury 1.40);

28 Dec 99 16:40:27 -500

Received: from SpoolDir by NCC\_VOL2 (Mercury 1.31); 28 Dec 99 16:40:25 -500

Received: from sunynassau.edu by nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu (Mercury 1.31) with ESMTP;

28 Dec 99 16:40:25 -500

Date: Tue, 28 Dec 1999 16:37:34 -0500

Sender: DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu>

From: DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

X-EXP32-SerialNo: 00002181

Subject: Republican Primary Polls

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: WebMail (Hydra) SMTP v3.51

Message-ID: <BA164BC78BF@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>

I am looking for the results of public polls conducted in the states where the early primaries are to be held (New Hampshire, South Carolina, Arizona, Michigan). The public sites I've been too all have national survey data.

Thank you for your suggestions?

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Tue Dec 28 16:23:59 1999

Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net

[199.45.39.156])

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

id QAA18565 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Dec 1999 16:23:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net

[151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA13093

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Dec 1999 19:20:48 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991228185144.00a3e400@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Tue, 28 Dec 1999 19:21:24 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Republican Primary Polls

In-Reply-To: <BA164BC78BF@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 04:37 PM 12/28/99 -0500, DION HOEY wrote:

>I am looking for the results of public polls conducted in the states where

>the

>early primaries are to be held (New Hampshire, South Carolina, Arizona,

>Michigan). The public sites I've been too all have national survey data.

Here a few state poll results:

<http://www.cnn.com/1999/ALLPOLITICS/stories/12/27/scpoll.reut/index.html>

(SC, just out)

<http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/1999/11/26/polls/> (NH , Nov))

<http://www.azcentral.com/news/election/elect2000/1028pres.shtml> (AZ, Oct)

[http://www.politics.com/polls/polls\\_frame.htm](http://www.politics.com/polls/polls_frame.htm) (contain NH poll conducted Dec 17-21, scroll to bottom)

The Polling Report maintains a more comprehensive list. While the national polls are freely available, the state polls are available for subscribers only. Subscriptions rate are not available on the web site, but you can request a free sample of the printed version:

<http://www.PollingReport.com/>

Other than that, I recommend using a search engine. My current favorite is Google:

<http://www.google.com/>

Also, if you have access to Lexis-Nexis search their newspaper data base.

Most polls leave some trace in the newspapers, but even if papers have websites, you don't find a lot of stuff via web search engines. Hope this helps, MK.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Tue Dec 28 17:13:08 1999

Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.157])

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

id RAA17920 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Dec 1999 17:13:07 -0800

(PST)



Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA01524

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Dec 1999 20:19:08 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991228192518.00a59f00@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Tue, 28 Dec 1999 20:11:47 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Republican Primary Polls (PS)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 04:37 PM 12/28/99 -0500, DION HOEY wrote:

>I am looking for the results of public polls conducted in the states where  
>the

>early primaries are to be held (New Hampshire, South Carolina, Arizona,  
>Michigan). The public sites I've been too all have national survey data.

A few more data (found via Lexis-Nexis):

Michigan (Detroit News, Dec 19)

>In the December Michigan poll, Bush had a 50-25 percentage lead over  
>McCain. In the November poll Bush's lead was 72-7. Other  
>GOP contenders remain in single digits.

And McCain is ahead of Bush in NH (39:30, N=600) -- from the  
www.politics.com website (polls provided by the PollingReport). But  
according to the Boston Globe poll (released Dec 19) the lead is just

37:33, check:

[http://www.newhampshireprimary.com/search\\_detail.html?id=5211](http://www.newhampshireprimary.com/search_detail.html?id=5211)

And a final hint (especially if you don't have access to Lexis-Nexis; if you are in the academe, chances are good that you do have access -- though you may not know it -- since about 50 percent of all colleges in the US have a subscription to "Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe"; ask one of your smarter librarians about it):

You can use a "news tracker" to automatically track news stories on state polls. One such service is provided for free by Excite:

<http://nt.excite.com/>

You can then visit your "personal web page" at Excite at your leisure and retrieve the news stories (mostly wires) on your topic.

So, there is plenty of information out there, you just need to grab it -- or have it grabbed for you. MK.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Dec 29 06:02:57 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id GAA06644 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 06:02:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (mxusw5x202.chesco.com [209.195.228.202])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA03762

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 09:02:53 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <001001bf5205\$1e5a1f00\$cae4c3d1@default>

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

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Consultant Needed

Date: Wed, 29 Dec 1999 09:00:29 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Consultant needed to estimate market potential for a commercial venture targeted at the gay & lesbian market. Must be familiar with easily available size of market data for major US cities, Philadelphia in particular. Also comparable case histories. Schedule does not permit primary research. Immediate assistance needed. Contact:

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Wed Dec 29 11:26:45 1999

Received: from mailgate.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.19])

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

id LAA01769 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 11:26:44 -0800

(PST)

