This is the USC Listproc archive of AAPORTNET 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
AAPORTNET volunteer host

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9902.
Part 1/1, total size 441574 bytes:
Senior Lecturer/Lecturer/Assistant Lecturer in
Marketing, Palmerston North

Department of Marketing

For the position of Senior Lecturer you will have a PhD, a good publication record and relevant teaching and professional experience.

For the position of Lecturer you will preferably have a degree at the
Masters level and a strong commitment to publication and research. Relevant teaching and professional experience would also be an advantage.

For the position of Assistant Lecturer you will have a good degree in marketing, or other relevant discipline, and a strong interest in academic research.

While the preferred qualification is a business degree with an emphasis on marketing, other relevant qualifications would include those in appropriate areas of the arts, humanities, social sciences and applied sciences. The successful applicant without a higher degree in marketing would be encouraged to undertake further study.

The Department believes that there are substantial weaknesses in many of the theories on which the conventional approach to marketing is based. Consequently, the Department emphasises the critical evaluation of assumptions underlying marketing practice and adopts a rigorous, empirical approach to marketing. The Department has a strong academic and applied research programme, and publishes the Marketing Bulletin. It also has an active involvement with the business community.

You would be expected to contribute to the Department's teaching programme, to supervise student research and to engage in your own research. The Department teaches undergraduate students in courses leading to the Bachelor of Business Studies degree, as well as students enrolled in postgraduate Honours, Masterate, MBA and PhD courses.

Enquiries of an academic nature may be made to Dr Janet Hoek, (telephone 64-6-350 5583, email J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz).
Reference number: NZJOB11/99S must be quoted.

Closing date: 5 March 1999.

Equality of opportunity is University policy.

Private Bag 11-222, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Janet Hoek  
Senior Lecturer in Marketing  
Massey University  
Palmerston North  
NEW ZEALAND

Phone :     +64 6350 5583  
Fax   :     +64 6350 2260  
E-mail      :     J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Wed Feb  3 06:59:35 1999  
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.32])  
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
    id GAA17515 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 06:59:34 -0800 (PST)  
Received: from oemcomputer (ts6-1.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.112.104])  
    by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id JAA15006  
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 09:59:30 -0500 (EST)
Within a few days, letters and email messages will go out to each person who submitted a proposal for a panel, paper, poster, or roundtable to be considered for inclusion in the 1999 AAPOR conference at the Tradewinds Hotel, St. Petersburg, FL, May 13-16, 1999.

Later in February, the AAPOR office will be sending out a mailing that will include a lot of information about the conference, including how to register and the Preliminary Program. Much of this information will go out via email and also be placed on the AAPOR website.

-----------------------
Professor Paul J. Lavrakas, Chair
1999 AAPOR Conference Committee

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Feb  3 07:26:38 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA23592 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 07:26:36 -0800
    (PST)
Locally, there is a discussion about initiating a test case under The Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 USC sec. 227. Some residents are annoyed by telemarketing calls, especially when left on the answering machine. Evidently, this law protects consumers who have asked to have their name placed on a "do not call" list." Statutory damages are $500.

Also, one resident reports that you can buy a book from Private Citizen -- http://www.private-citizen.com -- called something like "How to Sue a Telemarketer."

Is anyone aware of this "do not call" list, and impacts on sampling? = Does
AAPOR look after these issues and the potential impact on opinion research?

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

>From lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Feb 3 07:42:41 1999
Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EYEORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA26982 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 07:42:40 -0800 (PST)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])
    by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA20771
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 09:29:23 -0600 (CST)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
    with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 03 Feb 1999 09:27:08 -0600
Message-Id: <s6b8166b.007@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 03 Feb 1999 09:28:41 -0600
From: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: Mark@bisconti.com, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Consumer protection laws -Reply

Yes, I've heard of it. We purchase sample from Genesys and they ask about it when we order sample. The numbers are tiny (at this point anyway), something like a few thousand across the United States. You may want to contact someone at Genesys or SSI for more exact numbers. Linda Owens

>>> Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com> 02/03/99 09:16am >>>
Locally, there is a discussion about initiating a test case under The =
Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 USC sec. 227. Some residents are =
annoyed by telemarketing calls, especially when left on the answering =
machine. Evidently, this law protects consumers who have asked to have =
their name placed on a "do not call" list." Statutory damages are $500.

Also, one resident reports that you can buy a book from Private Citizen =
-- http://www.private-citizen.com -- called something like "How to Sue a =
Telemarketer."

Is anyone aware of this "do not call" list, and impacts on sampling? = Does
AAPOR look after these issues and the potential impact on opinion =
research?

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com
The National Center for Education Statistics seeks a senior education research analyst at the GS-14 level (beginning salary of $68,570). The incumbent of this position will be the senior analyst for the staff responsible for the design, implementation, analysis, and dissemination of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), a periodic sample survey of school districts, schools, principals, and teachers in both the public and private sectors.

The individual must have experience in the design, implementation, and analysis of large-scale sample surveys, and have knowledge of statistical and social science research methods as well as education research issues as they relate to elementary and secondary education.

For more information concerning this position, contact Dan Kasprzyk at 202-219-1588 or through e-mail - daniel_kasprzyk@ed.gov
At 10:16 AM 2/3/99 -0500, Mark Richards wrote:

>...

>Is anyone aware of this "do not call" list, and impacts on sampling?

>Does

AAPOR look after these issues and the potential impact on opinion research?

>
Also on the list of "scary trends influencing phone surveys" are products like Ameritech's new Privacy Manager and Anonymous Call Rejection features.


For about $4 a month, potential respondents can lock us out along with telemarketers, charity solicitors, scam artists and all those other people who call just as I've gotten comfortable with the paper. It actually sounds pretty tempting!

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

>From jbason@arches.uga.edu Wed Feb 3 07:57:27 1999
Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id HAA02310 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 07:57:26 -0800 (PST)
Received: from archa6.cc.uga.edu (archa6.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu (LSMT for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.007C6863@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 10:57:25 -0500
Received: from jud.ibr.uga.edu (jud.ibr.uga.edu [128.192.63.15]) by archa6.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA137486 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 10:56:01 -0500
From: James Bason <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Consumer protecâon laws
In-Reply-To: <01BE4F5E.39D47E60@mark-bri>
Message-ID: <SiMEON.9902031003.J@jud.ibr.uga.edu>
Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1999 10:55:03 -0800 (Pacific Standard Time)
The Georgia Legislature passed a law last year which allows a resident, for $5.00, to have their name placed on a list with the Georgia Office of Consumer Affairs. Telemarketers, fundraisers, etc. are forbidden from calling individuals on that list. Exempt are academic polling organizations and political pollsters. The penalty for violating the law is I think a $2,000.00 fine.

I am not sure exactly how it has worked thus far, or how it can prevent someone from out of state from calling an individual. I'm also not sure how enforcement of the law works.

Jim.

James J. Bason, Ph.D.
Director
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602
jbason@arches.uga.edu
(706) 542-6110
(706) 542-4057 FAX
The Council or American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) follows these laws as well as the Marketing Research Association (MRA).
Does The Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 USC sec. 227 apply specifically to telemarketing calls, that is, calls made for the purpose of selling something? If so, firms doing social surveys, particularly those sponsored by government or a nonprofit organization, need not be concerned.
This is probably also true for political polling. The case for market research may be less clear.

Also, if this is a statute with criminal penalties, what grounds does a person have for suing a telemarketer in a civil court?

begin: vcard
fn: Edward Freeland
n: Freeland;Edward
org: Princeton Survey Research Center
adr;dom: 202 Robertson Hall;;Princeton University;Princeton;NJ;08544-1013;
email;internet: efreelan@princeton.edu
title: Associate Director
tel;work: (609) 258-1854
tel;fax: (609) 258-1985
x-mozilla-cpt: ;0
x-mozilla-html: FALSE
version: 2.1
end: vcard
It is my understanding that these laws do not apply to legitimate survey research, i.e., a legitimate survey that has no sales pitch associated with it.

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

* * *

* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.

* *

* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management

*
>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Feb  3 10:48:40 1999
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA00950 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 10:48:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-37kb9a7.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.165.71])
    by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id NAA14849
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 13:48:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990203120809.007ea220@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 03 Feb 1999 12:08:09 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Consumer protection laws
In-Reply-To: <3.0.1.32.19990203120809.007ea220@pop.mindspring.com>
In response to Jim's note about Ameritech's new Privacy Manager and Anonymous Call Rejection features please know that we've had caller ID and Anonymous Call Rejection features as part of our phone service for over a year. It is supposed to prevent telemarketers and anyone else who won't reveal their phone number from getting through to us.

Bell South's description of their service:

"If capturing the names and numbers of callers is important to you, Bell South Anonymous Call Rejection can ensure that Caller ID with Name and Number Delivery works for you every time. With Anonymous Call Rejection, people who block delivery of their name and number to your Caller ID equipment can't reach you unless they stop blocking. This ensures that everyone who wants to speak with you will supply their identifying information.

"Bell South Caller ID with Name and Number Delivery lets you identify everyone who calls you, except for callers with privacy features that prevent their names and numbers from being identified. Anonymous Call Rejection identifies callers using privacy features and routes them to a recorded message. The message tells callers they must disable the privacy feature in order to reach you. And, your phone doesn't ring until they do just that."
Sounds great except that it does not work.

It does not always block calls from those who refuse to identify their number or name. Telemarketers and others have discovered a way of easily getting around this restriction. Bell South offers no satisfactory explanation except to say that calls originating outside of their area cannot be blocked. Apparently there are other ways for them to avoid caller block barriers.

One would think that caller block could be made to work with any caller whose name or number that shows up on our ID machine as private, unknown, etc. Electronically, this should be simple. In other words, if the number is not shown, the call should be automatically blocked.

I asked Bell South about this over a month ago but so far no response.

The moral of this I suppose, is that as currently featured, caller ID and Caller Block can easily be defeated by pollsters and anyone else who so chooses. But, if a polling organization correctly identifies itself, there should be no problem in getting through--and thus there should be no impact on polling using telephone samples.

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Feb 3 11:02:35 1999
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA05273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 11:02:33 -0800 (PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
    id <V848PT3R>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 14:02:59 -0500
Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9130949@AS_SERVER>
CMOR has a nice page on their website
that covers their work bit at the state and the
national level.

http://www.cmor.org/whatsnew.htm

I particularly recommend http://www.cmor.org/govtarticles/aug-art.htm

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Feb 3 12:13:05 1999
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA18392 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 12:12:51 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-38lcjl3.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.78.163])
    by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA02829
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 15:12:43 -0500 (EST)
I believe Paul is correct, at least in Georgia.

At 12:28 PM 2/3/1999 -0500, you wrote:
> It is my understanding that these laws do not apply to legitimate
> survey research, i.e., a legitimate survey that has no sales pitch
> associated
> with it.
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> *
> * * *
> * *
> Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
> *
> * Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy &
Management *
> * Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit
> *
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> ```
DIRECTOR, RESEARCH & EVALUATION

Prestigious healthcare organization in the Chicago area seeks Director, Research & Evaluation to assume responsibility for activities related to health services research, including goals, strategies, performance measurement, funding, etc. Outstanding opportunity for Ph.D., with healthcare related experience.

Plan, organize and direct activities related to health services research including the research and development of new programs, operating,
innovations, health care issues, and technical research.

Conceptualize, identify, test and develop major programmatic and operational innovations.

Conduct research to enhance and publicize the organization's ability and leadership in assessing and improving the quality of health care.

Develop short and long term goals and strategies to achieve those goals.

Manage the activities of department staff.

Identify and obtain funding from the public and private sectors to support research activities of the department.

Direct departmental research projects including oversight and leadership in research design assessment methodologies, data collection systems, survey techniques, and data analysis and interpretation.

Direct the dissemination of research and evaluation findings through presentations at conferences, publication in journals, and other means.

Requirements:

Doctoral degree

Eight + years experience managing research and development activities in a healthcare setting
Demonstrated ability to secure outside funding from public and private sources

Ability to lead and motivate staff

If interested, please respond in confidence to:

Cheryl McClees, President
McClees Henrich Associates
625 North Court
Palatine, IL 60067
Voice: 847.540.7701
Fax: 847.540.7786
Email: mccleeshenrich@worldnet.att.net

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Feb 4 09:39:20 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA05088 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 4 Feb 1999 09:39:10 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
    medusa.nei.org (Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id
    <B0000434322@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 04 Feb 1999
    12:37:30 -0500
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
    Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
    id D6BZ2462; Thu, 4 Feb 1999 12:41:35 -0500
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
From:  The Washington Post

For the Record
Thursday, January 28, 1999; Page A26

>From "Hyperdemocracy," by political scientist Hugh Heclo, in the Winter
>=
1999 issue of the Wilson Quarterly:

At all levels of government, the political culture of hyperdemocracy = encourages citizens to behave like spoiled children, demanding that = government "meet my needs," and alternating between sullen withdrawal = and boisterous whining. And like angry children who nonetheless never = doubt that their mother will always be there to ultimately set things = right, Americans -- at the same time that they exhibit an almost = pathological cynicism about the political processes by which they govern = themselves -- generally express immense, not to say blind, faith in = their nation's future and in its standing as a democratic model for the = world. In short, they naively trust in the ultimate unimportance of = their distrust -- that
when things get bad enough, the system somehow will automatically right itself, presumably through the efforts of other people, who do not share their cynicism. But the truth is that the ills of hyperdemocracy are not self-limiting or self-correcting. Things can keep going from bad to worse. And as concerns the quality of the public discussion that is so basic to democracy, things have been getting worse for some time now.

To tame hyperdemocracy, we must drastically reduce the influence of public opinion at its shallowest, and the way to do that is to pay a lot more attention to public opinion at its most thoughtful.

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company
Folks,

I am interested in learning the current hourly rates charged by academic and other consultants for work on legal cases and for court appearances and testimony.

Please send whatever enlightenment you might have directly to me (be sure you do NOT post to AAPORNET). I promise to treat all transmissions with the strictest confidence, and to post a summary of whatever I might learn for the enlightenment of all of us on AAPORNET.

-- Jim
An update re Georgia Law re restrictions against telemarketers:

Any restriction against telemarketers using any method to block their telephone number from caller ID’s is included in House Bill 71 which was passed in 1998. The restriction found in Section 1 specifically states

"No person or entity who makes a telephone solicitation to the telephone line of a residential subscriber in this state shall knowingly utilize any method to block or otherwise circumvent such subscribers use of a caller identification service."

A nice law which is violated thousands of times daily.
As stated the law should have no impact on legitimate polling operations.

Dick Halpern

At 02:02 PM 2/3/1999 -0500, you wrote:
> CMOR has a nice page on their website
> that covers their work bit at the state and the
> national level.
> 
> http://www.cmor.org/whatsnew.htm
> 
> I particularly recommend http://www.cmor.org/govarticles/aug-art.htm
> 
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
> 
> From CTalkov@aol.com Fri Feb 5 12:14:14 1999
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA10695 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 12:14:11 -0800
(PST)
From: CTalkov@aol.com
I am looking for information on scanning software, in particular, the SPSS product Teleform. Also, can anyone recommend a particularly good, reasonably priced scanner?

Thanks.

Please reply to: ctalkov@opiniondynamics.com

Cynthia Talkov
Director of Analysis
Opinion Dynamics Corporation
1030 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: 617/492-1400
Fax: 617/497-7944

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Feb 5 14:10:28 1999
Folks,

The spirit of AAPOR is alive and well! Within 24 hours of posting to AAPORNET my query about legal and court consulting fees, I had received--all by personal E-mail--22 helpful responses from prominent AAPOR members. My thanks to each of you! If AAPORNET weren't free, I'm sure I couldn't afford the service.

I had intended to keep my promise in this message, that is, to report to you all a summary of what I have learned. Since making that promise, in all innocence, however, I have learned from two of you that what I proposed
might be in violation of U.S. antitrust laws against price-fixing.

After some modest research, I am certain that I have not broken any law, nor have any of you kind enough to reply to me--personal, nonbinding discussions of fees are not against any law. Nor is AAPOR legally responsible in any way for private discussions of topics announced on a list fully-funded by the University of Southern California.

Unfortunately, the legal complications surrounding my posting of any summary of what I have learned here--to a mass audience of almost a thousand AAPOR members--is not at all clear to me at this time. For this reason, I must regretfully postpone my promised list, pending legal clarifications.

I have already asked USC attorneys for the university's interpretation of laws related to the *public* discussion of commercial fees via internet lists (again, private discussions are clearly *not* restricted). I plan to ask AAPOR Council whether it might not be a good idea to seek the advice of our own legal counsel. Considering the obvious involvement and interest of our members in such topics, I think it would good to know the extent to which these might be discussed, for example, at our annual conferences.

One AAPOR member has suggested a useful Web source on these issues:

    www.hwg.org/resources/faqs/priceFAQ.html

The information presented there essentially agrees with what I have learned on my own and summarized above.

Certainly all of us are free to discuss this topic here on AAPORNET--but no
mention of any specific fees, please.

My thanks to those of you who took the time to respond, or who will do so in the near future (only to me personally, however; do NOT post to AAPORNET).

Again, I apologize for not being able to keep my promise at this time.

-- Jim

******

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri Feb 5 14:26:39 1999
Received: from smtp2.mindspring.com (smtp2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.32])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA17725 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 14:26:36 -0800 (PST)
Received: from default (user-38ld35n.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.140.183])
   by smtp2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA31259
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 17:26:34 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.1.19990205172457.00a9e330@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Fri, 05 Feb 1999 17:28:02 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: RE: Legal and Court Consulting
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9902051408071.23551-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
I do not understand why there is a legal problem sharing information about
legal and court consulting fees. What is the difference between presenting a
summary of legal fees and the information regularly posted in scholarly
periodicals about salaries for various positions?

warren mitofsky

At 02:10 PM 2/5/99 -0800, you wrote:

> Folks,

> The spirit of AAPOR is alive and well! Within 24 hours of posting to
> AAPORNET my query about legal and court consulting fees, I had
> received--all by personal E-mail--22 helpful responses from prominent
> AAPOR members. My thanks to each of you! If AAPORNET weren't free,
> I'm sure I couldn't afford the service.

> I had intended to keep my promise in this message, that is, to report
> to you all a summary of what I have learned. Since making that
> promise, in all innocence, however, I have learned from two of you that
> what I proposed might be in violation of U.S. antitrust laws against
> price-fixing.

> After some modest research, I am certain that I have not broken any
> law, nor have any of you kind enough to reply to me--personal,
> nonbinding discussions of fees are not against any law. Nor is AAPOR
> legally responsible in any way for private discussions of topics
>announced on a list fully-funded by the University of Southern
>California.
>
>Unfortunately, the legal complications surrounding my posting of any
>summary of what I have learned here--to a mass audience of almost a
>thousand AAPOR members--is not at all clear to me at this time. For
>this reason, I must regretfully postpone my promised list, pending
>legal clarifications.
>
>I have already asked USC attorneys for the university's interpretation
>of laws related to the *public* discussion of commercial fees via
>internet lists (again, private discussions are clearly *not*
>restricted). I plan to ask AAPOR Council whether it might not be a
>good idea to seek the advice of our own legal counsel. Considering the
>obvious involvement and interest of our members in such topics, I think
>it would good to know the extent to which these might be discussed, for
>example, at our annual conferences.
>
>One AAPOR member has suggested a useful Web source on these issues:
>
>www.hwg.org/resources/faqs/priceFAQ.html
>
>The information presented there essentially agrees with what I have
>learned on my own and summarized above.
>
>Certainly all of us are free to discuss this topic here on
>AAPORNET--but no mention of any specific fees, please.
>
>My thanks to those of you who took the time to respond, or who will do
>so in the near future (only to me personally, however; do NOT post to >AAPORNET).
>
>Again, I apologize for not being able to keep my promise at this time.
>
> -- Jim

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From bgroves@survey.umd.edu Fri Feb  5 15:09:48 1999
Received: from umailsrv2.umd.edu (umailsrv2.umd.edu [128.8.10.76])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id PAA00346 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 15:09:47 -0800
(PST)
Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.4])
  by umailsrv2.umd.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id SAA27709
  for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 18:09:46 -0500
Received: from JPSM/SpoolDir by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.21);
  5 Feb 99 18:09:45 +1100
Received: from SpoolDir by JPSM (Mercury 1.21); 5 Feb 99 18:09:28 +1100
AAPOR is cosponsoring the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, October 28-31, 1999, in Portland, Oregon.

The conference will have over 150 presentations of recent research on understanding and reducing nonresponse rates, and compensating for missing data in surveys. Participants will receive a free copy of a monograph summarizing the state of the art in the field.

A large number of participants is expected. The registration process is being opened today. AAPOR members are encouraged to download a registration form and send it in to reserve their place.

To register for the conference, access the conference web site -- www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/

Follow the links to "registration" and download a conference registration form, for mailing or faxing.

Separate hotel reservations can also be made via the web, by following the link from "hotel reservation."

See you in Portland!
I don't know about anyone else, but I was fascinated and amazed by the dynamics and the volume of national news coverage D.C. and our new congressionally-approved mayor received after one of his white employees told his staff that he would have to be niggardly (miserly) with his agency's budget. Some of his black staff thought they heard THE "N" word, and rumors spread rapidly through our 120 neighborhoods. The white employee, the mayor's only gay appointee, felt he couldn't continue to
effectively head the front-line office of constituent services and resigned. Williams accepted his resignation, setting off a firestorm of criticism for "caving in to PC politics." Those who misunderstood and spread the rumor apologized. Yesterday, the mayor asked the employee to "withdraw his resignation," and the employee agreed to return in another position. The employee said "I just feel very pleased that this whole thing has a silver lining. The silver lining is that this has led to a discussion that can help everyone understand each other better... I used to think it would be great if we could all be colorblind. That's naive, especially for a white person, because a white person can't afford to be colorblind. They don't have to think about race every day. An African American does."

There are SO many District of Columbia stories that, nationally, go untold. I know it's hard to believe, but the District is regularly abused by Congressional representatives, most recently those from North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and Texas. [Historically, the former Confederate states kept DC from having even partial local self-government until 1974, especially SC-and it was clearly over race. These days, intervention is because of poor management or poor local decision-making, they say.] For example, VA and MD representatives sit on oversight committees that control DC's budget-all local money. Congress has prohibited DC from using its money to (1) sue the federal govt. for excluding DC from representation in the national legislature, (2) count the votes from a Nov. Ballot Initiative (Mr. Barr from Georgia didn't think he'd like the outcome, so we still don't know), (3) fund abortions, (4) allow adoptions by same sex partners, etc., etc., etc. In addition, VA and MD earn $1billion p/year in tax revenues for their cities because 60% of our workforce live miles away in those states,
and they prohibit DC from collecting any of it. Regardless of what one thinks of these issues, no other jurisdiction in this country lacks such basic republican protections while being taxed and fighting in wars without any vote in Congress. And, while DC citizens can vote for President, they have no say on Impeachment issues. NONE of these issues have warranted an inch of copy in the national press, as far as I can tell. 

So, while DC is the laughing stock, maybe the "niggardly" story is not about DC after all. The mayor clearly accepted the resignation in haste. But, I think the coverage nationally is more about white fright over immigration and the changing complexion of America (not reflected in Congress), and the fact that many are tired of feeling they have to "walk on ice" when they speak and should be given the benefit of the doubt. The mayor's office received angry calls from across the nation. I suspect the word niggardly will become more common in conversations now that it has been defined so carefully in the press, although our mayor says he won't use it and some local columnists report they just don't like the sound of it.

What does all this mean from an agenda-setting perspective?!

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Feb 5 19:06:36 1999
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id TAA14461 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 19:06:34 -0800
(PST)
In response to Jim's note about fees, I can't help but wonder what the difference is between the posting of these fees (as averages and ranges, of course) and the publication by different magazines about the salary structures (averages and ranges) of a wide variety of different positions by various business magazines (Business Week, Advertising Age, Forbes, etc.) This is done on a yearly basis and is a regular feature in such publications. I doubt seriously that their publication of such information constitutes price fixing. Salary structures for all sorts of professions are also published from time to time by daily newspapers.

Dick Halpern
Mark Richards wrote:

> There are SO many District of Columbia stories that, nationally, go
> untold. I know it's hard to believe, but the District is regularly
> abused by Congressional representatives, most recently those from North
> Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and Texas.

Speaking of which, it's struck me all throughout this impeachment
tragicomedy that the process, like Congress in general, is dominated by
white southern conservative men. Does anyone here know offhand what
percentage of the U.S. population fits that demographic? Off the top of my
head, I'd say around 5% - how far off am I? Doug
I've been reading about scanners, and the UMAX line seems well-regarded, with the product name of Astra 1200 or 1220, etc. I'm close to buying the 1220S for my Power Mac computer. I believe the UMAX line works with both PC and Mac computers. In general, I would go to the magazines and rating
services online and read PC and Mac reviews of hardware, such as at cnet.com, macworld.com, etc.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From mtrau@umich.edu Sat Feb 6 09:45:32 1999
Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.19])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA27796 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 09:45:31 -0800 (PST)
Received: from stargate.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@stargate.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.82])
   by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id MAA07746
   for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 12:45:28 -0500 (EST)
Received: from localhost (mtrau@localhost)
   by stargate.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id MAA04791
   for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 12:45:28 -0500 (EST)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Sat, 6 Feb 1999 12:45:28 -0500 (EST)
From: Michael W Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
X-Sender: mtrau@stargate.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: Answer and Citation
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.4.05.9902061243220.3682-100000@stargate.rs.itd.umich.edu>
Does any one know the current proportion (percent) of households with more than one telephone line (different numbers) coming into them? An accompanying citation would be helpful too.

