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

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

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

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

Begin archive:
-------------------------------------------------------------------
Archive aapornet, file log9802.
Part 1/1, total size 669316 bytes:

To Whom It May Concern:
Virtually all of you know that Dr. Martha (Marty) Riche has just resigned from the Census Bureau. You may not know that there will be a reception for her this coming Tuesday, February 3rd.

Her resignation as the Census Director was effective on January 31. The reception in her honor is being held from 5 to 7pm at the new American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) building at 1200 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC.

Because in a sense the attacks on sampling in the 2000 Census are a concern to all of us, I thought it worth announcing the reception generally. Marty has represented us well and deserves a big send-off.

If you wish to attend, please RSVP to Communications Consortium Media at 202-326-8727 or via email at <info@ccmc.org>.

All the best, Fritz
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Date: Mon, 02 Feb 1998 08:05:12 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Recent Gallup news story on Clinton approval

Linked to a discussion that ran on AAPORnet last week about media news of the public's opinions towards Clinton, I am forwarding a news story below, that AAPOR member, Dr. David Moore, wrote for the Gallup News Service late last week.

To me, this level of "explanatory" analysis makes for both very informative and very interesting news -- much more so than much of the polling news last week that reported only univariate findings on the public's opinions towards Clinton's interactions with Lewinsky. To me, this also is a very "responsible" news story in that it should stimulate more meaningful deliberation regarding the nature and volatility of public opinion on this issue...
January 31, 1998 -- For immediate release

REPUBLICANS, INDEPENDENTS BOOST CLINTON'S APPROVAL TO RECORD HIGH

By David W. Moore

PRINCETON, N.J. -- In the aftermath of his State of the Union address last Tuesday evening, President Clinton's job approval jumped eight percentage points, reaching the highest level in Clinton's presidency. Significant increases were also recorded in the President's personal favorability rating, and in the level of confidence people have in Clinton to carry out his duties as president. Contrary to what might be expected, these increases were not due to Democrats rallying around the President, but to Republicans and independents giving the President unusually high ratings. Democrats continued to be the source of Clinton's greatest support, but their support was unchanged from what they expressed over the previous weekend.

These results suggest that the Democrats had already reached a "saturation" level of support, with about nine of 10 giving the president high marks. By contrast, independents and Republicans, who initially gave Clinton much lower ratings than Democrats, seemed to be influenced by the speech -- and perhaps also by the White House strategy of criticizing independent counsel Kenneth Starr and the news media -- to a more positive view of the President.

According to the Gallup poll conducted the night after the State-of-the-Union address, 67% of the public approved of the way Clinton was handling his job as president, compared with 59% who approved the previous weekend. But the increase was found only among Republicans and independents. Among Democrats, 88% approved of the president, the highest among the three partisan groups, but no different from the earlier poll. Among independents, 65% approved -- up 12 points, and among Republicans, 43% approved -- also 12 points higher than the weekend numbers.

A similar pattern was found on other measures of Clinton support. Last weekend, 55% gave the president a favorable rating, but the day after the State-of-the-Union address, that number surged to 63% -- an eight-point increase. Among Democrats, however, the increase was just one point (to 86%), compared with a four-point increase among Republicans (to 29%) and a 15-point jump among independents (to 65%).

Republicans Show Largest Increase in Confidence

Clinton's greatest improvement came in the number of Americans who
have confidence in his ability to carry out his duties as president.
Over the weekend, 63% of the public said they were either "very" or
"somewhat" confident, compared with 36% who said they were either "not
too" or "not at all" confident. After Clinton's address to the nation,
Americans expressed confidence by a margin of 76% to 22% -- a jump in
confidence of 13 percentage points overall, with the number expressing
little confidence declining by 14 points.

