==

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

Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

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

Subject: February 1999 archive - one BIG message

This is the USC Listproc archive of AAPORNET messages for this entire

month. It is one big message, in chronological order, just the way the USC

archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's

search function (usually Ctrl-F).

Turning this into individual messages that ASU's Listserv software can

index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time

permits.

New messages are of course automatically formatted and indexed correctly,

and I have converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to

the present.

Shap Wolf

Survey Research Laboratory

Arizona State University

shap.wolf@asu.edu

AAPORNET volunteer host

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9902.

Part 1/1, total size 441574 bytes:

>From J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz Mon Feb 1 16:12:06 1999

Received: from cc-server9.massey.ac.nz (cc-server9.massey.ac.nz

[130.123.128.11])

   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

   id QAA09040 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 1 Feb 1999 16:12:01 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mk-pc34.massey.ac.nz (actually mk-pc34)

     by cc-server9.massey.ac.nz with SMTP(PP);

     Tue, 2 Feb 1999 11:42:49 +1300

Message-Id: <1.5.4.32.19990201224148.00841b94@mail.massey.ac.nz>

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Tue, 02 Feb 1999 11:41:48 +1300

To: elmar@sc.edu, SOC-MKTG@LISTSERV.GEORGETOWN.EDU, amodlmkt@ecatalyst.com,

    aapornet@usc.edu, ACR-L@LISTSERV.OKSTATE.EDU, MRKT-PHD@VM.SC.EDU

From: Janet Hoek <J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz>

Subject: Faculty Position: Massey University, NEW ZEALAND

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)

Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1999 09:59:30 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199902031459.JAA15006@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

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

Subject: AAPOR '99 Conference update

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 (EEYORE.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.

  http://www.Ameritech.com/products/answer/features.html

For about $4 a month, potential respondents can lock us out along with

telemarketers, charity soliciters, 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 (arch6.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu

(LSMTP 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 protection 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

>From SMarcy@NationalResearch.com Wed Feb 3 08:14:46 1999

Received: from nrc7.nationalresearch.com ([12.13.114.6])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id IAA07429 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 08:14:45 -0800

(PST)

Received: by nrc7.nationalresearch.com with Internet Mail Service

(5.5.2232.9)

    id <DK5TV2L2>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 10:13:28 -0600

Message-ID:

<A1D26D98B20AD211A2A00060089F9C0A5B7ADA@nrc7.nationalresearch.com>

From: Sherry Marcy <SMarcy@NationalResearch.com>

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

Subject: RE: Consumer protection laws -Reply

Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1999 10:13:06 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

The Council or American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) follows these

laws as well as the Marketing Research Association (MRA).

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Wed Feb 3 08:23:01 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 IAA09539 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 08:22:59 -0800

(PST)

Received: from IDENT-NOT-QUERIED@outbound.Princeton.EDU (port 45587

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?

--------------94A5B6D3F3D0DE486F2813DB

Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="vcard.vcf"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: Card for Freeland, Edward

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="vcard.vcf"

begin: vcard

fn: Edward Freeland

n: Freeland;Edward

org: Princeton Survey Research Center

adr;dom: 202 Robertson Hall;;Princeton

University;Princeton;NJ;08544-1013;

email;internet: efreelan@princeton.edu

title: Associate Director

tel;work: (609) 258-1854

tel;fax: (609) 258-1985

x-mozilla-cpt: ;0

x-mozilla-html: FALSE

version: 2.1

end: vcard

--------------94A5B6D3F3D0DE486F2813DB--

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

*

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

* *

*      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 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: <3.0.1.32.19990203104851.0069e048@postoffice.worldnet.att.n

et>

References: <01BE4F5E.39D47E60@mark-bri>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

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>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: Re: Consumer protection laws

Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1999 14:02:57 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

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

   *

>* *

>*

* * *

>*   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 rhickson@monmouth.com Wed Feb 3 12:35:49 1999

Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id MAA27380 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 12:35:48 -0800

(PST)

Received: from rachel (tr-ppp24.monmouth.com [209.191.24.56])

    by shell.monmouth.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id PAA16650

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Feb 1999 15:35:35 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <36B8B422.6C5E@monmouth.com>

Date: Wed, 03 Feb 1999 15:40:02 -0500

From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: [Fwd: Job Opportunity - Chicago area]

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 health

care 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: 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.=20

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Feb 4 12:31:29 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 MAA05854 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 4 Feb 1999 12:31:26 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

   by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

   id MAA27293 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 4 Feb 1999 12:31:24 -0800

(PST)

Date: Thu, 4 Feb 1999 12:31:24 -0800 (PST)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: QUERY: Legal and Court Consulting)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9902041230460.16264-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

        PLEASE DO *NOT* REPLY TO AAPORNET

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 enlightment of all of us on AAPORNET.

        -- Jim

        PLEASE DO *NOT* REPLY TO AAPORNET

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Feb 4 14:39:36 1999

Received: from camel7.mindspring.com (camel7.mindspring.com [207.69.200.57])

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/govtarticles/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 potions?

   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

From: "Bob Groves" <bgroves@survey.umd.edu>

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

Date: Fri, 5 Feb 1999 18:09:20 EST

Subject: Registration for International Conference on Survey Nonresponse

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

Message-ID: <40F987A4ECE@survey.umd.edu>

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!

>From Mark@bisconti.com Fri Feb 5 15:51:26 1999

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 na=EFve,

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 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 $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. =20

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?!

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

--

Doug Henwood

Left Business Observer

250 W 85 St

New York NY 10024-3217 USA

+1-212-874-4020 voice +1-212-874-3137 fax

email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sat Feb 6 09:14:11 1999

Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id JAA22641; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 09:14:10 -0800 (PST)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com

Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com

    by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id LUXRa23173;

    Sat, 6 Feb 1999 12:13:07 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <cbc816b4.36bc7823@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 6 Feb 1999 12:13:07 EST

To: CTalkov@aol.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Re: References for Scanners and Related Software

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Mac sub 79

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 12:45:29 -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>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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.

>From hschuman@umich.edu Sat Feb 6 16:48:46 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 QAA05879 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 16:48:45 -0800

(PST)

Received: from qix.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@qix.rs.itd.umich.edu

[141.211.63.87])

    by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id

TAA20263

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 19:48:43 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)

    by qix.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id TAA16255

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 6 Feb 1999 19:48:42 -0500 (EST)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Sat, 6 Feb 1999 19:48:42 -0500 (EST)

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>

X-Sender: hschuman@qix.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Lessons learned

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 separetely.

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 $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.

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.

>From KAF@cbsnews.com Sun Feb 7 08:46:44 1999

Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

    id IAA29237 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Feb 1999 08:46:43 -0800

(PST)

Received: from CBSNY-Message_Server by cbsnews.com

    with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 07 Feb 1999 11:46:03 -0500

Message-Id: <s6bd7cfb.064@cbsnews.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Sun, 07 Feb 1999 11:45:55 -0500

From: Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Lessons learned -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Disposition: inline

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 hypothtical 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 hypothticals 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
> hypothtical 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.

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:

http://www.gisjobs.com/survey

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: AAPORNET 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, 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

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 oneil@speedchoice.com Sun Feb 7 22:16:11 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 WAA22768 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Feb 1999 22:16:10 -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

XAA23846 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Feb 1999 23:17:09 -0700 (MST)

Message-ID: <004701be532a$893471c0$78d9f0cf@phx35035>

From: "Michael O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Lessons learned -Reply

Date: Sun, 7 Feb 1999 23:16:03 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

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 importrance 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.

>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

hypothticals

>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

>> hypothtical 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 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

Message-Id: <990208.092011.EST.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

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.
>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Mon Feb 8 08:22:16 1999
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu

[137.148.208.27])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id IAA29360 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 08:22:13 -0800

(PST)

Received: from s.kraus.csuohio.edu (137.148.207.64) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu

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

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

Subject: RE: Registration for International Conference on Survey Nonrespon

    se

Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 09:30:23 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

Roxanne,

I'd like to go to this conference. Can I got 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

> 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!

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Mon Feb 8 14:25:33 1999

Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu

[137.148.208.27])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id OAA05820 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 14:25:32 -0800

(PST)

Received: from 3481401060 (137.148.59.40) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu with

SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Mon, 8 Feb 1999 17:25:41 -0500

X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Sidney Kraus <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

Subject: Internet stats

Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 17:25:41 -0500

Message-ID: <1293627755-52538928@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

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

(includings 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 compartive salary scales,

consultant fees, pricing of goods, etc. were an almost daily occurance. The

medical and legal professions do pretty much the same thing. A problem might

arise if it can be shown that there is a conspiricy 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 potions?"

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

Content-Disposition: inline

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 ----------

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

Public Information Office   CB99-28

301-457-3030/301-457-3670 (fax)

301-457-4067 (TDD)

e-mail: pio@census.gov

Small Area Estimates Branch

301-457-3242

Census Bureau Releases Updated Income and Poverty Estimates

for States and Counties

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.