Please reply to me personally. Thanks in advance.
A month or so ago there was a useful discussion here of how Clinton, Lewinski, et al. has affected assumptions about agenda setting and media effects more generally. Perhaps there is also something to be learned from the same events about the limitations of hypothetical survey questions that attempt to predict how people will react to possible new information. Such questions are tempting, since the ability to foretell the future is always much in demand.

I don't have data from a year ago at hand, but my memory is that poll results then showed that a majority of Americans indicated they would favor impeachment (probably meaning conviction) if the president were shown to have lied or encouraged others to lie. Leaving aside the legal issues, a majority of Americans have probably concluded, rightly or wrongly, that Clinton has very likely done those things. Yet his support has remained steady, with the public's basic wish to see him continue in office having trumped whatever reservations are felt about his specific actions. Hypothetical poll questions can no doubt tell us something about the present--many of us have used them for that purpose--but probably very little about what the future holds.
Jim:

If I understand your comments, nothing prevents you from sending the summary to each of the 22 separately.

Best,

Sid
At 02:10 PM 2/5/99 -0800, you wrote:

> 
> >Folks, 
> > 
> >The spirit of AAPOR is alive and well! Within 24 hours of posting to 
> >AAPORNET my query about legal and court consulting fees, I had 
> >received--all by personal E-mail--22 helpful responses from prominent 
> >AAPOR members. My thanks to each of you! If AAPORNET weren't free, 
> >I'm sure I couldn't afford the service. 
> > 
> >I had intended to keep my promise in this message, that is, to report 
> >to you all a summary of what I have learned. Since making that 
> >promise, in all innocence, however, I have learned from two of you that 
> >what I proposed might be in violation of U.S. antitrust laws against 
> >price-fixing. 
> > 
> >After some modest research, I am certain that I have not broken any 
> >law, nor have any of you kind enough to reply to me--personal, 
> >nonbinding discussions of fees are not against any law. Nor is AAPOR 
> >legally responsible in any way for private discussions of topics 
> >announced on a list fully-funded by the University of Southern 
> >California. 
> > 
> >Unfortunately, the legal complications surrounding my posting of any 
> >summary of what I have learned here--to a mass audience of almost a
thousand AAPOR members--is not at all clear to me at this time. For this reason, I must regretfully postpone my promised list, pending legal clarifications.

I have already asked USC attorneys for the university's interpretation of laws related to the *public* discussion of commercial fees via internet lists (again, private discussions are clearly *not* restricted). I plan to ask AAPOR Council whether it might not be a good idea to seek the advice of our own legal counsel. Considering the obvious involvement and interest of our members in such topics, I think it would good to know the extent to which these might be discussed, for example, at our annual conferences.

One AAPOR member has suggested a useful Web source on these issues:

www.hwg.org/resources/faqs/priceFAQ.html

The information presented there essentially agrees with what I have learned on my own and summarized above.

Certainly all of us are free to discuss this topic here on AAPORNET--but no mention of any specific fees, please.

My thanks to those of you who took the time to respond, or who will do so in the near future (only to me personally, however; do NOT post to AAPORNET).

Again, I apologize for not being able to keep my promise at this time.
> -- Jim
>
>********
>
>From acep@sprintmail.com Sat Feb 6 17:31:37 1999
Received: from raven.prod.itd.earthlink.net (raven.prod.itd.earthlink.net [209.178.63.9])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id RAA20089 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 17:31:36 -0800 (PST)
Received: from a.parker (sdn-ar-001varestP213.dialsprint.net [168.191.218.125])
   by raven.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA06826
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 17:31:34 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <003001be5239$de831a60$7ddabfa8@a.parker>
From: "Albert Parker" <acep@sprintmail.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Defining "Niggardly" in the News
Date: Sat, 6 Feb 1999 20:25:37 -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 4.72.2106.4
>There are SO many District of Columbia stories that, nationally, go untold.

I know it's hard to believe, but the District is regularly abused by Congressional representatives, most recently those from North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and Texas. [Historically, the former Confederate states kept DC from having even partial local self-government until 1974, especially SC—and it was clearly over race. These days, intervention is because of poor management or poor local decision-making, they say.] For example, VA and MD representatives in Congress, living just a bridge away in the suburbs, sit on oversight committees that control DC's budget—all local money. Congress has prohibited DC from using its money to (1) sue the federal govt. for excluding DC from representation in the national legislature, (2) count the votes from a Nov. Ballot Initiative (Mr. Barr from Georgia didn't think he'd like the outcome, so we still don't know), (3) fund abortions, (4) allow adoptions by same sex partners, etc., etc., etc.. In addition, VA and MD earn $1 billion p/year in tax revenues for their cities because 60% of our workforce live miles away in those states, and they prohibit DC from collecting any of it. Regardless of what one thinks of these issues, no other jurisdiction in this country lacks such basic republican protections while being taxed and fighting in wars without any vote in Congress. And, while DC citizens can vote for President, they have no say on Impeachment issues. NONE of these issues have warranted an inch of copy in the national press, as far as I can tell.

I'm not sure what this has to do with AAPORNET, but for the record, the Congress in these instances and others is executing its Constitutional
There are even more recent examples in this situation that underscore Howard's point about the limitations of hypothetical questions. Prior to the impeachment vote in the House a number of survey questions found
significant support for what might be described as "resignation if impeached." They were frequently at variance with each other, as the hypothetical was described differently ("if he is impeached," "if the articles of impeachment are sent to the Senate for trial") as was the alternative to resignation ("fight the charges in the Senate," "defend himself in the Senate").

The hypothetical meant different things to different people. It was clear that at least some respondents were confusing impeachment with removal from office (in which case why wouldn't he resign?). At any rate, in the days before the vote, asking hypothetical questions resulted in the appearance of anywhere from 40% to 60% support for resignation. As soon as the vote was taken and the question was no longer hypothetical, resignation elicited the same level of support as it had for months in the polls -- just about a third of the public. There was NO evidence of increased support for resignation once the impeachment vote was finally taken, despite the hypothetical polls.

Kathy Frankovic

Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> 02/06/99 07:48pm >>>

A month or so ago there was a useful discussion here of how Clinton, Lewinski, et al. has affected assumptions about agenda setting and media effects more generally. Perhaps there is also something to be learned from the same events about the limitations of hypothetical survey questions that attempt to predict how people will react to possible new information. Such questions are tempting, since the ability to foretell the future is always much in demand.
I don't have data from a year ago at hand, but my memory is that poll results then showed that a majority of Americans indicated they would favor impeachment (probably meaning conviction) if the president were shown to have lied or encouraged others to lie. Leaving aside the legal issues, a majority of Americans have probably concluded, rightly or wrongly, that Clinton has very likely done those things. Yet his support has remained steady, with the public's basic wish to see him continue in office having trumped whatever reservations are felt about his specific actions.

Hypothetical poll questions can no doubt tell us something about the present--many of us have used them for that purpose--but probably very little about what the future holds.
Trite journalistic wisdom attributes Clinton's good fortune to his choices of enemies. I note the invisibility of the enemies in the passive voice and other constructions of the hypotheticals both Kathy and Howard quote. Put the enemies up front in the questions and I think the numbers would change. For instance, consider the effect of substituting for "if impeached" with "if the Republican House majority succeeds in impeaching him"--a wording consistent with the sentiments sustaining Clinton's high numbers. The formulation of the attack on Clinton puts him in opposition to abstractions--justice, the rule of law, the Truth, the impeachment process, equal justice for all, the rights of a poor woman in a civil rights case. Formulate poll Q's that way and you will maximize Clinton's negatives. Make it Clinton vs. Jones, Clinton vs. Starr, Clinton vs. any or all of his opponents and he wins big every time. In addition to Howard's example, the one instance I can think of a less abstract formulation was during the first week when it was the hypothetical, "If the charges are true that he sexually exploited a kid in the White House. . . ." and the general answer was "He should be out of there by the end of the week." So why did the anti-Bill forces abandon this for the abstractions of "It's not about sex. . . ?" My
guesses: (a) the glass house problem, (b) White House spins, (c) Monica, with Shapiro, stayed strongly FOB, (d-- or maybe "a") Clinton is lucky in his enemies.

The lesson for me is an old one: the caution needed in generalizing that some common general property we find a particular set of items is the major operative one in these, much less all items with that property. While the future is less concrete than the present, it is possible to write hypotheticals that are more concrete in some very important way than are alternative one addressed to present or past.

Some hypotheticals should allow for an additional cop-out response: "I'd prefer to cross that bridge if and when I get to it."

Kathy Frankovic wrote:

> There are even more recent examples in this situation that underscore Howard's point about the limitations of hypothetical questions. Prior to the impeachment vote in the House a number of survey questions found significant support for what might be described as "resignation if impeached." They were frequently at variance with each other, as the hypothetical was described differently ("if he is impeached," "if the articles of impeachment are sent to the Senate for trial") as was the alternative to resignation ("fight the charges in the Senate," "defend himself in the Senate").

> The hypothetical meant different things to different people. It was clear that at least some respondents were confusing impeachment with removal from office (in which case why wouldn't he resign?). At any
rate, in the days before the vote, asking hypothetical questions resulted in the appearance of anywhere from 40% to 60% support for resignation. As soon as the vote was taken and the question was no longer hypothetical, resignation elicited the same level of support as it had for months in the polls -- just about a third of the public. There was no evidence of increased support for resignation once the impeachment vote was finally taken, despite the hypothetical polls.

Kathy Frankovic

Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> 02/06/99 07:48pm >>>
A month or so ago there was a useful discussion here of how Clinton, Lewinski, et al. has affected assumptions about agenda setting and media effects more generally. Perhaps there is also something to be learned from the same events about the limitations of hypothetical survey questions that attempt to predict how people will react to possible new information. Such questions are tempting, since the ability to foretell the future is always much in demand.

I don't have data from a year ago at hand, but my memory is that poll results then showed that a majority of Americans indicated they would favor impeachment (probably meaning conviction) if the president were shown to have lied or encouraged others to lie. Leaving aside the legal issues, a majority of Americans have probably concluded, rightly or wrongly, that Clinton has very likely done those things. Yet his support has remained steady, with the public's basic wish to see him continue in office having trumped whatever reservations are felt about his specific actions. Hypothetical poll questions can no doubt tell
> us something about the present--many of us have used them for that
> purpose--but probably very little about what the future holds.

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sun Feb 7 14:52:45 1999
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA14322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Feb 1999 14:52:44 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
    by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id RAA07392
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Feb 1999 17:53:15 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sun, 7 Feb 1999 17:53:14 -0500 (EST)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Sender: andy@troll
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Fees for Others
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.990207174927.7375C-100000@troll>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear All:

This came from a listserv that I get.

I think Jim doth protest "too much." If one were serious about "anti-trust"
implications, his use of AAPORNET to solicit information from a group of
people who may be consultants would also constitute an illegal action.
It seems to me that some general summary at least to those who provided info
would be in order.

Andy Beveridge

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Sat, 06 Feb 1999 04:50:41 -0500
From: info@gisjobs.com
To: mail@gisjobs.com
Subject: FREE salary survey on GISjobs.com!

FREE salary survey on GISjobs.com!

Come to GISjobs.com today! We need GIS Professionals to fill out our salary
survey form so we can show you the results for FREE!

Please forward this announcement to any other persons you know who work in
the GIS industry.

The form is only a few questions & you can remain anonymous.

Currently, we have the results from almost 1400 GIS persons displayed.
Very soon, our results will be displayed to you instantly so you have the
most up to date survey results available--anytime, anywhere, for FREE!

Use this link to jump directly to the survey form:
Thanks for you support!

The staff of GISjobs.com—GIS classified ads & resumes online

http://www.gisjobs.com staff@gisjobs.com

If you wish to be removed from this mail list, please complete the form located at: http://www.gisjobs.com/remove

>From PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU Sun Feb 7 17:13:41 1999
Received: from donald.uoregon.edu (donald.uoregon.edu [128.223.32.6])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id RAA04621 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Feb 1999 17:13:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from OREGON.UOREGON.EDU by OREGON.UOREGON.EDU (PMDF V5.1-12
#D3397) id <01J7GXBP1C0Y8WX5PF@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Sun, 7 Feb 1999 17:13:39 PST
Date: Sun, 07 Feb 1999 17:13:39 -0800 (PST)
From: Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Re: AAPORNED digest 1007
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01J7GXBP1CZ88WX5PF@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
X-VMS-To: IN"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
On multiple telephone lines:
In two surveys last year OSRL added a question about multiple telephone lines. In the national study (n=1,226) 31.3% of households had multiple lines. In a northwest survey (n=6,758 in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Alaska), 25.7% had multiple lines. In OSRL’s 1998 annual report, which went to the press last week and should be posted on our WWW site soon, we have a short summary of that research. Here is a snippet:

"In more detailed analyses of the demographic correlates of multiple household telephone lines, Kimberlee Langolf finds that, nationally, multiple household telephone lines tend to increase with household income, from 22% for households earning less than $15,000 to 53% for households earning more than $75,000. Multiple lines increase with education, such that, in the northwest, 40% of those with doctorates and 37% of those with masters degrees have multiple lines, compared to 21% of those with high school diplomas. Homeowners more often have multiple telephone lines than renters (34% compared to 26%). Multiple lines tend to increase with household size, although not monotonically with number of children. Multiple lines increase gradually with respondent age, from 30% for those 18-30 to 34% for those 51-65, but at lower levels in the northwest (21% for those 18-30 to 33% for those 41-50). Nationwide, whites and blacks match in proportion with multiple lines (34%), with Asians at 31% and Hispanics at 21%. In the northwest parallel figures are 26% for whites, 36% for blacks, 25% for Asians, 22% for American Indians, and fully 33% for Alaskan natives."

Hope this helps,
Patty
Formulating the question as "If the President did this, should he be impeached" implies that people are making a determination about the facts and then reaching a conclusion about the consequences they believe are appropriate. The polling data seems to better support an interpretation that people start with a belief about the appropriateness of impeachment and only then consider (rationalize?) the linkage between lying and impeachment.

The most consistent public belief throughout this entire affair has been that the President should remain in office.

So when the Lewinsky thing first breaks, it is easy to say that "if the President lied, he should be impeached", since people at that time tended to not to believe that the President lied. The hypothetical with a false premise has no consequence.

When evidence mounts that he lied, it is easier to change one's beliefs about this linkage than one's fundamental belief about whether he should be tossed from office. (He lied, but it is not that big a deal. I would also not discount the extent to which such a belief has been made more acceptable due to the desensitization caused by months of speculation).

I think the comments about the importance of the juxtaposition (even if unstated in survey questions) of the President vs. Starr or versus a partisan Congress are also clearly operative. The more partisan the Congress and the more Starr came to appear to be on a mission to "get" the President, the more the public seems to have been to be willing to tolerate
bad behavior on the part of the President. Clinton has been fortunate in his "choice" of enemies.

-----Original Message-----
From: Albert Biderman <abider@earthlink.net>
To: aapornet <aapornet>
Date: Sunday, February 07, 1999 1:44 PM
Subject: Re: Lessons learned -Reply

>Trite journalistic wisdom attributes Clinton's good fortune to his choices of enemies. I note the invisibility of the enemies in the passive voice and other constructions of the hypotheticals both Kathy and Howard quote. Put the enemies up front in the questions and I think the numbers would change. For instance, consider the effect of substituting for "if impeached" with "if the Republican House majority succeeds in impeaching him"--a wording consistent with the sentiments sustaining Clinton's high numbers. The formulation of the attack on Clinton puts him in opposition to abstractions--justice, the rule of law,
>Truth, the impeachment process, equal justice for all, the rights of a poor
>woman in a civil rights case. Formulate poll Q's that way and you will maximize
>Clinton's negatives. Make it Clinton vs. Jones, Clinton vs. Starr,
>Clinton vs.
>any or all of his opponents and he wins big every time. In addition to Howard's
>example, the one instance I can think of a less abstract formulation
>was during
>the first week when it was the hypothetical, "If the charges are true that
>he sexually exploited a kid in the White House..." and the general answer
>was
>"He should be out of there by the end of the week." So why did the anti-Bill
>forces abandon this for the abstractions of "It's not about sex...?"
>
>My guesses: (a) the glass house problem, (b) White House spins, (c)
>Monica, with
>Shapiro, stayed strongly FOB, (d-- or maybe "a") Clinton is lucky in
>his enemies.
>
The lesson for me is an old one: the caution needed in generalizing that some common general property we find in a particular set of items is the major operative one in these, much less all items with that property. While the future is less concrete than the present, it is possible to write hypotheticals that are more concrete in some very important way than are alternative ones addressed to present or past.

Some hypotheticals should allow for an additional cop-out response:

"I'd prefer to cross that bridge if and when I get to it."

Kathy Frankovic wrote:

There are even more recent examples in this situation that underscore Howard's point about the limitations of hypothetical questions. Prior to the impeachment vote in the House a number of survey questions found significant support for what might be described as "resignation if impeached." They were frequently at variance with each other, as the hypothetical was described differently ("if he is impeached," "if the articles of impeachment are sent to the Senate for trial") as was the alternative to resignation ("fight the charges in the Senate," "defend himself in the Senate").

The hypothetical meant different things to different people. It was
that at least some respondents were confusing impeachment with removal from office (in which case why wouldn’t he resign?). At any rate, in the days before the vote, asking hypothetical questions resulted in the appearance of anywhere from 40% to 60% support for resignation. As soon as the vote was taken and the question was no longer hypothetical, resignation elicited the same level of support as it had for months in the polls -- just about a third of the public. There was NO evidence of increased support for resignation once the impeachment vote was finally taken, despite the hypothetical polls.

Kathy Frankovic

Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> 02/06/99 07:48pm >>> A month or so ago there was a useful discussion here of how Clinton, Lewinski, et al. has affected assumptions about agenda setting and media effects more generally. Perhaps there is also something to be learned from the same events about the limitations of hypothetical survey questions that attempt to predict how people will react to possible new information. Such questions are tempting, since the ability to foretell the future is always much in demand.

I don’t have data from a year ago at hand, but my memory is that poll results then showed that a majority of Americans indicated they would favor impeachment (probably meaning conviction) if the president were shown to have lied or encouraged others to lie. Leaving aside the legal issues, a majority of Americans have probably concluded,
rightly or wrongly, that Clinton has very likely done those things. Yet his support has remained steady, with the public's basic wish to see him continue in office having trumped whatever reservations are felt about his specific actions. Hypothetical poll questions can no doubt tell us something about the present--many of us have used them for that purpose--but probably very little about what the future holds.

>  
>  
>  
>  

>From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Mon Feb 8 06:22:51 1999
Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA04316 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 06:22:25 -0800 (PST)
Received:  by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id 0302 ; Mon, 08 Feb 1999 09:20:11 EST
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 0812; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 09:20:11 -0500
Date:         Mon, 08 Feb 99 09:14:33 EST
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject:      Re: Fees for Others
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
In-Reply-To:  <Pine.SOL.3.96.990207174927.7375C-100000@troll>
X-Mailer:     MailBook 98.01.000
This is a murky issue. I would submit, however, that "publishing" the results of Jim's canvass on AAPORNET would be closer to, for example, summaries of faculty salaries which are regularly published in such places as Academe -- or articles about CEO salaries. For that matter, consider the extremely common publication of mortgage or other rates in newspaper after newspaper, not to mention the web.

Oddly, circulating the results "privately" among those who (presumably) actually do legal consulting would seem to me to be far closer to conspiracy in restraint of trade. Imagine, to take my mortgage example, that there were no publication of rates, but every Monday, the responsible people in lending institutions shared information among themselves about what they were going to do. I'm not sure the limited discussion of rates would meet the test for being activity under the purview of anti-trust regs, but I'm pretty sure it would be riskier than a public summary, where, among other things those who might be in a position of paying for such work could also see the general range.
Since receiving Jim's inquiry about consultant fees, I have consulted with lawyers (within the family). The safest course: "Never enter into a conversation with people in the same business and talk about price." But, I would like the summary!

Best,

Sid
Roxanne,

I’d like to go to this conference. Can I go ahead and register? Polly

> -----Original Message-----
> From:     Bob Groves [SMTP:bgroves@survey.umd.edu]
> Sent:     Friday, February 05, 1999 3:09 PM
> To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
> Subject: Registration for International Conference on Survey
> Nonresponse
> 
> AAPOR is cosponsoring the International Conference on Survey
> 
> The conference will have over 150 presentations of recent research on
> understanding and reducing nonresponse rates, and compensating for
> missing data in surveys. Participants will receive a free copy of a
> monograph summarizing the state of the art in the field.
> 
> A large number of participants is expected. The registration
> process is being opened today. AAPOR members are encouraged to
> download a registration form and send it in to reserve their place.
To register for the conference, access the conference web site --
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/
Follow the links to "registration" and download a conference
registration form, for mailing or faxing.
Separate hotel reservations can also be made via the web, by
following the link from "hotel reservation."
See you in Portland!

We are looking for data from 1997 and 1999 for use of the Internet, access
to the Internet, number of sites on the Internet, percentage of homes with computers, percentage of computers with Internet access and the use of Web tv/Web tv sales. Does anyone know the numbers or have citations or sources to find such numbers? Please send to me directly and I will summarize for all.

Best,

Sid

>From HOneill536@aol.com Mon Feb  8 14:35:53 1999
Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA10741 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 14:35:51 -0800
   (PST)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
   by imo17.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id BGMEa03211
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 17:23:54 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <418ad00e.36bf63fa@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 17:23:54 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: fees for legal consulting
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 64

Who started this whole business about fees for legal consulting? It makes no
more sense than wanting to know fees for other types or consulting or involvement in surveys. Let's just forget about it! If you don't know what your time is worth, you're in real trouble.

Harry O'Neill

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Mon Feb  8 15:03:10 1999
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA22440 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 15:03:08 -0800
(PST)
Received: from social54.hunter.cuny.edu (social54.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.12.54])
    by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id SAA23962
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 18:02:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.1.19990208175155.009b8cb0@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Mon, 08 Feb 1999 18:02:28 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: Internet stats
In-Reply-To: <1293627755-52538928@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

At 05:25 PM 2/8/99 -0500, Sid Krauss wrote:

> We are looking for data from 1997 and 1999 for use of the Internet,
> access to the Internet, number of sites on the Internet, percentage of
> homes with computers, percentage of computers with Internet access and
the use of Web tv/Web tv sales. Does anyone know the numbers or have citations or sources to find such numbers?

Some of the obvious sources are:

http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/net2/
Falling Through the Net II: New Data on the Digital Divide  (truly representative data from fall 1997)

http://www.commerce.net/research/stats/
Nielsen

http://www.nua.ie/surveys/
NUA, Inc. -- also weekly e-mail list with links to many additional sources

http://www.gvu.gatech.edu/user_surveys/survey-1998-04/
Georgia Tech (questionnable methodology, self-selection)

In general, reliable data are hard to find and much attention must be paid to exact question wording. Nielsen data for one can be extremely misleading if not interpreted closely following the actual question wordings. Hope this helps, MK.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) More details (including hints about how to verify an encrypted signature you may see) at: http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Feb 8 15:26:20 1999
With regard to Sid's comment:

>Since receiving Jim's inquiry about consultant fees, I have consulted
>with lawyers (within the family). The safest course: "Never enter
>into a conversation with people in the same business and talk about
>price." But, I would like the summary!

I'm beginning to wonder what all the fuss is about. Business consultants
share their fee structures all the time. Having spent most of my life in the
corporate world (Coca-Cola Co), discussions about comparative salary scales,
consultant fees, pricing of goods, etc. were an almost daily occurrence. The
medical and legal professions do pretty much the same thing. A problem might arise if it can be shown that there is a conspiracy among those sharing the information to fix prices. This is very tough to prove as I think any lawyer will testify.

Warren Mitofsky made a similar point when he said:

"I do not understand why there is a legal problem sharing information about legal and court consulting fees. What is the difference between presenting a summary of legal fees and the information regularly posted in scholarly periodicals about salaries for various positions?"

Dick Halpern

>From Seth_Geiger@Magid.com Mon Feb  8 15:44:15 1999
Received: from Magid.com ([208.138.78.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id PAA12538 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 15:44:13 -0800 (PST)
Received: from FMDOMAIN-Message_Server by Magid.com
    with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 08 Feb 1999 17:35:32 -0600
Message-Id: <s6bf2064.055@Magid.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Mon, 08 Feb 1999 17:09:13 -0600
From: Seth Geiger <Seth_Geiger@Magid.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Internet stats
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Check the two latest Pew studies on the internet (January 1999; April 1998) they offer some tracking. As for number of web sites, I would look at the number of URLs registered. WebTV has had very weak sales and accounts for less than a half million internet connections.

