===

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

Sender: AAPORnet American Association for Public Opinion Research

        <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: January 1999 archive - one BIG message

This is the USC listproc archive of aapornet messages for this entire

month. It is one big message, just the way the USC archive stored it.

You can search within this month with your browser's search function.

Turning this into individual messages that Listserv can index and sort

means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits. Meanwhile,

the search function works, so we have as much functionality as before. New

messages are of course automatically formatted correctly--See August &

September 2002.

Some of the early months have been completed. Take a look at them for an

idea of how AAPORNET got started. (Thanks, Jim!)

Shap Wolf

shap.wolf@asu.edu

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9901.

Part 1/1, total size 199495 bytes:

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

>From acep@sprintmail.com Fri Jan 1 18:26:17 1999

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

[209.178.63.7])

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

    id SAA12758 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Jan 1999 18:26:16 -0800 (PST)

Received: from a.parker (1Cust128.tnt5.tco2.da.uu.net [153.35.91.128])

    by crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA16231

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Jan 1999 18:26:14 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <001301be35f7$7f0b6500$d7032599@a.parker>

From: "Albert Parker" <acep@sprintmail.com>

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

Subject: Census Sampling and New Speaker

Date: Fri, 1 Jan 1999 21:27:01 -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

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

AAPOR might have gained an important supporter of its position on Census

sampling

estimation. The latest estimates reported in the Washington Post today are

that

Illinois will just barely miss losing a seat in the 2000 reapportionment.

Thus,

Illinois might be one of the states that would benefit from any procedure that

would

adjust for the presumed differential undercount; a severe undercount among, say,

blacks and Hispanics in Chicago could still cost the state a seat. If the Democrats

have control of at least one house of the Illinois legislature and a chance to keep

it in the 2000 elections (I believe at least the former to be the case; but I do not

have the information readily at hand, partisan composition of state legislatures not

being widely reported), perhaps the Clinton administration would even leave the count

alone in Illinois, since such situations usually result in a status quo,

incumbent-protection redistricting. Since the new speaker is from Illinois, he might

be susceptible to supporting some kind of post-enumeration adjustment. Of course,

besides his political obligations to his state and its delegation, he also has

obligations to the entire Republican House caucus. Their fears/suspicions about what

the Clintonites would do with "adjustment" might override state advantage. But the

situation is better for AAPOR than having a Georgian speaker, since Georgia might

gain a seat regardless of whether the enumeration is adjusted, and Gingrich was,

perhaps, less attuned to strictly state interests than Hastert.

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

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1999 08:40:20 -0500

From: Larry Cohen <lcohen@sric.sarnoff.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

To: Survey Researchers <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Great Employment Opportunities

Dear friends, colleagues and acquaintances;

The Consumer Financial Decisions (CFD) group of has two research openings in
its
Princeton, NJ office, located at the Sarnoff Corporation. CFD is part of SRI
Consulting, a spin-off of SRI International, formerly known as The Stanford
Research
Institute.

The positions involve developing, researching, writing, and presenting
analysis of
consumer financial data; responding to client requests for technical and
business
information; handling multiple and varied tasks; meeting deadlines and working
without direct supervision. Frequent interaction with senior level
researcher/consultants and corporate managers. Excellent writing and strong
interpersonal skills are essential.

Experience with data sets, cross tabs, financial market research, consumer
financial
services, economics, macroeconomics, SAS or SPSS, and other word processing,
spreadsheet, graphics software. B.A./B.S. and/or applicable industry
experience.

Work involves frequent interactions with the leading financial services
companies

(Banks, S&Ls, Credit Unions, Insurance Companies, Mutual Funds, and

Brokerages) as

well as industry associations, government agencies, and universities.

Salary is market competitive depending on experience. Includes complete

benefits

package. There is some travel, but not much. Friendly, creative working

environment

with flexibility.

DO NOT RESPOND TO AAPORNET

Please send resume and any other information you deem appropriate to:

Larry Cohen

Director, CFD

SRI Consulting

201 Washington Road

Princeton, NJ 08543

(609) 734-2048 Tel

(609) 734-2094 Fax

lcohen@sric.sarnoff.com http://future.sri.com/cfd/cfd.index.html

>From Mark@bisconti.com Mon Jan 4 13:26:33 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 NAA20519 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 13:26:32 -0800 (PST)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000382868@medusa.nei.org> for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 04 Jan 1999 16:24:21 -0500

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange

Internet Mail

Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

    id Y8M0BLWL; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 16:28:44 -0500

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

    id <01BE37FD.BE005920@mark-bri>; Mon, 4 Jan 1999 16:17:36 -0500

Message-Id: <01BE37FD.BE005920@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Wash. Post article on census

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1999 16:17:28 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

=_NextPart_000_01BE37FD.BE005920"

------ =_NextPart_000_01BE37FD.BE005920

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

FYI--Article referred to by Albert Parker:

Washington Post, Jan. 1, 1999: "For Growing Sun Belt, More Political = Muscle"

(After

census and reapportionment, 3 states could elect 25% of = the house.) Full

article

at:

http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/01/134l-010199-idx=

.html

=20

Mark Richards

------ =_NextPart_000_01BE37FD.BE005920

Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="FORGRO~1.URL"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

W0ludGVybmV0U2hvcnRjdXRdDQpVUkw9aHR0cDovL3NlYXJjaC53YXNoaW5ndG9ucG9zdC5jb20v

d3Atc3J2L1dQbGF0ZS8xOTk5LTAxLzAxLzEzNGwtMDEwMTk5LWlkeC5odG1sDQo=

------ =_NextPart_000_01BE37FD.BE005920--

>From dhenwood@panix.com Tue Jan 5 09:07:29 1999

Received: from mail2.panix.com (mail2.panix.com [166.84.0.213])

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

    id JAA07386 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 09:07:28 -0800 (PST)

Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])

    by mail2.panix.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/PanixM1.3) with ESMTP id MAA14815

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Jan 1999 12:07:26 -0500 (EST)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com

Message-Id: <v0401170bb2b7a1d4d449@[166.84.250.86]>

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 12:07:17 +0100

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>

Subject: lying to pollsters

I just happened to be reading the extremely disreputable tabloid, Weekly World

News

(it's not on my regular reading list, I swear!), and there's this little item

in it:

"LOS ANGELES - Shocking new research proves it beyond a shadow of a doubt:

Eight out

of 10 Americans lie to pollsters regardless of the question asked. 'This makes

all

polls suspect - even our own,' said the head of a top market survey firm."