Again, the increased ratings did not come primarily from Democrats,
but from Republicans and independents. Democrats continue to express
the greatest confidence, with 93% in the latest poll and 88% in the
weekend poll, but that 5-point increase is small by comparison with the
increases recorded among the other two partisan groups. Republicans
showed a jump in favorability toward Clinton of 19 percentage points,
from 36% over the weekend to 55% after Clinton's speech. Similarly,
independents went from 61% to 75% favorable, up 14 percentage points.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The results reported here are based on three Gallup polls. The first
includes telephone interviews with a randomly selected national sample
of 903 adults, conducted January 23-24, 1998. The second includes
telephone interviews with a randomly selected national sample of 864
adults, conducted January 25-26, 1998. The two surveys were aggregated
to a total sample of 1,767 respondents. For results based on a sample
of this size, one can say with 95 percent confidence that the error
attributable to sampling and other random effects could be plus or
minus 3 percentage points. The third survey, which provides the current
results, includes telephone interviews with a randomly selected
national sample of 622, conducted January 28, 1998. For results based
on a sample of this size, one can say with 95 percent confidence that
the error attributable to sampling and other random effects could be
plus or minus 4 percentage points. In addition to sampling error,
question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can
introduce error or bias into the findings of public opinion polls.
Polls conducted entirely in one evening, such as this one, are subject
to additional error or bias not found in polls conducted over several
days.

TABLE 1.
Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bill Clinton is handling his
job as president?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Disapproval</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23-26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 28 ............... 67 ........... 28 ............ 5 ....
Republicans .............. 43 ........... 54 ............ 3 ....
Independents ............. 65 ........... 27 ............ 8 ....
Democrats ............... 88 .......... 9 ............ 3 ....

TABLE 2.
Next, I'd like to get your overall opinion of some people in the news.
As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable
opinion of this person -- or if you have never heard of him or her.

(Bill Clinton)

......................... Favorable..... Unfavorable.... No.....
......................... % .............. % .............. % ......
January 23-26 ............ 55 ........... 41 ............ 4 ....
Republicans .............. 25 ........... 71 ............ 4 ....
Independents ............. 50 ........... 45 ............ 5 ....
Democrats ............... 85 .......... 12 ............ 3 ....

January 28 ............... 63 ........... 32 ............ 5 ....
Republicans .............. 29 ........... 65 ............ 6 ....
Independents ............. 65 ........... 31 ............ 4 ....
Democrats ............... 86 .......... 9 ............ 5 ....

TABLE 3.
How confident are you in Bill Clinton's abilities to carry out his
duties as president --

......................... Very..... Not too/.... Not at all.....
......................... % .............. % .............. % ......
January 23-26 ............ 63 ........... 36 ............ 1 ....
Republicans .............. 36 ........... 62 ............ 2 ....
Independents ............. 61 ........... 37 ............ 2 ....
Democrats ............... 88 .......... 11 ............ 1 ....

January 28 ............... 76 ........... 22 ............ 2 ....
Republicans .............. 55 ........... 42 ............ 3 ....
Independents ............. 75 ........... 22 ............ 2 ....
Democrats ............... 93 .......... 6 ............ 1 ....

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* Director, Survey Research Unit *
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University *
A Washington Post survey of 1,390 randomly selected Americans conducted Wednesday through Saturday found that 66 percent of those interviewed said the country was "generally going in the right direction" and 34 percent we were headed "pretty seriously off on the wrong track." That is not merely the highest "right direction" number we've ever obtained, it's 17 percentage points higher than the percentage in a Post-ABC News national poll of 1,200+ conducted the Thursday-Monday before the intern scandal broke (results 44 percent right direction, 50 percent wrong track). The full text of the story reporting our results may be found on the Post's website, washingtonpost.com.

Anyone care to speculate on the record and for possible use in a Post story why the mood of the country is so positive at a time when the president is under fire? And, more to the point, why it should be far *more* positive now than it was before the scandal broke and when, presumably, the economy was just as good? Spillover from Clinton's soaring approval ratings (also a new record at 67 percent in our latest poll)? State of the Union rally effect? Another example of why this right direction/wrong track question misleads rather than informs? Backlash to the bad-news, scandal-mongering media? Something else? Any and all explanations/speculation cheerfully accepted.

Regards,
Rich Morin
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House Bill 443

Passed the House on 1/15/98
Referred to Senate Committee 1/29/98

According to radio new reports this morning the Senate is expected to
vote on the bill this week.

--
Leo G. Simonetta My Opinions! MINE. All Mine!
Director, UNH Survey Center leos@christa.unh.edu
Fight SPAM! Join CAUCE at http://www.cauce.org
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In response to Rich Morin's question:

Most of the possible reasons why Clinton's ratings are so high despite the zippergate affair surrounding the White House have been already raised by other writers. When the economy is good, inflation down, unemployment down, people tend to be more satisfied and less critical. What the people are saying is that if its not broke, don't fix it. To date, despite all of the news hysteria, nobody has been able to show that anything is really broken. Slightly tarnished, maybe, but not broken. In fact, it's functioning remarkably well.