-X-

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

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9902091612530.412-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

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

>From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Feb 10 08:38:54 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id IAA18569 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 08:38:51 -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 KAA10387

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 10:26:12 -0600 (CST)

Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

    with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 10:25:09 -0600

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

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

>----------

>From: Diane O'Rourke[SMTP:DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU]

>Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 1999 11:25 AM

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 1007 -Reply

>

>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

>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 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

lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

>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 DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Feb 10 09:08:14 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id JAA05522 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 09:08:12 -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 KAA14249

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 10:56:57 -0600 (CST)

Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

    with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 10:55:52 -0600

Message-Id: <s6c165b7.039@SRL.UIC.EDU>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 10:55:23 -0600

From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 1007 -Reply -Reply

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, 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

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? 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 jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Wed Feb 10 09:43:36 1999

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

   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

   id JAA23457 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 09:43:35 -0800

(PST)

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu ([128.103.76.224])

   by hsph.harvard.edu (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA27605

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:43:36 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <36C1C520.6E6B56A4@hsph.harvard.edu>

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:42:56 -0500

From: "john t. young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Taping Interviews

References: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B31FD173@arbmdex.arbitron.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 inconvience 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

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 inconvience 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

EDITORIAL-from The Washington Times, Feb. 10, 1999, page A16

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

>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

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 inconvience 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 LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Feb 10 11:43:28 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 LAA19554 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 11:43:27 -0800

(PST)

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

   id <14DRQRFL>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 11:44:21 -0800

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2130470FC@psg.ucsf.EDU>

From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

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

Subject: RE: Census editorial

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 11:44:20 -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"

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

EDITORIAL-from The Washington Times, Feb. 10, 1999, page A16

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

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed Feb 10 12:08:09 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 MAA29816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:08:08 -0800

(PST)

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

[128.186.197.2])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA96842

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 15:08:06 -0500

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 Mark@bisconti.com Wed Feb 10 12:55:23 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 MAA19960 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 12:55:07 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content

Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000442503@medusa.nei.org> for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 15:53:15 -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 1VPN9SXK; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 15:57:12 -0500

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

   id <01BE550C.493178A0@mark-bri>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 15:44:46 -0500

Message-Id: <01BE550C.493178A0@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: RE: Defining "Niggardly" in the News

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 15:44:42 -0500

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

front pages nationally-the story had little to do with D.C. (unless = it was

intended to perpetuate 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.

>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

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Feb 10 13:51:44 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 NAA12264 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:51:19 -0800

(PST)

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

    id <14DRQ40K>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:52:12 -0800

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2130470FD@psg.ucsf.EDU>

From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

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

Subject: RE: phone lines

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:52:11 -0800

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

(PST)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

   by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id TWGFa20087

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Feb 1999 20:41:05 +1900 (EST)

Message-ID: <daf4dc66.36c23531@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 20:41:05 EST

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: taping of phone interviews

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 64

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: <199902111259.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

>

>

* *

* *

*   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 rday@mcs.net Thu Feb 11 07:59:30 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 HAA13254 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 07:59:28 -0800

(PST)

Received: from gopher (P12-Chi-Dial-7.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.140]) by

Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id JAA26718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 11 Feb 1999 09:59:25 -0600 (CST)

Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990211093816.006d9d40@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 09:38:16 -0600

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>

Subject: Re: taping of phone interviews

In-Reply-To: <199902111259.HAA08420@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

That is all very simplistic. We had a meeeting (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 *

>* *

>*

* * *

>

>

>

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Feb 11 08:29:04 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 IAA24157 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 08:29:03 -0800

(PST)

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

   id <14DRQYS7>; Thu, 11 Feb 1999 08:29:59 -0800

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213047103@psg.ucsf.EDU>

From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

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

Subject: RE: taping of phone interviews

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 08:29:56 -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"

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 meeeting (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 *

   >* *

* * * * *

   * * *

   >

   >

   >

>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: <199902112109.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 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 meeeting (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 *

>>* *

>>* *

>* * *

>>

>>

>>

>

>

>

* *

* *

*   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 meeeting (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 oout 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 Illionis NFPs and Corps. that interviewed. He

agreed to kill the bill.

I understand your point and certainly have no problem with it. W do it our way for quality control purposes. If we are ever going to tape for aclient 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 meeeting (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 *

>>>* *

>>>* *

>>* * *

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>* *

>*

* * *

>*   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 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

>>

>> -----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 meeeting (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

>

>

>

>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

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: taping of phone interviews

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 64

Let's not confuse the routine monitoring of interviewers with the taping of

respondents without their permission. The former does not neeed 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

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,

Fayetteville, AR 72701 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
****
**

>From andrew_morrison@marketstrategies.com Fri Feb 12 04:40:13 1999

Received: from kestrel.marketstrategies.com (kestrel.marketstrategies.com

[206.251.93.130])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

    id EAA18483 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 04:40:11 -0800

(PST)

Received: from marketstrategies.com by kestrel.marketstrategies.com

(SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)

   id EAA18592; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 04:33:27 -0800

Received: from ccMail by marketstrategies.com (ccMail Link to SMTP

R8.30.00.7)

   id AA918823403; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 04:43:26 -0800

Message-Id: <9902129188.AA918823403@marketstrategies.com>

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 07:40:03 -0800

From: "Andrew Morrison"<andrew_morrison@marketstrategies.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: position   Please "unsubscribe" me from this list.

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="MimeMultipartBoundary"

Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

--MimeMultipartBoundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

          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,

Fayetteville, AR 72701 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

****

**

--MimeMultipartBoundary--

>From bgroves@survey.umd.edu Fri Feb 12 05:51:57 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 FAA28114 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 05:51:55 -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 IAA20131;

   Fri, 12 Feb 1999 08:51:54 -0500

Received: from JPSM/SpoolDir by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.21);

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)

Bob Groves

>From Robert_Camin@ama-assn.org Fri Feb 12 07:37:28 1999

Received: from mail03-ord.pilot.net (mail-ord-3.pilot.net [205.243.174.17])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id HAA19294 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 07:37:26 -0800

(PST)

Received: from unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org ([204.48.31.162]) by

mail03-ord.pilot.net with ESMTP id JAA21091 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12

Feb 1999 09:37:24 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gateway.ama-assn.org (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by

unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org with SMTP id JAA11511 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:37:23 -0600 (CST)

Received: by gateway.ama-assn.org id AA19243

  (InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for aapornet@usc.edu);

  Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:45:19 -0600

Received: by gateway.ama-assn.org (Internal Mail Agent-1);

  Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:45:19 -0600

Message-Id: <s6c3f64f.051@gwise.ama-assn.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:27:19 -0600

From: Robert Camin <Robert_Camin@ama-assn.org>

To: HOneill536@aol.com, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: taping of phone interviews

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Disposition: inline

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 neeed 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 neeed

permission,

>the latter certainly does.   Harry O'Neill

>

>

>

James Flynn

Decision Research

1201 Oak St., Eugene, OR 97401

(541) 485-2400; Fax (541) 485-2403

>From mlongstr@comp.uark.edu Fri Feb 12 08:57:02 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 IAA11283 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 08:57:01 -0800

(PST)

Received: (from mlongstr@localhost)

    by comp.uark.edu (8.9.0/8.9.0) id KAA08869;

    Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:56:59 -0600 (CST)

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:56:59 -0600 (CST)

From: Molly Longstreth <mlongstr@comp.uark.edu>

X-Sender: mlongstr@comp

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Potential call for help

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.95.990212104813.8388A-100000@comp>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

****

**

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9902120852020.13227-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

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

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:15:51 -0800

From: Robert Laforge <rla2071u@postoffice.uri.edu>

Reply-To: Robert Laforge <rlaforge@uri.edu>

Subject: F0IA and Federally Funded Research Data

>From rla2071u@postoffice.uri.edu Fri Feb 12 07:04:24 1999

Received: from pete.uri.edu (PETE.URI.EDU [131.128.1.12])

Subject: F0IA and Federally Funded Research Data

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

Disclosure law worries researchers

By Aaron Zitner, Globe Staff, 02/11/99

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 pubic 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.

****

(PST)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------------6F63E8536434385F1FD3BDEF

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

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

--------------6F63E8536434385F1FD3BDEF--

WE HAVE GENERALLY RECIEVED 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

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

Subject: Re: Potential call for help

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!

At 10:56 AM 2/12/99 -0600, you 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

>***

>*******

>

>

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 Barbara.O'Hare@arbitron.com Fri Feb 12 10:57:53 1999

Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])

   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

   id KAA01554 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 10:57:40 -0800

(PST)

Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id NAA26738; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:53:08

-0500 (EST)

Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via

smap (4.1)

   id xma026566; Fri, 12 Feb 99 13:52:23 -0500

Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

   id <1LLL22BG>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:53:29 -0500

Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B31FE832@arbmdex.arbitron.com>

From: "O'Hare, Barbara" <Barbara.O'Hare@arbitron.com>

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

Subject: $2 Bills as Incentive

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:53:27 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

Content-Type: text/plain

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.

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Fri Feb 12 13:06:19 1999

Received: from smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.138])

   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

   id NAA08639 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:06:17 -0800

(PST)

Received: from login4.isis.unc.edu (root@login4.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.134])

   by smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA20264

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 16:06:16 -0500 (EST)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <14341-26196>; Fri, 12 Feb 1999 16:06:10 -0500

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 16:06:08 -0500 (EST)

Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

X-Sender: pmeyer@login4.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Potential call for help

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.95.990212104813.8388A-100000@comp>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990212160452.79106E-100000@login4.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

  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.