>>> Sidney Kraus <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu> 02/08/99 02:25PM >>>
We are looking for data from 1997 and 1999 for use of the Internet, access to the Internet, number of sites on the Internet, percentage of homes with computers, percentage of computers with Internet access and the use of Web tv/Web tv sales. Does anyone know the numbers or have citations or sources to find such numbers? Please send to me directly and I will summarize for all.

Best,

Sid
AAPOR/New York Chapter BROWN-BAG LUNCH

Date ................ Thursday, 18 February 1999
Time ................ 12 noon -- 2:00 p.m.
Place ............... American Foundation for the Blind; Suite 300
                   11 Penn Plaza (7th Ave, 31-32 Sts)

Ten Things You Need To Know Before You Talk To Kids and Teens

      Joan Chiaramonte, Roper Starch Worldwide
"Millenials", "Echo-Boomers", "Generation Y" -- regardless of what you all
them, you need to think about how to talk to them. Joan Chiaramonte, head
of youth research, will share insights from "The Roper Youth Report", an
annual nation-wide survey of children 6 to 17.

This study is based on in-home interviews, and tracks the attitudes,
behaviors and future aspirations of children and teen-agers -- an
increasingly important market segment. Joan will discuss their
perspectives, opinions and interactions with:

* The Adult World and Family
* Media and Technology
* Advertising and Marketing

Joan Chiaramonte is a Vice President at Roper Starch Worldwide. She has
lead many 'kid' and teen age studies, and has contributed to numerous
publications, as well as television, on issues concerning children, teens
and families.

AS WITH ALL OF OUR BROWN-BAG LUNCHEONS,
YOUR PARTICIPATION IS ENCOURAGED.

Fee includes coffee, tea, soda, cookies. Don't forget to bring your
lunch.

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.
So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com),
or call if you must (212/722-5333).
Return the form below with your cheque by Tues., 16 Feb. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $20 (members), $25 (non-members), $10 (student members), $15 (student non-members, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

---------------------------------------------------------------
-
-
-
I will attend the NYAAPOR brown bag lunch on Thursday, 18 February 1999 with _____ additional guests.

NAME: ____________________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ____________________________________
HOME PHONE: ______________________________________
AFFILIATION: ______________________________________
GUEST’S NAME: _____________________________________
AFFILIATION: ______________________________________

PREPAID FEES: MEMBERS: $10 ___ NON-MEMBERS: $15 ___
STUDENT MEMBERS: $5 ___ STUDENT NON-MEMBERS, HLMs: $10 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 16 Feb. to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York 10128-1759
>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Feb 9 14:18:36 1999
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA03827 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 9 Feb 1999 14:18:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
FYI

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

Date: Tue, 9 Feb 1999 13:51:48 -0500 (EST)
From: Press-Corps-Owner@Census.GOV

EMBARGOED UNTIL: 12:01 A.M. EST, FEBRUARY 12, 1999 (FRIDAY)

Public Information Office
301-457-3030/301-457-3670 (fax)
301-457-4067 (TDD)
e-mail: pio@census.gov

Small Area Estimates Branch
301-457-3242
The Commerce Department's Census Bureau today released 1995 income and poverty estimates for the nation's states and 3,143 counties. The new figures could be used to allocate federal funds for programs such as Head Start.

The data posted on the Internet consist of 1995 state- and county-level estimates of median household income, the total number of poor persons, poor children under 18 and poor children ages 5 to 17 related to the person maintaining the household they live in and state-level estimates of the number of poor children under 5.

A panel of the National Academy of Sciences on estimates of poverty for small geographic areas recommended that the Department of Education use Census Bureau poverty estimates to determine the distribution of funds for programs to aid disadvantaged children under Title I. The Education Department will use either these county-level estimates or recently released school district-level poverty estimates.

The Census Bureau produced the state and county estimates by combining results from its March 1996 Current Population Survey with aggregate data from federal individual income tax returns, administrative records on food stamp program participation and 1990 decennial census figures.

The estimates were financed by the Census Bureau and the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services.
The U.S. Census Bureau, pre-eminent collector and disseminator of timely, relevant and quality data about the people and the economy of the United States, conducts a population and housing census every 10 years, an economic census every five years and more than 100 demographic and economic surveys every year, all of them evolving from the first census in 1790.

Editor’s Note: The embargoed data can be accessed at <http://www.census.gov/dcmd/www/embargo/embargo.html>. Call the Public Information Office for a password. After the release time, go to <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ saipe.html>.

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Feb  9 16:17:25 1999
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA21195 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 9 Feb 1999 16:17:23 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id QAA21945 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 9 Feb 1999 16:17:22 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 9 Feb 1999 16:17:22 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Image Consultant Wanted
Consultant Wanted

A local (Southern California) law firm has asked me to recommend consultants with practical experience in public relations and image management, particularly with the public images of celebrities and other well-known figures. Although experience in entertainment fields is preferred, those with image management experience in politics and the corporate world might also qualify. Location within the United States does not matter.

The interest is in individuals, who might also be available for limited court testimony on questions of scientific image manipulation, and *not* in firms intending to do collective work. The interest is also in long-time practitioners with actual experience in image measurement and management, and *not* in academics who have studied these phenomena only from outside the commercial environment.

I personally do not wish to recommend anyone who is not in AAPOR, or who is
not recommended, on the basis of good firsthand knowledge, by an AAPOR member.

If you think you qualify and would like to be considered, or if you can strongly recommend someone who is qualified, please send me a few paragraphs summarizing all relevant experience in the field.

Fees are negotiable (and you'll not get me to say anything more on this particular subject, as you might guess).

-- Jim

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

REPLY TO ADDRESS ABOVE--DO *NOT* REPLY TO AAPORNET

------------------------------------------------------------------------
Wouldn't the weight factor be the number of phone lines used for 
MAKING/RECEIVING VOICE PHONE CALLS? These numbers are so high, most must be 
second lines for computers. That doesn't count as far as we are concerned, 
does it? Also, if the second line is the "teen's phone" how would we deal 
with that?

>>> Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> 02/07/99 
07:13pm >>>

On multiple telephone lines:

In two surveys last year OSRL added a question about multiple telephone 
lines. In the national study (n=1,226) 31.3% of households had multiple 
lines. In a northwest survey (n=6,758 in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montanan 
and Alaska), 25.7% had multiple lines. In OSRL's 1998 annual report, which 
grew to the press last week and should be posted on our WWW site soon, we 
have a short summary of that research. Here is a snippet:

"In more detailed analyses of the demographic correlates of multiple 
household telephone lines, Kimberlee Langolf finds that, nationally, 
multiple household telephone lines tend to increase with household income, 
from 22% for households earning less than $15,000 to 53% for households 
earning more than $75,000. Multiple lines increase with education, such 
that, in the northwest, 40% of those with doctorates and 37% of those with
masters degrees have multiple lines, compared to 21% of those with high school diplomas. Homeowners more often have multiple telephone lines than renters (34% compared to 26%). Multiple lines tend to increase with household size, although not monotonically with number of children.

Multiple lines increase gradually with respondent age, from 30% for those 18-30 to 34% for those 51-65, but at lower levels in the northwest (21% for those 18-30 to 33% for those 41-50). Nationwide, whites and blacks match in proportion with multiple lines (34%), with Asians at 31% and Hispanics at 21%. In the northwest parallel figures are 26% for whites, 36% for blacks, 25% for Asians, 22% for American Indians, and fully 33% for Alaskan natives."

Hope this helps,
Patty

Patricia Anne Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 Eugene OR 97403-2545

telephone: 541-346-5007 WWW: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl fax:
541-346-5026 email: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<

>From TLamatsch@mathematica-mpr.com Wed Feb 10 08:52:25 1999
Received: from mpr5.MATHINC (MPR5.mathinc.com [38.233.146.17])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
I agree that only phone lines used for RECEIVING calls should be used. I would exclude computer lines, as well as fax lines unless the respondent could RECEIVE calls (not necessarily make calls) on that line. As for teen lines it depends, in my view, what you interviewers or instructed to do: If they are instructed to ask for an adult anyway, I would count them. If they terminate the interview and code the number as "ineligible" I would not count them.

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.
Survey Specialist
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
(609)936-3261
Wouldn't the weight factor be the number of phone lines used FOR MAKING/RECEIVING VOICE PHONE CALLS? These numbers are so high, most must be second lines for computers. That doesn't count as far as we are concerned, does it? Also, if the second line is the "teen's phone" how would we deal with that?

>>>> Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> 02/07/99 07:13pm >>>

> On multiple telephone lines:
> 
> In two surveys last year OSRL added a question about multiple telephone lines. In the national study (n=1,226) 31.3% of households had multiple lines. In a northwest survey (n=6,758 in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Alaska), 25.7% had multiple lines. In OSRL's 1998 annual report, which went to the press last week and should be posted on our WWW site soon, we have a short summary of that research.

> Here is a snippet:

> "In more detailed analyses of the demographic correlates of multiple household telephone lines, Kimberlee Langolf finds that, nationally, multiple household telephone lines tend to increase with household income, from 22% for households earning less than $15,000 to 53% for households earning more than $75,000. Multiple lines increase with
education, such that, in the northwest, 40% of those with doctorates
and 37% of those with masters degrees have multiple lines, compared to
21% of those with high school diplomas. Homeowners more often have
multiple telephone lines than renters (34% compared to 26%). Multiple
lines tend to increase with household size, although not monotonically
with number of children. Multiple lines increase gradually with
respondent age, from 30% for those 18-30 to 34% for those 51-65, but at
lower levels in the northwest (21% for those 18-30 to 33% for those
41-50). Nationwide, whites and blacks match in proportion with
multiple lines (34%), with Asians at 31% and Hispanics at 21%. In the
northwest parallel figures are 26% for whites, 36% for blacks, 25% for
Asians, 22% for American Indians, and fully 33% for Alaskan natives."

Hope this helps,
Patty

Patricia Anne Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 Eugene OR 97403-2545

telephone: 541-346-5007  WWW: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl fax:
541-346-5026 email: patygg@oregon.uoregon.edu

From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Feb 10 09:06:21 1999
On the assumption that you are surveying households, you must count any line that gives you access to that household. Thus modem and fax dedicated lines do not count, but "teen" lines do. It is perfectly legitimate to get referral to another number in the same household to reach an adult. This is no different than reaching a respondent at home but being given a work number at which they will continue the interview later. If your interviewers are listing "teen" lines as ineligible then you are overestimating the number of ineligible households.

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
I agree that only phone lines used for RECEIVING calls should be used.

I would exclude computer lines, as well as fax lines unless the respondent could RECEIVE calls (not necessarily make calls) on that line.

As for teen lines it depends, in my view, what you interviewers or instructed to do:

If they are instructed to ask for an adult anyway, I would count them.

If they terminate the interview and code the number as "ineligible" I would not count them.

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.
Survey Specialist
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
(609)936-3261
Wouldn't the weight factor be the number of phone lines used FOR
MAKING/RECEIVING VOICE PHONE CALLS? These numbers are so high,
most must be second lines for computers. That doesn't count as far as
we are concerned, does it? Also, if the second line is the "teen's phone"
how would we deal with that?

>>>> Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> 02/07/99
>07:13pm >>>
>On multiple telephone lines:
>In two surveys last year OSRL added a question about multiple
telephone
>lines. In the national study (n=1,226) 31.3% of households had
multiple
>lines. In a northwest survey (n=6,758 in Oregon, Washington,
Idaho, Montanan and Alaska), 25.7% had multiple lines. In OSRL's
1998 annual report, which went to the press last week and should be
posted on our WWW site soon, we have a short summary of that
research.
>Here is a snippet:
>
"In more detailed analyses of the demographic correlates of multiple
household telephone lines, Kimberlee Langolf finds that, nationally,
multiple household telephone lines tend to increase with household income, from 22% for households earning less than $15,000 to 53% for households earning more than $75,000. Multiple lines increase with education, such that, in the northwest, 40% of those with doctorates and 37% of those with masters degrees have multiple lines, compared to 21% of those with high school diplomas. Homeowners more often have multiple telephone lines than renters (34% compared to 26%).

Multiple lines tend to increase with household size, although not monotonically with number of children. Multiple lines increase gradually with respondent age, from 30% for those 18-30 to 34% for those 51-65, but at lower levels in the northwest (21% for those 18-30 to 33% for those 41-50). Nationwide, whites and blacks match in proportion with multiple lines (34%), with Asians at 31% and Hispanics at 21%. In the northwest parallel figures are 26% for whites, 36% for blacks, 25% for Asians, 22% for American Indians, and fully 33% for Alaskan natives.

Hope this helps,
Patty

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

Patricia Anne Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor                Founding Director
Department of Sociology  Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon     University of Oregon
AAPORNET: Sorry about this obscure response. I thought I was responding to an internal query about weighting households for multiple phone lines. Now that I've bothered you with this anyway..... how do YOU deal with the issue
of multiple lines, if at all? Do you ask respondents about them and what they are used for? If so, do you weight, and by what?

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Lab
Univ. of IL

>>> Diane O'Rourke <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU> 02/10/99 10:25am >>>

Wouldn't the weight factor be the number of phone lines used FOR MAKING/RECEIVING VOICE PHONE CALLS? These numbers are so high, most must be second lines for computers. That doesn't count as far as we are concerned, does it? Also, if the second line is the "teen's phone" how would we deal with that?

>>> Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> 02/07/99 07:13pm >>>

On multiple telephone lines:

In two surveys last year OSRL added a question about multiple telephone lines. In the national study (n=1,226) 31.3% of households had multiple lines. In a northwest survey (n=6,758 in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Alaska), 25.7% had multiple lines. In OSRL's 1998 annual report, which went to the press last week and should be posted on our WWW site soon, we have a short summary of that research. Here is a snippet:

"In more detailed analyses of the demographic correlates of multiple household telephone lines, Kimberlee Langolf finds that, nationally, multiple household telephone lines tend to increase with household income, from 22% for households earning less than $15,000 to 53% for households earning more than $75,000. Multiple lines increase with education, such that, in the northwest, 40% of those with doctorates and 37% of those with
masters degrees have multiple lines, compared to 21% of those with high school diplomas. Homeowners more often have multiple telephone lines than renters (34% compared to 26%). Multiple lines tend to increase with household size, although not monotonically with number of children. Multiple lines increase gradually with respondent age, from 30% for those 18-30 to 34% for those 51-65, but at lower levels in the northwest (21% for those 18-30 to 33% for those 41-50). Nationwide, whites and blacks match in proportion with multiple lines (34%), with Asians at 31% and Hispanics at 21%. In the northwest parallel figures are 26% for whites, 36% for blacks, 25% for Asians, 22% for American Indians, and fully 33% for Alaskan natives."

Hope this helps,
Patty

Patricia Anne Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 Eugene OR 97403-2545

telephone: 541-346-5007 WWW: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl fax:
541-346-5026 email: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu

>From Adam.Safir@arbitron.com Wed Feb 10 09:13:05 1999
We're interested in exploring the feasibility of taping interviewers on live calls. The tapes would be used as part of interviewer training to highlight successful vs. unsuccessful use of gaining cooperation techniques.

While recording phone conversations without the permission of both parties is illegal in the state of Maryland, does anyone have any information on the legality of this in other states, or know of the results of any studies investigating the effectiveness of this interviewer training approach?
search on this issue in the POQ Index did not turn up anything. Any information would be helpful...

thanks in advance,

Adam Safir
Arbitron
410.312.8481
adam.safir@arbitron.com

It seems obvious that one should never record a phone conversation without
the permission of all parties. One option is to follow the practice of many companies and organizations who inform callers that their conversation may be recorded for training purposes. I find even that practice objectionable, and when I am willing to pay the inconvenience cost of hanging up, I do.

John Young
jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu

Safir, Adam wrote:

> We're interested in exploring the feasibility of taping interviewers on live calls. The tapes would be used as part of interviewer training to highlight successful vs. unsuccessful use of gaining cooperation techniques.

> While recording phone conversations without the permission of both parties is illegal in the state of Maryland, does anyone have any information on the legality of this in other states, or know of the results of any studies investigating the effectiveness of this interviewer training approach? A search on this issue in the POQ Index did not turn up anything. Any information would be helpful...

> thanks in advance,

> Adam Safir
> Arbitron
> 410.312.8481
> adam.safir@arbitron.com
CMOR (Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) compiled a list of the laws in effect as of 12/31/97. At that time only 2 states (South Carolina & Vermont) did NOT have relevant laws. Most states require one-party consent (the worker/interviewer is enough). 12 states (including Maryland) require 2-party consent. This information was re-printed in the Survey Research newsletter Vol. 29, No. 1, 1998. Or, contact CMOR at info@cmor.org, 516-928-6206.

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Lab
It seems obvious that one should never record a phone conversation without the permission of all parties. One option is to follow the practice of many companies and organizations who inform callers that their conversation may be recorded for training purposes. I find even that practice objectionable, and when I am willing to pay the inconvenience cost of hanging up, I do.

John Young jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu

Safir, Adam wrote:

>We're interested in exploring the feasibility of taping interviewers on live calls. The tapes would be used as part of interviewer training to highlight successful vs. unsuccessful use of gaining cooperation techniques.

>While recording phone conversations without the permission of both parties is illegal in the state of Maryland, does anyone have any information on the legality of this in other states, or know of the results of any studies investigating the effectiveness of this interviewer training approach? A search on this issue in the POQ Index did not turn up anything. Any information would be helpful...
> thanks in advance,
>
> Adam Safir
> Arbitron
> 410.312.8481
> adam.safir@arbitron.com

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Feb 10 10:49:15 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA24521 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 10:49:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org  (Content
Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000442189@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;  Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:47:29 -0500
Received: from MARK-
   BRI ([10.2.0.183]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP
(Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)
   id 1VPN9SN3; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:51:26 -0500
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
   id <01BE54FA.B7873040@mark-bri>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:39:01 -0500
Message-Id: <01BE54FA.B7873040@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Census editorial
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:38:59 -0500
The next battle in the census war

Before the federal courts began blowing holes in the Clinton administration's plans to conduct the 2000 census using statistical sampling, the Census Bureau had a good idea. "The Census Bureau plans to produce a 'one number' census estimate of the U.S. population in census 2000 that will improve accuracy and eliminate confusion and controversy created by having more than one set of census results measuring the same population," the bureau officially stated in its operational plan.

Last month, however, the Supreme Court determined that a federal statute forbids "the use of sampling in calculating the population for purposes of apportioning" the 435 seats in the House of Representatives among the states. Once the federal courts began ruling against the Clinton administration's plans to use sampling for apportionment, the Census Bureau changed its mind. Now, the Census Bureau is trumpeting the great benefits of having a "two number" census. Having lost the battle over the use of sampling for apportionment, President Clinton and his allies have now embarked on a two-front counterattack. The administration intends to produce two sets of census numbers. One set, based on the constitutionally mandated "actual enumeration," would conform to Supreme Court requirements involving the apportionment of seats among the states. The second set of census numbers, developed in part by statistical sampling, would be used by state legislatures for redistricting those same 435 seats within state
borders and for the annual distribution of $180 billion of federal funds to the states and cities.

What ever happened to the "confusion and controversy created by having more than one set of census results"? Like so many other policies in this administration, the "one number" census has been superseded by political expediency.

The second front of the administration's attack plan involves legislation proposed by Rep. Carolyn Maloney, a New York Democrat who is ranking member of the House subcommittee overseeing the census. Purporting to change federal law to comply with the Supreme Court's requirements, Rep. Maloney's bill would in fact permit the use of statistical sampling for apportionment purposes. While it is true that the Supreme Court's January decision based itself on amendments to the Census Act, a federal statute, it is also almost certainly true that Mrs. Maloney's proposed legislation would be deemed unconstitutional by the same Supreme Court. One wonders what part of "actual enumeration" she doesn't understand.

Fortunately, the Maloney bill stands no chance of passing during this Congress. Nevertheless, at some point in the future, the Court will undoubtedly be called upon to address the constitutionality of the use of statistical sampling for apportionment purposes in the decennial census. And at some point the Court will also have to rule on the constitutionality of using statistical sampling for any other purposes, including redistricting and the distribution of federal money. Recall that the recent decision was based only on a federal statute.

In the meantime, Congress must block the administration from using statistical sampling for any purpose whatsoever. Apart from the likelihood that sampling is unconstitutional, there is yet another important factor. As Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in a concurring opinion signed by four justices, a genuine enumeration probably represents "the most accurate way
of determining population with minimal possibility of political manipulation." An administration led by a president who manipulates the definition of the very word "is" to suit his convenience can hardly be trusted to implement "statistical sampling" in a fair and nonpartisan manner.

Mark Richards
mark@bisconti.com

>From shap.wolf@asu.edu Wed Feb 10 11:17:42 1999
Received: from post1.inre.asu.edu (post1.inre.asu.edu [129.219.13.100])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA07885 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 11:17:37 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mainex1.asu.edu (mainex1.asu.edu [129.219.10.200]) by
   asu.edu (PMDF V5.2-29 #31135) with ESMTP id <0F6Y00IAFDM45I@asu.edu> for
   aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:18:04 -0700 (MST)
Received: by mainex1.asu.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
   id <1T57ZFNX>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:17:04 -0700
Content-return: allowed
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:16:59 -0700
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Subject: RE: Taping Interviews -Reply
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <82E57D16D1D7D111A6B300A0C99B54100311DE4A@mainex2.asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Human Subjects requirements make this moot for us--our IRB requires us to notify the respondent in all cases, even if the state we’re calling doesn't require 2nd party notification.

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL
shap.wolf@asu.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Diane O'Rourke [mailto:DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU]
Sent: 10 February 1999 10:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Taping Interviews -Reply

CMOR (Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) compiled a list of the laws in effect as of 12/31/97. At that time only 2 states (South Carolina & Vermont) did NOT have relevant laws. Most states require one-party consent (the worker/interviewer is enough). 12 states (including Maryland) require 2-party consent. This information was re-printed in the Survey Research newsletter Vol. 29, No. 1, 1998. Or, contact CMOR at info@cmor.org, 516-928-6206.

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Lab
Univ. of IL

>>> john t. young <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu> 02/10/99 11:42am >>>
It seems obvious that one should never record a phone conversation without the permission of all parties. One option is to follow the practice of many companies and organizations who inform callers that their conversation may be recorded for training purposes. I find even that practice objectionable, and when I am willing to pay the inconvenience cost of hanging up, I do.

John Young jjyoung@hsph.harvard.edu

Safir, Adam wrote:

> We're interested in exploring the feasibility of taping interviewers on live calls. The tapes would be used as part of interviewer training to highlight successful vs. unsuccessful use of gaining cooperation techniques.

> While recording phone conversations without the permission of both parties is illegal in the state of Maryland, does anyone have any information on the legality of this in other states, or know of the results of any studies investigating the effectiveness of this interviewer training approach? A search on this issue in the POQ Index did not turn up anything. Any information would be helpful...

> thanks in advance,
But of course, actual enumeration is NOT the most accurate assessment of population size. And knowingly using an inaccurate count and what kind of effort and money gets put into that count are themselves political
manipulations. It is amazing to me how Scalia can so consistently portray in the most intelligent way the most idiotic, uninformed, misconstrued ideas. But, what do us scientists know anyways.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark Richards [SMTP:Mark@bisconti.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 1999 10:39 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Census editorial


The next battle in the census war

Before the federal courts began blowing holes in the Clinton administration's plans to conduct the 2000 census using statistical sampling, the Census Bureau had a good idea. "The Census Bureau plans to produce a 'one number' census estimate of the U.S. population in census 2000 that will improve accuracy and eliminate confusion and controversy created by having more than one set of census results measuring the same population," the bureau officially stated in its operational plan.

Last month, however, the Supreme Court determined that a federal statute forbids "the use of sampling in calculating the population for purposes of apportion[ing]" the 435 seats in the House of Representatives
among the states. Once the federal courts began ruling against the Clinton administration's plans to use sampling for apportionment, the Census Bureau changed its mind. Now, the Census Bureau is trumpeting the great benefits of having a "two number" census. Having lost the battle over the use of sampling for apportionment, President Clinton and his allies have now embarked on a two-front counterattack. The administration intends to produce two sets of census numbers. One set, based on the constitutionally mandated "actual enumeration," would conform to Supreme Court requirements involving the apportionment of seats among the states. The second set of census numbers, developed in part by statistical sampling, would be used by state legislatures for redistricting those same 435 seats within state borders and for the annual distribution of $180 billion of federal funds to the states and cities.

What ever happened to the "confusion and controversy created by having more than one set of census results"? Like so many other policies in this administration, the "one number" census has been superseded by political expediency.

The second front of the administration's attack plan involves legislation proposed by Rep. Carolyn Maloney, a New York Democrat who is ranking member of the House subcommittee overseeing the census. Purporting to change federal law to comply with the Supreme Court's requirements, Rep. Maloney's bill would in fact permit the use of statistical sampling for apportionment purposes. While it is true that the Supreme Court's January decision based itself on amendments to the Census Act, a federal statute, it is also almost certainly true that Mrs. Maloney's proposed legislation would be deemed unconstitutional by the same Supreme Court. One wonders what part of "actual enumeration" she doesn't understand.