Anyone have any idea what this is all about?

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 Mark@bisconti.com Tue Jan 5 11:45:37 1999

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

Wonder how they defined lie ("Have you ever taken a position on a = subject

when you

really hadn't firmly made up your mind or when you = weren't sure?")... =20

If one has lied to a pollster, is one fit to serve in elected office?! = (And

are

there exceptions, such as International Trade Negotiator, where = bluffing

skills are

highly desirable?!)

RE: Random thoughts on AGENDA SETTING

As far as predictability goes, Plutzer makes good points. Yet, = considering

the

fact that our "object of study" is formed of subjects = who interpret,

evaluate

(tradeoffs), and may change their opinions = and/or course of action

(...depending on

changing environmental = factors--personal experience, new information from

opinion

leaders, the = media or advertising, costs, etc. ...and the extent to which

these =

factors reach people--breakthrough and message frequency), it seems to = me

that,

when we choose our audiences and methods carefully, we get a = pretty good

sense of

values, intent, and likely responses to different = stimuli. In addition,

historic

trends give us clues (we know people = rally around the leader in a brief war

with

few casualties, for = example). Although our engineering side of the brain

would

like to pin = down a model, I think our "object" makes that difficult??!?

Where there is drama (the federal stage), there are actors (elected =

officials);

where there is smoke, there is probably either a fire or = smoke machines. If

there

are smoke machines, behind them are many = interests/stakeholders who are

posturing

and bargaining (Tichenor's = entrenched power groups), and feeding information

to the

media, hoping = to get their issue on the agenda, to get a soundbite or two,

and to

hold = or shift the weight of public opinion in their favor. I agree that =

public

opinion isn't necessarily a measure of effective power = (Tichenor), but do

think it

is usually a measure of potential =

(persuasive) power. The role of $ should not be underestimated, either. = As

others

discussed (sorry to oversimplify), issue importance (Moore), = issue

attentiveness

(Pew), direct vs. indirect experience (Zucker, = Plutzer), personal relevance

(Zucker), mushiness of opinion, cognitive = time (Converse, Bobo), are all

important

factors. All this requires a = lot of research (Pollack) and those who

control the

research/money might = not give the knowledge high priority or may keep the

information for = proprietary use.

While the "democracy" function of social science research has been = called

into

question since C.W. Mills pointed out that the = bureaucracies/elites were

using the

information as an instrument of mass = control, that research offers

intelligence is

rarely questioned. In my = opinion, the more data on the public table, the

better

(thank you Roper = Center, etc.).

And opinion research is only one method amongst others. For example, by =

observing

the way the public responded to rising energy costs, we saw = how they

implemented

conservation and efficiency measures (and vice = versa). And, by observing

the

President (like Reagan, he does not back =

down) and the Congress (increasingly partisan--in/out group behavior, =

black/white

imaging) as they all work to sell/tell "the story" from = their point-of-view;

and

knowing the structural arrangements and group = strategizing that goes on (the

Republican-controlled Lower House could = impeach the President and please

their core

constituency, while the = Senate can save the Republican Party and the overall

system

by = redirecting the impeachment train...), we can speculate in an informed =

way

(isn't that what Wall Street does?). Relying on any one factor too = heavily

will

probably lead to an overly simplistic prediction. I = predict Trent Lott will

work

like Hell to find a way out of this = predicament while saving face and

hopefully

(for him, that is) seats in = the upcoming election-in the meantime, Senate

Republicans are quite = annoyed with their partisans in the Lower House. I bet they

believe = they may actually lose the Senate in the next round, but they will

lie = to

media interviewers and pollsters who dare ask the question.

Mark Richards

FACULTY RESEARCH ASSISTANT ANNOUNCEMNT

Survey Research Center

Oregon State University

The Survey Research Center, located in the Department of Statistics at Oregon State

University, is seeking a faculty research assistant to be responsible for data

collection, managing day-to-day activities of ongoing surveys, and data

entry/reduction procedures for surveys the Center conducts. The individual in this

position must be able independently to conduct the entire development and

administration of surveys as well as assist clients in questionnaire

construction.

The Center undertakes and conducts sample surveys for many Oregon State

University

departments, State agencies, and local Oregon businesses. Applicants must have a

bachelor's degree in social science, statistics, or a related field.

Candidates

should be well organized with excellent communication skills and computer

aptitude,

and have some experience in admistering surveys; database and statistical analysis

experience would be useful.

Applicants should submit a resume and copies of university transcripts, and provide

names, addresses and telephone numbers of three people who have agreed to provide

letters of reference if requested. Review of applications will begin on January 15,

1999 and will continue until the position is filled.

Send applications to:

Dr. Virginia M. Lesser, Director

Survey Research Center

Department of Statistics

44 Kidder Hall

Oregon State University

Corvallis, OR 97331-4606

Telephone: 541/737-3584

Fax: 541/737-3489

E-mail: lesser@stat.orst.edu

OSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and has a policy of

being

responsive to dual-career needs. The University has an institution-wide

commitment

to diversity and multiculturalism, and provides a welcoming atmosphere with

unique

professional opportunitys for leaders who are women and people of color.

>From RLee@fsmail.pace.edu Wed Jan 6 08:01:15 1999

Received: from fsmail.pace.edu (fsmail.pace.edu [205.232.111.6])

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

    id IAA24260 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 08:01:14 -0800 (PST)

Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1999 11:01:13 EDT

Message-Id: <199901061101.AA91750954@fsmail.pace.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

This coming May at the 54th annual conference of the American Association for

Public

Opinion Research, we again plan to have an exhibit area for microcomputer

products of

interest to the survey profession. We would very much like to have

suggestions or

requests from new exhibitors.

The 1999 meeting will be held May 13-16th at the Tradewinds Resort, St. Pete

Beach,

Florida. In addition to our usual varied program, there will be some special

sessions this year on the use of the Internet for survey research. We expect

that

between 550 and 600 people will attend.

The exhibits will be on display from 9 AM to 5 PM on May 14th and May 15th.