None of Starr's allegations have been proved to date. And his Whitewater investigation hasn't done much to enhance his image. And the other folks like Tripp, Monica and Goldberg haven't emerged from all of this with improved images. Look at their ratings. So, with the others failing to establish any moral high ground, people are willing to give Clinton the benefit of the doubt. He went into the presidency with a somewhat tarnished reputation and so now its a bit more tarnished. But I think what the people are saying, is "so what?" There may also be a practical element in their thinking, namely, that whatever Clinton was doing, however inappropriate and less than desirable morally, it is not relevant to the governance of the country. And, with all the unproven allegations about Clinton's behavior and the attempted character assassinations, is it remotely possible that he is now seen as the underdog? And we know how the American public reacts to underdogs. Republicans must now! be beside themselves.

Dick Halpern
in the category of random speculation: maybe the scandal is encouraging people to stand back and ask themselves if they really are _concerned_ about what obviously no one believes in (that is, sleeping with young women who work for one when one is married, and lying about it...). But when they ask themselves if they really are concerned, they discover that the answer is no -- why not? because they and the country are actually doing fine on the dimensions that turn out to really matter in their minds -- jobs, crime, drugs, peace.... So it's a coming to awareness of what they have been thinking all along. How's that for some arm chair psychologizing? JH
right direction at 61%

A Washington Post survey of 1,390 randomly selected Americans conducted Wednesday through Saturday found that 66 percent of those interviewed said the country was "generally going in the right direction" and 34 percent we were headed "pretty seriously off on the wrong track." That is not merely the highest "right direction" number we've ever obtained, it's 17 percentage points higher than the percentage in a Post-ABC News national poll of 1,200+ conducted the Thursday-Monday before the intern scandal broke (results 44 percent right direction, 50 percent wrong track). The full text of the story reporting our results may be found on the Post's website, washingtonpost.com.

Anyone care to speculate on the record and for possible use in a Post story why the mood of the country is so positive at a time when the president is under fire? And, more to the point, why it should be far *more* positive now than it was before the scandal broke and when, presumably, the economy was just as good? Spillover from Clinton's soaring approval ratings (also a new record at 67 percent in our latest poll)? State of the Union rally effect? Another example of why this right direction/wrong track question misleads rather than informs? Backlash to the bad-news, scandal-mongering media? Something else? Any and all explanations/speculation cheerfully accepted.

Regards,
Rich Morin
One of the most important points that Paul Lavarkas's request for partisan data brings out is that it allows one to understand some of the ebb and flow of politics in the United States, particularly regarding political communication. For instance, it allows one to answer the question of why many prominent Republicans, who were willing to "let the investigation run its course" last week were out on the hustings this week. It also explains the serial appearances of William Bennett and other conservatives on talk shows, and William Safire's sudden rush to judgment, after his initial column the day the scandal broke, where he stated that the issues were legal, and he "hoped the allegations were false." I see two reasons for this change in strategy.

First, when it looked like Clinton was going down, it was smart politically for Republican leaders to take the high road and to step back from the investigation. We must see this as a purely political decision, however, because over the last week, as the LEGAL case against Clinton has weakened, the Republicans have become MORE vocal. One would expect that if Republican reticence to speak was linked to a desire to step back from the legal issues, that they would become LESS likely to comment on the case as the legal case became WEAKER. The poll numbers from Gallup are also important here-- if Clinton's upward movement in approval ratings is occurring primarily due to the movement of Republicans and Independents, the Republican leadership has to take some action to stop this shift in support. Remaining silent no longer becomes an option; instead, it becomes necessary to rally the troops, which might also have the salutary effect (for the Republicans) of bringing down the approval numbers, and making it appear the President is losing support.
The second reason has to do with midterm elections. One recalls that the primary models for predicting the number of seats the party in power loses in the House of Representatives at midterm use two variables—growth in the economy and the Gallup Presidential approval rating. Tufte argues that these measures directly affect the vote, while Jacobsen argues that they affect strategic decisions by quality candidates to run or not run from the President's (and the opposing) party. For this reason, Jacobsen argues that it is not the measures at the time of the election that matter, but rather, these measures from the previous quarters, when candidates are making their decisions to run.