Received: from conversion.mailgate.nau.edu by mailgate.nau.edu

(PMDF V5.2-32 #39840) id <0FNI00H01OOFNU@mailgate.nau.edu> for  
aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 12:26:41 -0700 (MST)  
Received: from computer (ts15-7.ppp.nau.edu [134.114.12.32])  
by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #39840)  
with SMTP id <0FNI00J5JOODNR@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed,  
29 Dec 1999 12:26:39 -0700 (MST)  
Date: Wed, 29 Dec 1999 12:25:23 -0700  
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Republican Primary Polls  
In-reply-to: <BA164BC78BF@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>  
X-Sender: solop@jan.ucc.nau.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <4.1.19991229122406.00a59b10@jan.ucc.nau.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1  
Content-type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_msJEcbz/ByEDhchV0o65aQ)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_msJEcbz/ByEDhchV0o65aQ)

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

Arizona primary numbers are located at the following  
address:

<http://www.nau.edu/~srl/releases/rel13oct99.htm>

At 04:37 PM 12/28/99 -0500, you wrote:

>I am looking for the results of public polls conducted in the states where  
the

>early primaries are to be held (New Hampshire, South Carolina, Arizona,

>Michigan). The public sites I've been too all have national survey data.

>

>Thank you for your suggestions?

>

Fred Solop, Ph.D.

Director

Social Research Laboratory

PO Box 15301

Northern Arizona University

Flagstaff, AZ 86011

(520) 523-3135 -- phone

(520) 523-6654 -- fax

Fred.Solop@nau.edu

[www.nau.edu/~srl](http://www.nau.edu/~srl)

--Boundary\_(ID\_msJEcbz/ByEDhcHVOo65aQ)

Content-type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<html><div>Arizona primary numbers are located at the following</div>

<div>address:</div>

<br>



eudora="autourl">www.nau.edu/~srl</a></html>

--Boundary\_(ID\_msJEcbz/ByEDhcHVOo65aQ)--

>From cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu Wed Dec 29 11:42:01 1999

Received: from ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.5.9])

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

id LAA12924 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 11:42:01 -0800

(PST)

Received: (from cswhite@localhost)

by ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id NAA22039

for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 13:41:35 -0600 (CST)

Date: Wed, 29 Dec 1999 13:41:35 -0600 (CST)

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

Message-Id: <199912291941.NAA22039@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

Subject: RE: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-MD5: KVY6Bv5qsPOAYWYEp5nTmw==

In 1980 the Census Bureau used suppression to protect the identity of minorities as the geographic levels got smaller .

In 1990 the Census Bureau used a reallocation scheme where information for a

randomly chosen person of similar characteristics were substituted to protect the identity of, say the one black in a given block.

I understand that Census 2000 will also use a reallocation scheme.

Will the reallocation scheme consider multiple racial categories or only single racial categories? That is, if a person of Black & Pacific Islander descent is to be substituted, will blacks be the population for reallocation for one of the tables produced and Pacific Islanders be the population for the other table, or will the population of persons responding Black and Pacific Islander be the population for reallocation?

If the incidence of people responding in multiple racial categories varies regionally, and reallocation is limited to the population of multiple-race respondents, doesn't this significantly complicate the reallocation process?

I realize the Census Bureau isn't going to publish the exact algorithm for reallocation, but does anyone have citations of articles discussing the process and problems of reallocation, particularly given the multiple-race categories issues?

I suppose the problem is more general -- in that similar issues arise with handling missing data. For instance, 30%+ of the block groups in Champaign-Urbana Illinois in 1990 had allocations on the questions contributing to the designation "income below poverty". (Source: American Fact-Finder) Surely this level of allocation was due more to missing data, than to privacy protection. And surely race was one of the variables used in hot-decking the missing values. In Census 2000, how will missing data be estimated?



Carolyn S. White, PhD  
Program Coordinator, OCCSS  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801  
Voice: 217-333-6751  
email: cswwhite@uiuc.edu

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

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

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

Date: Monday, December 27, 1999 11:47 AM

Subject: Re: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

..

>According to Ken Prewitt, at the American Sociological Association meeting,

>all iterations of race/Hispanic status will be produced for the reapportionment

>files (PL94-174), which include counts to the block. There will be two sets of

>such files: 1) One with raw counts; 2) One with counts using the coverage and

>enumeration improvement program. The second count will be marked official.

>In one

>tract in Sacramento, apparently, almost 30% gave a two race answer. I

>think this

>will be also true in CA, NY, FLA, TX, other parts of the West and industrial

>areas. The SC test had no such problems.

>

>There is no definite answer about the tabulations in the Summary Files to

>follow: these are the successors to STF1, STF3, STF2 and STF4. What

>constitutes

>any given race/Hispanic status is not yet firmed up. Furthermore, the new

>classification will make it very difficult to "bridge back" to older

censuses.