Tables,

chairs and lighting will be supplied by the hotel. If needed, telephone

service can

be arranged for through the hotel. We recommend that exhibitors bring your

own

extension cords to avoid hotel charges. Exhibitors will have to bring their

own PCs

and arrange for their own accommodations and overnight storage of their

equipment.

We strongly recommend that exhibitors bring or rent a full-sized monitor if

they plan

to use a laptop.

There will be no fee for exhibiting. It is expected, however, that exhibitor

personnel will register for the conference. The pre-conference registration

fee for

AAPOR members will be $90, for non-members it will be $170. Exhibitors will

receive

a copy of the current AAPOR Membership Directory.

Please get in touch with me soon as there is only a limited amount of exhibit

space.

Bob Lee

Rlee@fsmail.pace.edu

Can anyone direct me to public opinion data that has been collected in = China

on

issues that might be of interest to the democracy movement = there? Data

collected

in U.S. about China?

Background: I don't know much about this issue, but I told exiled = Chinese

dissident Lian Shengde I would post this. He told me via E-mail = that the

new China

Labor Party (CLP) is being organized by some editors = of an underground E-

mail

Public Opinion Magazine in China because they = believe it is time "to stand

up to

fight for the basic rights," such as = freedom of speech and association.
Their main

goal is to represent = working class-ordinary industrial and manual

workers-interests. They = will try to register the party with the Ministry of

Civil

Affairs in = Beijing, and Li Yongning said he will "radically commit suicide

in order

= to express my desperate anger and protest'' if the government does not =

register

it.

This CLP follows the establishment of the China Democracy Party (first =

non-communist party since the 1940s), for which democracy advocates have =

been

jailed in the recent crackdown. The Free China Movement homepage = is at:

http://www.freechina.net/

Mark Richards

>From GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net Wed Jan 6 15:36:06 1999

Received: from mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net

[204.127.131.38])

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

    id PAA03300 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 15:36:04 -0800 (PST)

Received: from worldnet.att.net ([12.75.155.146])

      by mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.05 118 121 101)

      with ESMTP id <19990106233046.RBEJ29733@worldnet.att.net>

      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jan 1999 23:30:46 +0000

Message-ID: <3693F259.42E1E789@worldnet.att.net>

Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 17:31:37 -0600

From: Gary Siegel <GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net>

Reply-To: GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: best places

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What are the best 3 or 4 places (print or web) to advertise for a survey

research

professional?

Is it OK to list the job opportunity on aapornet?

Please respond to Gary Siegel

gary@gsoresearch.com

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Thu Jan 7 10:23:49 1999

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

[141.211.63.17])

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

    id KAA15616 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 10:23:48 -0800 (PST)

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

[141.211.63.89])

    by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id NAA17523

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 13:23:46 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (mbednarz@localhost)

    by gorf.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id NAA05387

Do not reply to aapornet.

From: jennifer_m_rothgeb@ccMail.Census.GOV

Subject: JOB OPENING - Senior Position

U.S. Bureau of the Census

STATISTICAL RESEARCH DIVISION

_____

Assistant Division Chief for

Survey Methodology

The U.S. Bureau of the Census collects and provides data for

decision makers, investigators, and researchers to address many

concerns ranging from housing and health care to employment,

education, and transportation. The Statistical Research Division is

the Census Bureau's statistical and methodological research and

consulting facility. Its researchers conduct research motivated by

practical problems arising in all phases of data collection,

processing, and dissemination using tools from: survey methodology,

mathematical statistics, computing and technology, and behavioral

sciences.

The Assistant Division Chief for Survey Methodology (ADCSM)

serves as leader of the division's survey methodology area (Center for

Survey Methods Research) which employs sociologists, psychologists,

and anthropologists who work in questionnaire design research

(development, pretesting, evaluation); measurement error research; and

human factors and usability research. The ADCSM is responsible for

the supervision of approximately 25 employees engaged in a broad

program of research for the improvement of Census Bureau processes and

products. The ADCSM is a senior level expert with outstanding

competence and demonstrated ability to provide intellectual,

technical, and management leadership and to perform groundbreaking

research and development.

Applicants should have (1) experience in and knowledge of

research methods in a social science; (2) contributed to the

literature in survey methodology; (3) technical leadership ability;

and (4) management ability.

Salary Range: $80,658 - $104,851.

U.S. Citizenship Required

To apply: See the Vacancy Announcement No. ASF-99-03 Internet:

http://www.census.gov/hrd/www/

vacancy/vacancy.htm. To request a vacancy announcement, call (301)

456-4499. For further information, contact Deborah Proctor (301)

457-3705. Application Deadline is 3/01/99.

The Census Bureau is an Equal

Opportunity Employer

>From TI0JIM1@mvs.cso.niu.edu Thu Jan 7 13:00:24 1999

Received: from mvs.cso.niu.edu (mvs.cso.niu.edu [131.156.113.1])

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

    id NAA19058 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Thu, 7 Jan 1999 13:00:16 -0800 (PST)

Message-Id: <199901072100.NAA19058@usc.edu>

Received: from MVS.CSO.NIU.EDU by mvs.cso.niu.edu (IBM MVS SMTP V3R2)

  with BSMTP id 7054; Thu, 07 Jan 99 15:00:01 LCL

Date: Thu, 07 Jan 99 14:59 CST

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

From: TI0JIM1@mvs.cso.niu.edu

Subject: UNSUBSCRIBE

>From camburn@rti.org Fri Jan 8 05:13:14 1999

Received: from cscnts3.rti.org (cscnts3.rti.org [152.5.128.49])

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

    id FAA04342 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 05:13:12 -0800 (PST)

Received: by cscnts3.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (6.0.2102.0)

    id <XKHRJ7YS>; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 08:12:40 -0500

Message-ID: <363A185194EDD111889C0000F81E597F0B0C9B@cscnts3.rti.org>

From: "Camburn, Donald P." <camburn@rti.org>

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

Cc: "Pate, D. Kirk" <dkp@rti.org>

Subject: Position Announcements at Research Triangle Institute

Date: Fri, 8 Jan 1999 08:12:34 -0500

> Experienced Survey Specialists Sought

>

> The Research Triangle Institute, a leading contract research

> organization with offices located in the Research Triangle Park (NC),

> Chicago, and Washington, D.C., areas currently has openings in each of

> our offices for mid- and senior-level Survey Specialists. These

> individuals will perform various survey research duties in accordance

> with their level of experience.