===

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085

CB 3365 Howell Hall   Fax: 919 962-1549

University of North Carolina   Cell: 919 906-3425

Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365   http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

===

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

>

>

****

**

> Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.   University of Arkansas

> Director   Fayetteville, AR 72701

> Survey Research Center   501-575-3495

> HOEC 118   Fax: 501-575-7171

> **

> ********

>

>

>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

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I will be out of the office until 2/18. If you need immediate attention, =

please contact Kathleen Martin. Her e-mail address is:=20

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: F0IA 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

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

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

>From JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu Tue Feb 16 10:35:34 1999

Received: from OAVAX.CSUCHICO.EDU (oavax.CSUChico.EDU [132.241.80.95])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id KAA18082 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Feb 1999 10:35:33 -0800

(PST)

From: JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu

Received: from oavax.csuchico.edu by oavax.csuchico.edu (PMDF V4.2-13 #2) id

<01J7T35S5KEO0069CZ@oavax.csuchico.edu>; Tue, 16 Feb 1999 10:09:15 PDT

Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 10:09:15 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: Census editorial

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <01J7T35S6MZM0069CZ@oavax.csuchico.edu>

X-Envelope-to: aapornet@usc.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 6/26/72-7/9/72 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.

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 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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

ME INC.: GETTING THE GOODS ON CONSUMERS

Marketing Firms Want Basic Data About You and Me, But We're Wising Up to =

What Those Facts Are Worth

By Paul Farhi

Washington Post Staff Writer

Sunday, February 14, 1999; Page H01=20

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 rect ways. 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

=20

>From abider@earthlink.net Wed Feb 17 12:40:39 1999

Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net

[207.217.120.50])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id MAA16241 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 12:40:35 -0800

(PST)

Received: from earthlink.net (sdn-ar-001dcwashP166.dialsprint.net

[168.191.20.102])

    by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA10792

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 12:40:29 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <36CB3916.5B9BF078@earthlink.net>

Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1999 16:48:09 -0500

From: Albert Biderman <abider@earthlink.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: So what does he know.

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Wed Feb 17 13:14:56 1999

Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu

[137.148.208.27])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id NAA14971 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 13:14:45 -0800

(PST)

Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu (137.148.59.65) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu

with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Wed, 17 Feb 1999 16:14:50 -0500

X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

Subject: Re: So what does he know.

Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1999 16:14:50 -0500

Message-ID: <1292854406-5984964@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

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

At 04:48 PM 2/17/99 -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.

>

>

>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 Sta-tistical 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 As-sociation 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

<Daniel_Kasprzyk@ed.gov>.

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.

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Feb 17 14:51:53 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 OAA06278 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 14:51:51 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content

Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000450582@medusa.nei.org> for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 17:50:38 -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 F1DL57TJ; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 17:51:41 -0500

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

    id <01BE5A9C.BB7BBFC0@mark-bri>; Wed, 17 Feb 1999 17:41:21 -0500

Message-Id: <01BE5A9C.BB7BBFC0@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: RE: So what does he know.

Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1999 17:41:20 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