Fortunately, the Maloney bill stands no chance of passing during this Congress. Nevertheless, at some point in the future, the Court will
undoubtedly be called upon to address the constitutionality of the use of statistical sampling for apportionment purposes in the decennial census. And at some point the Court will also have to rule on the constitutionality of using statistical sampling for any other purposes, including redistricting and the distribution of federal money. Recall that the recent decision was based only on a federal statute.

In the meantime, Congress must block the administration from using statistical sampling for any purpose whatsoever. Apart from the likelihood that sampling is unconstitutional, there is yet another important factor. As Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in a concurring opinion signed by four justices, a genuine enumeration probably represents "the most accurate way of determining population with minimal possibility of political manipulation." An administration led by a president who manipulates the definition of the very word "is" to suit his convenience can hardly be trusted to implement "statistical sampling" in a fair and nonpartisan manner.

Mark Richards
mark@bisconti.com
Are mobile phones being counted in that "second line" statistic? We have excluded mobile telephone exchanges when drawing our samples (maybe we shouldn't??)

Susan

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.
Albert Parker wrote:

"I'm not sure what this has to do with AAPORNET, but for the record, the Congress in these instances and others is executing its Constitutional responsibility "To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases = whatsoever over such District . . . as may . . . become the Seat of Government of = the United States." Reference is to Article I, Section 8. This clause was debated at the time and was the subject of #43 of the essays attributed = to "Publius" and now known as "The Federalist." No. 43 was written by = James Madison. I can't find my copy of Madison's notes, but I know that there = was commentary on this clause in the pamphlets that circulated during the ratification period. It's deliberate, not an afterthought."

Sorry for the lag in response. The question for researchers, especially = those working with the media, is:

* Why did the media nationwide (even tiny local papers) front page the = local DC "niggardly" story, while other DC stories of much greater = significance to DC citizens are routinely ignored?

* What is it that propels a local story into national news, or leads to = dismissal? Is it a market issue--the editors think the public is = interested and will buy paper/watch?

I speculated that latent white fear of reverse discrimination and = immigration played a role in propelling the local DC "niggardly" story = to
The story had little to do with D.C. (unless it was intended to perpetrate the image of DC as a "banana republic"). I still don't know why other DC issues of national substance are not covered. What do DC citizens have to do to get a public hearing—dress like Mohawks and throw a tea party?!!!

Yesterday, after House managers each told how many people they represent (Example: Rep. Jim Sensenbrenner said "I represent 580,000 people in southeastern Wisconsin in the U.S. House of Reps..."), White House Counsel Charles F.C Ruff followed with "I'm from the District of Columbia. And we don't have a vote in the Congress of the United States." Thus far, I don't think his comment has gotten nearly the coverage that the local DC "niggardly" story did. That half a million citizens are disenfranchised is not a media issue.

P.S.-More DC History: Albert Parker is correct that the founders gave Congress exclusive legislative authority over DC in the Constitution (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17), including the right to decide the form of local govt. Since, D.C. citizens have never been apportioned for Congressional representation. In 1974, DC was allowed a partial "home rule" govt., similar to what is allowed in colonies—no budgetary control, etc. The reason for the exclusive legislative clause, stated by Madison and others, was that the federal govt. wanted their own police protection (recall the soldiers badgering the feds in PA for back pay, and the state of PA ignoring their call for help... they became a transient body!). The intent in establishing DC was never to disenfranchise American citizens. Madison stated in the Federalist papers that the political status of a federal district would be amply protected, "as they will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority..."
over them; [and] as a = municipal legislature for local purposes, derived
from their own = suffrages, will of course be allowed them." D.C.'s
enfranchisement = would not pose a grave national danger today. The CIA and
Pentagon are = located in Virginia-and they have the vote. In addition, the
= Constitution originally excluded women, blacks, and those living in =
federal enclaves from voting. This was rectified by changes to the =
Constitution. Those in federal enclaves, were allowed to vote in =
surrounding states and are apportioned to those states since the 1950s. =
DC citizens are the only ones, besides prisoners, who are not = apportioned.
Locally, there is little doubt about the role race has = played in the
delay.

>From surveys@wco.com Wed Feb 10 13:26:03 1999
Received: from smtp1.ncal.verio.com (smtp1.ncal.verio.com [204.247.247.82])
        by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
        id NAA00971 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:26:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from compaq (as52-141.okldca.pacific.verio.net [207.20.232.141])
        by smtp1.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id NAA06801
        for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:25:58 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <009c01be553b$b912c8c0$ad6ffe9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Taping Interviews -Reply
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:22:07 -0800
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
CMOR (Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) compiled a list of the laws in effect as of 12/31/97. At that time only 2 states (South Carolina & Vermont) did NOT have relevant laws. Most states require one-party consent (the worker/interviewer is enough). 12 states (including Maryland) require 2-party consent. This information was re-printed in the Survey Research newsletter Vol. 29, No. 1, 1998. Or, contact CMOR at info@cmor.org, 516-928-6206.

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Lab
Univ. of IL

Hi

We make interviewing software that can record respondents' answers to specified questions; so we have some experience with this issue.

I would certainly start with CMOR's list, but be sure to check the current status of any state within which you want to make calls. The laws may have changed in the past year. Also note that when calling between states, federal rules make it illegal to record a conversation without the
permission of both parties.

I suggest you ask the respondents something like "Do you mind if we record your answers?" Based on our clients' experiences, most people (over 90%) will give permission. In any case, the number should be ample for your training purpose. The only problem with this approach for your purpose is that you cannot record the opening statement by your interviewer until you get that permission.

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
http://www.surveysystem.com
mailto:surveys@wco.com
If the intent is to sample HOUSEHOLDS, then mobile telephones, like car phones, are excluded (ineligible) because they are not attached to households. If households are not what you are sampling then mobile phones can be included, but you will need to screen for where the respondent lives, how many people have access to that phone, how many phone numbers lead to that person, etc. If you include mobile phones, then why exclude work phones?

Of course, down the line all phones, except for the one "bundled" with your home computer/telephone/television/fax machine, will be attached to people, not households. Sampling by telephone will be a real bear then.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Susan Losh [SMTP:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 1999 12:08 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: phone lines

Are mobile phones being counted in that "second line" statistic? We have
excluded mobile telephone exchanges when drawing our samples (maybe we shouldn't??)

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 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From HOneill536@aol.com Wed Feb 10 19:05:19 1999
Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA17803 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 19:05:15 -0800
Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without the respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises, particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.

Harry O'Neill

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Thu Feb 11 04:59:31 1999
Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.31])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id EAA29562 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 04:59:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from oemcomputer (ts3-14.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.112.69])
    by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id HAA08420
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 07:59:27 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 07:59:27 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <1999021111259.HAA08420@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu>
Ditto to Harry's comment!

At 08:41 PM 2/10/99 -0500, you wrote:
> Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without the
> respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises,
> particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.
> Harry O'Neill
>
That is all very simplistic. We had a meeting (CASRO people and folks such as Norman Brdburn and Dick Warneke). We discussed this issue with him.
Consider this as a training issue and a quality control issue. If you don't tape and monitor you are unable to evaluate quality and teach for improvement. Nobody is interested in getting any respondent identifiers— but how do you continually work to improve the quality of your data collection, model those who are better able to avert refusals, are respectful of respondents— by monitoring and taping and teaching.

Richard Day
At 07:59 AM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:
>Ditto to Harry's comment!
>
>At 08:41 PM 2/10/99 -0500, you wrote:
>>Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without the respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises, particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.
>>    Harry O'Neill
>>
>>
>*****************************************************************
>*
* *
>*    Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
  *
>*    Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management *
>*    Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit *
  *
>*****************************************************************
>*
* *
No, your response assumes all respondents will refuse to be taped, or refuse to participate, if they are informed. This is not the case. The vast majority of respondents don't mind and/or don't think about it. No university IRB will allow taping without informed consent unless you have an incredibly powerful reason why respondents should not be informed. I believe simply saying up front that interviews may be monitored and taped for quality control purposes is probably sufficient. That gives the respondent the option to say they don't want to be taped.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day [SMTP:rday@mcs.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 1999 7:38 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: taping of phone interviews

That is all very simplistic. We had a meeting (CASRO people and folks such as Norman Brdburn and Dick Warneke). We discussed this issue with him. Consider this as a training issue and a quality control issue.

If
you don't tape and monitor you are unable to evaluate quality and
teach for
improvement. Nobody is interested in getting any respondent
identifiers-
but how do you continually work to improve the quality of your data
collection, model those who are better able to avert refusals, are
respectful of respondents- by monitoring and taping and teaching.

Richard Day
At 07:59 AM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:
>Ditto to Harry's comment!
>
>At 08:41 PM 2/10/99 -0500, you wrote:
>>Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without
the
>>respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises,
>>particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.
>> Harry O'Neill
>>
>>
>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

* * * * *

>* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
*

>* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy &
Management *
>* Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit *
*
>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Thu Feb 11 13:10:00 1999

Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.31])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA17449 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 13:09:59 -0800 (PST)

Received: from oemcomputer (ts14-8.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.113.47])
    by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id QAA03753
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 16:09:53 -0500 (EST)

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 16:09:53 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <1999021112109.QAA03753@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Sometimes simple language is all that's needed.

To me, the ethical point is that all respondents need to be at least implicitly informed that they *may* be monitored, but should give their permission if they are to be taped. For example, a study in which we wanted to do behavioral coding of the introductory sequence told respondents that the conversation "might be taped as part of our quality control process" and were asked if this was OK. If they objected, the taping was not done.

At 09:38 AM 2/11/99 -0600, you wrote:

> That is all very simplistic. We had a meeting (CASRO people and folks
> such as Norman Brdburn and Dick Warneke ). We discussed this issue with
> him. Consider this as a training issue and a quality control issue.
> If you don't tape and monitor you are unable to evaluate quality and
> teach for improvement. Nobody is interested in getting any respondent
> identifiers- but how do you continually work to improve the quality of
> your data collection, model those who are better able to avert
> refusals, are respectful of respondents- by monitoring and taping and
teaching.

Richard Day

> At 07:59 AM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:

>> Ditto to Harry's comment!

>>

>> At 08:41 PM 2/10/99 -0500, you wrote:

>>> Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without

>>> the respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even

>>> arises, particularly in this day of growing concern over personal

>>> privacy.

>>> Harry O'Neill

>

>>>*

>>>*

>>>*

>>> 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

> *
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
Just to put in my 2 cents:

I have to concur with both Lance and Richard. The need to monitor or tape record for quality control and quality improvement is a real one, and CASRO/CMOR has in the past, I believe, fought legislation that would have made monitoring and taping illegal in research phone interviews. I
think a blanket, verbal, introductory notice that "some of our interviews are tape recorded for quality control" would be sufficient from the standpoint of informed consent, assuming of course that the survey lab really does turn off the machines if the respondent voices objection. I would be assuming further that the interview content would not be highly sensitive and that the tape would be treated just as fully confidentially as any other interview record. If adequate informed consent is provided by the survey lab, then the ethical issue of taping disappears. It then becomes a cost and non-response control issue whether to turn on the tapes and inform respondents, or not use tapes on a particular study to ensure maximum rates of cooperation.

Is there an ethical difference between monitoring and making a confidential tape of the conversation that can be listened to post-interview? I wonder what other AAPORnetters think about that.

I agree that there is an ethical issue if taping occurs with no knowledge of the respondent, even though that may be legal in many states. On the other hand, I don't think the respondent is ethically obligated to notify the interviewer if he or she decides to hit the 'memo' button on the answering machine and tape record the interview from home--but I guess that behavior would be illegal in Maryland . . .

It is nonetheless worth noting that IRB's are primarily based in university settings, and many studies are exempt from IRB review, so a lot of research surveys do not fall under their purview. So, the issue is not mooted by the policies of IRB's.

For what it may be worth . . .

Tom

On Thu, 11 Feb 1999 08:29:56 -0800 "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu> wrote:
No, your response assumes all respondents will refuse to be taped, or refuse to participate, if they are informed. This is not the case. The vast majority of respondents don't mind and/or don't think about it. No university IRB will allow taping without informed consent unless you have an incredibly powerful reason why respondents should not be informed. I believe simply saying up front that interviews may be monitored and taped for quality control purposes is probably sufficient. That gives the respondent the option to say they don't want to be taped.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day [SMTP:rday@mcs.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 1999 7:38 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: taping of phone interviews

That is all very simplistic. We had a meeting (CASRO people and folks such as Norman Brdburn and Dick Warneke). We discussed this issue with him. Consider this as a training issue and a quality control issue.
If you don't tape and monitor you are unable to evaluate quality and teach for improvement. Nobody is interested in getting any respondent identifiers - but how do you continually work to improve the quality of your data collection, model those who are better able to avert refusals, are respectful of respondents - by monitoring and taping and teaching.

Richard Day

At 07:59 AM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:

>Ditto to Harry's comment!

>>

>At 08:41 PM 2/10/99 -0500, you wrote:

>>Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without the respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises,

>>particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.

>> Harry O'Neill

>>

>>

>>

> > .................................

> ****

>  ***

> >*

> * 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 *
> > >* ******************************
> > >* ****
> > >* ***
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >>

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
Paul, nicely said. What I left out of my message was that I set up a meeting with Paul Simon when he was the Senator and when the Democrats controlled the Senate (remember that far back). Anyway he introduced a bill that would have made monitoring illegal. Casro was very concerned from a quality control standpoint. That is when we set up a meeting with him in Chicago and brought in the Illinois NFPs and Corps. that interviewed. He agreed to kill the bill.
I understand your point and certainly have no problem with it. We do it our way for quality control purposes. If we are ever going to tape for a client we always get prior permission.

At 04:09 PM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:

> Sometimes simple language is all that's needed.
>
> To me, the ethical point is that all respondents need to be at least implicitly informed that they *may* be monitored, but should give their permission if they are to be taped. For example, a study in which we wanted to do behavioral coding of the introductory sequence told respondents that the conversion "might be taped as part of our quality control process" and were asked if this was OK. If they objected, the taping was not done.
>
> At 09:38 AM 2/11/99 -0600, you wrote:

>> That is all very simplistic. We had a meeting (CASRO people and folks such as Norman Brdburn and Dick Warneke). We discussed this issue with him. Consider this as a training issue and a quality control issue. If you don't tape and monitor you are unable to evaluate quality and teach for improvement. Nobody is interested in getting any respondent identifiers - but how do you continually work to improve the quality of your data collection, model those who are
better able to avert refusals, are respectful of respondents- by monitoring and taping and teaching.

Richard Day

At 07:59 AM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:

Ditto to Harry's comment!

At 08:41 PM 2/10/99 -0500, you wrote:

Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without the respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises, particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.

Harry O'Neill

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* * *
* * *
* 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 *
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:
From rday@mcs.net Thu Feb 11 13:55:22 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA08318 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 13:55:20 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gopher (P58-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.122]) by
Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id PAA10532 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 11 Feb 1999 15:55:14 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990211153404.006ef188@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 15:34:04 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Subject: RE: taping of phone interviews
In-Reply-To: <SIMEON.9902111622.G@bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU>
References: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213047103@psg.ucsf.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
anytime we tape for a client we ALWAYS ger prior and even taped agreement. When we tape for quality control and teaching we never have a responden identifiers, but it is a great way to continually work to improve your interviewing. At 04:19 PM 2/11/99 -0500, you wrote:

>Just to put in my 2 cents:

> I have to concur with both Lance and Richard. The need to monitor
or tape record for quality control and quality improvement is a real one,
and CASRO/CMOR has in the past, I believe, fought legislation that would
have made monitoring and taping illegal in research phone interviews. I
think a blanket, verbal, introductory notice that "some of our interviews
are tape recorded for quality control" would be sufficient from the
standpoint of informed consent, assuming of course that the survey lab
really does turn off the machines if the respondent voices objection. I
would be assuming further that the interview content would not be highly
sensitive and that the tape would be treated just as fully confidentially
as any other interview record. If adequate informed consent is provided by

the survey lab, then the ethical issue of taping disappears. It then
becomes a cost and non-response control issue whether to turn on the tapes
and inform respondents, or not use tapes on a particular study to ensure
maximum rates of cooperation.

> Is there an ethical difference between monitoring and making a
confidential tape of the conversation that can be listened to
post-interview? I wonder what other AAPORnetters think about that.

> I agree that there is an ethical issue if taping occurs with no
knowledge of the respondent, even though that may be legal in many states.

>On the other hand, I don't think the respondent is ethically obligated to
> notify the interviewer if he or she decides to hit the 'memo' button on the
>
> answering machine and tape record the interview from home--but I guess that
>
> behavior would be illegal in Maryland . . .
>
> > It is nonetheless worth noting that IRB's are primarily based in
> > university settings, and many studies are exempt from IRB review, so a lot
> > of research surveys do not fall under their purview. So, the issue is not
> > mooted by the policies of IRB's.
> > > For what it may be worth . . .
> > > Tom
> > >
> > On Thu, 11 Feb 1999 08:29:56 -0800 "Pollack, Lance"
> > <<LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
> > wrote:
> > >
> > >> No, your response assumes all respondents will refuse to be taped, or
> > >> refuse to participate, if they are informed. This is not the case.
> > >> The vast majority of respondents don't mind and/or don't think about
> > >> it. No university IRB will allow taping without informed consent
> > >> unless you have an incredibly powerful reason why respondents should
> > >> not be informed. I believe simply saying up front that interviews may
> > >> be monitored and taped for quality control purposes is probably
> > >> sufficient. That gives the respondent the option to say they don't
> > >> want to be taped.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Lance M. Pollack
> > >> University of California, San Francisco lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu
That is all very simplistic. We had a meeting (CASRO people and folks such as Norman Brdburn and Dick Warneke). We discussed this issue with him. Consider this as a training issue and a quality control issue. If you don’t tape and monitor you are unable to evaluate quality and teach for improvement. Nobody is interested in getting any respondent identifiers but how do you continually work to improve the quality of your data collection, model those who are better able to avert refusals, are respectful of respondents by monitoring and taping and teaching.

Richard Day
Legality be damned! Good ethical practice demands no taping without the respondent's permission. I'm appalled that the question even arises, particularly in this day of growing concern over personal privacy.

Harry O'Neill

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:
>lavrikas.1@osu.edu *
>> ***************** ****************************************
>> *****  
>> *** 
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>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 HOneill536@aol.com Thu Feb 11 14:33:21 1999
Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA23792 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 14:33:17 -0800
(PST)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
    by imo17.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 3TAAa03212
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 17:31:11 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <6d40844b.36c35a2f@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 17:31:11 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Let's not confuse the routine monitoring of interviewers with the taping of respondents without their permission. The former does not need permission, the latter certainly does.  

Harry O'Neill

>From mlongstr@comp.uark.edu Thu Feb 11 14:44:03 1999
Received: from comp.uark.edu (mlongstr@comp.uark.edu [130.184.252.197])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA28390 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 14:44:02 -0800
   (PST)
Received: (from mlongstr@localhost)
   by comp.uark.edu (8.9.0/8.9.0) id QAA15987;
   Thu, 11 Feb 1999 16:44:00 -0600 (CST)
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 16:44:00 -0600 (CST)
From: Molly Longstreth <mlongstr@comp.uark.edu>
X-Sender: mlongstr@comp
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: position
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.95.990211163933.11846A-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Field Director
Survey Research Center
The University of Arkansas' Survey Research Center is seeking applicants for the 12-month position of field director.

RESPONSIBILITIES:
Manage day-to-day activities of ongoing surveys conducted via a variety of methods; work with Center director to develop, implement, & monitor research designs; supervise all aspects of field projects including personnel; occasionally consult on stages of research design including sampling, data collection, and analysis; and assist in starting the Center. Responsible for interfacing with Computing Services for routine maintenance of PCs and assisting with other technical details, including maintaining CATI systems.

QUALIFICATIONS:
This position requires a record of successfully implementing surveys or managing complex research projects. A masters degree completed or in process in a social science or business is essential; a Ph.D. is preferable. Required are: an ability to assume multiple assignments, often under tight timeframes; very good oral and written communications and an ability to write clear research reports for professional and public audiences; very good interpersonal skills; experience with computers in a networked environment and some evening and weekend work. Desirable qualities include: Experience using a CATI system, e-mail and/or other web-based surveys, mail and/or in-person surveys, and/or focus groups; knowledge of sampling methods; a strong background in social science research in general & survey methodology in particular; knowledge/experience with SAS or SPSS or other statistical packages; computer programming; supervisory skills.

Salary depends on academic preparation and professional experience.
Starting date is negotiable. Start may be immediate, but no later than May
Review of applications will begin March 3, 1999 and continue until position is filled. Interested persons should send a resume, official college transcripts, & three letters of recommendation to: Molly Longstreth, Ph.D., Director, University of Arkansas Survey Research Center, ADSB 100A, Fayetteville, AR 72701. For further information see http://www.uark.edu/campus-resources/osredker/jobfac.htm.

The University of Arkansas is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and applications will be accepted without regard to age, race, color, sex or national origin. Persons hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.

**************************************************************************
**
Molly Longstreth, Ph.D. University of Arkansas
Director Fayetteville, AR 72701
Survey Research Center 501-575-3495
HOEC 118 Fax: 501-575-7171
**************************************************************************
**
Field Director
Survey Research Center

The University of Arkansas' Survey Research Center is seeking applicants for the 12-month position of field director.

RESPONSIBILITIES:
Manage day-to-day activities of ongoing surveys conducted via a variety of
methods; work with Center director to develop, implement, & monitor research designs; supervise all aspects of field projects including personnel; occasionally consult on stages of research design including sampling, data collection, and analysis; and assist in starting the Center. Responsible for interfacing with Computing Services for routine maintenance of PCs and assisting with other technical details, including maintaining CATI systems.

QUALIFICATIONS:
This position requires a record of successfully implementing surveys or managing complex research projects. A masters degree completed or in process in a social science or business is essential; a Ph.D. is preferable. Required are: an ability to assume multiple assignments, often under tight timeframes; very good oral and written communications and an ability to write clear research reports for professional and public audiences; very good interpersonal skills; experience with computers in a networked environment and some evening and weekend work. Desirable qualities include: Experience using a CATI system, e-mail and/or other web-based surveys, mail and/or in-person surveys, and/or focus groups; knowledge of sampling methods; a strong background in social science research in general & survey methodology in particular; knowledge/experience with SAS or SPSS or other statistical packages; computer programming; supervisory skills.

Salary depends on academic preparation and professional experience. Starting date is negotiable. Start may be immediate, but no later than May 1, 1999.

Review of applications will begin March 3, 1999 and continue until position is filled. Interested persons should send a resume, official college transcripts, & three letters of recommendation to: Molly Longstreth, Ph.D., Director, University of Arkansas Survey Research Center, ADSB 100A,
The University of Arkansas is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and applications will be accepted without regard to age, race, color, sex or national origin. Persons hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.

**
Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.                    University of Arkansas
Director                                    Fayetteville, AR 72701
Survey Research Center                      501-575-3495
HOEC 118                                     Fax: 501-575-7171

**
The recent reorganization of the grant review procedures at the National Institutes of Health has created a separate study section (a separate review panel) for grant proposals involving methodological work. This is potentially a very important development for survey research inquiries, because it increases the likelihood that methodological grant proposals will be reviewed by those knowledgeable about important issues in survey and statistical methods.

This is an opportunity that we should all investigate. Check out the web page

http://www.csr.nih.gov/review/bss.htm

and follow the button for

Social Science, Nursing, Epidemiology and Methods (SNEM)
Regarding this topic of debate, I believe the taping of respondents without
their permission IS permissible, if and only if, you are doing so as your patriotic duty. If, in your own little mind, you feel that these taped conversations are going to save the American people from an over(under?)-sexed middle aged CEO, then by all means, tape away.

God Bless America.

>>> <HOneill536@aol.com> 02/11 4:31 PM >>>
Let's not confuse the routine monitoring of interviewers with the taping of respondents without their permission. The former does not need permission, the latter certainly does.  Harry O'Neill

>From jflynn@decisionresearch.org Fri Feb 12 08:43:32 1999
Received: from guppy.pond.net (guppy.pond.net [205.240.25.2])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA07612 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 08:43:30 -0800 (PST)
Received: from ralph (p3p4.pond.net [205.240.25.114])
    by guppy.pond.net (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id IAA06437
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 08:37:52 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.19990212084053.007d6b80@decisionresearch.org>
X-Sender: jflynn@decisionresearch.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 08:40:53 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: James Flynn <jflynn@decisionresearch.org>
Subject: Re: taping of phone interviews
In-Reply-To: <s6c3f64f.051@gwise.ama-assn.org>
I hope that Camin is being satirical and does not mean to suggest that civil liberties such be negated by the scoundrels of patriotism and morality. God bless American, indeed.