>

> Mid-level Position - requires a B.S. or B.A. degree with a background

> in social science research methods, and 3+ years of post-graduate

> experience in survey research, research design, client interaction,

> budget development, cost control, data collection, report writing,

> presentation, and task management. Experience with sample surveys

> involving field or telephone data collection and with managing

> day-to-day activities of ongoing research studies is required.

> Activities include working with study collaborators to develop,

> implement, and monitor research designs; overseeing data collection

> operations (field or phone); documenting study procedures;

> implementing quality control procedures; scheduling and delegating of

> study tasks; preparing and presenting research reports to clients.

> Strong writing and oral communications, interpersonal, word

> processing, organizing, and computer spreadsheet skills are required.

> Periodic overnight travel is required. Marketing and business

> proposal experience are a plus.

>

> Senior-Level Position - requires B.S. or B.A. degree with a

> background in social science research methods, plus 10+ years of

> experience serving as a project director, principal investigator, or

> in other senior management or scientific roles on research contracts

> with Federal agencies. Must also have experience in contract research

> and program management and have a demonstrated ability to deal with

> clients and manage field study staff, other survey researchers, and

> computer applications and design staff.   Should also be experienced

> in working closely with staff across a wide variety of substantive and

> technical fields (epidemiologists, survey methodologists,

> statisticians).

>

> Experience in managing day-to-day activities of ongoing research

> studies. Activities include working with study collaborators to

> develop, implement, and monitor research designs; overseeing data

> collection operations (field or phone); documenting study procedures;

> implementing quality control procedures; scheduling and delegating of

> study tasks; preparing and presenting research reports to clients.

>

> Regularly make positive contributions to marketing activities,

> including planning for research programs, generating research in

> existing and new market and technical areas, marketing

> multi-disciplinary concepts. Contribute to and direct the preparation,

> presentation, and follow-up of research proposals.

>

> Apply on a broad basis principles, theories, and concepts to a

> scientific field or specialty, and apply a working knowledge of

> related disciplines. Work on a wide range of problems requiring the

> use of creative and imaginative thinking. Have gained recognition

> from peers and clients for technical expertise. Frequently author

> articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Initiate and

> carry out appropriate self-development efforts.

>

> Strong oral and written communications skills, project management,

> administrative abilities, ability to work collaboratively on large

> project teams, and the ability to manage multiple tasks are essential.

> Periodic overnight travel is required.

>

> RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits.

>

> Interested applicants may submit resume directly by email to

> dkp@rti.org or by mail to:

>

> Mr. Kirk Pate

> Research Triangle Institute

> PO Box 12194

> Research Triangle Park, NC   27709

>

> To learn more about RTI, please visit out Website at

> http://www.rti.org

>

> RTI is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

>From armiller@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu Fri Jan 8 10:28:59 1999

Received: from ns-mx.uiowa.edu (ns-mx.uiowa.edu [128.255.1.4])

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

    id KAA00172 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Jan 1999 10:28:56 -0800 (PST)

Try "T.J. Shi" at Duke University. He is a former colleague of mine and this

is his

area of interest and should be very useful to you or whoever needs it. I'm not

sure

of his e-mail address, but his phone number is 919/660-4300.

Arthur Miller

At 05:51 PM 1/6/99 -0500, you wrote:

>Can anyone direct me to public opinion data that has been collected in

China on issues that might be of interest to the democracy movement there?

Data

collected in U.S. about China?

>

>Background: I don't know much about this issue, but I told exiled

>Chinese

dissident Lian Shengde I would post this. He told me via E-mail that the new

China

Labor Party (CLP) is being organized by some editors of an underground E-mail

Public

Opinion Magazine in China because they believe it is time "to stand up to

fight for

the basic rights," such as freedom of speech and association. Their main goal

is to

represent working class-ordinary industrial and manual workers-interests.

They will

try to register the party with the Ministry of Civil Affairs in Beijing, and

Li

Yongning said he will "radically commit suicide in order to express my

desperate

anger and protest'' if the government does not register it.

>

>This CLP follows the establishment of the China Democracy Party (first

non-communist party since the 1940s), for which democracy advocates have been

jailed

in the recent crackdown. The Free China Movement homepage is

at: http://www.freechina.net/

>

>Mark Richards

>

>

Date: Fri, 08 Jan 1999 13:43:03 -0500

From: "Henderson, Patsy M" <hendersp@BATTELLE.ORG>

To: "'Beniger@rcf.usc.edu'" <Beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

Subject: AAPORNET posting

Battelle, a world leader in research and technology, has an opening in support

of

Battelle's Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation (CPHRE). This

position

is located in CPHRE's Durham, NC office.

MANAGER CPHRE SITE OPERATIONS

Job Reference Code 1130-JC

Qualified candidates should hold an advanced degree in survey research, survey

methodology or related field. Candidates should possess 10 or more years of

experience in obtaining and managing government and private sector contracts.

Excellent

technical, managerial and communication skills are essential.   An

outstanding professional reputation for the successful conduct of survey

research

projects is mandatory. This position is responsible for the personnel and

financial

management of CPHRE's Durham office in addition to providing significant

leadership

in funded project work. This position actively participates as a member of

CPHRE's

Management Council.

Battelle offers a comprehensive salary and benefits package. If qualified,

please

mail or fax cover letter and resume to CPHRE Human Resources Manager, 6115

Falls

Road, Baltimore, MD 21209. Fax: (410)377-6802 or send electronically to

CPHRE.HRManager@Battelle.org Battelle is an Affirmative Action/Equal

Opportunity

Employer M/F/D/V.

****

>From rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Sat Jan 9 20:56:43 1999

<smaller>If We Ask It Right, You Answer Well

By Richard Morin

Washington Post Staff Writer

Sunday, January 10, 1999; Page C1

If his current government job ends abruptly, President Clinton might think

about

becoming a pollster. Anyone who ponders the meaning of the word "is" has

precisely

the right turn of mind to track public opinion in these mindless, mindful

times.