About fourteen years ago, I wrote a paper in which I played a bit with these formulas, as they existed at that time. Basically, I discovered that if the President had an 80% approval rating (admittedly, one which is abnormally high) and there was NO CHANGE in the economy, the election would be a wash—that is, the President's party would lose no seats. Assuming that the formulas haven't shifted much since then (it's been a while since I've done this work), it is clear why a 73% approval rating for Clinton in the midst of a rapidly growing economy would be of great concern to Republicans, who presently hold an 11 seat majority in the House (and who are facing a special election for the seat that Sonny Bono held). In short, the season is close to the period that Jacobsen describes as being the "critical decision" time by potential candidates, and if the patterns of approval ratings and economic growth are not reversed, the Republicans could be the first not in the White House to lose seats in the House since FDR was President, thereby jeopardizing their slim majority.

All of this is hypothetical, of course, and does not consider such questions as whether the formula holds for seats gained as well as lost, or if "surge and decline" factors might mitigate the above effects. (My work suggested that "surge and decline" explanations were less useful in predicting House outcomes in a President's second term).

It is way too premature to suggest that the Republicans would actually lose seats in the House at midterm, breaking a pattern that has existed for more than fifty years for the President's party. However, looking at the present numbers, I think the Republican leadership is smart to be concerned and to get out on the talk circuit.

Sorry for the lengthy commentary, but this brings me back to my initial point: understanding these trends in public opinion data, and the underlying bivariate relations Paul Lavarkas requested, helps us to understand the actions and political communication strategies of political elites much better. I suspect the media are less likely to analyze trends in this way because they are basically involved with the process, as the outlet in which political elites will appear.

Frank Rusciano
Professor, Political Science Department
Rider University
As a consumer of others' polling on the Clinton issue, it seems like the AAPOR debate has gone a couple of steps forward of my real concerns in helping decide what polls my newspaper should publish and what polls it shouldn't.

The major national organizations have been doing "instant" polling on the Clinton issue (often at the request of their media clients) without always allowing reasonable time to attempt callbacks...one-night windows, two-night windows, even during and after the State of the Union address. This should cause them to oversample older people and women most likely to be at home on the first call, and even if they weight for it, they could do a more thorough job of representing the United States if they had more time to try some of those numbers again.

Furthermore, the results have often been about a day behind the news. The story has been moving so quickly that few respondents have had the same information about the Clinton story two days in a row. So if newspapers are to use these polls, we're left in an uncomfortable position -- either a shallow selection of respondents weighted to look like a more thorough one, or a sample whose components don't have the same information from beginning to end. It may be that those called at the beginning of a two- or three-day sample in this story may have changed their minds about their answers by the end of the fielding period!

My paper's philosophy has been to proceed with extreme caution regarding polls on the Clinton issue. We have not published too many poll results, and are carefully watching (and burying on inside pages) those we use. Until the story slows down, if ever, it seems like the wisest approach.

Are we missing something?
I agree with you about the problems with the speed and haste of polling. This is certainly not an issue/area in which daily tracking polls are called for.

Another troubling issue is the variety of "causal factors" that are offered as explanations for the observed trends, almost none of which have been explicitly measured in any of the surveys (i.e., attitudes toward the State of the Union speech, evaluations of Hillary's defense, etc.).
Would anyone know of any references to articles written about survey work in the field of organizational development? I'm interested in any articles that discuss methodology and/or development as it pertains specifically to organizational development.

Any references will be greatly appreciated.

Yasamin DiCiccio  
Computer-Assisted Survey Team  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
tel: (607) 255-0148  
fax: (607) 255-7774  

A client is conducting a survey of approximately 1,000 attendees at a conference on the Queen Mary on a Saturday evening, February 21. Of course, the client wants toplines on Sunday.

I am looking for someone to handle data entry and tabulation of a 3 page
self-administered questionnaire. There is one open-end question, but coding and tabulation of that question can be delayed.

I welcome any suggestions for free-lancers, tab houses, data entry shops, or full service firms that would be available and interested in this business.

Thanks.
Bob Steen
Fleishman-Hillard Research
St. Louis, MO
314-982-1752
Fax 314-982-9105
E-mail Steenb@fleishman.com

200 N. Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102

This might be a good opscan ("bubble publishing") application. For about $2K you can purchase software to design optically scannable instruments. For about $5K you can purchase a scanner that can read about 2,500 instruments an hour.

I'm not keen on using opscan forms (even non-generic custom-designed ones) for many applications. But if you have a well-educated and young population that's being studied (such as might be the case of those on the Queen Mary), then they are no doubt accustomed to using opscan sheets from their school test-taking days, and would hence have no trouble with responding to these
type of formatted instruments.