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   *

```
*              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 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

<color><param>0000,0000,ffff</param><smaller><smaller>++++++++++++++++++++++

++++++++++++++++++++++++++

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

+++</smaller></smaller></c

+++olor>

>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; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Book Materials

References: <2.2.32.19990218165852.00bc7518@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="------------E7E8E8DC2EC616B93060B1D6"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------------E7E8E8DC2EC616B93060B1D6

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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?

--------------E7E8E8DC2EC616B93060B1D6

Content-Type: application/msword; name="Paul's Information.doc"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: inline; filename="Paul's Information.doc"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAIgAAAAAA

AAAAEAAAJAAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAACEAAAD//////////////////////////////////////

//

//
//
//
//
//
//
/////////////////////////////////spcEAWQAJBAAAABK/AAAAAAAAEAAAAAABAAA

WAcAAA4AYmpiavNX81cAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJBBYAHhAAAJE9AQCRPQEAWAMAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAD//w8A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAF0AAAAAMYAAAAAAAAxgAAAMYAAAAAAAAxgAAAAAAADGAAAA

AAAAAMYAAAAAAAAxgAAABQAAAAAAAAAAAAAANoAAAAAAAA2gAAAAAAADaAAAAAAAAANoA

AAAAAAAA2gAAAwAAADmAAAAFAAAANoAAAAAAAAzwEAALYAAAAGAQAAAAAAAAYBAAAAAAAA

BgEAAAAAAAGAQAAAAAAAAYBAAAAAAAABgEAAAAAAAGAQAAAAAAAAYBAAAAAAAAlAEAAAIA

AACWAQAAAAAAAJYBAAAAAAAlgEAAAAAACWAQAAAAAAAJYBAAAAAAAlgEAACQAAACFAgAA

9AEAAHkEAADOAAAAugEAABUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAxgAAAAAAAGAQAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGAQAAAAAAAYBAAAAAAAABgEAAAAAAAGAQAAAAAALoBAAAAAAA

MgEAAAAADGAAAAAAAAAMYAAAAAAAABgEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYBAAAAAAAABgEAAAAA

AAAyAQAAAAAADIBAAAAAAAMgEAAAAAAGAQAAFgAAAMYAAAAAAAABgEAAAAAADGAAAA

AAAAAAYBAAAAAAAAlAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA2gAAAAAAADaAAAAAAAAAMYA

AAAAAAAxgAAAAAAADGAAAAAAAAAMYAAAAAAAABgEAAAAAACUAQAAAAAADIBAABiAAAA

MgEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJQBAAAAAAAxgAAAAAADGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAlAEAAAAAAAGAQAA

AAAAAPoAAAMAAAAIHKTFW1bvgHaAAAAAAAAANoAAAAAAAAHAEAABYAACUAQAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAU2V2ZW4gQnJpZGdlcyBQcmVzcy9DaGF0aGFtIEhv

dXNlIFB1Ymxpc2hlcnMNQXV0aG9yIE1hcmtldGluZyBRdWVzdGlvbm5haXJlDQ0NUGxlYXNl

IGNvbXBsZXRlIHRoaXMgbWFya2V0aW5nIHF1ZXN0aW9ubmFpcmUgYXMgZnVsbHkgYXMgcG9z

c2libGUuIFlvdXIgcmVzcG9uc2VzIHdpbGwgaGVscCB1cyB0byBkZXZlbG9wIHRoZSBtYXJr
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З3JhcGh5IChhcyB5b3Ugd291bGQgbGlrZSB0byBzZWUgaXQgaW4gYWR2ZXJ0aXNp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AAQAAC0E
AABMBAAATQQAAE4EAACvBQAAsAUAALEFAACyBQAAxQUAAMYFAADHBQAA6gUAAOsFAADsBQAA
BAYAAAUGAAAGBgAANQYAADYGAAA3BgAARQYAAEYGAABHBgAAVgYAAFcGAAABYBgAAgAYAAIEG
AACCBgAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+wAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAPsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPsAAAAAAAAAAAAA
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AA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AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA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ACAAVwAuACAAVAByAGEAdQBnAG8AdAB0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
ACAAVwAuACAAVAByAGEAdQBnAG8AdAB0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQBAAATAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/v8AAAQAAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAQAAAOCFn/L5T2gQq5EIACsns9kwAAAAlAEAABAAAAABAAAAiAAAAAIAAACQAAAA
AwAAAMgAAAAEAAAA1AAAAAUAAADwAAAABwAAAPwAAAAIAAAADAEAAAkAAAAoAQAAEgAAADQB
AAAKAAAAUAEAAAwAAABcAQAADQAAAGgBAAAOAAAAdAEAAA8AAAB8AQAAEAAAAIQBAAATAAAA
jAEAAAIAAADkBAAAHgAAAC0AAABTRVZFTiBCCUklER0VTIFBSRVNTL0NIQVRIQU0gSE9VU0Ug
UFVCTElTSEVVUwA4LjAeAAAAAQAAABFVkUeAAAAFAAAAE1pY2hhZWwgVy4gVHJhdWdodQA
HgAAAAEAAAAaWNoHgAAAcAAABOb3JtYWwAIB4AAAAUAAAATWljaGFlbCBXLiBUcmF1Z290

dAAeAAAAAgAAADEAY2geAAAAEwAAAE1pY3Jvc29mdCBXb3JkIDguMAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAA

QAAAAACQsvhsW74BQAAAACQsvhsW74BAwAAAAEAAAADAAAAewAAAMAAADBAgAAAwAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAAAwAAAE1pY3Jvc29mAAAAEAAAAewAAAMAAADBAgAAAwAAAAAAAA

AAAACQsvhsW74BQAAAACQsvhsW74BAwAAAEAAAADAAAAewAAAMAAADBAgAAAwAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP7/AAAEAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIA

AAAC1c3VnC4bEJOXCAArLPmuRAAAAAXVzdWcLhsQk5cIACss+a5YAQAAFAEAAAwAAAABAAAA

aAAAAA8AAABwAAAABQAAAHwAAAGAAAAhAAAABEAAACMAAAAFwAAAJQAAAALAAAAnAAAABAA

AACkAAAAEwAAAKwAAAAWAAAAtAAAAA0AAAC8AAAADAAAAPUAAACAAAA5AQAAB4AAAACAAAA

IAAgAAMAAAAFAAAAwAAAAEAAAADAAAAYQMAAAMAAADoEAgACwAAAAAAAALAAAAAAAAAAsA

AAAAAAACwAAAAAAAAeEAAAAQAAAC0AAABTRVZFTiBCCUklER0VTTIFBSRVNTL0NIQVRIQU0g

SE9VU0UgUFVCCTElTEVUSUwwAMEAAAAgAAAB4AAAAGAAAAVGl0bGUAAwAAAAEAAAAmAAAAMA

AAAAAAAIAAAAAEAAAA2AAAAAgAAAD4AAAABAAAAAgAAAoAAAABfUElEX0dVSUQAAgAAAOQE

AABBAAAATgAAAHsANgBBADUANgBDAEEAQwAwAC0AQwA3ADMADANgAtADEAMQBEADIALQA5ADYA

RQBEAC0ARAAxAEQAMgA1ADAANgAxAEQAQwwAzAEEAfQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAAgAAAAMAAAAEAAAABQAAAAYAAAAHAAAACAAAAP7/
//8KAAAACwAAAAwAAAANAAAADgAAAA8AAAAQAAAA/v///xIAAAATAAAAFAAAABUAAAAWAAAA
FwAAABgAAAD+////GgAAABsAAAAcAAAAHQAAAB4AAAAfAAAAIAAAAP7////9////IwAAAP7/
///+/////v//
//
//
//
//
//
//1IAbwBvAHQA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bVu+AQA7pBVtW74BAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//////////8AAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA/v//////

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///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--------------E7E8E8DC2EC616B93060B1D6--

>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 uneceesary 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 chpater possibility. I assuem you have one,

but I can't tremember 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

(PST)

Received: from HCFA-Message_Server by hcfa.gov

   with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 08:09:13 -0500

Message-Id: <s6cd1c29.011@hcfa.gov>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 08:08:17 -0500

From: Nancy Berson <NBerson@hcfa.gov>

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

>>> "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 *

* *

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 09:36:58 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Conference info on AAPOR Webpage -Reply

In-Reply-To: <s6cd1c29.011@hcfa.gov>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

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 in to.

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

=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=
=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D
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:=20

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.

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@oneilresearch.com

as appropriate. www.oneilresearch.com Company web site w/link to company

email.

------=_NextPart_000_000E_01BE5BE0.D47E4700

Content-Type: text/html;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 = http-equiv=3DContent-Type>

<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.72.3110.7"' name=3DGENERATOR> </HEAD> <BODY

bgColor=3D#ffffff> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>I have recently

encountered an RFP = which has a=20 requirement for Errors and Omission

(E&O) coverage. My = insurance agent=20 informed me that State

Farm does not provide such coverage. She = referred=20 me to another

company that provides E&O coverage for, as I recall, = about=20

$1500. The incredulous part is that she said she told me this = agent

said=20 she could provide coverage for the entire association for

about = the same=20 amount, a negligible per person. If anything

remotely like this = turns out=20 to be true, it is something AAPOR should

look in to.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000

size=3D2></FONT> </DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2>In the meantime, I would appreciate knowing what = other AAPOR=20 members do with respect to this type of insurance. Does anyone = carry=20 E&O or other professional liability insurance? Who offers = it? At=20 what cost? Should AAPOR offer an umbrella policy? Opinion = research=20 is an esoteric enough field that it appears it would be a niche product = not=20 widely offered.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT> </DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2>Any information would be appreciated. If you = respond to=20 me directly I will summarize and report back to AAPORnet.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT> </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Mike O'Neil</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT> </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000=20 size=3D2>=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D= =3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D
Michael = O'Neil,=20 Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, = Arizona=20 85282 USA</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT> </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Reaching me: Best bet, if you = are reading=20 this, is to simply hit <reply>. Some alternatives: = </FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT> </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>602.967.4441 Main Office = Line. Has=20 24 hour voice mail after=20 hours.