Never has polling been so risky or so much in demand. Never have so many of

the

rules of polling been bent or broken so cleanly, or so often. Pollsters are

sampling

public reaction just hours sometimes minutes after events occur.

Interviewing

periods, which traditionally last several days to secure a solid sample, have

sometimes shrunk to just a few hours on a single night. Pollsters have been

asking

questions that were taboo until this past year. Is oral sex really sex? (Yes,

said 76

percent of those interviewed in a Newsweek poll conducted barely a week after

the

scandal broke back in January.)

"No living pollster has ever had to poll in a situation like this," said

Michael

Kagay, the editor of news surveys at the New York Times. "We're in uncharted

territory." After all, Andrew Johnson had to deal with political enemies, but

not

pollsters. And Richard Nixon's resignation before impeachment meant that

pollsters

didn't have a chance to ask whether the Senate should give him the boot.

Clinton has it about right: Words do have different meanings for different

people,

and these differences matter. At the same time, some seemingly common words

and

phrases have no meaning at all to many Americans; even on the eve of the

impeachment

vote last month, nearly a third of the country, didn't know or didn't

understand what

"impeachment" meant.

Every pollster knows that questions with slightly different wording can

produce

different results. In the past year, survey researchers learned just how big

and

baf=FEing those differences can be, particularly when words are used to

capture

public reaction to an arcane process that no living American not even Strom

Thurmond

has witnessed in its entirety.

=46ear of getting it wrong coupled with astonishment over the persistent

support for

Clinton revealed in poll after poll spawned a =FEood of novel tests by

pollsters to

determine precisely the right words to use in our questions.

Last month, less than a week before Clinton was impeached by the House, The

Washington Post and its polling partner ABC News asked half of a random

sampling of

Americans whether Clinton should resign if he were impeached or should "=DEght

the

charges in the Senate." The other half of the sample was asked a slightly

different

question: Should Clinton resign if impeached or should he "remain in of=DEce

and face

trial in the Senate?"

The questions are essentially the same. The results were not. Nearly six in 10

59

percent said Clinton should quit rather than =DEght impeachment charges in

the

Senate. But well under half 43 percent=20 said he should resign when the

alternative

was to "remain in of=DEce and stand trial in the Senate." What gives?

The difference appears to be the word "=DEght." America is a peaceable

kingdom; we

hate it when our parents squabble and are willing to accept just about any

alternative including Clinton's resignation to spare the country a partisan

=DEght.

But when the alternative is less overtly combative stand trial in the Senate

Americans are less likely to scurry to the resignation option.

Such a fuss over a few words. But it is just more proof that people do not share the

same understanding of terms, and that a pollster who ignores this occupational hazard

may wind up looking for a new job.

Think I'm exaggerating? Then let's do another test. A month ago, how would you have

answered this question: "If the full House votes to send impeachment articles to the

Senate for a trial, then do you think it would be better for the country if Bill

Clinton resigned from of=DEce, or not?"

And how would you have answered this question: "If the full House votes to impeach

Bill Clinton, then do you think it would be better for the country if Bill Clinton

resigned from of=DEce, or not?"

The questions (asked in a New York Times/CBS News poll in mid-December) seem

virtually identical. But the differences in results were stunning: =46orty-three

percent said the president should quit if the House sends "impeachment

articles to

the Senate" while 60 percent said he should quit if the House "votes to

impeach."

What's going on here? Kagay says he doesn't know. Neither do I, but here's a

guess:

Perhaps "impeach" alone was taken as "found guilty" and the phrase "send

impeachment

articles to the Senate for a trial" suggests that the case isn't over. If only

we

could do another wording test. . .

Language problems have challenged pollsters from the very start of the Monica

Lewinsky scandal. Among the =DErst: How to describe Monica herself? The

Washington

Post's =DErst survey questions referred to her as a "21-year-old intern at the

White

House," as did questions asked by other news organizations. But noting her age

was

potentially biasing. Highlighting her youthfulness conjured up visions of

innocence

and victimhood that appeared inconsistent with her apparently aggressive and

explicitly amorous conduct with Clinton. In subsequent Post poll questions,

she

became a "former White House intern" of indeterminate age.

Then came the hard part: How to describe what she and Bill were accused of doing in a

way that didn't offend, overly titillate or otherwise stampede people into one

position or the other? In these early days, details about who did what to whom and

where were sketchy but salacious. It clearly wasn't a classic adulterous love

affair;

love had apparently little to do with it, at least on Clinton's part. Nor was

it a

one-night stand. It seemed more like the overheated fantasy of a 16-year-old

boy or

the musings of the White House's favorite pornographer, Penthouse magazine

publisher

Larry Flynt. Piled on top of the sex were the more complex and less easily

understood

issues of perjury and obstruction of justice. After various iterations, we and

other

organizations settled on simply "the Lewinsky matter" nice and neutral,

leaving

exactly what that meant to the imaginations (or

memories) of survey respondents.

One thing is clear, at least in hindsight: Results of hypothetical questions

those

that ask what if? did not hold up in the past 12 months, said political

scientist

Michael Traugott of the University of Michigan. Last January, pollsters posed

questions asking whether Clinton should resign or be impeached if he lied

under oath

about having an affair with Lewinsky. Clear majorities said he should quit or

be

impeached.

=46ast forward to the eve of the impeachment vote. Nearly everybody believed

Clinton

had lied under oath about his relationship with Lewinsky, but now healthy

majorities

said he should not be impeached a tribute, perhaps, to the White House

strategy of

drawing out (dare we say stonewalling?) the investigation to allow the public

to get

used to the idea that their president was a sleazy weasel.

=46ortunately, pollsters had time to work out the kinks in question wording.

Demand

for polling produced a =FEood of questions of all shades and =FEavors, and

good

wording drove out the bad. At times, it seemed even to pollsters that there

may be

too many questions about the scandal, said Kathy Frankovic, director of

surveys for

CBS News. Through October, more than 1,000 survey questions speci=DEcally

mentioned

Lewinsky's name double the number of questions that have ever been asked

about the

Watergate scandal, Frankovic said.