Our Survey Center has just purchased this software and hardware for a particular large contract application (surveying large N's of university faculty, staff, and students, all of whom probably are used to filling out "bubble forms" at least monthly). There are probably a bunch of vendor options out there. If you'd phone me, I'll be glad to give you two names/organizations that we contacted for our recent explorations.

Alan Bayer
Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research

At 09:54 AM 2/3/98 -0600, you wrote:
>A client is conducting a survey of approximately 1,000 attendees at a
>conference on the Queen Mary on a Saturday evening, February 21. Of
>course, the client wants toplines on Sunday.
>
> I am looking for someone to handle data entry and tabulation of a 3
>page self-administered questionnaire. There is one open-end question,
>but coding and tabulation of that question can be delayed.
>
>I welcome any suggestions for free-lancers, tab houses, data entry
>shops, or full service firms that would be available and interested in
>this business.
>
>Thanks.
>Bob Steen
>Fleishman-Hillard Research
>St. Louis, MO
>314-982-1752
>Fax 314-982-9105
>E-mail Steenb@fleishman.com
>
>200 N. Broadway
>St. Louis, MO 63102
>
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Alan E. Bayer, Director e-mail: yogi@vt.edu
Center for Survey Research phone: (540)231-3676
207 W. Roanoke St. fax: (540)231-3678
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543 USA

============================================================================
Never play leapfrog with a unicorn
============================================================================
Nancy Mathiowetz has put together another outstanding selection of short courses for the 1998 AAPOR Conference in St. Louis, May 14-17. Most of you know that Bob Groves and Jon Krosnick are at the very top in their areas. Their courses are a special opportunity.

But you may not know, that I, among others at NYAAPOR highly recommended Tony Babinec to Nancy because of his clear, thorough, and very popular workshops for us.

You will receive the conference materials, including the preliminary program, at the end of February; you can sign up for these courses along with your conference registration.

Market Segmentation and Segmentation Analysis
Lynd D. Bacon and Tony Babinec

Thursday, May 14
1:30-5:30pm
Cost: $75

Course Description:

Market segmentation consists of dividing customers into distinct groups, or segments, so that an organization can develop more appropriate marketing programs for them. When done properly, segmentation can advance the organization further towards its goals than it can accomplish by marketing
to undifferentiated customers. In this workshop, we'll review the basics of market segmentation, and we will describe important criteria for evaluating segmentation approaches. We will survey analytic tools that are used for "post hoc" segmentation, i.e., segmentation based on structure in data. Our examples will include recently developed tree-based methods, and partitioning methods. As a result of attending this workshop, participants will have a better understanding of segmentation basics and the variety of analytic tools that may be used to do segmentation analyses.

The Instructors

Lynd D. Bacon, Ph.D. is president of Lynd Bacon and Associates, Ltd. (LBA), a marketing and management science consulting firm serving clients in several industries. He received his Ph.D. in Experimental Psychology from the University of Illinois at Chicago, and an MBA from the University of Chicago. Previously he has been president of Information Arts, Inc., a software development firm; Director, GM Customer Satisfaction Center for Maritz Marketing Research Inc.; and Associate Director, Center for Research in Marketing, Graduate School of Business, The University of Chicago.

Tony Babinec is Director, Advanced Products Marketing at SPSS Inc. SPSS Inc. is a multinational company that delivers reporting, analysis, and modeling software. He received his M.S. from the University of Chicago in Sociology, with a concentration in Advanced Statistics.

Designing Good Questions
Jon Krosnick

Thursday, May 14
2:00-5:00pm
Cost: $75

Course Description

Every questionnaire designer's goal is to build items that produce maximally reliable and valid measurements. And since the beginning of this century, social scientists have conducted thousands of studies comparing different item designs in order to understand which yield the most reliable and valid assessments. Although many of these studies are currently well-known, many more are not, published in a wide range of journals in a wide array of disciplines as far back as 1910. In an investigative project lasting ten years, the course instructor has located these studies and pulled them together in a forthcoming book (The Handbook of Questionnaire Design, Oxford Press, 1999). This course will provide participants with an early insight into the major findings of the book. Topics to be covered include comparisons of open-ended and closed-ended questions, rating vs. ranking, the formation of rating scales, acquiescence, social desirability response bias, response order effects, no-opinion filters, question wording, and question ordering.
The Instructor

Winner of the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award for excellence and Creativity in the Field of Political Psychology, Jon Krosnick is Professor of Psychology and Political Science at the Ohio State University. Trained at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center and Center for Political Studies, Jon has published more than 70 articles on methods to maximize the quality of data collected through surveys, on how public attitudes on political issues are formed and changed, and on the social and cognitive forces shaping political activism and voting behavior.