          &nb= sp;   &nbs= p; =20 Leave messages with Pamela Gebhart or Michael Proulx during the=20 day.
602.967.6171 Personal Fax. Preferred for reaching me=20 directly.
602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates General Office =

Fax. Use=20 if my personal office fax is busy.
602.741.4680 Mobile

= Phone. =20 Generally used only when I am out of the

office.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>

<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2><A=20

href=3D"mailto:oneil@speedchoice.com">oneil@speedchoice.com</A> &nbs=

p;=20

Personal email. Read nearly every evening.
<A=20

href=3D"mailto:surveys@oneillresearch.com">surveys@oneillresearch.com</A>=

 =20

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

appropriate.
<A =

href=3D"mailto:USAPolls@aol.com">USAPolls@aol.com</A> =20

Read by me when I am travelling. Office staff will forward from <A =

href=3D"mailto:surveys@oneilresearch.com">surveys@oneilresearch.com</A> =

as=20 appropriate.
<A=20

href=3D"http://www.oneilresearch.com">www.oneilresearch.com</A> =

Company web=20 site w/link to company email.</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

------=_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

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,

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 (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@mathmatica-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

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Fri Feb 19 14:59:13 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 OAA19279 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 14:59:12 -0800

(PST)

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

[128.186.197.2])

    by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA87878

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 17:59:11 -0500

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial386.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.33.132])

    by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA74580

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Feb 1999 17:59:09 -0500

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 17:59:09 -0500

Message-Id: <199902192259.RAA74580@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>

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

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

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

Subject: Re: "Challenges of Survey Research in Urban Areas" -- 3/9

 NYAAPOR 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

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,

>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

>

>

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$78d9f0cf@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,

> >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

> >

> >

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> 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

>

>

****

****

Susan H. Pinkus

Los Angeles Times Poll

Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com

American Online: spinkus@aol.com

FAX: 213-237-2505

****

***

>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

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1999 18:05:28 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

> 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 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,

> 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

>RFunk787@aol.com Sat Feb 20 10:20:59 1999

Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id KAA20247 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 20 Feb 1999 10:20:57 -0800

(PST)

From: RFunk787@aol.com

Received: from RFunk787@aol.com

    by imo14.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id TSPIa05517

     for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 20 Feb 1999 13:19:34 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <ed49b9c8.36cefcb6@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 20 Feb 1999 13:19:34 EST

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: FYI re CID

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: PCAO 1.6

2/20/99

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 easy your distress:

Telephone Preference Service

Direct Marketing Association

P.O. Box 9014

Farmingdale, NY 11735-9014

Mail Preference Service

Direct Marketing Association

P.O. Box 9008

Farmingdale, NY 11735-9008

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 . . . naaah,

forget it, bad idea.

Ray Funkhouser

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sun Feb 21 03:57:16 1999

Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.71])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id DAA15269; Sun, 21 Feb 1999 03:57:15 -0800 (PST)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com

Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com

    by imo27.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id OQYAa26290;

    Sun, 21 Feb 1999 06:55:30 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <6b8671a5.36cff432@aol.com>

Date: Sun, 21 Feb 1999 06:55:30 EST

To: jwerner@jwdp.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Re: Re: Update re Caller ID and Phone block

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Mac sub 79

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:

H E A L T H   a n d   B E H A V I O R

I N F O R M A T I O N   T R A N S F E R   (H A B I T)

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

institution, 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 harrassment 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:

http://www.house.gov/science_democrats/releases/99jan11.htm

==> For background information, see HABIT, Dec. 3, 1998:

http://www.cfah.org/alliance/habit1-16.htm

>From ARCCGS@langate.gsu.edu Tue Feb 23 14:33:49 1999

Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (root@sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id OAA28374 for <Aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 23 Feb 1999 14:33:48 -0800

(PST)

Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.175.15])

    by sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.8.8/8.8.8-GSU-MOD-1) with SMTP id RAA17802

    for <Aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 23 Feb 1999 17:33:41 -0500 (EST)

Received: from GSU-Message_Server by langate.gsu.edu

    with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 23 Feb 1999 17:35:07 -0500

Message-Id: <s6d2e6cb.010@langate.gsu.edu>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 17:34:57 -0500

From: "Charlotte G. Steeh" <ARCCGS@langate.gsu.edu>

To: Aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Recording interviews

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I am forwarding the following message for one of my co-workers.

++

Colleagues,

I would like to know your thoughts on using audio recordings of actual =

telephone interviews for interviewer training purposes. Assume that we =

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? =20

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

>From DRouner@vines.colostate.edu Tue Feb 23 17:08:05 1999

Received: from yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU (root@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU

[129.82.100.64])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id RAB27214 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 23 Feb 1999 17:08:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: from vines.colostate.edu (vines.ColoState.EDU [129.82.100.99]) by

thanks, Donna

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

SUBJECT too long. Original SUBJECT is Information Services Positions at

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

--------------------- Original Message Follows ---------------------

>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@mathmatica-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 - - - - - - - - - - - -

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Feb 24 07:44:21 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

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.=20

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 =

counting methods.

"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.

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@uiuc.edu>

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

Subject: Issues of identifying clusters by phone number

Date: Wed, 24 Feb 1999 10:53:31 -0600

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

  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 implict 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

>From tholp@wright.edu Wed Feb 24 10:43:25 1999

Received: from nova.wright.edu (nova.wright.edu [130.108.128.43])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id KAA14126 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Feb 1999 10:43:22 -0800

(PST)

Received: from 83382.cupa.wright.edu (m48601c.cola.wright.edu) by

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 freinds 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.

Tim

> 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

>

Timothy J. Sweet-Holp

Center for Urban and Public Affairs Timothy.Sweet-Holp@Wright.Edu (please

note new e-mail address,

effective 01/01/99)

"Everyone is important, no one is necessary, life goes on" --- Paul Brown

>From featherstonf.rced@gao.gov Wed Feb 24 11:21:57 1999

Received: from viper.gao.gov (viper.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])

    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

    id LAA26935 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Feb 1999 11:21:55 -0800

(PST)

Received: from viper.gao.gov (root@localhost)