Polling's new popularity has attracted a tonier class of critic. In the past, mostly

assistant professors and aggrieved political operatives or their bosses trashed the

public polls. Today, one of the =DEercest critics of polling is syndicated columnist

Arianna Huf=DEngton, the onetime Cambridge University debating champ, A-list

socialite and New Age acolyte. A few weeks ago, Huf=DEngton revealed in her column

that lots of people refuse to talk to pollsters, a problem that's not new (except,

apparently, to Huf=DEngton).

Actually, I think Huf=DEngton has it backward. The real problem is that people are

too willing to answer poll questions dutifully responding to poll takers even if

they don't really have an opinion or understand the question that has been asked.

A famous polling experiment illustrates the prevalence of

pseudo-opinions: More than 20 years ago, a group of researchers at the University of

Cincinnati asked a random sample of local residents whether the 1975 Public

Affairs

Act should be repealed. About half expressed a view one way or another.

Of course there never was a Public Affairs Act of 1975. Researchers made it up
to see

how willing people were to express opinions on things they knew absolutely

nothing

about.

I duplicated that experiment a few years ago in a national survey, and

obtained about

the same result: Forty-three percent expressed an opinion, with 24 percent

saying it

should be repealed and 19 percent saying it should not.

But enough about the problems. In hindsight, most experts say that the polls

have

held up remarkably well. Within a month of the =DErst disclosure, the public

moved

quickly to this consensus, as captured by the polls: Clinton's a good

president but a

man of ghastly character who can stay in the White House but stay away from

my

house, don't touch my daughter and don't pet the dog.

"It is so striking. The public =DEgured this one out early on and stuck with it,"

said Thomas E. Mann, director of governmental studies at the Brookings Institution.

"If anything, the only changes were these upward blips in support for Clinton in the

face of some dramatic development that was certain to presage his collapse."

Mann and others argue that public opinion polls may never have played a more important role in American political life. "This last year illustrates the wisdom of

George Gallup's optimism about the use of polls in democracy: to discipline the

elites, to constrain the activists, to allow ordinary citizens to register sentiments

on a matter of the greatest public importance," Mann said.

Well, hooray for us pollsters! Actually, there is evidence suggesting that all the

attention in the past year may have improved the public's opinions of opinion polls

and pollsters. And why shouldn't they? These polls have had something for everyone:

While Democrats revel in Clinton's high job-approval ratings and otherwise bulletproof presidency, Republicans can point to the equally lopsided majority who

think Clinton should be censured and formally reprimanded for his behavior.

A few weeks ago, as bombs fell in Baghdad and talk of impeachment roiled

Washington,

pollster Nancy Belden took a break from business to attend the annual holiday

pageant

at her 10-year-old son's school. As she left the auditorium, the steadfast

Republican

mother of one of her son's classmates approached Belden and clapped her on the

shoulder. "Thank heavens for you pollsters," she said.

"I was stunned. I was delighted," Belden laughed. "I've spent many years being

beat

up on by people who complain that public opinion polling is somewhat thwarting

the

political process, as opposed to helping it. Suddenly, people are coming up to

me at

parties and saying thanks for doing what you do. What a relief!"

Richard Morin is director of polling for The Washington Post. "What Americans

Think"

appears Mondays in The Washington Post National Weekly Edition. Morin can be

reached

at morinr@clark.net.

I received this note from a ABD student at George Washington University who
has asked

me for some help with her dissertation. If anyone could help her find

information

that she has requested about Education research (message

below) it would be appreciated. Her e-mail is naya@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu so

please

respond directly to her. Thanks. Robie

>

>

> Dr. Sangster,

>

> I am a doctoral student in the Department of Teacher Preparation and

> Special Education at the Graduate School of Education and Human

> Development at the George Washington University. I am planning my

> dissertation and the title is : An Investigation of the Facilitators

> and Barriers to Collaboration in Professional Development Schools: A

> Survey of the Holmes Partnership.

>

> I need assistance on devising a survey that will

> answer the research questions : What are the perceived barriers to

> collaboration of university faculty involved in Professional

> Development Schools? What are the perceived barriers to collaboration

> of school administrators involved in Professional Development Schools?

> (And then questions about perceived facilitators by the two groups AND

> then analysis of answers as compared to years in PDS, gender,

> ethnicity, geographic region etc).

>

>   I am looking for any surveys already created that measure

> collaboration between two organizations (not necessarily education

> related). Also, I am interested in surveys that measure perceptions

> of major stakeholders or leaders in organizations. I can be reached

> via email at naya@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu , by phone (202) 994-2780 , or

> by mail - 806 Prince Street #1, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. I would

> greatly appreciate any information! Thank you for your time!

>

>From abider@earthlink.net Mon Jan 11 01:02:10 1999

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

[207.217.120.14])

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

    id BAA14236 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 01:02:09 -0800

(PST)

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

[207.217.120.50])

    by ostrich.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with ESMTP id UAA00975

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 10 Jan 1999 20:22:54 -0800 (PST)

Received: from alvbynsy (sdn-ar-001dcwashP209.dialsprint.net [168.191.20.121])

    by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id UAA00790;

    Sun, 10 Jan 1999 20:22:39 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <006001be3d1a$dd052ae0$7914bfa8@alvbynsy>

Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Cc: <morinr@clark.net>

Subject: Re: Never has polling been so risky

Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1999 23:28:28 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

Thanks are due to Robert Godfrey for posting Richard Morin's defense of the

polling

trade and of polling on Clinton's troubles, in particular (or, in the wording

Morin

found most to his taste for

question design, "the Lewinsky matter").   I liked how Morin handled

one of the two themes: how much variability of response can come with

seemingly minor

wording variations. Any careful survey designer knows to fret over what the

meaning

of "is" may be (as in Q. "What is your occupation?" A. "What do you mean by

"is"?)

And I hope we all know better than to use as ambiguous a word as "alone" ("Do

you

work alone?" would be a dumb question).

I also posted here a message to poll bashers similar to Morin's; in

effect: "Don't worry, just be selective."   As he puts it:

   Actually, there is evidence suggesting that all the attention in the past

year

may have improved the public's opinions of opinion polls and pollsters. And

why

shouldn't they? These polls have had something for everyone. . . . Morin

illustrates

that you don't even need to be consistent in your selections. It helps one

find what

one needs in opinion polls if,

like Morin, you add a big scoop of opinionation.   For instance, he

concludes:

    . . .the polls have held up remarkably well: within a month of the first

disclosure the public quickly moved to this consesensus as captured by the

polls:

Clinton's a good president but a man of ghastly character who can stay in the

White

House. . . . He quotes Tomas E. Mann to support this contention of constancy

in

polled opinion:

    'It's so striking. The public figured this one out early and stuck with

it." Not

to worry that nine paragraphs earlier Morin had this to say:

    Last January, pollsters posed questions asking whether Clinton should

resign or

be impeached if he lied under oath about having an affair with Lewinsky.