At 09:27 AM 2/12/99 -0600, you wrote:
>Regarding this topic of debate, I believe the taping of respondents without their permission IS permissible, if and only if, you are doing so as your patriotic duty. If, in your own little mind, you feel that these taped conversations are going to save the American people from an over(under?)-sexed middle aged CEO, then by all means, tape away.
>
>God Bless America.
>
>>>> <HOneill536@aol.com> 02/11 4:31 PM >>>
>Let's not confuse the routine monitoring of interviewers with the taping of respondents without their permission. The former does not need permission,
>
>the latter certainly does.  Harry O'Neill
For those of you at university survey centers, how have you handled confidential student responses indicating a potential for suicide? For
example, if you were surveying students about a university-sponsored program in which they had participated and had assured them of confidentiality, yet see a response that is very worrisome, does one ignore it, contact the student... What have you done?

Thank you for your input. Molly

******************************************************************************
**
Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.                       University of Arkansas
Director                                    Fayetteville, AR 72701
Survey Research Center                      501-575-3495
HOEC 118                                    Fax: 501-575-7171
******************************************************************************
**

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Feb 12 09:09:00 1999
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/us) with ESMTP
      id JAA13908 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:08:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/us) with ESMTP
      id JAA19968 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:08:58 -0800
(PST)
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:08:58 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: F0IA and Federally Funded Research Data (fwd)
I am interested in list members opinions about the legislation described below and whether there should be an organizational response from AAPOR. Is anyone working on this yet?

Robert Laforge, Sc.D.
Associate Professor
Director, Survey Research Center
Cancer Prevention Research Center
2 Chafee Rd
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881
WASHINGTON - With rising alarm, universities and hospitals are moving to repeal a new and little-noticed federal law that requires them to release details of their research to the public, possibly including confidential interviews and trade secrets, if the work is backed by federal funds.

The law was included with little debate in a 4,000-page appropriations bill that Congress approved as one of its final actions last year. It says that "all data" produced by researchers receiving federal grants can be obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, a federal law that gives citizens access to government documents.

Supporters of the law, who include Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, say its intent is to provide the public access to all research used by federal agencies in setting policies and regulations. The measure arose from a complaint by industry groups that the Harvard School of Public Health refused to release data that federal regulators relied on when they proposed tougher air-quality standards two years ago.

But as news of the law trickles through the research community, universities and hospitals are reacting with apprehension. They say the law could result in much broader releases of information, putting notes,
confidential material, and incomplete or misleading data in the hands of those who want to use it for profit or who oppose the research for political reasons.

"I see nothing positive in this," said Dr. Eugene Braunwald, who oversees 2,000 researchers at Partners Health Care, the parent of Massachusetts General Hospital and Brigham & Women's Hospital in Boston. "It's mischievous. It was not discussed. It was buried in a huge bill without a full airing. This is nothing you just slip in to suddenly change the life of lots and lots of scientists."

"We have grave concerns," said Kevin Casey, spokesman for Harvard University. "This is a large problem, and the more we look into it, the more sirens go off."

A wide range of other research organizations expressed concern about how the law will be applied. They include the National Academy of Sciences, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston University Medical Center, and the American Association of University Professors.

"There is no way to implement this law that is tolerable," said Dr. David Korn of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Representative George Brown Jr., Democrat of California, has filed a bill to repeal the law, and 21 lawmakers echoed the research community's concerns in a letter to the federal agency charged with implementing the new measure.

The Freedom of Information Act is a 32-year-old law that compels government agencies to release a wide variety of documents on request. The law,
however, allows the government to withhold information for a variety of reasons, such as national security and "unwarranted" invasion of privacy.

Those exemptions will prevent the government from releasing sensitive information gathered by researchers, such as confidential medical records or proprietary material, said Andrea Andrews, spokeswoman for Senator Richard Shelby, the Alabama Republican who wrote the law.

Andrews said the law arose from a dispute over Harvard's Six Cities study, which tracked the health of about 8,000 people for close to 20 years and found a link between air pollution and health. When the EPA cited the study in proposing tougher air standards, lawmakers and industry groups demanded that Harvard release more details of its work. The researchers refused, saying that the habits, death records, and medical histories of their subjects were obtained under confidentiality agreements.

The researchers allowed independent scientists to review the data, but Shelby believes better access is needed.

"If the public pays for a study, then we should be able to examine that study," Andrews said. "And agencies such as the EPA should not be allowed to propose regulations without releasing the study on which they are basing the regulations."

But researchers say that the language in Shelby's measure is so broad that confidential information might not be protected.

Moreover, depending on how it is interpreted, the law could give anyone access to research data before it is published, violating a long-held
tradition that those who gather the data get to interpret it first. Researchers also worry that the law might force them to disclose new research that could be patented and turned into profitable products.

"We do a lot of industrially supported research," said David Litster, vice president for research at MIT. "Sometimes a company will provide us with confidential information - the source code for software or something else - that they do not want public. This law just seems to cast a very broad net, and nobody knows quite what could be scooped up."

Researchers say that the scientific process, by its very nature, already requires that all pertinent data be made public. Scientific results are not valid unless they can be reproduced, and prominent journals will not publish papers unless they contain enough data to satisfy independent reviewers. "If scientists don't put their work in the public eye, it's not worth anything to their careers," said Ruth Flower of the American Association of University Professors.

Some academic groups also say they fear the law will be used by industry groups to harass researchers whose work might lead to tougher regulations.

They cite the case of Dr. Paul M. Fischer of the Medical College of Georgia. In 1991, Fischer and others released a study showing that Joe Camel, the cigarette cartoon symbol, was as well known to 6-year-olds as Mickey Mouse.

Tobacco giant R.J. Reynolds sought the details of Fischer's work, including the names and telephone numbers of all children who participated in the study and the addresses, phone numbers, and background information of the people who interviewed them. The company argued that Fischer, as a public
employee, had to release this and other information under Georgia’s open records law. The tobacco company won, though the state law was quickly amended so the children's names remained confidential.

"What happened to me was very clearly not an attempt to understand the science. This was an attempt to shut down my research operation," said Fischer, who has since left the medical school. The new federal law, he said, "will be used by companies to harass researchers. This is going to be a mess."

Scott Williams, a spokesman for the five largest US tobacco companies, said it was "blatantly unfair" to say the industry would use the new law to harass researchers.

Williams said that if researchers "try to drive public policy, then they should be prepared to have their data face rigorous public review."

-------

This story ran on page A01 of the Boston Globe on 02/11/99.

******

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Fri Feb 12 09:49:22 1999
Received: from outbound.Princeton.EDU (outbound.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.74])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA00614 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:49:21 -0800
This problem fits into a wider issue about what to do when an interviewer encounters a situation in which a respondent may be in danger for any number
of reasons, including domestic violence, severe depression, etc. Anne Ciemnecki, a survey researcher at Mathematica Policy Research, presented a paper at an AAPOR conference a few years back in which she describes several situations like these, including a case of an elderly respondent who fell and injured himself while talking on the telephone to an interviewer. In this case I believe the survey team quickly called for help and directed an emergency medical team to the respondent’s home.

In the case that Molly Longstreth is describing, the issue is whether the imperative to help violates the assurance of confidentiality. My suggestion is that someone from the survey team get back in touch with the student asap, to express their concern and offer information about where the student can seek help. You might also ask whether the student wants to be referred to someone else on campus who can help. Best to consult a specialist on this issue if you have that resource available to you on campus. But you may have to do this without revealing the student’s identity.

----------6F63E8536434385F1FD3BDEF
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="vcard.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Freeland, Edward
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="vcard.vcf"

begin: vcard
fn: Edward Freeland
n: Freeland;Edward
org: Princeton Survey Research Center
adr;dom: 202 Robertson Hall;;Princeton University;Princeton;NJ;08544-1013;
email;internet: efreelan@princeton.edu
WE HAVE GENERALLY RECEIVED GUIDANCE FROM OUR HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE AND
UNIVERSITY ATTORNEYS AND ON CAMPUS BIOETHICISTS; THE LEGAL AND ETHICAL
CONSIDERATIONS OF EITHER CHOICE (TO OR NOT TO ACT) NEED TO BE CLEAR OR AS
CLEAR AS POSSIBLE BEFORE YOU CAN DECIDE. GOOD LUCK. JCATANIA

> ---------
> From:     Molly Longstreth
> Reply To:       aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent:     Friday, February 12, 1999 8:56 AM
> To:       aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject:  Potential call for help
> 
> For those of you at university survey centers, how have you handled
> confidential student responses indicating a potential for suicide? For
> example, if you were surveying students about a university-sponsored
> program in which they had participated and had assured them of
> confidentiality, yet see a response that is very worrisome, does one
> ignore it, contact the student... What have you done?
> 
> Thank you for your input. Molly
> 
> **********************
>
>
> **********************
> 
> Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.    University of Arkansas
> Director                     Fayetteville, AR 72701
> Survey Research Center  501-575-3495
> HOEC 118                Fax: 501-575-7171
> 
> **********************
>
> **
That happened on a survey we did a few years ago. In consultation with our Human Subjects committee, we placed a statement to be read to all participants immediately after the question. It read something to the effect of "Regardless of how you answered the last question, the University Counseling Center is available to assist you if you feel like you need to talk to someone. The number is.....".
In that manner, the Center was providing a referral to a professional.
Our interviewers are not professional counselors, and are therefore not
qualified to determine when someone is at risk.

Jim Bason

On Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:56:59 -0600 (CST) Molly Longstreth
<mlongstr@comp.uark.edu> wrote:

> For those of you at university survey centers, how have you handled
> confidential student responses indicating a potential for suicide?
> For example, if you were surveying students about a
> university-sponsored program in which they had participated and had
> assured them of confidentiality, yet see a response that is very
> worrisome, does one ignore it, contact the student... What have you
> done?
> 
> > Thank you for your input. Molly
> >
> >
> >******************************************************************************
> >**
> >Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.                       University of Arkansas
> >Director                                      Fayetteville, AR 72701
> >Survey Research Center                       501-575-3495
> >HOEC 118                                      Fax: 501-575-7171
> >******************************************************************************
> >*******
James J. Bason, Ph.D.
Director
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602
jbason@arches.uga.edu
(706) 542-6110
(706) 542-4057 FAX

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Fri Feb 12 10:56:52 1999
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA00657 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:56:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (garnet2-fi.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.197.3])
    by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id NAA82130
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:56:46 -0500
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial434.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.33.180])
    by garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA54336
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:56:44 -0500
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:56:44 -0500
Message-Id: <199902121856.NAA54336@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
Hi Molly:

When I work with Project TAL at our Survey Research Center, we post the name and telephone number of our local 24-hour counselling and referral service hotline ("224-NEED") in every booth. If there is a suggestion of distress, interviewers give the Telephone Counselling & Referral Service number. TCRS has many referral options (e.g., legal aid in the case of divorce or domestic violence; disability or homeless assistance referrals) as well as trained counsellors. All interviewers are also told about TCRS during training. My guess is that you have a local group comparable to TCRS and can refer to same. Given the anonymity of RDD, in many cases this will be the best you can do for *non-emergency* but distressing situations.

Susan

P.S. For AAPORneters who wanted a summary on the juror attitude material from last November, it's coming!
Thank you for your input. Molly

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 850-644-1753 Office
     850-644-6416 Sociology Office
Has anyone found any benefit in using a $2 bill, as opposed to two $1 bills, as an incentive in mail surveys? Hopefully, there is no sign that it hurts response. We are considering this option, in part, due to the difficulty in getting enough clean $1 bills for mailing.
I've reviewed literature on the amount of the incentive, but have found nothing on the $2 bill.

If you would prefer to respond to me directly: Barbara.O'Hare@arbitron.com

Thanks.

We had such a question on our binge-drinking survey of undergraduates. The research protocol called for us to remove the identifying information before we looked at the data, and so we were unable to respond.
On Fri, 12 Feb 1999, Molly Longstreth wrote:

> Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:56:59 -0600 (CST)
> From: Molly Longstreth <mlongstr@comp.uark.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Potential call for help

> For those of you at university survey centers, how have you handled confidential student responses indicating a potential for suicide? For example, if you were surveying students about a university-sponsored program in which they had participated and had assured them of confidentiality, yet see a response that is very worrisome, does one ignore it, contact the student... What have you done?

> Thank you for your input. Molly

>
>From smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com Sat Feb 13 00:01:42 1999
Received: from relay3.smtp.psi.net (relay3.smtp.psi.net [38.8.210.2])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id AAA11741 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 13 Feb 1999 00:01:41 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [38.176.63.7] (helo=mail.icrsurvey.com)
   by relay3.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
   for aapornet@usc.edu
   id 10Ba1F-0001PK-00; Sat, 13 Feb 1999 03:01:41 -0500
Received: from media#u#dom-Message_Server by mail.icrsurvey.com
   with Novell_GroupWise; Sat, 13 Feb 1999 03:02:51 -0500
Message-Id: <s6c4eb5b.070@mail.icrsurvey.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Sat, 13 Feb 1999 03:02:41 -0500
From: "Steve McFadden" <smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com>
Sender: Postmaster@mail.icrsurvey.com
Reply-To: smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Potential call for help
I will be out of the office until 2/18. If you need immediate attention, please contact Kathleen Martin. Her e-mail address is: kmartin@mail.icrsurvey.com

From tmg1p@server1.mail.virginia.edu Mon Feb 15 15:36:40 1999
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id PAA02665 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Feb 1999 15:36:37 -0800 (PST)
Received: from server1.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa27788;
    15 Feb 99 18:36 EST
Received: from bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU (bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU [128.143.140.192]) by server1.mail.virginia.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id SAA09718
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Feb 1999 18:36:36 -0500 (EST)
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@server1.mail.virginia.edu>
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: FOIA and Federally Funded Research Data (fwd)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9902120852020.13227-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.9902151835.A@bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU>
Date: Mon, 15 Feb 1999 18:36:35 -0500 (EST)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Windows Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Jim: (cc: AAPORnet)

The article you forwarded about the new challenge to confidentiality of data should be of grave concern to survey researchers everywhere. I wasn’t aware of it but would like to be kept posted on any response from AAPOR, or of responses already happening from others on this list. Let me know if I can be of help.

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
Sorry to bother you all, but;;;

I need to recall how to unsubscribe from this system so that I change servers. Does anyone have the old set of directions?

I've lost mine. I'm sorry about this.

jon ebeling
ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu
Hi AAPORneters. I am posting this message for Brenda Hughes, who is one of our doctoral students, currently completing her dissertation. I hope you can be of help. Please respond directly to Brenda at the various locations she lists below.

Thanks,
Susan

My name is Brenda Hughes, I am a doctoral candidate in sociology at Florida State University working on a dissertation in which I will examine the "series life-span" of a sample (approx. 400+) of prime-time network television programs. As part of this research I have been trying to obtain the weekly national Nielsen television ratings for all the television series in my sample. To date, I have a majority of the ratings data that I need with the exception of: 2/24/69-3/9/69 6/26-7/9/72 7/24/72-8/6/72
8/7/72-8/20/72 8/21/72-9/3/72 9/4/72-9/17/72

September 1972-December 1973
All reports between 1978 to 1984

Any assistance and or direction you could provide would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you
Brenda Hughes
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2270

I can be reached via email at
bhughes@garnet.acns.fsu.edu or
ebrenny@email.msn.com

home phone: (850)385-4073

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.
>From Mark@bisconti.com Tue Feb 16 11:11:27 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA06397 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Feb 1999 11:11:21 -0800 (PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org  (Content
    Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000448491@medusa.nei.org> for
    <aapornet@usc.edu>;  Tue, 16 Feb 1999 14:08:54 -0500
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.184]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP
    (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)
    id 1Z4PSRJX; Tue, 16 Feb 1999 14:10:02 -0500
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
    id <01BE59B4.96414D80@mark-bri>; Tue, 16 Feb 1999 13:59:36 -0500
Message-Id: <01BE59B4.96414D80@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wash. Post article
Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 13:59:35 -0500
The phone's ringing. We've just sat down for dinner, so of course the phone's ringing.

A youngish male voice greets me, mispronounces my name and immediately swings into his rap: "I'm calling from Acme Associates, and we're conducting some research. We're not trying to sell you anything. We just want to ask you a few questions . . . "

Snappy comebacks race through my head. Should I use Jerry Seinfeld's line on him, about cooperating only if I can have his home phone number, so that I call him back during his dinner?

Instead, conditioned by habit, I respond as tens of millions have responded before me: "Sorry," I say. "Not interested. Goodbye."

Shortly after I've hung up, after I've dug back into my mashed potatoes, it hits me. The proper response wasn't "Sorry. Not interested."
What I should have said was "How much?"

Let's face it: Companies are fascinated by me.

Okay, maybe not me personally, but "me"--the consumer--collectively. I possess something nearly as valuable as spendable cash: information about myself. Before they can get "me" to buy something, they need to know a lot about me: how old I am, how much I make, who I voted for, what I eat, wear, drive, think or do.

Market research is a $6 billion-a-year business, according to Jack Honomichl, who tracks the industry for Marketing News magazine. The shocking thing about that is how one-sided this flow of money is. By that I mean I'm not getting any of it.

The research company that called me up the other day wanted something for nothing; in essence, the researchers wanted to get their hands on my facts. This company was no doubt being paid by another company to learn about me. This second company undoubtedly planned to hand my facts to its marketing department or ad agency, where several well-compensated employees. Picking consumers' brains helps companies develop new products and establish competitive prices. This enhances the efficiency and profitability of the company, which in turn helps fuel the larger economy.

Besides, marketers argue, no company wants to waste your time and its money trying to sell you something you don't want. As the grease in the sale process, market research makes everyone's life easier. "Research is part of the way in which consumers take charge of what they get, where =
they get it from and what they pay for it," says Bill Cook of the =
Advertising Research Foundation, an organization of ad agencies, media =
companies and market research organizations.

This argument would be persuasive if it weren't for one inconvenient =
fact: Collecting personal data has become an end unto itself.

Recently, Conde Nast Publications Inc., publisher of the New Yorker, =
Vanity Fair and other magazines, asked subscribers to fill out a =
remarkably detailed survey, with intimate questions about smoking, =
drinking and personal health. Respondents were told they would become = part
of a select group that might get product samples.

Conde Nast wasn't interested in this information solely because it = wanted
to improve its magazines. Instead, it was assembling a massive, = exclusive
database on its readers that it could resell to drug = companies, retailers
and other marketers.

The good news--from consumers' perspective, at least--is that the guinea =
pigs have begun to wise up. They're demanding more for their = information.

Some companies have begun to reverse the old paradigm of something for =
nothing and have been dangling "rewards" in front of those who give up =
personal details.

To maintain customer loyalty, for example, marketers created =
frequent-flier and frequent-shopper programs. A chief aim of these =
loyalty, or "relationship," programs is to collect consumer information =
that can be used to induce customers to buy more, or to persuade = customers
to change their buying patterns with coupons, "exclusive" = d, this is
exactly what companies such as Catalina Marketing Corp. of = St. Petersburg,
Fla., do. Using shopper-club data supplied by = supermarket chains, Catalina
then singles out families for specific = marketing pitches from consumer
goods manufacturers. The company claims = it has shopping histories on 30
million families.

To which I say, so what?

The real problem with this, I'd suggest, is not that someone might know =
which brand of peanut butter you prefer. The problem is that they won't =
compensate you adequately for this fact.

A number of legal and economic researchers say many consumers don't get =
discounts or products worth anything close to what their information is =
worth. These researchers are studying how to place a price tag on such =
information.

Paul M. Schwartz, a legal scholar at Brooklyn Law School, says few = people
are even aware of how their information is used by a company, or = resold or
rented out. And so they can't properly price their data.

The grocery store may give you a deal on peanut butter, for instance, = but
the store may be reaping much larger discounts from food = manufacturers who
pay to send out direct mail. Similarly, consumers who = fill out a survey at
a music store may get a free CD, but the company = may sell the information
at a great profit to another marketer. = Consumers "are getting ripped off,"
Schwartz concludes. "They don't = realize the true value" of their facts.
Management consultants John Hagel and Marc Singer argue in a forthcoming book that the balance of power between marketers and consumers has begun to shift--so much so that in a few years consumers will have a personal information intermediary, or "infomediary," to negotiate on their behalf with information seekers.

In "Net Worth: Shaping Markets When Customers Make the Rules," Hagel and Singer suggest that consumers may someday coalesce into a kind of massive co-op, a marketing HMO. Taking information from many consumers, the infomediary would use their combined market power to extract lower prices and other perks from groups of marketers.

Frankly, I don't mind having some frivolous piece of my identity bandied about among strangers. I'm not even sure I mind disclosing important facts about myself to marketers. But I do mind not getting enough in return.

And so, I place myself up for bid.

What do I hear for a male, age 40, who . . . well, that's just a taste. =
Want to know more? Then let me ask you a question: What's it worth to you?

Staff writers Robert O'Harrow and Fred Barbash contributed to this report.

Where the Marketing Money Goes

Nearly a third of market research is spent on consumer nondurable goods, which includes packaged items such as food.
Consumer nondurables: 32.7%

Media advertising: 18.7%

Pharmaceutical, health care 17.2%

Government 6.0%

Other 5.7%

Telecom. 4.6%

Cons. durables 4.4%

Automotive 3.6%

Financial servs. 3.4%

Retailers 1.4%

Travel, tourism 1.1%

Entertainment 1.0%

Political 0.2%

31.4% = 20

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company
David Broder today cites a Goess-Lake survey of young people to lament their political ignorance: "Only a quarter of the respondents could answer correctly all the three of such basic questions as the name of the vice president, the name of their governor and the length of House member's term . . . . a woeful failure of education."

With the survey trade having assimilated a good deal of cognitive science
pertinent to interview methodology, perhaps it can begin to catch on to some relevance it may have to the substance and interpretation of surveys. To be thankful for small favors, Broder’s construction was "could not answer the question" rather than the common "did not know" that is attached to such survey results. He did imply same meaning as the latter phrase does, however. To counter it, I need merely say that I often cannot, when asked, give my phone number, but that does not mean I do not "know" it or wouldn't dial it correctly if at that moment I was handed a phone. Yup, it depends on knowing what the meaning of "know" is and upon knowing something about the relevant (or not) contexts in which the question was asked.

I am loathe to say that Broder’s failure to apply such elementary psychological knowledge in this instance represents "a woeful failure of education" to equip him for responsible practice of his profession. (Possibly, I am reluctant because he and I were credentialed by the same university. He was there at a time that made him a subject of my MA research which gave some answers to the question of why students couldn’t use what they knew to answer correctly social sciences exam questions.) Since experience alone is enough to acquaint one with the fact that there are different forms of knowing and remembering, it is safe to say that he knows this but didn't bring this knowledge to bear when he inferred young people's ignorance from this question. (I don't know how Goeas and Lake treated the matter.)

In any event, it would be helpful to have survey practitioners do some practical "overlearning" of such concepts as "domain dependent learning and recall" and "metamemory." Indeed, the survey method might well be put to the job of expanding knowledge about knowing and learning. It is an important task because of the vulnerability of the words "know" and
"learn" to the semantic fallacy: things are the same if we attach the same name to them. There are innocent folks in jail, I am sure, because "knowing" does not necessarily equate to an "ability to recall," given the particular time, place and circumstance of the asking.

Three cheers to Al Biderman, a most astute observer of the critic's commission of the criticism itself. You ought to send this excellent commentary to him!

Best,

Sid
David Broder today cites a Goess-Lake survey of young people to lament their political ignorance: "Only a quarter of the respondents could answer correctly all the three of such basic questions as the name of the vice president, the name of their governor and the length of House member's term... a woeful failure of education."

With the survey trade having assimilated a good deal of cognitive science pertinent to interview methodology, perhaps it can begin to catch on to some relevance it may have to the substance and interpretation of surveys. To be thankful for small favors, Broder's construction was "could not answer the question" rather than the common "did not know" that is attached to such survey results. He did imply same meaning as the latter phrase does, however. To counter it, I need merely say that I often cannot, when asked, give my phone number, but that does not mean I do not "know" it or wouldn't dial it correctly if at that moment I was handed a phone. Yup, it depends on knowing what the meaning of "know" is and upon knowing something about the relevant (or not) contexts in which the question was asked.

I am loathe to say that Broder's failure to apply such elementary psychological knowledge in this instance represents "a woeful failure of education" to equip him for responsible practice of his profession. (Possibly, I am reluctant because he and I were credentialled by the same university. He was there at a time that made him a subject of my MA research which gave some answers to the question of why students couldn't use what they knew to answer correctly social sciences exam..."
Since experience alone is enough to acquaint one with the fact that there are different forms of knowing and remembering, it is safe to say that he knows this but didn't bring this knowledge to bear when he inferred young people's ignorance from this question. (I don't know how Goeas and Lake treated the matter.)

In any event, it would be helpful to have survey practitioners do some practical "overlearning" of such concepts as "domain dependent learning and recall" and "metamemory." Indeed, the survey method might well be put to the job of expanding knowledge about knowing and learning. It is an important task because of the vulnerability of the words "know" and "learn" to the semantic fallacy: things are the same if we attach the same name to them. There are innocent folks in jail, I am sure, because "knowing" does not necessarily equate to an "ability to recall," given the particular time, place and circumstance of the asking.