Nonresponse in Household Interview Surveys

Robert M. Groves

Sunday, May 17
10:30am-5:30pm (includes 1 hour lunch break)
Cost:$125 / $195 Includes the text, Nonresponse in Household Interview Surveys

Course Description

This short course is based on a new book of the same title, coauthored with Mick P. Couper (Wiley, 1998), summarizing theoretical and practical lessons from a six year research program in survey nonresponse. The course offers a convenient way to learn the major findings of the research, focusing on a review of the key chapters of the book.

As AAPOR members know well, the difficulty of contacting and obtaining cooperation from sampled persons in the United States (and other developed countries) is increasing. Some survey organizations attempt to maintain overall response rates by spending more money making calls on previously uncontacted units or by refusal conversion efforts. Some attempts to persuade involve incentives to respondents. Proxy respondents are used when the measurement error impacts are tolerable. Finally, after efforts to reduce nonresponse rates, statistical adjustments to reduce nonresponse errors are attempted. Higher response rates do not by themselves guarantee lower nonresponse error. Nonresponse error depends also on how nonrespondents and respondents differ on the survey statistics. Knowing how efforts to reduce nonresponse rates affect nonresponse error requires some theoretical insights into the causes of survey participation. The course reviews alternative theories and attempts to draw implications for nonresponse error.

The course focuses entirely on interviewer-assisted surveys, not self-administered surveys. The empirical research is based on face-to-face surveys, but each component of the course has a section on telephone surveys as well. The discussion will assume participant knowledge of basic design and collection issues in surveys. When statistical or technical material is presented, examples will be offered for illustration. However, rudimentary
ability to understand linear models is desirable on the part of participants.

The Instructor

Robert M. Groves is Professor of Sociology at the University of Michigan and Senior Research Scientist at its Survey Research Center. He is the director of the Joint Program in Survey Methodology, a consortium of the University of Maryland, Michigan, and Westat, Inc. He is the author of Survey Errors and Survey Costs (Wiley, 1989), Surveys by Telephone (with Robert Kahn, Academic Press, 1979), chief editor of Telephone Survey Methodology (Wiley, 1987), and contributing editor of Measurement Errors in Surveys (Wiley, 1991), and an author of several articles on survey design and survey quality issues. From 1995-1996 he served as AAPOR’s president.

Sage has two books that may be helpful: Harrison: Diagnosing Organizations and Edwards et al., How to Conduct Organizational Surveys. I have not seen the Edwards book.

Would anyone know of any references to articles written about survey work in the field of organizational development? I'm interested in any articles that discuss methodology and/or development as it pertains specifically to organizational development.

Any references will be greatly appreciated.
I forwarded Yasamin DiCiccio's request to a colleague, Jack Edwards, who replied as follows.

I don't know if my meta-analysis will help, but its reference list might include some studies that could help the requestor. Here is the reference for that study.


A couple of years ago, I served as a reviewer for a newer meta-analysis of OD interventions. I think the article was supposed to appear in Academy of Management Review.

Rob Simmons (for Jack Edwards)

--------
From: Yasamin DiCiccio
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: surveys in OD
Date: Tuesday, February 03, 1998 9:19AM

Would anyone know of any references to articles written about survey work in the field of organizational development? I'm interested in any articles that discuss methodology and/or development as it pertains specifically to organizational development.
Any references will be greatly appreciated.

Yasamin DiCiccio
Computer-Assisted Survey Team
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

tel: (607) 255-0148
fax: (607) 255-7774

---

AAPORNET Colleagues:
Please see the question below. I'm sure that these Swedish students would greatly appreciate any input you could give them on "the differences between attitudes and opinions." Please respond to them at marin.strandberg@goteborg.mail.telia.com.