Clear

majorities said he should quit or be impeached.

    Fast forward to the eve of the impeachment vote. Nearly everybody believed

Clinton had lied under oath about his relationship with Lewinsky, but now

healthy

majorities said he should not be impeached a tribute, perhaps, to the White

House

strategy of drawing out (dare we say stonewalling?) the investigation to allow

the

public to get used to the idea that their president was a sleazy weasel.

Morin's "White House strategy of drawing out" is particularly cute in that his piece

was paired as lead items in today's Washington Post "Outlook" with one by Marianne

Lavelle, "Star Won't Stop," in which she finds every reason to believe that Starr

intends to hound Clinton to the last hour of the last day that he remains in office

and perhaps beyond.

Lavelle also speculates: "Clinton would have the option of doing what

most criminal suspects do. Work out a deal." But to get a deal from

Starr, he'd have to offer to give testimony against a target or targets even higher

on Starr's enemy list. But who's higher than the President and has done more to

obstruct his investigation? The answer

is obvious: the Pollsters; the voice of the people.   Do you think

Bill may have something on you guys?

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

From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu>

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

Date: Sunday, January 10, 1999 1:17 AM

Subject: Never has polling been so risky

If We Ask It Right, You Answer Well

By Richard Morin

Washington Post Staff Writer

Sunday, January 10, 1999; Page C1

If his current government job ends abruptly, President Clinton might think

about

becoming a pollster. Anyone who ponders the meaning of the word "is" has

precisely

the right turn of mind to track public opinion in these mindless, mindful

times.

<SNIP>

Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

I have seen a few pieces lately in support of good opinion polling voicing

similar

opinions to Morin's. That is, it is hard to be inside the Beltway and

understand what

is going on outside it, and that messages based on personal opinion or

lobbyists or

constituents who "yell the loudest" or "pay the most" can be equally skewed.

Well

run, thoughtfully worded, administered, and analyzed public opinion polling is

a

window on the thoughts of the American public on any number of issues. Perhaps

this

is the message AAPOR can concentrate on. I have some specific responses to

Morin.

First, while I understand that differences in poll results were a function of

wording, the root cause of the wording problem were respondents' ignorance of

terms

used and the process involved in impeaching, trying, and removing a president.

It is

incumbent upon public opinion researchers do find out whether people

understand what

they are being asked. It probably helps if the researchers understand those

things

themselves. I am not always convinced they do. Dick = Morris, in defending the

amount

of polling the Clinton administration does, pointed out that often the polls

were

used not to determine what direction policy should take, but what needs to be

done to

"sell" the policy chosen. "Sell" is a somewhat loaded term since it smacks of

manipulation, but it was clear from Morris' comments that often they were

trying to

find what things people most objected to, what didn't they understand, or what

people

had misunderstandings of. Sometimes a political leader must educate the public

first

before the public can generate a sound opinion on a subject.

Second, I do not consider overnight polling, with its not allowing respondents

to

digest what has happened and its inability to do refusal conversion, to be

well

administered public opinion research. Such polls fulfill a function, mostly a

news

deadline one, but have to be followed up with further polling using more

comprehensive methodologies.

Third, my objection to much of the polling on the issue of perjury in "the

Lewinsky

matter" is that almost all polls do not get into the specific context under

which

Clinton was asked questions about = Lewinsky. Lawyers, like social science

researchers, understand that even "common" terms must be operationalized when

not

being used in a "common" = context. Clinton was asked questions in the context

of a

civil trial in which words like "sex" have indeed been operationalized.

Therefore,

the = proper opinion questions about perjury should have provided the

respondents

with the operational definitions involved and then asked if they = thought

Clinton

had "lied under oath". Those who deride "legal hair splitting" might best

remember

that Clinton was not the President standing before Congress, but a private

citizen

responding to a civil complaint, a = legal proceeding. Legal hair splitting is

expected and accepted as = commonplace in that context. Much of the polling

has

studiously avoided that context.

Finally, a columnist who uses phrases like "the White House's favorite

pornographer

Larry Flynt" and "sleazy weasel" is hardly one who = inspires confidence in me

that

he is willing to evaluate everything public opinion research can tell him

about a

situation. The public's opinion = of the press has declined markedly during

"the

Lewinsky matter", I suspect due in no small part to intellectually lazy

columns

written by vocabulary-deficient writers like Morin.

Lance M. Pollack

University of California, San Francisco

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

From: Robert Godfrey [SMTP:rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu]

Sent: Saturday, January 09, 1999 8:56 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Never has polling been so risky

If We Ask It Right, You Answer Well=20

By Richard Morin=20

Washington Post Staff Writer=20

Sunday, January 10, 1999; Page C1=20

If his current government job ends abruptly, President Clinton might

think

about becoming a pollster. Anyone who ponders the meaning = of the word "is"

has

precisely the right turn of mind to track public opinion in these mindless,

mindful

times.=20

Never has polling been so risky or so much in demand. Never have so

many of

the rules of polling been bent or broken so cleanly, or so often. Pollsters

are

sampling public reaction just hours sometimes minutes after events occur.

Interviewing periods, which traditionally last several days to secure a solid

sample,

have sometimes shrunk to just a few hours on a single night. Pollsters have

been

asking = questions that were taboo until this past year. Is oral sex really

sex?