    by viper.gao.gov with ESMTP id OAA19000

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Feb 1999 14:19:57 -0500 (EST)

Received: from mailgateway.gao.gov (mailgateway.gao.gov [161.203.15.2])

    by viper.gao.gov with SMTP id OAA18991

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Feb 1999 14:19:56 -0500 (EST)

Received: from ccMail by mailgateway.gao.gov (ccMail Link to SMTP

R8.20.00.25)

    id AA919884188; Wed, 24 Feb 1999 14:23:13 -0500

Message-Id: <9902249198.AA919884188@mailgateway.gao.gov>

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.20.00.25

Date: Wed, 24 Feb 1999 14:18:25 -0500

From: "Fran A Featherston"<featherstonf.rced@gao.gov>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, <feldesmana.rced@gao.gov>

Subject: Intern Opportunity in Survey Research

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

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.

****

>From jaistrup@tiger.fhsu.edu Thu Feb 25 10:00:44 1999

Received: from tiger.fhsu.edu (tiger.fhsu.edu [198.22.249.17])

Position Announcement:

Joint Appointment as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociol= ogy

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 Aff=

airs. Primary responsibilities include conducting research for community and

= regional development efforts and assisting in the Institute?s Center for Survey = Research. Proficiency in social science research methods is essential. The Docki= ng Institute of Public Affairs is a university based research organization= and think tank engaging in research and policy analysis in the Plains and M= idwest regions. The Institute?s Center for Survey Research is very active in = telephone surveying, with 15 CATI stations. Mail surveys and focus groups are al= so commonly conducted by the Institute. For more information about activi= ties of the Docking Institute visit our website at: http://www.fhsu.edu/docking=

The other half of the appointment is a renewable position with the Depa= rtment of Sociology at the rank of assistant professor. The successful candidate= will have a record of, or demonstrated potential for, achieving excellence i= n teaching and research in at least two of the following areas: community= theory & development, rural sociology, demography and research methods. The suc= cessful applicant will also be prepared to teach introductory sociology and sup= ervise student internships. These areas of teaching closely parallel research= and activities of the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. For more inform= ation 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 sprin= g semester. The salary range is in the mid $30,000s, commensurate with e= xperience and education. The appointment begins August 16, 1999. Review of app= lications begins March 29, 1999, and continues until the position is filled. ABD=

considered; Ph.D. in sociology by time of appointment preferred. Pleas= e

submit application materials including letter of interest, vita, and three

let= ters of reference to Dr. Mark Bannister, Search Committee Chair,

Docking Instit= ute of Public Affairs, Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS,

67601. You may d= irect 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 discr=

iminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, national origin, age,

disability, = Vietnam era veteran status or special disabled veteran status

in its programs a= nd activities. Fort Hays State University is an

affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. The director of affirmative

action, coordinator o= f 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

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

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 =

that."

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." =20 Copyright (c) 1999 News World Communications, Inc.

WASHINGTON POST

Hill Republicans Vow Fight on Dual Census

Head Count Dispute Likely to End in Court

By Barbara Vobejda

Washington Post Staff Writer

Thursday, February 25, 1999; Page A02=20

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.

>From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Thu Feb 25 13:05:08 1999

Received: from isp1.isp.net (root@isp1.isp.net [205.216.190.3])

   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

   id NAA21081 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 13:05:07 -0800

(PST)

Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (mail.socialresearch.com

[208.128.218.194]) by mail1.isp.net (8.9.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id NAA00861 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 13:02:06 -0800 (PST)

Message-Id: <199902252102.NAA00861@isp.net>

Received: by RESEARCHNT with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

   id <F2SFP7FQ>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 12:56:45 -0800

From: Kathy Cirksena <KathrynC@socialresearch.com>

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

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>>

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.

Research Services Manager

Communication Sciences Group/

Survey Methods Group

140 Second Street, Suite 400

San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 495-6692 ext. 269

------ =_NextPart_000_01BE6101.59BD832A

Content-Type: application/msword;

   name="Res. Analyst Announcement.doc"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment;

   filename="Res. Analyst Announcement.doc"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAKAAAAAAAA
AA

EAAAKgAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAACcAAAD/////////////////////////////////////

EAAAKgAAAAEAAAD+////

//

//

//

//

//

//

//s

pcEAWQAJBAAAABK/AAAAAAAAEAAAAAAABAAAmA4AAA4AYmpiavNX81cAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAJBBYAIRoAAJE9AQCRPQEAfAoAAAAAAAAbAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAA

AAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAF0AAAAAABIBAAAAAAAAEgEAABIB

AAAAAAAAEgEAAAAAAASAQAAAAAAABIBAAAAAAAAEgEAABQAAAAAAAAAAAAAFYBAAAAAAAAVgEA

AAAAAABWAQAAAAAAAFYBAAA4AAAAjgEAAAwAAACaAQAAHAAAAFYBAAAAAAAAkA0AALYAAADCAQA
A

AAAAAMIBAAAoAAAA6gEAAAAAAADqAQAAAAAAOoBAAAAAAAA6gEAAAAAAADqAQAAAAAAOoBAA
AA

AAAAfQsAAAIAAAB/CwAAAAAAAH8LAAAAAAAAfwsAADAAAACvCwAA1AAAAIMMAADUAAAAVw0AACQ
A

AABGDgAA9AEAADoQAADEAAAAew0AABUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEgEAAAAAAADqAQAAAA
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADqAQAAAAAAOoBAAAAAAAA6gEAAAAAAADqAQAAAAAAHsNAAAAAA
AAA

IgIAAAAAAASAQAAAAAAABIBAAAAAAAA6gEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOoBAAAAAAAAwgEAAAAAAAi

AgAAAAAAACICAAAAAAAAIgIAAAAAADqAQAAHAAAABIBAAAAAAAA6gEAAAAAAASAQAAAAAAAOoB

AAAAAAAAfQsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJgEAABgAAAA+AQAAGAAAABIBAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAfQsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJgEAABgAAAA+EgEA

AAAAAAASAQAAAAAAABIBAAAAAAAA6gEAAAAAAAB9CwAAAAAAACICAABaBQAAIgIAAAAAAAB8BwAA

/gAAAHIKAADzAAAAEgEAAAAAAAASAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAfQsAAAAAAADqAQAAAAAAALYBAAAMAAAAYH8QHf
9g

vgFWAQAAAAAAFYBAAAAAAAABgIAABwAAABlCwAAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAU
kVT

RUFSQ0ggQU5BTFlTVC9QUk9KRUNUIE1STkFHRVINDQ1BIGdyb3dpbmcgc3VydmV5IHJlc2VhcmNo

IGNvbXBhbnkgaXMgc2Vla2luZyBhIHJlc2VhcmNoIHByb2Zlc3Npb25hbCB0byBwcm92ZXJmb3JtIGEg

cmFuZ2Ugb2YgYW5hbHl0aWMgYW5kIHByb2plY3RtYW5hZ2VtZW50IHRhc2tzIGJvbiBzb2NpYWwg

cmVzZWFyY2ggYW5kIGhlYWx0aCBwcm9tb3Rpb24gcHJvamVjdHMuICBMb2NhdGVkIGluIGRvd250

b3duIFNhbiBGcmFuY2lzY28sIENvbW11bmljYXRpb24gU2NpZW5jZXMgR3JvdXAgaGFzIGEgbmF0

aW9uYWwgcmVwdXRhdGlvbiBmb3IgZGVzaWduaW5nLCBjb25kdWN0aW5nLCBhbmFseXppbmc

IG1ldGhvZG9sb2dpY2FsbHkgcmlnb3JvdXMgc3R1ZGllcyBvbiBzb2NpYWwgYW5laGlyYWx0aC1y

ZWxhdGVkIHRvcGljcy4gDQ0NUmVzcG9uc2liaWxpdGllcy4gICANDURldmVsb3BzIHN1cnZlSBy

ZXNlYXJjaCBpbnN0cnVtZW50cyBmb3IgdXNlIGluIGNvbmR1Y3RpbmcgY29tcHV0ZXItYXNzaXN0

ZWQgdGVsZXBob25lIGludGVydmlld3MgZGlyZWN0ZWQgdG93YXJkIHRoZSBkZXNpZ24gYW5kL29y

IGV2YWx1YXRpb24gb2YgaGVhbHRoIHByb21vdGlvbiBhbmQgc29jaWFsIG1hcmtldGluZyBjYW1w

YWlnbnMuDQ1EZXZlbG9wcyBzaW1wbGUgc2FtcGxlIHBsYW5zIGFuZCB3b3JrcyB3aXRoIHRoZSBS

ZXNlYXJjaCBTZXJ2aWNlcyBNYW5hZ2VyIG9yIGNvbh9zdWx0YW50cyBvbiBjb21wbGV4IHNhbXBs

ZSBwbGFucy4NDVBlcmZvcm1zIHN0YXRpc3RpY2FsIGFuYWx5c2VzIHVzaW5nIFNQU1MgYW5kIHdy

aXRlcyByZXBvcnRzIHRvIHByZXNlbnQgdGhlIHN0dWRpZXOSIGZpbmRpbmdzIHRvIGNsaWVudHMu

LiAgUGFydGljaXBhdGVzIGluIG1ha2luZyBwcmVzZW50YXRpb25zIHRvIGNsaWVudHMuDQ1QcmVw

YXJlcyBhIGxpc3Qgb2Ygd29yayBwcm9kdWN0cyB0aGF0IHNob3VsZCBiZSBkZXZlbHZlZWQgdG8g

dGhlIGNsaWVudCBkdXJpbmcgdGhlIGNvdXJzZSBvZiBhbmQgYXQgdGhlIGNvbXBsZXRpb24gb2Yg

dGhlIHN0dWR5LiAgTWFpbnRhaW5zIEgdGltZWxpbmUgZm9yIGNvbXBsZXRpbmcgZWFjaCBvZiB0

aGUgdGFza3MgaW52b2x2ZWQgaW4gdGhlIHN0dWR5IA0NRGV0ZXJtaW5lcyB0aGUgc3RhZmYgZnVu

Y3Rpb25zIHRoYXQgd2lsbCBiZSBuZWVkZWQgb24gdGhlIHByb2plY3QgdGVhbS4gIENvbnZlbnMg

IGFuZCBsZWFkcyBwcm9qZWN0IHN0YXJ0LXVwIGFuZCBjbG9zZS1vdXQgbWVldGluZ3MgZ2l0aCB0

aGUgcHJvamVjdCB0ZWFtLiAgQXMgbmVlZGVkLCBkZXZlbG9wcyBhbmQgaW1wbGVtZW50cyByZWMf

b21tZW5kYXRpb25zIGZvciBpbXByb3ZpbmcgcGVyZm9ybWFuY2Ugb24gZnV0dXJlIHN0dWRpZXMu

ICANDU92ZXJzZWVzIHRoZSB3b3JrIG9mIHN1YmNvbnRyYWN0b3JzLCBwYXJ0aWN1bGFybHkgZGF0

YS1jb2xsZWN0aW9uIGNvbXBhbmllcy4NDUludGVyYWN0cyB3aXRoIGNsaWVudHMgd2hpbGUgc3R1

ZGllcyBhcmUgaW4gdGhlIGZpZWxkLiAgDQ1QYXJ0aWNpcGF0ZXMgaW4gZGVzaWduaW5nIHN0dWRp

ZXMgYW5lIHdyaXRpbmcgcHJvcG9zYWxzLg0RGV2ZWxvcHMgYmlkcywgbm5vb3RpYXRlcyBmaW5h

bCBidWRnZXRzLCBhbmQgd3JpdGVzIHVwIGNvbnRyYWN0cyBmb3IgY29uZHVjdGluZyBwcm9qZWN0

cy4NDU1SZXF1aXJlbWVudHMuDQ1BIGZpcnQgY29tbVl0bWVudCB0byBleGNlbGxlbmNlIGluIGFs

bCB3b3JrLg0NQSBnb29kIHVuZGVyc3RhbmRpbmcgb2Ygc3VydmV5IHJlc2VhcmNoIG1ldGhvZG9s

b2d5LiAgDQ1BYmlsaXR5IHRvIGNvbW11bmljYXRlIGNsZWFybHksIGJvdGggb3JhbGx5IGFuZCBp

biB3cml0aW5nLCB3aXRoIGNsaWVudHMgYW5kIGNvbGxlYWd1ZXMuDQ1BIG1hc3RlcidzIGRlZ3Jl

ZSBpbiBoZWFsdGggY29tbXVuaWNhdGlvbiwgc29jaW9sb2d5LCBwdWJsaWMgaGVhbHRoLCBvciBh