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Wed Dec 29 16:28:55 1999

Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id QAA27948 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 16:28:54 -0800

(PST)

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com

Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])

by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA04745

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 16:27:19 -0800

Message-Id: <199912300027.QAA04745@web2.tdl.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Wed, 29 Dec 1999 16:18:50 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: RE: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

In-reply-to: <199912291941.NAA22039@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Anyone interested in this issue ought to read "Draft Provisional

Guidance On the Implementation Of the 1997 Standards For The Collection of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity". It is a pretty in depth discussion of the technical issues involved in changing the data collection and tabulation protocols. This document used to be available on the web through the Whitehouse website, but has subsequently disappeared. If you want a copy I suggest you call Katherine Wallman at OMB. Her number is (202) 395-3093.

Date sent: Wed, 29 Dec 1999 13:41:35 -0600 (CST)

Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

In 1980 the Census Bureau used suppression to protect the identity of minorities as the geographic levels got smaller .

In 1990 the Census Bureau used a reallocation scheme where information for a

randomly chosen person of similar characteristics were substituted to protect the identity of, say the one black in a given block.

I understand that Census 2000 will also use a reallocation scheme.

Will the reallocation scheme consider multiple racial categories or only single racial categories? That is, if a person of Black & Pacific Islander descent is to be substituted, will blacks be the population for reallocation

for one of the tables produced and Pacific Islanders be the population for the other table, or will the population of persons responding Black and

Pacific Islander be the population for reallocation?

If the incidence of people responding in multiple racial categories varies regionally, and reallocation is limited to the population of multiple-race respondents, doesn't this significantly complicate the reallocation process?

I realize the Census Bureau isn't going to publish the exact algorithm for reallocation, but does anyone have citations of articles discussing the process and problems of reallocation, particularly given the multiple-race categories issues?

I suppose the problem is more general -- in that similar issues arise with handling missing data. For instance, 30%+ of the block groups in Champaign-Urbana Illinois in 1990 had allocations on the questions contributing to the designation "income below poverty". (Source: American Fact-Finder) Surely this level of allocation was due more to missing data, than to privacy protection. And surely race was one of the variables used in hot-decking the missing values. In Census 2000, how will missing data be estimated?

Carolyn S. White, PhD

Program Coordinator, OCCSS

University of Illinois

Urbana, IL 61801

Voice: 217-333-6751

email: [cwhite@uiuc.edu](mailto:cwhite@uiuc.edu)

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

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

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

Date: Monday, December 27, 1999 11:47 AM

Subject: Re: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

..

>According to Ken Prewitt, at the American Sociological Association meeting,

>all iterations of race/Hispanic status will be produced for the reapportionment

>files (PL94-174), which include counts to the block. There will be two sets of

>such files: 1) One with raw counts; 2) One with counts using the coverage and

>enumeration improvement program. The second count will be marked official.

>In one

>tract in Sacramento, apparently, almost 30% gave a two race answer. I

>think this

>will be also true in CA, NY, FLA, TX, other parts of the West and industrial

>areas. The SC test had no such problems.

>

>There is no definite answer about the tabulations in the Summary Files to

>follow: these are the successors to STF1, STF3, STF2 and STF4. What

>constitutes

>any given race/Hispanic status is not yet firmed up. Furthermore, the new

>classification will make it very difficult to "bridge back" to older

censuses.

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

If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [postmaster@fsc-research.com](mailto:postmaster@fsc-research.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From [mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu](mailto:mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu) Wed Dec 29 17:58:10 1999

Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156])

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

id RAA16768 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 17:57:32 -0800

(PST)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])

by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA12873

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 29 Dec 1999 20:54:32 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.2.2.19991229204413.00a40050@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

X-Sender: [mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu](mailto:mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu)

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Wed, 29 Dec 1999 20:55:03 -0500

To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

From: Manfred Kuechler <[mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu](mailto:mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu)>

Subject: RE: Census 2000 race/ethnicity categories

In-Reply-To: <199912300027.QAA04745@web2.tdl.com>

References: <199912291941.NAA22039@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 04:18 PM 12/29/99 -0800, sullivan@fsc-research.com wrote:

>Anyone interested in this issue ought to read "Draft Provisional Guidance  
>On the Implementation Of the 1997 Standards For The  
>Collection of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity". It is a pretty in  
>depth discussion of the technical issues involved in changing the  
>data collection and tabulation protocols. This document used to be  
>available on the web through the Whitehouse website, but has  
>subsequently disappeared. ....

The Whitehouse site has gone through some restructuring, and so has the OMB  
subsite -- still under some reconstruction. So, probably nothing sinister  
about the disappearance. However, the document is still available on the  
Web via the "Federal Register" web site at

[http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/aces/aces140.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces140.html)

Search for "Notices" issued "7/9/97" dealing with "statistical policy" and  
you can retrieve the document quickly (choice of ASCII text and PDF, PDF  
file is about 1.2 MB or 74 pages).

Note that this a draft documenting an intermediate point in the discussion.

The final policy plus some history can be found at:

<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/race/Ombdir15.html>

The actual definitions are towards the end of this rather lengthy web page  
(some 15 pages depending on printer/browser setup).

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>