From Scheuren@aol.com Wed Feb 17 14:09:33 1999
Received: from imo22.mx.aol.com (imo22.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.66])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA12667 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 14:09:30 -0800 (PST)
From: Scheuren@aol.com
Received: from Scheuren@aol.com
    by imo22.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 7LYMa01440;
    Wed, 17 Feb 1999 17:04:08 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <258bfab3.36cb3cd8@aol.com>
Dear Fellow AAPOR Members:

Please let me call your attention to the nomination process, now ongoing, for the next recipient of the Roger Herriot Award. One of last year's awardees, by the way, was a fellow member of AAPOR, Clyde Tucker.

AWARD BACKGROUND

After the sudden death in May, 1994 of Roger Herriot, an Associate Commissioner for Statistical Standards and Methodology at the National Center for Education Statistics, the Washington Statistical Society, the Social Statistics and Government Statistics Sections of the American Statistical Association established an award in his memory to recognize individuals who develop unique approaches to the solution of statistical problems in federal data collection programs.

The award is intended to reflect the special characteristics that marked Roger Herriot's career:

* Dedication to the issues of measurement
* Improvements in the efficiency of data collection programs; and

* Improvements and use of statistical data for policy analysis.

HERRIOT AWARD NOMINATIONS SOUGHT

The recipient of the 1999 Roger Herriot Award will be chosen by a committee of representatives of the Social Statistics Section and Government Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association and a representative of the Washington Statistical Society. Roger Herriot was associated with and strongly supportive of these organizations during his career. The award consists of an honorium of $500 and a framed citation.

PREVIOUS RECIPIENTS

Joseph Waksberg (Westat)

Monroe Sirken (National Center for Health Statistics)

Constance Citro (National Academy of Sciences)

Roderick Harrison (U.S. Bureau of the Census) jointly with Clyde Tucker (Bureau of Labor Statistics)

HOW TO APPLY

A nomination form can be obtained by contacting Daniel Kasprzyk at 202-219-1588, 202-219-1325 (fax) or e-mailing him at
All nomination forms should be returned to the Roger Herriot Award Committee c/o, Daniel Kasprzyk, 4906 Colonel Contee Place, Upper Marlboro, MD 20772-2875.

Completed nomination forms must be received by May 14, 1999. Nominations are sought for the 1999 Roger Herriot Award for Innovation in Federal Statistics.

The award is not restricted to senior members of an organization; nor is it to be considered as a culmination of a long period of service. Individuals at all levels, from entry to senior, federal employees, private sector employees, or employees of the academic community, may be nominated on the basis of the significance of the specific contribution.
Eloquently stated!

Maybe Broder has been talking with the Capital police-one officer told me tourists frequently ask him if the President and Hillary live in the Capitol and what representatives do there. And to think these "ignorant" Americans might be voters! Angst! They wouldn't even know it if Al Gore was standing next to them!

How easy it is to "prove" Americans are ignorant--whether on political, scientific, or environmental facts. Just maybe Americans think their brains need not be burdened with so much clutter, since they can call a library or turn on a computer and find out the answers when needed.

Here's to computer memory! But, you put these "ignorant" folks in a room and give them a problem to solve, and it soon becomes obvious that it is not "knowing" alone that makes one a capable and productive citizen. People get informed when they get involved. Maybe the issue is not how to "educate" citizens, but how to get them to feel their involvement is a good use of precious time or makes any difference whatsoever.

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com
From: Albert Biderman[SMTP:abider@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 1999 4:48 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: So what does he know.

David Broder today cites a Goess-Lake survey of young people to lament their political ignorance: "Only a quarter of the respondents could answer correctly all the three of such basic questions as the name of the vice president, the name of their governor and the length of House member's term . . . . a woeful failure of education."

With the survey trade having assimilated a good deal of cognitive science pertinent to interview methodology, perhaps it can begin to catch on to some relevance it may have to the substance and interpretation of surveys. To be thankful for small favors, Broder's construction was "could not answer the question" rather than the common "did not know" that is attached to such survey results. He did imply same meaning as the latter phrase does, however. To counter it, I need merely say that I often cannot, when asked, give my phone number, but that does not mean I do not "know" it or wouldn't dial it correctly if at that moment I was handed a phone. Yup, it depends on knowing what the meaning of "know" is and upon knowing something about the relevant (or not) contexts in which the question was asked.

I am loathe to say that Broder's failure to apply such elementary psychological knowledge in this instance represents "a woeful failure of education" to equip him for responsible practice of his profession.
(Possibly, I am reluctant because he and I were credentialled by the same university. He was there at a time that made him a subject of my MA research which gave some answers to the question of why students couldn't use what they knew to answer correctly social sciences exam questions.) Since experience alone is enough to acquaint one with the fact that there are different forms of knowing and remembering, it is safe to say that he knows this but didn't bring this knowledge to bear when he inferred young people's ignorance from this question. (I don't know how Goeas and Lake treated the matter.)

In any event, it would be helpful to have survey practitioners do some practical "overlearning" of such concepts as "domain dependent learning and recall" and "metamemory." Indeed, the survey method might well be put to the job of expanding knowledge about knowing and learning. It is an important task because of the vulnerability of the words "know" and "learn" to the semantic fallacy: things are the same if we attach the same name to them. There are innocent folks in jail, I am sure, because "knowing" does not necessarily equate to an "ability to recall," given the particular time, place and circumstance of the asking.

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Thu Feb 18 08:58:55 1999
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.32])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA07852 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 08:58:54 -0800 (PST)

Received: from lavrakas.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])
    by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id LAA01934
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 11:58:52 -0500 (EST)
After today you can go to the AAPOR webpage to get new information about the 1999 conference at the Tradewinds Resort Hotel, St. Petersburg, FL.

The link is:

http://www.aapor.org/cfc/index.html

If you are presenting at the conference, please see the "information for presenters" section (that is available on the main conference menu) that has all the information about guidelines, av requests, abstracts, etc.

Links to the preliminary program (available in acrobat pdf format) and the hotel and travel information are also available on that main conference page.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Hi Folks

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Feb 18 12:55:50 1999
Received: from camel14.mindspring.com (camel14.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA09988 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 12:55:46 -0800 (PST)
Received: from default (user-38lcb79.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.44.233])
    by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA25818
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 15:55:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990218153048.008064b0@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Thu, 18 Feb 1999 15:30:48 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Update re Caller ID and Phone block
In-Reply-To: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2130470F9@psg.ucsf.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Hi Folks
Some weeks ago there was a discussion about caller ID and anonymous call block as possible impediments to public opinion polling using phone interviewing. Based on a lengthy phone conversation I had yesterday with the customer service folks at Bell South I was told that current technology does not facilitate blocking of calls emanating from 800 numbers or Watts lines. Thus, even if you have caller ID and anonymous call rejection, the call will get through to you. On your caller ID gadget you will see "private number" or "unknown name" or something like that, but your phone will ring.

As many of you know caller ID uses a gadget connected to your phone which tells you who is calling by giving their phone number and occasionally their name. Anonymous caller rejection, when activated on your phone, is supposed to block all calls emanating from anyone who refuses to be identified, i.e., telemarketers, stock brokers, etc. Problem is that it cannot block calls emanating from 800 numbers or Watts lines. If you have caller block, only your friends who also have caller block will be frustrated unless they know how to unhook their caller identification so that your machine will accept their call. Complicated and obviously designed not only to protect privacy but to make a little money.

I had thought the problem was merely technical but it seems it is also highly political/economic because, according to the customer service representative I spoke to, telemarketers are opposed to any mechanism which will block their calls unless they reveal their identity...which most do not wish to do. And the phone companies, naturally, are opposed to any impositions on their bottom line.
Having said all this, it would seem that for the moment, at least, pollsters should have little difficulty in getting through, particularly if they use watts or 800 numbers. The only risk comes from respondents who rush to their caller ID box and when they see that the caller is not identified, they may refuse to pick up. Or, they may ask for your phone number.

The customer service representative was very nice and said that they had received similar complaints from other customers and that the phone company "was working on the problem".

You may wish to check this out with your own local phone company.

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 mtrau@umich.edu Thu Feb 18 15:19:25 1999
Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA05760 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 15:19:24 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from umich.edu (pm552-21.dialip.mich.net [198.110.22.175])
    by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id SAA08610
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 18:18:11 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36CCA053.FB6589F1@umich.edu>
Date: Thu, 18 Feb 1999 18:20:51 -0500
From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; l)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Paul - I am in Kansas City for the university, but I am working on a marketing questionnaire for Chatham. I am enclosing a copy of the first page of a computer readable questionnaire from them that asks for personal information. Why don't you fill it out for yourself and send it in to Chatham independently. Then I'll send you a copy of the rest of it that I have drafted (when I'm done), and we can compare notes on that part.

On another, related matter. Did we discuss adding a chapter to the edited book on push polls? I can't remember the resolution of that, but I didn't send that chapter to Chatham. Do you want me to?
> From mtrau@umich.edu Thu Feb 18 15:27:51 1999

Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.83.11])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA09974 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Feb 1999 15:27:49 -0800
(PST)

Received: from umich.edu (pm552-21.dialip.mich.net [198.110.22.175])
    by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id SAA10244
Sorry about the unnecessary transmission (and the need to send this apology).
I thought I was picking up Paul's address from an Email, but I didn't notice the "reply to" address.
Thanks for this excellent example!

I am teaching now a freshmen-course methods and statistics for an international group of very clever students, and I will certainly use it as an illustration when discussing survey-methods.

The statistics on the danger of bread that Rachel Hicks sent to this list some time ago were a great example as well, and were great fun to discuss. She wrote a.o.: "More than 98 % of convicted felons are bread eaters" My students will now never forget that you need a 'control' group to make comparisons: (perhaps bread is beneficiary, and 99% of the 'good' guys eat bread)

Now we are at it, how would a survey of the general population answer the questions? Perhaps this group of young people surveyed know far more than the somewhat elderly, which would completely change conclusions into: what a good investment they know more!

Best regards, from Edith
At 16:48 17-02-99 -0500, you wrote:
>David Broder today cites a Goess-Lake survey of young people to lament
>their political ignorance: "Only a quarter of the respondents could
>answer correctly all the three of such basic questions as the name of
>the vice president, the name of their governor and the length of House
>member's term . . . a woeful failure of education."
>
>With the survey trade having assimilated a good deal of cognitive
>science pertinent to interview methodology, perhaps it can begin to
>catch on to some relevance it may have to the substance and
>interpretation of surveys. To be thankful for small favors, Broder's
>construction was "could not answer the question" rather than the
>common "did not know" that is attached to such survey results. He did
>imply same meaning as the latter phrase does, however. To counter it, I
>need merely say that I often cannot, when asked, give my phone number,
>but that does not mean I do not "know" it or wouldn't dial it correctly
>if at that moment I was handed a phone. Yup, it depends on knowing
>what the meaning of "know" is and upon knowing something about the
>relevant (or not) contexts in which the question was asked.
>
>I am loathe to say that Broder's failure to apply such elementary
>psychological knowledge in this instance represents "a woeful failure
>of education" to equip him for responsible practice of his profession.
>(Possibly, I am reluctant because he and I were credentialled by the
>same university. He was there at a time that made him a subject of my
>MA research which gave some answers to the question of why students
>couldn't use what they knew to answer correctly social sciences exam
>questions.) Since experience alone is enough to acquaint one with the
>fact that there are different forms of knowing and remembering, it is
safe to say that he knows this but didn't bring this knowledge to bear when he inferred young people's ignorance from this question. (I don't know how Goeas and Lake treated the matter.)

In any event, it would be helpful to have survey practitioners do some practical "overlearning" of such concepts as "domain dependent learning and recall" and "metamemory." Indeed, the survey method might well be put to the job of expanding knowledge about knowing and learning. It is an important task because of the vulnerability of the words "know" and "learn" to the semantic fallacy: things are the same if we attach the same name to them. There are innocent folks in jail, I am sure, because "knowing" does not necessarily equate to an "ability to recall," given the particular time, place and circumstance of the asking.

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel/fax +31 20 622 34 38 e-mail edithl@educ.uva.nl

-----------------------------------------------
Ode to Heinz (sorry Spot):

A tail is quite essential for your acrobatic talents
You would not be so agile if you lacked its counterbalance
And when not being utilized to aid in locomotion
It ALWAYS serves to illustrate the state of your emotion

From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Feb 19 05:02:18 1999
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
I don't remember the Push poll chapter possibility. I assume you have one, but I can't remember reading it. Please (re)send it to me and then we can talk about it fitting in. Thanks.

At 06:20 PM 2/18/99 -0500, you wrote:
> Paul - I am in Kansas City for the university, but I am working on a
> marketing questionnaire for Chatham. I am enclosing a copy of the
> first page of a computer readable questionnaire from them that asks for
> personal information. Why don't you fill it out for yourself and send
> it in to Chatham independently. Then I'll send you a copy of the rest
> of it that I have drafted (when I'm done),
> and we can compare notes on that part.
On another, related matter. Did we discuss adding a chapter to the edited book on push polls? I can't remember the resolution of that, but I didn't send that chapter to Chatham. Do you want me to?

Attachment Converted: C:\HNW30\temp\Paul'sIn.doc

* * *

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

* * *

>From NBerson@hcfa.gov Fri Feb 19 05:13:16 1999

Received: from hcfa.gov (gate.hcfa.gov [158.73.85.22])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id FAA19693 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 05:13:06 -0800
Paul,

I tried to access the PDF file on the preliminary program via Adobe Acrobat and received an error message indicating that pages could not be read.

If there are technical problems perhaps it bears mentioning to the list.

Nancy

nberson@hcfa.gov

>>> "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu> 02/18/99 11:58am >>>

After today you can go to the AAPOR webpage to get new information about the 1999 conference at the Tradewinds Resort Hotel, St. Petersburg, FL.

The link is:

http://www.aapor.org/cfc/index.html
If you are presenting at the conference, please see the "information for presenters" section (that is available on the main conference menu) that has all the information about guidelines, av requests, abstracts, etc.

Links to the preliminary program (available in acrobat pdf format) and the hotel and travel information are also available on that main conference page.

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

* 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 *
* Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210 *
* Voice: 614-292-3468 Fax: 614-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Fri Feb 19 06:36:23 1999
Received: from asa1.asan.com (asa1.asan.com [206.20.111.11])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA01838 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 06:36:23 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ppp31-2.asan.com (ppp31-2.asan.com [207.113.83.31]) by
asa1.asan.com (NTMail 3.03.0018/1.aehb) with ESMTP id ua364592 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 09:36:16 -0500
Message-Id: <4.1.1999021919093451.00979de0@asan.com>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
At 08:08 AM 2/19/99 -0500, Nancy Berson wrote:
...
>I tried to access the PDF file on the preliminary program via Adobe Acrobat and
>received an error message indicating that pages could not be read.
>
> If there are technical problems perhaps it bears mentioning to the
>list.
>
>The files display just fine. I guess Nancy (and others experiencing
problems) use an outdated version of the Acrobat Reader, the current version
is 3.02, but any version 3.x should work fine. Download the recent version.

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Fri Feb 19 07:22:59 1999
Received: from mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com
[207.240.197.31])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA09812 for <AAPORnet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 07:22:57 -0800
(PST)
Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com


I have recently encountered an RFP which has a requirement for Errors and Omission (E&O) coverage. My insurance agent informed me that State Farm does not provide such coverage. She referred me to another company that provides E&O coverage for, as I recall, about $1500. The incredulous part is that she said she told me this agent said she could provide coverage for the entire association for about the same amount, a negligible per person. If anything remotely like this turns out to be true, it is
something AAPOR should look into.

In the meantime, I would appreciate knowing what other AAPOR members do with respect to this type of insurance. Does anyone carry E&O or other professional liability insurance? Who offers it? At what cost? Should AAPOR offer an umbrella policy? Opinion research is an esoteric enough field that it appears it would be a niche product not widely offered.

Any information would be appreciated. If you respond to me directly I will summarize and report back to AAPORnet.

Mike O'Neil

Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282 USA

Reaching me: Best bet, if you are reading this, is to simply hit <reply>. Some alternatives:

602.967.4441 Main Office Line. Has 24 hour voice mail after hours. Leave messages with Pamela Gebhart or Michael Proulx during the day. 602.967.6171 Personal Fax. Preferred for reaching me directly. 602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates General Office Fax. Use if my personal = office fax is busy. 602.741.4680 Mobile Phone. Generally used only when I am out of the office.
I have recently encountered an RFP which has a requirement for Errors and Omission (E&O) coverage. My insurance agent informed me that State Farm does not provide such coverage. She referred me to another company that provides E&O coverage for, as I recall, about $1500. The incredulous part is that she said she told me this agent said she could provide coverage for the entire association for about the same amount, a negligible per person. If anything remotely like this turns out to be true, it is something AAPOR should look into.
In the meantime, I would appreciate knowing what other AAPOR members do with respect to this type of insurance. Does anyone carry E&O or other professional liability insurance? Who offers it? At what cost? Should AAPOR offer an umbrella policy? Opinion research is an esoteric enough field that it appears it would be a niche product not widely offered.

Any information would be appreciated. If you respond to me directly I will summarize and report back to AAPORnet.

Mike O'Neil
Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282 USA

Reaching me: Best bet, if you are reading this, is to simply hit reply. Some alternatives: 

602.967.4441 Main Office Line. Has 24 hour voice mail after 20 hours. Leave messages with Pamela Gebhart or Michael Proulx during the day.

602.967.6171 Personal Fax. Preferred for reaching me directly.

602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates General
Fax. Use if my personal office fax is busy. 602.741.4680 Mobile

Phone. Generally used only when I am out of the office.

oneil@speedchoice.com

Personal email. Read nearly every evening.

surveys@oneillresearch.com

O'Neil Associates email. Read by office staff each morning. Forwarded as appropriate.

USAPolls@aol.com

Read by me when I am travelling. Office staff will forward from surveys@oneillresearch.com as appropriate.

www.oneilresearch.com

Company web site w/link to company email.

------=_NextPart_000_000E_01BE5BE0.D47E4700--

>From tompson.1@osu.edu Fri Feb 19 09:04:14 1999
Received: from mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.30])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA01475 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 09:04:13 -0800
(PST)
Received: from tnt ([128.146.93.19])
Paul Lavrakas asked me to reply to this message from Nancy Berson about problems she encountered in viewing the preliminary program pdf file.

I suspect that Manfred Kuechler is correct that this is a version compatibility issue. We have therefore posted a new pdf file that should be backward compatible with Adobe Acrobat readers back to version 2.1.

We would strongly encourage AAPORnetters to update their Acrobat readers to the latest version. Acrobat files optimized for the older versions are much larger and take longer to download. The upgrade to the latest version of the reader is free and you can follow the link that is on the preliminary
program webpage, which is at:

http://www.aapor.org/cfc/preprog/index.html

Please let us know if there are any more problems reading this file.

Trevor

_____________________________________________________________
Trevor Tompson (tompson.1@osu.edu)
Research Associate
Survey Research Unit, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences The Ohio
State University 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330
(614) 292-6672

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
> Of Nancy Berson
> Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 8:08 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Conference info on AAPOR Webpage -Reply
> 
> > Paul,
> >
> > I tried to access the PDF file on the preliminary program via Adobe
> Acrobat and received an error message indicating that pages could not
> be read.
If there are technical problems perhaps it bears mentioning to the list.

Nancy
nberson@hcfa.gov

From RoniRosner@aol.com Fri Feb 19 12:40:52 1999

Received: from imo29.mx.aol.com (imo29.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.73])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA23747 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 12:40:45 -0800
    (PST)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
    by imo29.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 0RJYa11057
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:36:03 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <2f78eb08.36cdcb33@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:36:03 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: "Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas" -- 3/9 NYAAPOR WS
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 206

AAPOR/New York Chapter EVENING WORKSHOP

Date .................. Tuesday, 9 March 1999
LESSONS LEARNED: Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas

Who is left out of surveys of urban populations and what can we do about it?

This evening workshop will focus on the practical and statistical implications of nonresponse issues encountered when conducting telephone (Shapiro, etal.) and face to face, household (Aidala, etal.) surveys in New York City and New York State. Topics that will be covered include:

* Analysis of sources and types of nonresponse and nonresponse bias

* Recommendations for increasing sample completion rates

* Alternative statistical adjustment techniques to reduce nonresponse error.

Join our pre-eminent, Columbia University researchers, as they present the issues and lessons learned from their urban research projects:

Angela Aidala, Research Scientist, Department of Sociomedical Sciences;
Joyce Moon Howard, Asst. Professor, Department of Sociomedical Sciences;
Robert Y. Shapiro, Professor Of Political Science; Ester Fuchs, Director of the Center for Urban Research and Policy; Lorraine Minnite, Assoc. Director
of the Center for Urban Research and Policy

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.
So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com),
or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Fri., 5 Mar.. Pre-paid fees are
on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $40 (members), $50 (non-
members), $20 (student members), $25 (full-time student nonmembers, HLMs).
Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

I will attend the NYAAPOR evening workshop on Tuesday, 9 March 1999 with
additional guests.

NAME: ______________________________________

OFFICE PHONE: ________________________________

HOME PHONE: ________________________________

AFFILIATION: __________________________________

GUEST'S NAME: ________________________________

AFFILIATION: __________________________________

PREPAID FEES: MEMBERS: $30 ___ NONMEMBERS: $40 ___
STUDENT MEMBERS: $15 ___ FULL-TIME STUDENT NONMEMBERS,
HLMs: $20 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 5 March to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York

>From ACiemnecki@mathematica-mpr.com Fri Feb 19 12:59:33 1999
Received: from mpr5.mathinc.com [38.233.146.17]
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) is seeking Systems Analysts, Senior Programmers and Programmers to work with a fast growing Information Services team in Princeton, New Jersey, and Washington, DC, developing the next generation of MPR survey data systems. Platforms include SAS, MS Access, Informix, C, and packages to support computer-assisted interviewing, running on Windows and UNIX. A New Jersey location is preferred but location is negotiable for the right candidates.

Experience with survey or market research is highly preferred; Strong written and verbal communication skills are important. MPR is an employee-owned firm offering a competitive compensation package with comprehensive benefits, including an on-site fitness center and three weeks vacation. To apply, please send your resume via email to David Uglow, Associate Director, SIS, at duglow@mathematica-mpr.com, or by
For those of us "in the boonies" (actually the Paris of the Big Bend of Florida), workshops like this are enough to make one salivate. Is there any way to make summaries available of workshops like this for AAPOR members who can't attend (even if the ambiance is missing?)

Susan

At 03:36 PM 2/19/99 EST, you wrote:

>AAPOR/New York Chapter EVENING WORKSHOP
>
> Date ................ Tuesday, 9 March 1999
>
> Time ................ 5:30 p.m. sharp - 8:00 p.m.
>
> Place .............. CUNY Graduate Center; 3 West 42nd Street, Room 1800
> (between 5th & 6th Avenue)
>
> LESSONS LEARNED: Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas
>
> Who is left out of surveys of urban populations and what can we do about it?
This evening workshop will focus on the practical and statistical implications of nonresponse issues encountered when conducting telephone (Shapiro, et al.) and face to face, household (Aidala, et al.) surveys in New York City and New York State. Topics that will be covered include:

- Analysis of sources and types of nonresponse and nonresponse bias
- Recommendations for increasing sample completion rates
- Alternative statistical adjustment techniques to reduce nonresponse error.

Join our pre-eminent, Columbia University researchers, as they present the issues and lessons learned from their urban research projects:

Angela Aidala, Research Scientist, Department of Sociomedical Sciences; Joyce Moon Howard, Asst. Professor, Department of Sociomedical Sciences; Robert Y. Shapiro, Professor of Political Science; Ester Fuchs, Director of the Center for Urban Research and Policy; Lorraine Minnite, Assoc. Director of the Center for Urban Research and Policy

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.

So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com), or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Fri., 5 Mar.. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $40 (members), $50 (non-members), $20 (student members), $25 (full-time student
nonmembers, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

---

I will attend the NYAAPOR evening workshop on Tuesday, 9 March 1999 with additional guests.