IHJlbGF0ZWQgZmllbGQgaXMgcHJlZmVycmVkLg0UHJvZmljaWVuY3kgaW4gTWljcm9zb2Z0IFdv

cmQsIE1pY3Jvc29mdCBFeGNlbCwgYW5kIFNU1MuDQ1BdCBsZWFzdCB0d28geWVhcnMgb2YgZXhw

ZXJpZW5jZSBkZXNpZ25pbmcsIGNvbmR1Y3RpbmcsIGFuZCByZXBvcnRpbmcgb24gYXBwbGllZCBz

dXJ2ZXkgcmVzZWFyY2gsIGluY2x1ZGluZyB0aGUgYW5hbHlzaXMgb2YgcXVhbnRpdGF0aXZlIGRh

dGEgdXNpbmcgU1BTUyBvciBhIHNpbWlsYXIgYXBhY2thZ2UuIA0QWJpbGl0

eSB0byB3b3JrIGVmZmVjdGl2ZWx5IG9uIG11bHRpcGxlIHByb2plY3RzIGluIGEgZmFzdC1wYWNl

ZCwgcmFwaWRseSBjaGFuZ2luZyB3b3JrIGVudmlyb25tZW50L4NRnVsbHktdGltZW50Lg0RnVs

bC10aW1lIGVtcGxveW1lbnQgYXZhaWxhYmllIGltbWVkaWF0ZWx5Lg0NQ29tcGVuc2F0aW9uOiAg

JDQ3LDAwMC01MiwwMDAveWVhciB3aXRoIGdvb2QgYmVuZWZpdHMuDQ1TZW5lIHJlc3VtZSBhbmcg

Y292ZXIgbGV0dGVyIHByZXNlbnRpbmcgcXVhbGlmaWNhdGlvbnMsIGNhcmVlciBnb2FscywgYW5k

IHNhbGFyeSBoaXN0b3J5IHRvIERyLiBLYXRocnluIENpcmtzZW5hLiAgS1tYWlsOiBrYXRocnlu

Y0Bzb2NpYWxyZXNlYXJjaC5jb20gICBGYXg6ICg0MTUpIDk1NS04MTg1LiAgUHJpbmNpcGFscyBv

bmx5LiAgRGVhZGxpbmUgZm9yIGFwcGxpY2F0aW9uIGlzIFR1ZXNkYXkgTWFyY2ggOSwgMTk5OS4N

IA0TUEFHRSAgFDIVDQ0NE1BBR0UgIBQyFQ0NDQ0NAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAACAEA
AAh

BAAAIwQAAKQFAAC0BQAAfQoAAIkKAAAUDQAAHg0AAHwOAAB9DgAAgw4AAIQOAACFDgAAhg4AAIcO

AACJDgAAig4AAJAOAACRDgAAkg4AAJMOAACUDgAAlw4AAJgOAAD7+Pv4+/j7+Pv48e7x6fHu

AACJDgAAig4AAJAOAACRDgAAkg4AAJMOAACUDgAAlw4AAJgOAAD7+Pv4+APHu

8enx7gD4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAgwShAAbUgABAAEMEoQAAANA2oAAAAAMEoQAFUIAQRDShYAAAc1CIFDShYAABkABAAAIQQAACIE

AAAjBAAAogUAAKMFAACkBQAAuQUAALoFAAB9BgAAfgYAAPEGAADyBgAAjgcAAI8HAABeCAAAXwgA

AF4JAABfCQAArAkAAK0JAADmCQAA5wkAACAKAAAhCgAAewoAAHwKAAD8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+gAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD6AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD6AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAD6AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOoA

7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADvAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAA+gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA5QAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAA+APoA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAADvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAUAAAomA
AtG

BAAFAAAKJgALRgYABQAACiYAC0YBAAAFAAAPhGgBEYSY/gABAAADAAADJAEAGgAEAAAhBAAAIgQA

ACMEAACiBQAAowUAAKQFAAC5BQAAugUAAH0GAAB+BgAA8QYAAPIGAACOBwAAjwcAAF4IAABf

ACMEAACiBQAAowUAAKQFAAC5BQAAugUAAH0GAAB+CAAA

XgkAAF8JAACsCQAArQkAAOYJAADnCQAAIAoAACEKAAB7CgAAfAoAAH0KAACLCgAAjAoAALkKAAC6

CgAA8QoAAPIKAABLCwAATAsAALILAACzCwAA7QsAAO4LAACrDAAArAwAABINAAATDQAAFA0AACAN

AAAhDQAATQ0AAE4NAACFDQAAhg0AAHoOAAB8DgAAhA4AAIUOAACJDgAAlA4AAJUOAACWDgAAlw4A

AJgOAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPwA9gDwAO0A5wDhANsA2ADSAAAA0MrQxNC+ALvQuNCy0KwAAAAAqQCm

AJgOAAAAAAAAAAAAAPwA9gDwAO0A5wDhANsA2ADSAAAA0MrQxNC+AAAA

pKSkop+dpAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAg0BAAUCDwANAQMCDwACAQEABQgJAAkBBQgIAAkBCggBAAkB

pKSkop+CgsA

AAAACggBAAkBCgoAAAAABQgFAAkBBBQgCAAkBCggBAAkBCgkAAAAACggBAAkBCggAAAAACggBAAkB

CgcAAAAAAgcMAAoIAQAJAQoGAAAAAAUIBAAJAQoIAQAJAQoFAAAAAoIAQAJAQoEAAAAAoIAQAJ

AQoDAAAAAAUIBgAJAQoIAQAJAQoCAAAAAoIAQAJAQoBAAAAAUIAQAJAQA8fAoAAH0KAACLCgAA

jAoAALkKAAC6CgAA8QoAAPIKAABLCwAATAsAALILAACzCwAA7QsAAO4LAACrDAAArAwAABINAAAT

DQAAFA0AACANAAAhDQAATQ0AAE4NAACFDQAAhg0AAHoOAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAAA

AAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAADvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0

AAAAAAAAAAAAA7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAADqAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAOUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAA

AADvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/Q

AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAOAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA2wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABQAACiYAC0YJAAUAAAomAAtGCAAFAAAKJgALRgUA

BQAACiYAC0YCAAUAAAomAAtGAQAJAAAKJgwLRgAD4RoARGEmP4AAQAAABl6DgAAfA4AAIcOAACI

DgAAiQ4AAJQOAACVDgAAVDgAAlg4AAJcOAACYDgAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAADyAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAADyAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEPAAAIDwAbJmAjJAIYhPz/GYQBAAABAAAACR8AFDAMH7DQLyCw4D0h

sAgHIrCgBSOQoAUkkKAFJbAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEgASAAoAAQBbAA8AAg
AA

AAAAAAAkAABA8f8CACQAAAAGAE4AbwByAG0AYQBsAAAAAgAAAQAbUgJBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAADwAQUDy/6EAPAAAABYARABlAGYAYQB1AGwAdAAgAFAAYQByAGEAZwByAGEAcABoACAARgBv
AG4AdAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAsACBAAQDyACwAAAAGAEYAbwBvAHQAZQByAAAADQAPAA3GCAAC4B
DA

IQECAAAAJgApQKIAAQEmAAAACwBQAGEAZwBlACAATgB1AG0AYgBlAHIAAAAAACgAVUCiABEBKAAA
AAkASAB5AHAAZQByAGwAaQBuAGsAAAAGAD4qAUIqAgAAACYCgAABAAAGgAAAD/////AgAAAQg
//8BAAAAAACIP//AgAAAAAAAAAAO0HAACYCgAAAAABAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADQAAABoAAAAaAAAAGgAAAB0AAAAABAAAmA4AAAgAAAAABA
AA

fAoAAHoOAACYDgAACQAAAAsAAAAMAAAAAQAAJgOAAAKAAAAAAAAAcAAAAJAAAADQAAABQAAA
AW

AAAAHQAAABMhFP+VgBMhFP+VgAAAAAB0CgAAeAoAAHwKAACZCgAABwAEAAcABwAAAAARwoA

AAAAHQAAABMhFP+VgBMhFP+AHkK

AAB8CgAAmQoAAAcABAAHAAcA//8UAAAABABFAHIAaQBjAD8AQwA6AFwAVwBJAE4ARABPAFcAUwBc

AFQARQBNAFAAXABBAHUAdABvAFIAZQBjAG8AdgBlAHIAeQAgAHMAYQB2AGUAIABvAGYAIABSAGUA

cwBlAGEAcgBjAGgAIABBBAG4AYQBsAHkAcwB0ACAARgBsAGkAZQByAC4AYQBzAGQAABFAHIAaQBj

AEwAQwA6AFwATQB5ACAARABvAGMAdQBtAGUAbgB0AHMAXABTAGUAYQByAGMAaAAgAFAAcgBvAG

MA

ZQBzAHMAZQBzAFwAUgBlAHMAZQBhAHIAYwBoACAAQQBuAGEAbAB5AHMAdABcAFIAZQBzAGUAYQBy

AGMAaAAgAEEAbgBhAGwAeQBzAHQAIABGAGwAaQBlAHIALgBkAG8AYwAEAEUAcgBpAGMATABDADoA

XABNAHkAIABEAG8AYwB1AG0AZQBuAHQAcwBcAFMAZQBhAHIAYwBoACAAUAByAG8AYwBlAHMAcwBl

AHMAXABSAGUAcwBlAGEAcgBjAGgAIABBBAG4AYQBsAHkAcwB0AFwAUgBlAHMAZQBhAHIAYwBoACAA

QQBuAGEAbAB5AHMAdAAgAEYAbABpAGUAcgAuAGQAbwBjAAQARQByAGkAYwA/AEMAOgBcAFcASQBO

AEQATwBXAFMAXABUAEUATQBQAFwAQQB1AHQAbwBSAGUAYwBvAHYAZQByAHkAIABzAGEAdgBlACAA

bwBmACAAUgBlAHMAZQBhAHIAYwBoACAAQQBuAGEAbAB5AHMAdAAgAEYAbABpAGUAcgAuAGEAcwB

k

AAQARQByAGkAYwBMAEMAOgBcAE0AeQAgAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBlAG4AdABzAFwAUwBlAGEAcgBjAGgA

IABQAHIAbwBjAGUAcwBzAGUAcwBcAFIAZQBzAGUAYQByAGMAaAAgAEEAbgBhAGwAeQBzAHQAXABS

AGUAcwBlAGEAcgBjAGgAIABBBAG4AYQBsAHkAcwB0ACAARgBsAGkAZQByAC4AZABvAGMABABFAHIA

aQBjAEwAQwA6AFwATQB5ACAARABvAGMAdQBtAGUAbgB0AHMAXABTAGUAYQByAGMAaAAgAFAAcgB

v

AGMAZQBzAHMAZQBzAFwAUgBlAHMAZQBhAHIAYwBoACAAQQBuAGEAbAB5AHMAdABcAFIAZQBzAGU

A

YQByAGMAaAAgAEEAbgBhAGwAeQBzAHQAIABGAGwAaQBlAHIALgBkAG8AYwAEAEUAcgBpAGMAHQBB

ADoAXABSAGUAcwBlAGEAcgBjAGgAIABBBAG4AYQBsAHkAcwB0ACAARgBsAGkAZQByAC4AZABvAGMA

BABFAHIAaQBjAB0AQQA6AFwAUgBlAHMAZQBhAHIAYwBoACAAQQBuAGEAbAB5AHMAdAAgAEYAbABp

AGUAcgAuAGQAbwBjAAQARQByAGkAYwBMAEMAOgBcAE0AeQAgAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBlAG4AdABzAFwA

UwBlAGEAcgBjAGgAIABQAHIAbwBjAGUAcwBzAGUAcwBcAFIAZQBzAGUAYQByAGMAaAAgAEEAbgBh

AGwAeQBzAHQAXABSAGUAcwBlAGEAcgBjAGgAIABBBAG4AYQBsAHkAcwB0ACAARgBsAGkAZQByAC4A

ZABvAGMADgBLAGEAdABoAHkAIABDAGkAcgBpAHMAZQBuAGEAMABDADoAXABNAHkAIABEAG8AYwB1

AG0AZQBuAHQAcwBcAHMAdABhAGYAZgBcAFIAZQBzAGUAYQByAGMAaAAgAEEAbgBhAGwAeQBzAHQA

IABGAGwAaQBlAHIALgBkAG8AYwAJAP7//////w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8PAQB2MJ0TAQAJ

BP8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAVXauIAEACQT/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAJt0MygBAAkE

/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQCRUA02AQAJBP8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAfy2xNwEACQT/

DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABACZDOEEBAAkE/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQA4J3JZAQAJBP8P

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAvjDLZwEACQT/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABACoAAQAAABcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACxAAAA+EaAERhJj+

FcYFAAFoAQZPSgEAUUoBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAAFwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALEAAAD4RoARGE

mP4VxgUAAWgBBk9KAQBRSgEAbygAAQC38AEAAAAXAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAsQAAAPhGgB

EYSY/hXGBQABaAEGT0oBAFFKAQBvKAABALfwAQAAABcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACxAAAA+E

aAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQZPSgEAUUoBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAAFwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAL

aAERhJj+EAAA

D4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBk9KAQBRSgEAbygAAQC38AEAAAXAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAsQ

AAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGT0oBAFFKAQBvKAABALfwAQAAABcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

CxAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQZPSgEAUUoBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAAFwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

CxAAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAA

AAALEAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBk9KAQBRSgEAbygAAQC38AkAAAD+////AAAAAIjCdAAB

AAALEAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBk9KAQBRSgEAbygAAQC38AkAAAD+AAAA

fy2xNwAAAAAAAAAAAAAFV2riAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4J3JZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJkM4QQAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAHYwnRMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAC+MMtnAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAm3QzKAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAHYwnRMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAC+AJFQ

DTYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD/////lMJ0ACAAAAABAAAAF0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgBAAALCAAAD4Ro

ARGEmP5PSgEAUUoBAG8oAAEAt/D//CQAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP9ATUdNVF9RAFxcU3VydmV5XG1nbXRfcQBIUFBBDTDVNUwBIUCBM

YXNlckpldCBJSUkkATUdNVF9RAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAEElABAAANnAAQB

AAEAAAAAAAAAQABACwBAQABACwBAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAQABNU1VECANI