Thanks,
Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Laboratory
Champaign, IL

(Marina,
Anti gives me too much credit, even on a good day, to discuss the differences between attitudes and opinions, real or semantic. On a bad day like this, after returning from a glorious week in Jamaica to a pile of things including 93 e-mails, I cannot say "no problem, mon." However, I think several of my colleagues know of such things and can and will give you insights into your query. I have sent your message to AAPORNET and asked them to respond to you. (Anti can tell you more about AAPOR and AAPORNET.)

Good luck.
Diane O'Rourke

Received: from d1o25.telia.com (root@d1o25.telia.com [195.198.160.241])
Ms O’Rourke,

We received your e-mail address through Mr Anti Attiainen, who said you if anyone could help us with to solve a theoretical problem. We are two HRM students who are fighting with our master report. We done a survey about attitudes within an organization, but we are very unsecure about the difference between attitudes and opinions. We have of course tried to find the answer in various literature, with a number of teachers and institutes here in Sweden, but nobody seems to exactly know a proper definition between the two. So when we finally Mr. Attiainen he recommended you as one of the best experts in the field. The question we have, and hope you can help us with is "what are the differences between attitudes and public opinions?" We would really appreciate if you would take a minute of your time to help us solve our problem.

Sincerely,
Marina Strandberg & Maria Thilman
e-mail: marin.strandberg@goteborg.mail.telia.com=20

>From JonRicht@aol.com Tue Feb  3 17:22:02 1998
Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.19.174])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id RAA21280 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Feb 1998 17:21:49 -0800
(PST)
From: JonRicht@aol.com
Received: from JonRicht@aol.com
  by imo17.mx.aol.com (IMOv12/Dec1997) id 0VAa012129
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Feb 1998 18:41:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <ccaa10c6.34d7ab45@aol.com>
To further add to the speculation about the high 'right direction' / 'wrong track' numbers (and touching on the univariate analysis issue). We have found that there is a significant difference in 'right direction' percents when examined by those who watched the President's State of the Union address and those who did not. Those who had seen all or part of the speech rate 'right direction' more than 20% higher than those who did not see it.

Jonathan Richter  
Senior Associate  
KRC Research and Consulting

At 06:41 PM 2/3/98 -0500, you wrote:

> To further add to the speculation about the high 'right direction' /  
> 'wrong track' numbers (and touching on the univariate analysis issue).  
> We have found that there is a significant difference in 'right  
> direction' percents when examined by those who watched the President's  
> State of the Union address and those who did not. Those who had seen
all or part of the speech rate 'right direction' more than 20% higher than those who did not see it.

Jonathan Richter
Senior Associate
KRC Research and Consulting

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

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.

Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management

Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit

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

College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126

154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210

Voice: (614)-292-6672    Fax: (614)-292-6673    E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu

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

I have attached a complete set of releases from recent CBS News and CBS News/New York Times polls. Let me review our polling in this case:
1. 1/22/98. This was a one-night survey consisting of few substantive questions, reported on a Special 48 Hours broadcast that same night (10 p.m. EST).

2. 1/24-25/98. A scheduled CBS/NYT poll conducted before the State of the Union message. We used both weekend days for interviewing, with multiple callbacks and refusal conversions.

3. 1/26/98. A continuation of the weekend poll. CBS News continued interviewing to protect against any changes in opinion as new information came out.

4. 1/27/98. This was a special POST-State of the Union message poll. We had pre-interviewed a sample of possible respondents between 1/18 and 1/21 and recruited them to participate after the SOTU address. This was the first indication to us of a major change in presidential support levels after the speech. Please note that this group is more heavily skewed to speech watchers -- because of the recruitment procedures -- than the country.

5. 1/28/98. Panel reinterviews of respondents first interviewed 1/24-26. It provided truer measures of opinion change, and solidified the judgment that opinion had shifted in the president's direction. One indication: 38% of those who DISAPPROVED of Clinton's job performance before the speech approved afterwards.

6. 2/1/98. An all-day Sunday poll, with multiple callbacks. This was used as a check on the elevated ratings earlier in the week.

There is support for the belief that the speech helped, as well as support for the belief that many Americans view this as a PRIVATE, not a PUBLIC matter, and that the attacks on the President are viewed as partisan. But the general pro-administration reaction in the President's numbers is also a pro-government reaction. Congress's approval ratings have never been higher. The last time Congress did nearly as well was in the wake of the Persian Gulf War, when all branches of government seemed to benefit from the rally effect.

Please note: the attachments are in Word Perfect format and heavily formatted. They should be saved before reading.

Kathy Frankovic
CBS News
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