NAME: ____________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ________________________________
HOME PHONE: ________________________________
AFFILIATION: __________________________________
GUEST’S NAME: ________________________________
AFFILIATION: __________________________________

PREPAID FEES: MEMBERS: $30 ___ NONMEMBERS: $40 ___
STUDENT MEMBERS: $15 ___ FULL-TIME STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: $20 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 5 March to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York
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 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From rday@mcs.net Fri Feb 19 15:00:27 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA20107 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:00:26 -0800 (PST)
Received: from gopher (P61-Chi-Dial-8.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.253]) by Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id RAA25824 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri, 19 Feb 1999 17:00:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990219163857.006f5bf0@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 16:38:57 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Subject: Re: Survey Research and Professional Liability
In-Reply-To: <001101be5c1b$b02a7f00$78d9f0c0@phx35035>
as that great philosopher, Moe, used to say "Why you knucklehead"
this is the kind of stuff that CASRO might be able to help you with. We
have reviewed this on a number of occasions to see if we wanted to offer it
to members. Most firms decided not to. Contact the CASRO office and tell
them
1. that you are a knucklehead because you haven't joined
2. that you are calling on my recommendation
3. see what you learn or in your case loin "Why I oughta"
516 928 6954 EMAil casro@casro.org
At 08:21 AM 2/19/99 -0700, you wrote:
> & & If anything remotely like this turns out to be true, it is
>something AAPOR should look in to. & Opinion research is an
>esoteric enough field that it appears it would be a niche product not
>widely offered. If you respond to me directly I will summarize and
>report back to AAPORnet. Mike O'Neil
>=========================================
>Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
>O'Neil Associates, Inc.
>412 East Southern Avenue
>Tempe, Arizona 85282 USA <> Some alternatives: Has 24 hour
>voice mail after hours.
> Leave messages with Pamela Gebhart or Michael
>Proulx during the day.
> Personal Fax. Preferred for reaching me directly.
> Office Fax. Use if my personal office fax is busy.
Generally used only when I am out of the office.
> oneil@speedchoice.com Read nearly every evening.
> surveys@oneillresearch.com O'Neil Associates email. Read by office staff each morning. Forwarded as appropriate.
> USAPolls@aol.com Office staff will forward from surveys@oneilresearch.com as appropriate.
> www.oneilresearch.com Company web site w/link to company email.

From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Fri Feb 19 15:06:31 1999
Received: from mail-lax-2.pilot.net (mail-lax-2.pilot.net [205.139.40.16])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA24247 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:06:29 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com [204.48.23.147] (may be forged))
    by mail-lax-2.pilot.net (Pilot/) with ESMTP id PAA15882 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:06:28 -0800 (PST)
Received: from latimes.com (bierce.latimes.com [192.187.72.9])
    by mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA26281 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:06:27 -0800 (PST)
Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTP id PAA25182 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:06:26 -0800
Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by news.latimes.com (8.6.9/8.6.9) id PAA99643; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:10:00 -0800
Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:10:00 -0800 (PST)
From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
I agree with susan Losh - can the session get hooked up - I know last year NYAAPOR had a satellite hookup with one of their sessions. I was also interested in their child's workshop session as well. I guess we have to move to the New York area!!!!

Susan

On Fri, 19 Feb 1999, Susan Losh wrote:

> For those of us "in the boonies" (actually the Paris of the Big Bend of Florida), workshops like this are enough to make one salivate. Is there any way to make summaries available of workshops like this for us AAPOR members who can't attend (even if the ambiance is missing?)
> 
> Susan
>
> At 03:36 PM 2/19/99 EST, you wrote:
> >AAPOR/New York Chapter EVENING WORKSHOP
> >>
Date ................ Tuesday, 9 March 1999

Time ................ 5:30 p.m. sharp - 8:00 p.m.

Place .............. CUNY Graduate Center; 3 West 42nd Street, Room 1800
                     (between 5th & 6th Avenue)

LESSONS LEARNED: Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas

Who is left out of surveys of urban populations and what can we do about it?

This evening workshop will focus on the practical and statistical implications of nonresponse issues encountered when conducting telephone (Shapiro, et al.) and face to face, household (Aidala, et al.) surveys in New York City and New York State. Topics that will be covered include:

- Analysis of sources and types of nonresponse and nonresponse bias
- Recommendations for increasing sample completion rates
- Alternative statistical adjustment techniques to reduce nonresponse error.

Join our pre-eminent, Columbia University researchers, as they present the issues and lessons learned from their urban research projects:
ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.
So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com), or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Fri., 5 Mar.. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $40 (members), $50 (non-members), $20 (student members), $25 (full-time student nonmembers, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

I will attend the NYAAPOR evening workshop on Tuesday, 9 March 1999 with additional guests.

NAME: ____________________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ____________________________________
HOME PHONE: ____________________________________
AFFILIATION: ____________________________________
GUEST'S NAME: ____________________________________
AFFILIATION: ____________________________________
PREPAID FEES: MEMBERS: $30 ___  NONMEMBERS: $40 ___
STUDENT MEMBERS: $15 ___  FULL-TIME STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: $20 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 5 March to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York

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 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208
>From Mark@bisconti.com Fri Feb 19 15:15:46 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id PAA29089 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:15:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org  (Content
Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000454436@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 18:13:45 -0500
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.181]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP
(Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)
   id F2DWD08B; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 18:15:30 -0500
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
   id <01BE5C32.70CC25E0@mark-bri>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 18:05:32 -0500
Message-Id: <01BE5C32.70CC25E0@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: "Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas" -- 3/9NYAAPOR WS
Great idea-I live only 4 hours from THE city ("in the dredges," Trent = Lott describes DC), but have a conflicting obligation on that day, so would also appreciate proceedings or summary on E-mail. Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

--------

From: Susan Losh [SMTP:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 5:59 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: "Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas" -- 3/9NYAAPOR WS

For those of us "in the boonies" (actually the Paris of the Big Bend of Florida), workshops like this are enough to make one salivate. Is there any way to make summaries available of workshops like this for us AAPOR members who can't attend (even if the ambiance is missing?)

Susan

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Feb 19 15:59:40 1999
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA16016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 15:59:39 -0800
   (PST)
I guess you don't have CID yourself, or you'd know how people use it.

The Caller ID (CID) information displayed falls into 3 categories:

1) The calling number. If the subscriber has CID/name service, the name listed for the calling number will also be displayed if the call comes from an exchange that transmits the name information, otherwise just the state the call originated from will be shown.

2) A message that the calling number is being blocked. This means that the caller has blocked outgoing CID for that line or just for that one call.

3) A message that the calling number is "unknown" or "unidentified".
This almost always means that the call originated through a service such as WATTS.

It is precisely because their calls are flagged as "unknown" that people can screen out telemarketers and interviewing services, nearly all of whom use WATTS or similar services to place calls. This is not the same as rejecting "blocked" calls, which many answering machines can now be programmed to do.

Some people will pick up on "unknown" calls, but most people I know who have CID (including myself), will not, even if they will answer "blocked" calls.

Keeping a CID box in the dining room is one the best way to enjoy an uninterrupted dinner these days.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

_____________________

Dick halpern wrote:
>
> Hi Folks
>
> Some weeks ago there was a discussion about caller ID and anonymous call block as possible impediments to public opinion polling using phone interviewing. Based on a lengthy phone conversation I had yesterday with the customer service folks at Bell South I was told that current technology does not facilitate blocking of calls emanating from 800 numbers or Watts lines. Thus, even if you have caller ID and anonymous call rejection, the call will get through to
As many of you know caller ID uses a gadget connected to your phone which tells you who is calling by giving their phone number and occasionally their name. Anonymous caller rejection, when activated on your phone, is supposed to block all calls emanating from anyone who refuses to be identified, i.e., telemarketers, stock brokers, etc.

Problem is that it cannot block calls emanating from 800 numbers or Watts lines. If you have caller block, only your friends who also have caller block will be frustrated unless they know how to unhook their caller identification so that your machine will accept their call.

Complicated and obviously designed not only to protect privacy but to make a little money.

I had thought the problem was merely technical but it seems it is also highly political/economic because, according to the customer service representative I spoke to, telemarketers are opposed to any mechanism which will block their calls unless they reveal their identity...which most do not wish to do. And the phone companies, naturally, are opposed to any impositions on their bottom line.

Having said all this, it would seem that for the moment, at least, pollsters should have little difficulty in getting through, particularly if they use watts or 800 numbers. The only risk comes from respondents who rush to their caller ID box and when they see that the caller is not identified, they may refuse to pick up. Or, they may ask for your phone number.
The customer service representative was very nice and said that they had received similar complaints from other customers and that the phone company "was working on the problem".

You may wish to check this out with your own local phone company.

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 jankiley@soltec.net Fri Feb 19 20:40:41 1999
Received: from photon.soltec.net (photon.soltec.net [206.148.208.27])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id UAA23133 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 20:40:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from dmdwnjdz (ppp152.cu.soltec.net [206.148.209.152])
  by photon.soltec.net (8.8.8/8.8.9) with ESMTP id WAA22593
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 22:40:38 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <199902200440.WAA22593@photon.soltec.net>
Reply-To: <jankiley@soltec.net>
From: "Jan Kiley" <jankiley@soltec.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Hello to Cecil Baber! MM is fine. Let us hear from you. JK
jankiley@soltec.net

----------
> From: RoniRosner@aol.com
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: "Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas" -- 3/9 NYAAPOR
> WS
> Date: Friday, February 19, 1999 2:36 PM
> 
> AAPOR/New York Chapter EVENING WORKSHOP
> 
> Date ................. Tuesday, 9 March 1999
> 
> Time ................. 5:30 p.m. sharp - 8:00 p.m.
> 
> Place ............... CUNY Graduate Center; 3 West 42nd Street, Room 1800
> (between 5th & 6th Avenue)
>
LESSONS LEARNED: Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas

Who is left out of surveys of urban populations and what can we do about it?

This evening workshop will focus on the practical and statistical implications of nonresponse issues encountered when conducting telephone (Shapiro, et al.) and face to face, household (Aidala, et al.) surveys in New York City and New York State. Topics that will be covered include:

* Analysis of sources and types of nonresponse and nonresponse bias

* Recommendations for increasing sample completion rates

* Alternative statistical adjustment techniques to reduce nonresponse error.

Join our pre-eminent, Columbia University researchers, as they present the issues and lessons learned from their urban research projects:

Angela Aidala, Research Scientist, Department of Sociomedical Sciences; Joyce Moon Howard, Asst. Professor, Department of Sociomedical Sciences; Robert Y. Shapiro, Professor of Political Science; Ester Fuchs, Director of the Center for Urban Research and Policy; Lorraine Minnite, Assoc. Director of the Center for Urban
ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.

So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com),
or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Fri., 5 Mar. Pre-paid fees are
on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $40 (members), $50 (non-
members), $20 (student members), $25 (full-time student nonmembers,
HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

NAME: ______________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ________________________________
HOME PHONE: ________________________________
AFFILIATION: ________________________________
GUEST’S NAME: ______________________________
AFFILIATION: ________________________________

PREPAID FEES: MEMBERS: $30 ___ NONMEMBERS: $40 ___
STUDENT MEMBERS: $15 ___ FULL-TIME STUDENT NONMEMBERS,
HLMs: $20 ___
To Jan Werner and all other AAPORians whose Domestic Tranquillity (DT) may be experiencing Excessive Telemarketing Intrusiveness (ETI):

Here are two addresses that may help ease your distress:

Telephone Preference Service
Just send them your name, address and phone number with your request to be included in a national "do not solicit" file. We did this several years ago, and the reduction in ETI was palpable. It won't stop mailings from catalog companies, etc that you have patronized, or from local solicitations, but at least it keeps you off lists that are rented. Indeed, lately it seems that our DT has been disturbed more often by survey interviewers than by telemarketers. Does anyone know if there's an address for . . . naaaah, forget it, bad idea.
A sign that I might be getting old (sounds like a Jay Leno routine!):

I remember when WATS was introduced by the telephone companies; it stands for Wide Area Telephone Service (and therefore is not spelled WATTS, if I may gently mention that)

Milton Goldsamt, Ph. D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From jedarroch@agi-usa.org Mon Feb 22 10:05:39 1999
Received: from mail.agi-usa.org (agi-usa.org [206.215.210.11]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA23755 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Feb 1999 10:05:32 -0800 (PST)
Received: by AGI-NY3 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
    id <1L6MY1GW>; Mon, 22 Feb 1999 13:05:19 -0500
Message-ID: <41D3316E78B4D211BBCA00104B90BD000B8C31@AGI-NY3>
From: "Darroch, Jacqueline E." <jedarroch@agi-usa.org>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: F0IA and Federally Funded Research Data (fwd)
Here is information on the new regulations, and a call for sending comments
to OMB - by April 5.

From:

HEALTH and BEHAVIOR
INFORMATION TRANSFER (HABIT)
February 19, 1999 <> Vol. 2, No. 3

Information:

Dear Colleagues,

As you may have heard by now, a new law could force researchers to provide
their data to anyone who requests it under the Freedom of Information Act.
This law has the potential to be extremely expensive, and could open
researchers to harassment. We should do whatever we can to keep it from
being implemented into regulations, but if we have to live with it, we
should do our best to influence how those regulations are written. I have
three requests for you:

(1) Read the first article below, which outlines concerns about how the law
will be interpreted.

(2) Submit comments to the Office of Management and Budget by April 5, 1999.
(Link below.) Urge your department, your professional society, your
institutions, your colleagues, etc. to submit comments as well.

(3) Tell your members of Congress you'd like to have hearings on HR88, a bill which would repeal the law (see below). Sincerely, Jessie Gruman, PhD

Executive Director, Center for the Advancement of Health

<><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><>

==> F E A T U R E S <==

1) FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT **Take Action!**

The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has released its interpretation of last fall's law requiring that "all data produced under an award...be made available to the public through the...Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)." The law ordered OMB to provide guidance to federal agencies in implementation (specifically, to modify Circular A-110). OMB's statement is open for public comment until April 5, and health and behavior researchers are strongly encouraged to weigh in.

While the law itself causes many concerns, OMB's interpretation does mitigate some of the potentially harmful effects. Its notice says the law should apply only to "research findings used by the federal government in developing policy or rules," rather than to all federally funded research. OMB also says results and underlying data cannot be released until after research is published. Worries about how the law would affect subject privacy have also been slightly relieved, because the FOIA gives government agencies the right not to share information they believe threatens subject privacy.

Despite these clarifications, questions remain about how the law will be interpreted. For instance:

* How broadly will "research data" be interpreted? Would researchers have
to release notebooks, rough drafts, etc., or be required to release data from pilot studies?

* How broadly will data "used by the government in developing policy" be interpreted? For example, if a policy is based on a study about violence, would the body of behavioral and social science research on which it was grounded also be considered fair game?

* How broadly will "published research" be interpreted? Is research presented at meetings or press conferences "published?" What about data for which preliminary or partial findings have been published?

* Will researchers and government agencies be compensated for the substantial time and expense of compiling requested data? The law allows agencies to "authorize a reasonable user fee equaling the incremental cost of obtaining the data," however, it is not clear whether the fee would go to researchers, agencies, or the federal treasury. For many researchers, particularly under-funded ones in the behavioral and social sciences, that cost could be prohibitive.

Beyond these, there are also some more fundamental concerns about the law, some particularly acute for behavioral and social scientists. Scientists in controversial fields such as tobacco control already face substantial harassment and requests for their data, and could be swamped by a law like this one. With or without reimbursement, the time and hassle of preparing data for sharing could be enormous. The law could also threaten researchers' ability to recruit subjects, who may distrust that their privacy will be protected. Subjects may be particularly concerned about privacy given the content or methods (video, etc) of some behavioral studies. And if privacy concerns cause increased nonparticipation rates in large sample studies, results could be significantly affected. Researchers themselves are also concerned about privacy protections, worrying that after
they turn over their data to funding agencies as required, the funding agencies might not adequately protect sensitive data from distribution. These concerns could lead them to avoid certain lines of research.

In addition to concerns about the law, there is widespread anger about how it was passed. It was slipped into last fall's Omnibus budget bill without hearings, without opportunity for comment by those most affected, and without background information on the scope of or possible solutions to any existing problem. Overall, according to David Korn, senior vice president for biomedical and health sciences research at the Association of American Medical Colleges, "There is developing a very broad sense that [the policy] has to go."

Rep. George Brown (D-CA), ranking Democrat on the House Science Committee, has introduced legislation (HR 88) to repeal the law. Supporters hope that unlike the original, THIS bill will be widely discussed: they are asking legislators to organize hearings about it on Capitol Hill.

*** TAKE ACTION!!
1) Submit comments to the OMB (DUE: APRIL 5, 1999). Substantive comments pointing to specific issues are appreciated.
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/fr-cont.html
2) Ask your congressional representatives to support hearings on HR88:
http://www.congress.org

==> View the OMB's Notice:
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/fr-cont.html
==> HR 88 press release and link to bill:
I am forwarding the following message for one of my co-workers.

+++++++++++++++++++++++
are interviewing adults, that we inform the respondent that the interview may be recorded, and that any identifying information from the recording would be erased. At what point can recording begin?

For the purpose of training new interviewers, an important function of audio recordings would be to demonstrate good technique during the introduction from the point of initial contact with the household. However, can we begin recording before informing the respondent that such recording is taking place? And if so, what about the case where the initial contact is with an informant who does not turn out to be the respondent?

Thanks in advance for your ideas and suggestions. Please send your comments to me directly at arcbwc@langate.gsu.edu unless you feel that they would be of interest to the entire list.

Brian Cannon
Applied Research Center
Georgia State University
Phone: 404-651-3750 Fax: 404-651-3524
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) is seeking Systems Analysts, Senior Programmers and Programmers to work with a fast growing Information Services team in Princeton, New Jersey, and Washington, DC, developing the next generation of MPR survey data systems. Platforms include SAS, MS Access, Informix, C, and packages to support...
computer-assisted interviewing, running on Windows and UNIX. A New Jersey location is preferred but location is negotiable for the right candidates.

Experience with survey or market research is highly preferred; Strong written and verbal communication skills are important. MPR is an employee-owned firm offering a competitive compensation package with comprehensive benefits, including an on-site fitness center and three weeks vacation. To apply, please send your resume via email to David Uglow, Associate Director, SIS, at duglow@mathematica-mpr.com, or by mail to Human Resources, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., PO Box 2393, Princeton, NJ 08543-2393. Visit our Web site at http://www.mathematica-mpr.com. An equal opportunity affirmative action employer.

David Uglow
Mathematica Policy Research
PO Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Voice: (609) 936-2729
Fax: (609) 799-0005
duglow@mathematica-mpr.com

- - - - - - - - - - - - End of Original Message - - - - - - - - - - - -
Double Census Count Might Cost $7 Billion

By Barbara Vobejda
Washington Post Staff Writer
Wednesday, February 24, 1999; Page A19=20

Federal officials are estimating that the 2000 census will cost $6 = billion
to $7 billion, a dramatic increase over the $4 billion price tag = attached
to the Census Bureau's initial plan, administration and other = sources
say.="
The new estimates are likely to spark yet another controversy on Capitol Hill over next year's population count, which has been mired in conflict as Democrats and Republicans fight over how it should be conducted.

The dispute will surface again today, with the Census Bureau set to announce officially that it will produce two population numbers for the 2000 census, one based on a traditional door-to-door count, and a second using a controversial method designed to compensate for people missed in the head count.

A bureau document, scheduled for release today, states in writing for the first time what Clinton administration officials have been suggesting for weeks: They will issue a traditional count to be used for apportionment—dividing House seats among the states—and a second set of adjusted figures to be used to redraw political boundaries and distribute nearly $200 billion in federal funds each year.

The bureau would use a survey of 300,000 households taken after the head count to project how many people it had missed and then adjust the totals, according to the bureau document, which was obtained by The Washington Post.

The document does not indicate how much the new census plan would cost and the Office of Management and Budget has not finalized the figures, but sources say the $6 billion figure and higher estimates are being circulated at the bureau. The 1990 census cost $2.6 billion.

The higher cost stems primarily from the need to hire 250,000 additional...
census takers in an increased effort to collect information from every household. The bureau had initially planned to use a survey to supply information for some missing households, which would have required many fewer workers to knock on doors.

The plan to produce two sets of numbers grows out of a Supreme Court decision last month banning the government from using statistical sampling, as the controversial method is known, for apportionment. But the bureau argues that the court's ruling requires it to use that method for other purposes, if it is feasible.

Bureau director Kenneth Prewitt said in an interview yesterday that he believes the need to conduct a traditional head count hampers the bureau's ability to produce the most accurate numbers.

Prewitt and other government officials argue that, because it is impossible to count every American, it is much more accurate to use statistical estimates. The current plan, he said, will not improve on the accuracy of the 1990 census, which missed 1.6 percent of the population. Among Hispanics, the undercount was 10 times higher and among African Americans, it was eight times higher.

"We're going to spend a lot of effort and a lot of money to do as well as we did in 1990," Prewitt said.

He said a census dress rehearsal last year in South Carolina that did not adjust the figures missed 10 percent of the population.

Republicans have vowed to fight for a census using only traditional =
"If the bureau is intent upon draining resources from a full count in order to do a two-number census, then that's going to create problems," said Chip Walker, spokesman for the House Census Subcommittee. "We're talking about a recipe for disaster in confusing the public."

While both sides point to issues of accuracy, underlying the debate are strong political considerations. It is widely believed that the adjusted figures are more likely to benefit Democrats because they will produce higher counts in neighborhoods that tend to vote Democratic.

The dispute will likely come to a head as Congress approaches a June 15 deadline when funding for the census and some other federal agencies expires. Republicans say they won't approve funding for the administration's two-number plan, and Democrats say President Clinton would veto any appropriations bill that does not allow the plan to go forward.

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company
I am confused and I need some help understanding the rationale of the use of Kish sampling in telephone surveys in 1999.

Every piece I read seems to indicate that the underlying assumption is that the household is the sampling unit when using Kish. Historically it would seem that as survey organizations switched to telephone surveys from face-to-face surveys, there was the implicit assumption that there was basically one phone per household and the phone of the household was the phone for everyone.

Recent discussion on the list has noted problems with one dimension of this assumption -- the issue of multiple phones for a household.

But I am particularly interested in the implications of the assumptions of the other dimension -- the assumption that any given (voice) phone line in a household is for the household. Thus, CLUSTER sampling selection methods such as Kish and Troldahl-Carter ask the person answering the phone what the sex and age distribution is of ALL the people in the HOUSEHOLD.

How valid is that assumption these days? For instance, in households with
multiple unrelated adults does everyone answer everyone else's phone line, or is the answering machine substituted? In blended households particularly, do spouses have different phone lines? What are the implications for cluster sampling methods if and when this assumption is no longer valid? How do we conceptualize a household as we move into this new age of communication? Do we use different selection criteria in the cluster as the nature of the cluster changes? Isn't the whole notion based on the assumption that the within cluster variation is less than the between cluster variation? What are the implications for statistical efficiency when the nature of the households/clusters, and their sharing of phone lines, differs?

Perhaps newer algorithms have been developed or there is current research that addresses this question?

Carolyn S. White
Program Coordinator, OCCSS
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Voice: 217-333-6751
Fax: 217-333-2869
Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu
Thought I would add another twist to this discussion. Mobile phones are no longer "car phones," with many nontraditional users of cell phones. I know of two personal friends that have scrapped their household phones and only use their cell phone (including inside their home).

As a casual observation, these people are of lower SES status and got into trouble with high phone bills. With new programs such as "Pick Up and Go" calling cards, it makes sense for them to adopt this behavior. They pay for service as they can afford it.

Has anyone else heard of this behavior? Do any of you sampling experts have advise on working through this problem? My questions are endless, but I will stop and hope for some good discussion.
> If the intent is to sample HOUSEHOLDS, then mobile telephones, like
> car phones, are excluded (ineligible) because they are not attached to
> households. If households are not what you are sampling then mobile
> phones can be included, but you will need to screen for where the
> respondent lives, how many people have access to that phone, how many
> phone numbers lead to that person, etc. If you include mobile phones,
> then why exclude work phones?
> >
> > Of course, down the line all phones, except for the one "bundled" with
> > your home computer/telephone/television/fax machine, will be attached
> > to people, not households. Sampling by telephone will be a real bear
> > then.
> >
> > Lance M. Pollack
> > University of California, San Francisco
> > lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Susan Losh [SMTP:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
> > Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 1999 12:08 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: phone lines
> >
> > Are mobile phones being counted in that "second line" statistic? We
have

excluded mobile telephone exchanges when drawing our samples (maybe we shouldn't??)

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 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208
"Everyone is important, no one is necessary, life goes on" --- Paul Brown
Please distribute the announcement below to interested students.

Respond using Alice's phone or e-mail address at end of message and NOT to this message.

Thanks,

(fran)

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

The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) has a paid summer internship for a graduate or undergraduate student who is interested in survey research. The internship will provide experience in developing questionnaires, planning data analyses, and working with teams in interpreting data. Projects typically range from small telephone surveys (50 to 100 respondents) to mail surveys of 500 to 1,000 respondents.

About the Internship: This internship is in the Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division (RCED) of GAO. RCED projects cover many areas of
domestic policy including transportation, energy, science, national parks and
lands, the environment, housing, agriculture, and telecommunications. The
intern will work in RCED's Design, Methodology, and Technical Assistance
Group (DMTAG). Staff in DMTAG include survey researchers, operations analysts, and
computer specialists from a variety of backgrounds including psychology,
political science, public administration, and mathematics.

About GAO: The U.S. Congress created GAO in 1921 as an independent,
nonpartisan agency. GAO assists congressional oversight of the executive branch of the
federal government and provides analytical support for congressional
decision-making by issuing reports, testifying, commenting on proposed
legislation, and providing other information as needed. GAO reports often
include recommendations to the Congress on the need for legislation and
recommendations to agencies for program or operational changes. The GAO
office is located at 441 G Street, NW, in Washington, D.C. GAO convenient to the
subway, and there is a reasonably priced, non-profit health club in the
building.