NI

UCBMYXNlckpldCBJSUkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABkAAoAAABNR01U

X1EAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAQSUAEAAA2cABAEAAQAAAAAAAAABAAEALAEB

AAEALAECAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQBAAE1TVUQIA0hQIExhc2VySmV0IElJSQAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGQACgAAAGAAQB4CgAAeAoAAPC0dAABAAEA

eAoAAAIAAABjCgAAAAAAAAIQAAAAAAAAAJgKAABAAAAIAEAAAMAAABHFpABAAACAgYDBQQFAgME

AwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAVABpAG0AZQBzACAATgBlAHcAIABSAG8AbQBhAG4AAAA1

FpABAgAFBQECAQcGAgUHAAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAIAAAAAUwB5AG0AYgBvAGwAAAAzJpAB

AAACCwYEAgICAgIEAwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAQQByAGkAYQBsAAAAIgAEAPEIiBgA

ANACAABoAQAAAACuGzJmKMsyhqvsMaYDAAEAAACEAQAApQgAAAIABAAAAAQAgxASAAAAAAAAAAA

AAACAAEAAAABAAAAAAAACQDAAAAhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKUGwAe0ALQA

gAByMAAAEAAZAGQAAAAZAAAAnQoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAGMKAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAAPAL//xIAAAAAAAALQBbAFMARQBBAFIA

QwBIACAAUABSAE8AQwBFAFMAUwBFAFMAXABEAEEAEEAVABBACAATQBBAE4AQQBHBHAEUATQBFAE4AVAAg

AFMAUABFAEMASQBBAEwASQBTAFQAXQAAAAAAAAAAAAASAFAAcgBlAGYAZQByAHIAZQBkACAAQwB1AHMA

dABvAG0AZQByAA4ASwBhAHQAQAaAB5ACAAQwBpAHIAawBzAGUAbgBhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/v8AAAQKAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA

AQAAAOCFn/L5T2gQqq5EIACsns9kwAAAuAEAABIAAAABAAAAmAAAAIAAACgAAAAwAAANgAAAAE

AAAA5AAAAAUAAAAAAQAABgAAAwBAAAHAAAAGAEAAAgAAAAoAQAACQAAAEABAAASAAAATAEAAA
oA

AABoAQAACwAAAHQBAAAMAAAAgAEAAA0AAACMAQAADgAAAJgBAAAPAAAAoAEAABAAAACoAQAAEw
AA

ALABAAACAAAA5AQAAB4AAAAuAAAAW1NFQVJJDSCBQUk9DRVNTRVNcREFUQSBNQU5BR0VNRU5UIFN
Q

RUNJQUxJU1RdAC4wHgAAAEAAAAAU0VBHgAAABMAAABQcmVmZXJyZWQgQ3VzdG9tZXIAQR4AAAAB

AAAAAHJlZh4AAAABAAAAAHJlZh4AAAAHAAAATm9ybWFsAGUeAAAADwAAAEthdGh5IENpcmmtzZW5h

AG0eAAAAgAAADMAdGgeAAAAEwAAAE1pY3Jvc29mdCBXb3JkIDguMABBQAAAAABGwyMAAAAAQAA
A

AADS9j/6S74BQAAAAADEP/jGT74BQAAAAADQOQP/YL4BAwAAAAIAAAADAAAAhAEAAAMAAACICAAA

AwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP7/AAAECgIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIAAAAC1c3V

nC4bEJOXCAArLPmuRAAAAAXVzdWcLhsQk5cIACss+a5sAQAAKAEAAA0AAAABAAAAcAAAAA8A

nC4bEJOXCAArLPmuRAAAAAXVzdWcLhsQk5cIACss+AAB4

AAAABAAAAIgAAAFAAAAkAAAAAYAAACYAAAAEQAAAKAAAAAXAAAAqAAAAAsAAACwAAAAEAAAALgA

AAATAAAAwAAAABYAAADIAAAADQAAANAAAAAMAAAACgEAAAIAAADkBAAAHgAAAgAAABDU0cvU01
H

AAMAAAAAOgAAAwAAABIAAAADAAAABAAAAAMAAACdCgAAAwAAAOgQCAALAAAAAAAAAsAAAAAA
AAA

CwAAAAAAAALAAAAAAAAB4QAAABAAAALgAAAFtTRUFSUFSQ0ggUFJPQ0VTU1VTXERBVEEgTUFOQUdF

TUVOVCBTUEVDSUFMSVNUXQAMEAAAAgAAAB4AAAAGAAAAVGl0bGUAAwAAAEAAACYAAAAAwAAAA
AA

AAAgAAAAAQAAADYAAAACAAAAPgAAAAEAAAACAAAACgAAACgAAAF9QSURfR1VJRAAACAAAA5AQAAEEAAABO

AAAAewAyADMAMwBBAEEAMQA2ADAALQA5AEYAMABBBAC0AMQAxAEQAMgAtADgAOQAzADcALQAwA
DAA

MgAwAEEARgBCAEMAMARABFAEMAOQB9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAAgAAAAMAAAAEAAAABQAAAAYAAAAHAAAACAAAAAkAAAAKAA
AA

CwAAAAwAAAANAAAA/v///w8AAAAQAAAAEQAAABIAAAATAAAAFAAAABUAAAAWAAAA/v///xgAAAAZ

AAAAGgAAABsAAAAcAAAAHQAAAB4AAAD+////IAAAACEAAAAiAAAAIwAAACQAAAAlAAAAJgAA

AAAAGgAAABsAAAAcAAAAHQAAAB4AAAD+AP7/

///9////KQAAAP7////+/////v//

//

//

//

//

//

///////////////////1IAbwBvAHQAIABFAG4AdAByAHkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAWAAUB//////////8DAAAABgkCAAAAAADAAAAAAAARgAA

AAAAnDpUnFC+ASCnGR3/YL4BKwAAAIAAAAAAAAAMQBUAGEAYgBsAGUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAnDpUnFC+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4AAgD////////////8AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOAAAA/hAAAAAAAABXAG8AcgBkAEQAbw
Bj

AHUAbQBlAG4AdAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgACAQUUA

AAD//////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAhGgAAAAAA

AAUAUwB1AG0AbQBhAHIAeQBJAG4AZgBvAHIAbQBhAHQAaQBvAG4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAoAAIBAgAAAAQAAAD/////AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAFwAAAAQAAAAAAAABQBEAG8AYwB1AG0AZQBuAHQAUwB1AG0AbQBhAHIAeQBJAG4AZgBvAHIA

bQBhAHQAaQBvAG4AAAAAAAAAAAAADgAAgH//////////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAfAAAAABAAAAAAAAABAEMAbwBtAHAATwBiAGoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEgACAQEAAAAGAAAA/////wAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABqAAAAAAAAE8AYgBqAGUAYwB0AFAAA

bwBvAGwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAWAAEA/////

///////////AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgpxkd/2C+ASCnGR3/YL4BAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//////////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA/v//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

////////////////wEA/v8DCgAA/////wYJAgAAAAAwAAAAAAEYYAAATWljcm9zb2Z0IFdv

cmQgRG9jdW1lbnQACgAAE1TV29yZERvYwAQAAAAV29yZC5Eb2N1bWVudC44APQ5snEAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

------ =_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>;

Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:11:32 -0600 (CST)

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

(PST)

Received: from [38.223.226.2] (helo=talmey-drake.com)

   by relay1.smtp.psi.net with esmtp (Exim 1.90 #1)

   for aapornet@usc.edu

   id 10G9zO-0004wj-00; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 18:14:42 -0500

Received: from TDRS_MAIN/SpoolDir by talmey-drake.com (Mercury 1.40);

  25 Feb 99 16:14:40 -0700

Received: from SpoolDir by TDRS_MAIN (Mercury 1.40); 25 Feb 99 16:14:22

-0700

Received: from talmey.talmey-drake.com (38.223.226.8) by talmey-drake.com

(Mercury 1.40);

  25 Feb 99 16:14:16 -0700

From: talmey@talmey-drake.com

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 16:12:13 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: Professoinal Opportunity

X-pmrqc: 1

In-reply-to: <3.0.2.32.19990225144953.00685e84@popmail.mcs.net>

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

Message-ID: <44BFCE47CC@talmey-drake.com>

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 esmtp (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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 16:28:38 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: Professoinal Opportunity

X-pmrqc: 1

In-reply-to: <3.0.2.32.19990225144953.00685e84@popmail.mcs.net>

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

Message-ID: <45057D1247@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.

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: Professoinal 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 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

>

>

>

>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 rday@mcs.net Thu Feb 25 15:57:13 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 PAA28155 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Feb 1999 15:56:55 -0800

(PST)

Received: from gopher (P29-Chi-Dial-10.pool.mcs.net [205.253.226.93]) by

Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id RAA01359 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 25 Feb 1999 17:56:51 -0600 (CST)

Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990225173513.006ffa60@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 17:35:13 -0600

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>

Subject: Re: Professoinal Opportunity

In-Reply-To: <45057D1247@talmey-drake.com>

References: <3.0.2.32.19990225144953.00685e84@popmail.mcs.net>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

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 lutfisk) 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: Professoinal 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 unwighted 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 evelope" 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 reproducable.

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 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

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

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 implementsurvey 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 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 statistic

    al 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 unwighted 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 evelope"

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

reproducable.

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 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 titile?)

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: Professoinal 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 [198.81.17.66])

    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 "Professoinal 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

(PST)

Received: from server1.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id ac16381;

    28 Feb 99 22:05 EST

Received: from bam8v95.virginia.edu (Dialin2218.cstone.net

[205.139.233.218])

   by server1.mail.virginia.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id WAA13427;

   Sun, 28 Feb 1999 22:05:54 -0500 (EST)

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@server1.mail.virginia.edu>

To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>

Cc: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re:name that quote

In-Reply-To: <002801be62b2$6c21ae80$78d9f0cf@phx35035>

Message-ID: <SIMEON.9902282220.B@bam8v95.virginia.edu>

Date: Sun, 28 Feb 1999 22:04:20 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)

X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)

X-Authentication: IMSP

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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 titile?)

>

> 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: Professoinal 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

> >>

> >>

> >

> >

>

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