Desired Qualifications of Applicant: We are looking for an intern who has
knowledge of survey design and at least some knowledge of data analysis.
Experience with either SAS or SPSS is highly desirable.

GAO Internship Requirements and Compensation: You must be a U.S. citizen
enrolled in an accredited graduate or undergraduate program in good
standing.
You must have completed the equivalent of 60 semester hours. You must be
returning to school following the internship unless you complete degree
requirements and internship concurrently. The internship lasts up to 16
weeks.
The salary is $1,400 to $2,500, depending on your education. Top salary is for
those with a Master's degree or two years of graduate education. GAO may
noncompetitively appoint interns to permanent positions after graduation,
subject to satisfactory performance and budgetary constraints.

For more information on GAO, including access to our reports, visit GAO's
Web
site at:

www.gao.gov

To be considered for this internship, please call or e-mail by March 12, 1999:

Dr. Alice Feldesman, Assistant Director, DMTAG
phone: (202) 512-4927
e-mail: feldesmana.rced@gao.gov

Reminder: U.S. citizenship is required.
Position Announcement:

Joint Appointment as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Social Work and a Research Scientist in the Docking Institute of Public Affairs at Fort Hays State University

Description:

One half of the appointment is with the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. Primary responsibilities include conducting research for community and
The other half of the appointment is a renewable position with the Department of Sociology at the rank of assistant professor. The successful candidate will have a record of, or demonstrated potential for, achieving excellence in teaching and research in at least two of the following areas: community theory & development, rural sociology, demography and research methods. The successful applicant will also be prepared to teach introductory sociology and supervise student internships. These areas of teaching closely parallel research and activities of the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. For more information about the Department of Sociology and Social Work visit our website at:

http://www.fhsu.edu/sociology/index.html

This is a 12-month appointment teaching two courses each fall and spring semester. The salary range is in the mid $30,000s, commensurate with experience and education. The appointment begins August 16, 1999. Review of applications begins March 29, 1999, and continues until the position is filled. ABD=
considered; Ph.D. in sociology by time of appointment preferred. Please submit application materials including letter of interest, vita, and three letters of reference to Dr. Mark Bannister, Search Committee Chair, Docking Institute of Public Affairs, Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS, 67601. You may direct inquiries to Dr. Bannister at (785) 628-4233 or by email at: markbannister@fhsu.edu.

Notice of Non-discrimination: Fort Hays State University does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, national origin, age, disability, Vietnam era veteran status or special disabled veteran status in its programs and activities. Fort Hays State University is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. The director of affirmative action, coordinator of Title IX, Title VI, Section 504 and ADA regulations, may be contacted at 600 Park Street, Hays, KS 67601-4099, (785) 628-4033.

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Feb 25 12:37:46 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA12363 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 12:37:40 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000461166@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:35:56 -0500
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.182]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)
    id FQ9690SP; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:37:15 -0500
TOP POLITICAL STORY

Census counts on a compromise

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

By August Gribbin

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

The battle over how to take the census next year took a critical turn yesterday. The Census Bureau, caught in the middle of a fierce political fight, decided to produce two population figures instead of one. In effect, this is a tactical victory for the Clinton administration and a setback for congressional leaders.

The new plan, a revision of one produced months ago, will be the most costly ever. There were reports the extra work it requires will add $2 billion to the tab, bringing the 2000 census total to nearly $7 billion.

But in announcing the new plan and confirming it would involve additional costs, Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt insisted: "We don't know yet just how much more it will cost. We're still calculating =
The Census Bureau has revamped its planning to comply with a Supreme Court decision handed down last month. The high court ruled that, for "purposes of apportionment," the census must be taken by "enumeration," meaning the familiar system of mailing out census questionnaires, then sending bureau workers to personally interview those who fail to respond.

As a result, the first population number generated will be developed solely by using enumeration and will be utilized for the constitutionally required process of determining how many House seats each state will have. The number will be reported to the president and Congress by Dec. 31, 2000.

The second number will come later and will be produced using "scientific sampling," the system of estimating the number and characteristics of one group by gathering data from a randomly selected portion of the group and applying the findings to the entire group. It will, in effect, correct the first census number and will be the official population figure.

The Census Bureau will deliver that final count in April 2001 for the federal government to use in distributing roughly $180 billion in funds for everything from bridge building to child care, and for states to use in redrawing the lines of state and local election districts.

Congressional Republicans have fiercely opposed the use of sampling in the census, fearing it would produce a higher count of minorities, immigrants and city dwellers and ultimately shift power to the Democrats.

GOP leaders have especially condemned the use of sampling-based numbers for redistricting, for it is widely assumed that the foundations of political power lie in the voting districts, where state and local elections are decided.

Within hours of the bureau's announcement, Rep. Dan Miller, Florida =
Republican and chairman of the committee overseeing census issues, called the plan a "recipe for disaster."

"The Census Bureau is peddling snake oil, and they're headed for your neighborhood," Mr. Miller said. The congressman predicted the bureau's plan would generate a rash of lawsuits.

The bureau had devised a plan for the 2000 census that included use of "scientific sampling" for all purposes. It promised that doing so would yield highly accurate results at reduced costs. It later cautioned that using enumeration only would require hiring 200,000 more enumerators than planned.

But Mr. Miller led a long, fierce attack on the sampling plan, and the Supreme Court ruled sampling could not be used in arriving at the population count used for apportionment.

As Mr. Miller and his colleagues interpret the decision, it also specifically bars the use of sampling in arriving at population figures used for redistricting. The administration and the Census Bureau have come to an opposite conclusion.

It is widely believed that the new Census Bureau plan will cause more trouble. Indeed, Sen. Judd Gregg, New Hampshire Republican and chairman of the committee that oversees and funds the bureau, reiterated last night he will block money for a census that employed sampling.

But Mr. Prewitt warned yesterday that the time for tinkering with census operations is past. "Anything that interferes at this stage will put the census at risk. We've simply got to be doing it -- got to make it happen. It's too late to tell us what we can't use."
Congressional Republicans yesterday attacked the Census Bureau plan to produce two sets of numbers in the 2000 census, arguing it would trigger years of court challenges and massive public confusion.

The criticism came a few hours after the bureau formally released a blueprint calling for a traditional head count to reapportion House seats among the states and a second set of figures to distribute federal money and redraw political boundaries. The second set of numbers would rely on a controversial method that uses a statistical survey to project information for Americans who were missed in the door-to-door count.

Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt said at a news conference that because it is impossible to count everyone, the more accurate numbers will be those that have been adjusted on the basis of the survey.

But Republicans on Capitol Hill held their own news conference to dispute that claim and said they would continue fighting the government’s proposal.

"This irresponsible approach will only serve to confuse and confound the American people while hiding under a thinly veiled shield of so-called accuracy," said Rep. Dan Miller (R-Fla.), who chairs the House census
subcommittee. "The Census Bureau is peddling snake oil and they're headed for your neighborhood."

But he did not repeat earlier vows that Republicans would cut off Census Bureau funding to stop the adjusted numbers, saying "threats like that are inappropriate."

If Republicans and Democrats, who support the administration plan, remain in a stalemate over the issue, it could lead to a partial government shutdown when funding for the bureau and three Cabinet agencies expires June 15.

Both sides acknowledge the dispute will probably end up in federal court again.

Matthew J. Glavin, president of the Southeastern Legal Foundation, said yesterday he would go back to court to challenge the bureau's use of adjusted data for redistricting. Glavin's organization, a conservative public interest law group, brought an earlier challenge that was decided in January when the Supreme Court barred the government from using adjusted figures for apportionment.

The Census Bureau, however, interpreted the ruling as a requirement to use adjusted data for other purposes, if feasible, an interpretation that Republicans and Glavin reject.

Miller has offered his own plan to improve accuracy, including additional funding for advertising, enlisting Americorps volunteers and allowing local governments to review their population data.
Prewitt said the bureau would release two sets of numbers, but that it is up to others to decide which set of numbers to use. In theory, state legislatures could choose between the two sets to redraw political boundaries and federal agencies could decide which one to use to distribute nearly $200 billion.

While the bureau plan did not contain cost figures, sources say the agency is using estimates ranging from $6 billion to $7 billion, far above the $4 billion estimated for the initial plan. The higher cost stems from the Supreme Court's decision requiring only a door-to-door count for apportionment, which will force the bureau to hire 200,000 additional workers.

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company
Subject: Research Analyst position--San Francisco

Date: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 13:03:30 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
    boundary="---- =_NextPart_000_01BE6101.59BD832A"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

----=_NextPart_000_01BE6101.59BD832A

Content-Type: text/plain

Communication Sciences Group has an opening for a Research Analyst-Project Manager. Communication Sciences Group provides high quality research services for social and health marketing and communication and specializes in research on sensitive topics with hard-to-reach populations. Desired qualifications include a master's degree in a relevant field of study and project management experience in health communication/social marketing. Candidates with strong quantitative skills are sought to complement existing staff areas of expertise.

I am attaching the complete announcement as a Word97 document. Please contact me privately (kathrync@socialresearch.com) if you would like to receive this document in another form or have further questions. Please feel free to post/forward this announcement. Thanks for your interest.

<<Res. Analyst Announcement.doc>>
----- =_NextPart_000_01BE6101.59BD832A--

>From rday@mcs.net Thu Feb 25 13:11:48 1999

Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA23905 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 13:11:36 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gopher (P10-Chi-Dial-9.pool.mcs.net [205.253.226.10]) by
Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id PAA15498 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990225144953.00685e84@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 14:49:53 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
SENIOR/CLIENT PROJECT MANAGER. We are fast growing, collegial, informal, and organizationally flat market research firm. We focus on quality and exceeding client expectations.

Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project. They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports. They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.

We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real. If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research
  P.O. Box 5090
  Evanston, IL 60201
  RDR@mcs.com

>From talmey@talmey-drake.com Thu Feb 25 15:14:48 1999
Received: from relay1.smtp.psi.net (relay1.smtp.psi.net [38.8.14.2]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
           id PAA02929 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:14:47 -0800
Pharma? Don't you mean Farming? You's in Illinois, right? Or do you mean Pharming? Does that have anything do to with "organizationally flat" or did you mean Fat? And what's that shit about "bright people," I know you.
See ya Monday.

SENIOR/CLIENT PROJECT MANAGER. We are fast growing, collegial, informal, and organizationally flat market research firm. We focus on quality and exceeding client expectations.

Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project. They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports. They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.
We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real.

If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research

P.O. Box 5090
Evanston, IL 60201
RDR@mcs.com

Paul A. Talmey
Talmey-Drake Research & Strategy, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado
303.443.5300

From talmey@talmey-drake.com Thu Feb 25 15:31:12 1999

Received: from relay1.smtp.psi.net (relay1.smtp.psi.net [38.8.14.2])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA09552 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:31:11 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from [38.223.226.2] (helo=talmey-drake.com)
    by relay1.smtp.psi.net with esmt (Exim 1.90 #1)
    for aapornet@usc.edu
    id 10GAFJ-0006Mv-00; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 18:31:09 -0500
Received: from TDRS_MAIN/SpoolDir by talmey-drake.com
    (Mercury 1.40); 25 Feb 99 16:31:07 -0700
Received: from SpoolDir by TDRS_MAIN (Mercury 1.40); 25 Feb 99 16:30:42 -0700
Received: from talmey.talmey-drake.com (38.223.226.8) by talmey-drake.com
    (Mercury 1.40);
    25 Feb 99 16:30:42 -0700
From: talmey@talmey-drake.com
Oooppps! My earlier reply to this missive was meant only for Richard Day, and not everyone else on aapornet. Hope no one was too offended.
exceeding client expectations.

Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project.
They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports.
They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.

We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real.
If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research

    P.O. Box 5090
    Evanston, IL 60201
    RDR@mcs.com

Paul A. Talmey
Talmey-Drake Research & Strategy, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado
303.443.5300

>From rday@mcs.net Thu Feb 25 15:54:12 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA26468 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:54:08 -0800
(PST)
Hey we don't want nobody nobody sent (name that quote)

At 04:12 PM 2/25/99 -0700, you wrote:

> Pharma? Don't you mean Farming? You's in Illinois, right? Or do
> you mean Pharming? Does that have anything do to with
> "organizationally flat" or did you mean Fat? And what's that shit
> about "bright people," I know you.

> See ya Monday.

> Date sent: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 14:49:53 -0600
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Professional Opportunity

>

SENIOR/CLIENT PROJECT MANAGER. We are fast growing, collegial, informal, and organizationally flat market research firm. We focus on quality and exceeding client expectations.

Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project. They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports. They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.

We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real.

If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research

    P.O. Box 5090

    Evanston, IL 60201
hey its ok to offend me? whatta

I expect that you will be coming in Sunday night and join us all for dinner at the greek Islands (not that phony Kenilworth 1/2 Greek stuff- I know dolmades with lutefisk) Anyway I hope that you make it for dinner- you can even meet the little bride

At 04:28 PM 2/25/99 -0700, you wrote:

> 
> Oooppps! My earlier reply to this missive was meant only for Richard Day, and not everyone else on aapornet. Hope no one was too offended.
>
>
> Date sent: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 14:49:53 -0600
> Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
> From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Professional Opportunity

> SENIOR/CLIENT PROJECT MANAGER. We are fast growing, collegial, informal, and organizationally flat market research firm. We focus on quality and exceeding client expectations.

>
Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project. They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports. They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.

We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real.

If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research

P.O. Box 5090
Evanston, IL 60201
RDR@mcs.com

Paul A. Talmey
Talmey-Drake Research & Strategy, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado
303.443.5300

From cswhite@uiuc.edu Fri Feb 26 12:32:28 1999

Received: from ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu (ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.68.203])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
Ok, going back to the original Kish book:

1. I found some of the assumptions going into the protocol are based on
   the social and demographic structure of the 1950's.
   
   "over 70 percent of dwellings contain two adults, and almost all of
   the rest have either one, three, or four adults"

   The above quote cites "Proportion of Dwellings with Different
   Numbers of Adults (From an SRC Survey of 2000 U.S. Adults in 1957)

   What of the effect of household size? The decision to use unweighted
   estimates is made after comparing weighted versus unweighted means for a few
   dozen variates for many (SRC) studies over the years (the book was published
   in 1964).

2. Essentially then the procedure is
   
   a: when you have a complete listing prior to going to the field --
assign an interviewing schedule to each household address.

(Kish gives an example with 8 interview schedules A through F)

once the interviewer finds out the number of people in the household, the list of people is ordered from oldest male to youngest male and then oldest female to youngest female and numbered from 1 to k.

then the interviewer checks "behind black tape or in an envelope" to see which ordered number is the choice for a household the size of the one in question.

b: If you don’t have a complete list, e.g., you find a new dwelling once you get to the field, the interviewer has some extra schedule sheets that are ordered. They assign a sheet from this extra set and complete it whether the household is qualified or not.

Here's the question:

How important is it that the household members be ordered?

One person believes that it is sufficient that each person have the same probability of being chosen regardless of how the list members are ordered (that would make the programming easier); another person says if you don't follow a protocol on ordering the members, the results are not reproducible.

I see that Kish says that for EPSEM selection of persons, "Selection bias is prevented either with a strict scheme of ordering persons in the dwelling (e.g., according to sex and age), or with hidden random starts."

It seems to me that if you didn't order by age and sex in the household, then why would you even need to know age? That is, you are using some other equal probability method; several of those exist and have been
evaluated. I have seen the Bryant 1973 study. Please point me to other (more recent) studies that examine the outcomes of modified Kish selection methods. But what are the statistical consequences, if any, of following the Kish protocol above without ordering?

Thank you.

>From Roger_Tourangeau@gallup.com Fri Feb 26 12:52:11 1999
Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
   id MAA00577 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Feb 1999 12:52:07 -0800 (PST)
From: Roger_Tourangeau@gallup.com
Received: from exchng5.gallup.com by fw (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
   id OAA16014; Fri, 26 Feb 1999 14:51:28 -0600
Received: by EXCHNG5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
   id <FAPL0RNT>; Fri, 26 Feb 1999 14:51:30 -0600
Message-ID: <1DA55C2176E0D111BE14006008CE8EE601ECE54B@EXCHNG5>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Job Openings
Date: Fri, 26 Feb 1999 14:51:27 -0600
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The Gallup Organization is recruiting both senior and junior statisticians for its Government and Education Division. This division conducts surveys
for federal and academic clients and is located in Rockville, Maryland, near its clients in Washington, D.C.

Senior Statistician

Requirements: PhD in Statistics with five or more years of experience in survey sample design and data analysis. Strong background in estimation procedures including weighting, imputation, variance estimation and small area estimation techniques. Practical experience in the design and selection of survey samples is required. Good writing skills are also needed.

Responsibilities: Design and select samples; write technical sections of proposals to federal agencies; document sample selection procedures; develop and implement survey estimation procedures; conduct of substantive analysis of data from complex surveys; design and manage methodological projects.

Statistician

Requirements: PhD in Statistics or a related field with some course work in survey sample design and data analysis. Exposure to survey estimation procedures such as weighting, imputation, variance estimation and small area estimation techniques. Writing skills are also needed.

Responsibilities: Assist in the design and selection of samples; help to write proposals to federal agencies; document sample selection procedures; implement survey estimation procedures; conduct substantive data analysis.
Please fax a resume to: Roger Tourangeau
The Gallup Organization
301 309-0635

In addition, please schedule a confidential phone interview with Laura Mussman by calling 800-561-5258 or 800-561-5270.

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Fri Feb 26 13:30:52 1999
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA24122 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Feb 1999 13:30:51 -0800
(PST)
Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
   id <F1QL456V>; Fri, 26 Feb 1999 13:32:27 -0800
Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2133F2654@psg.ucsf.EDU>
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Another Kish sampling method question: What are the statistical consequences of not ordering the list of household members?
Date: Fri, 26 Feb 1999 13:32:26 -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"

What characteristics you order by has to do with the eligibility criteria
for the particular study. In a typical household survey you usually interview only one individual per household. The Kish method is one means of randomly selecting from among the ELIGIBLES the person to be interviewed. If only adult males are eligible for interviewing, then both gender and age must be recorded, but the random selection will be done only among the adult males in that household.

The other advantage of a full inventory is that you now have a complete picture of the household composition, i.e., a whole bunch of data, that can be important in determining SES, social support, etc. Obviously, you also have the number of eligibles in the household which you must have when weighting for probability of selection.

In telephone surveys, we have tended to shorten the screening process by asking whether anyone in the household matches the study criteria. If so we ask how many. If more than one then we ask to speak to the eligible individual who is next to celebrate their birthday. This "next birthday" method, when compared to Kish, yielded similar response rates and sample compositions. I do not have references at hand, but there should be some method-comparison articles in the literature.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Carolyn White [SMTP:cswhite@uiuc.edu]
Sent: Friday, February 26, 1999 12:30 PM
To: 'AAPORNET'

Subject: Another Kish sampling method question: What are the statistical consequences of not ordering the list of household members?

Ok, going back to the original Kish book:

1. I found some of the assumptions going into the protocol are based on the social and demographic structure of the 1950's.

"over 70 percent of dwellings contain two adults, and almost all of the rest have either one, three, or four adults"

The above quote cites "Proportion of Dwellings with Different Numbers of Adults (From an SRC Survey of 2000 U.S. Adults in 1957)

What of the effect of household size? The decision to use unweighted estimates is made after comparing weighted versus unweighted means for a few dozen variates for many (SRC) studies over the years (the book was published in 1964).

2. Essentially then the procedure is
   a: when you have a complete listing prior to going to the field -- assign an interviewing schedule to each household address.
   (Kish gives an example with 8 interview schedules A through F)

:once the interviewer finds out the number of people in the
household, the list of people is ordered from oldest male to youngest male
and then oldest female to youngest female and numbered from 1 to k.
then the interviewer checks "behind black tape or in an envelope"
to see which ordered number is the choice for a household the size of the
one in question.

b: If you don't have a complete list, e.g., you find a new dwelling
once you get to the field, the interviewer has some extra schedule sheets
that are ordered. They assign a sheet from this extra set and complete it
whether the household is qualified or not.

Here's the question:
How important is it that the household members be ordered?
One person believes that it is sufficient that each person have the
same probability of being chosen regardless of how the list members are
ordered (that would make the programming easier); another person says if you
don't follow a protocol on ordering the members, the results are not reproducible.
I see that Kish says that for EPSEM selection of persons,"Selection bias is prevented either with a strict scheme of ordering persons in
the
dwelling (e.g., according to sex and age), or with hidden random
starts."
P402

It seems to me that if you didn't order by age and sex in the
household, then why would you even need to know age? That is, you are
using
some other equal probability method; several of those exist and have
been
evaluated. I have seen the Bryant 1973 study. Please point me to other
(more
recent) studies that examine the outcomes of modified Kish selection
methods. But what are the statistical consequences, if any, of
following the
Kish protocol above without ordering?

Thank you.

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Sat Feb 27 16:37:39 1999
Received: from mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com
[207.240.197.31])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA06341 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 27 Feb 1999 16:37:20 -0800
(PST)
Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com
[207.240.217.120]) by mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id
RAA26331 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 27 Feb 1999 17:38:07 -0700 (MST)
Message-ID: <002801be62b2$6c21ae80$78d9f0cf@phx35035>
>Hey we don't want nobody nobody sent (name that quote)

That would be what the ward heeler in Richard Daley's (sr.) Chicago told Abner Mikva (then a University of Chicago student), when the latter volunteered to do political work for the Chicago Machine.

wh: Who sent you?
am: Nobody
wh: We don't want nobody nobody sent.

One of the truly great quotes in American political folklore. (Didn't someone use it in a book title?)

Obviously, Day Research holds itself to the standards of its Chicago forebears.
Mike O'Neil

>At 04:12 PM 2/25/99 -0700, you wrote:
>>
>>Pharma? Don't you mean Farming? You's in Illinois, right? Or do you
>>mean Pharming? Does that have anything do to with
>>"organizationally flat" or did you mean Fat? And what's that shit
>>about "bright people," I know you.
>>
>>See ya Monday.
>>
>>
>>
>>Date sent: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 14:49:53 -0600
>>Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
>>From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
>>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>>Subject: Professioinal Opportunity
>>
>>
>>
>>SENIOR/CLIENT PROJECT MANAGER. We are fast growing, collegial,
>>informal, and organizationally flat market research firm. We focus on
>>quality and
>>exceeding client expectations.
>>
>>Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project.
>>They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports.
They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.

We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real. If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research

P.O. Box 5090
Evanston, IL 60201
RDR@mcs.com

Paul A. Talmey
Talmey-Drake Research & Strategy, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado
303.443.5300

From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sun Feb 28 03:54:13 1999
Received: from imo22.mx.aol.com (imo22.mx.aol.com [198.81.352.17.66])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id DAA10321; Sun, 28 Feb 1999 03:54:12 -0800 (PST)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
This level of "Professioinal Opportunity" is beginning to remind me of the employment agency I once visited when "in need." I was talking to an employment agency interviewer, and saw two file cabinets behind that person, one labeled: "Active Candidates" (which I guessed to mean employable, actively being worked with candidates). However, the other cabinet was labeled---"Obsolete Candidates"! I always wondered about the caliber of those latter persons' resumes, and of the people themselves!

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph. D.
Research Psychologist and Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com
Mike’s got it right, and the author who used it in a book title was the late Milton Rakove. Rakove’s book about the old days of the Chicago machine was based on verbal reminiscences of those who had been part of it. I referred to it in my own work on the later days of that same machine . . .

Tom

On Sat, 27 Feb 1999 17:36:44 -0700 Michael O’Neil <oneil@speedchoice.com> wrote:

> >Hey we don’t want nobody nobody sent (name that quote)
That would be what the ward heeler in Richard Daley's (sr.) Chicago
told Abner Mikva (then a Univeristy of Chicago student), when the
latter volunteered to do political work for the Chicago Machine.

wh: Who sent you?
am: Nobody
wh: We don't want nobody nobody sent.

One of the truly great quotes in American political folklore. (Didn't
someone use it in a book title?)

Obviously, Day Research holds itself to the standards of its Chicago
forebears.

Mike O'Neil

> At 04:12 PM 2/25/99 -0700, you wrote:
> 
> Pharma? Don't you mean Farming? You's in Illinois, right? Or do
> you mean Pharring? Does that have anything do to with
> "organizationally flat" or did you mean Fat? And what's that shit
> about "bright people," I know you.
> 
> See ya Monday.
SENIOR/CLIENT PROJECT MANAGER. We are fast growing, collegial, informal, and organizationally flat market research firm. We focus on quality and exceeding client expectations.

Our Senior people have primary client contact and manage each project. They also write questionnaires, analyze data and write reports. They are supported by a team of very bright people.

You have 5+ years of Pharma. experience, excellent market research skills, and like relating directly with clients. You also like the idea of running your business in this environment.

We pay at CASRO norms and bonus well beyond. Our profit sharing is real. If you are interested and you qualify please contact Richard Day Research

P.O. Box 5090
Evanston, IL 60201
RDR@mcs.com
Paul A. Talmey
Talmey-Drake Research & Strategy, Inc.
Boulder, Colorado
303.443.5300

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