(Yes, = said 76 percent of those interviewed in a Newsweek poll conducted

barely a

week after the scandal broke back in January.)=20

"No living pollster has ever had to poll in a situation like this," said

Michael Kagay, the editor of news surveys at the New York Times. "We're in

uncharted

territory." After all, Andrew Johnson had to deal with political enemies, but

not

pollsters. And Richard Nixon's resignation before impeachment meant that

pollsters

didn't have a = chance to ask whether the Senate should give him the boot.=20

Clinton has it about right: Words do have different meanings for

different

people, and these differences matter. At the same time, some seemingly common

words

and phrases have no meaning at all to many Americans; even on the eve of the

impeachment vote last month, nearly a third of the country, didn't know or

didn't

understand what "impeachment" meant.=20

Every pollster knows that questions with slightly different wording can produce

different results. In the past year, survey researchers learned just how big and

baf=FEing those differences can = be, particularly when words are used to capture

public reaction to an = arcane process that no living American not even Strom

Thurmond has witnessed in its entirety.=20

Fear of getting it wrong coupled with astonishment over the persistent support

for Clinton revealed in poll after poll spawned a =FEood of novel tests by pollsters

to determine precisely the right = words to use in our questions.=20

Last month, less than a week before Clinton was impeached by the House, The

Washington Post and its polling partner ABC News asked half of a random sampling of

Americans whether Clinton should resign if he were impeached or should "=DEght the

charges in the Senate." The other half of the sample was asked a slightly different

question: Should Clinton resign if impeached or should he "remain in of=DEce and face

= trial in the Senate?"=20

The questions are essentially the same. The results were not. Nearly six

in 10

59 percent said Clinton should quit rather than = =DEght impeachment charges
in the

Senate. But well under half 43 percent = said he should resign when the
alternative

was to "remain in of=DEce and = stand trial in the Senate." What gives?=20

The difference appears to be the word "=DEght." America is a peaceable
kingdom;
we hate it when our parents squabble and are willing to accept just about any
alternative including Clinton's resignation to spare the country a partisan
=DEght.
But when the alternative is = less overtly combative stand trial in the
Senate
Americans are less likely to scurry to the resignation option.=20

Such a fuss over a few words. But it is just more proof that people do
not
share the same understanding of terms, and that a = pollster who ignores this
occupational hazard may wind up looking for a new job. =

Think I'm exaggerating? Then let's do another test. A month ago, how
would you
have answered this question: "If the full House votes to send impeachment
articles to
the Senate for a trial, then do you think it would be better for the country
if Bill
Clinton resigned from = of=DEce, or not?"=20

And how would you have answered this question: "If the full House votes to

impeach Bill Clinton, then do you think it would be better for the country if Bill

Clinton resigned from of=DEce, or not?"=20

The questions (asked in a New York Times/CBS News poll in

mid-December) seem virtually identical. But the differences in results were stunning:

Forty-three percent said the president should quit if = the House sends "impeachment

articles to the Senate" while 60 percent said he should quit if the House "votes to

impeach."=20

What's going on here? Kagay says he doesn't know. Neither do I, but here's a

guess: Perhaps "impeach" alone was taken as "found guilty" and the phrase "send

impeachment articles to the Senate for a trial" suggests that the case isn't over. If

only we could do another wording test. . .=20

Language problems have challenged pollsters from the very start of the Monica

Lewinsky scandal. Among the =DErst: How to describe = Monica herself? The Washington

Post's =DErst survey questions referred to her = as a "21-year-old intern at

the

White House," as did questions asked by other news organizations. But noting her age

was potentially biasing. Highlighting her youthfulness conjured up visions of

innocence and victimhood that appeared inconsistent with her apparently

aggressive =

and explicitly amorous conduct with Clinton. In subsequent Post poll

questions, she

became a "former White House intern" of indeterminate age.=20

    Then came the hard part: How to describe what she and Bill were accused of

doing in a way that didn't offend, overly titillate or otherwise stampede

people into

one position or the other? In these = early days, details about who did what

to whom

and where were sketchy but salacious. It clearly wasn't a classic adulterous

love

affair; love had apparently little to do with it, at least on Clinton's part.

Nor was

it a one-night stand. It seemed more like the overheated fantasy of a 16-year-

old boy

or the musings of the White House's favorite pornographer, Penthouse magazine

publisher Larry Flynt. Piled on top of the sex were the more complex and less

easily

understood issues of perjury and obstruction of justice. After various

iterations, we

and other organizations settled on simply "the Lewinsky matter" nice and

neutral,

leaving exactly what that meant to the imaginations (or

memories) of survey respondents.=20

One thing is clear, at least in hindsight: Results of hypothetical
questions
those that ask what if? did not hold up in the past 12 months, said political
scientist Michael Traugott of the University of Michigan. Last January,
pollsters
posed questions asking whether Clinton should resign or be impeached if he
lied under
oath about having an affair with Lewinsky. Clear majorities said he should
quit or be
impeached.=20

Fast forward to the eve of the impeachment vote. Nearly everybody
believed
Clinton had lied under oath about his relationship with Lewinsky, but now
healthy
majorities said he should not be impeached a tribute, perhaps, to the White
House
strategy of drawing out (dare we say stonewalling?) the investigation to allow
the
public = to get used to the idea that their president was a sleazy weasel.=20

Fortunately, pollsters had time to work out the kinks in question
wording.
Demand for polling produced a =FEood of questions of = all shades and
=FEavors, and
good wording drove out the bad. At times, it seemed even to pollsters that

there may

be too many questions about the scandal, said Kathy Frankovic, director of

surveys

for CBS News. = Through October, more than 1,000 survey questions

speci=DEcally

mentioned Lewinsky's name double the number of questions that have ever been

asked

about the Watergate scandal, Frankovic said.=20

   Polling's new popularity has attracted a tonier class of critic. In the

past,

mostly assistant professors and aggrieved political operatives or their bosses

trashed the public polls. Today, one of the =DEercest critics of polling is

syndicated columnist Arianna = Huf=DEngton, the onetime Cambridge University

debating

champ, A-list socialite and New Age acolyte. A few weeks ago, Huf=DEngton

revealed in

her column = that lots of people refuse to talk to pollsters, a problem that's

not

new (except, apparently, to Huf=DEngton).=20

   Actually, I think Huf=DEngton has it backward. The real problem is that

people

are too willing to answer poll questions dutifully responding to poll takers

even if

they don't really have an opinion or understand the question that has been

asked.=20

   A famous polling experiment illustrates the prevalence of

pseudo-opinions: More than 20 years ago, a group of researchers at the

University of

Cincinnati asked a random sample of local residents whether the 1975 Public

Affairs

Act should be repealed. About half expressed a view one way or another.=20

Of course there never was a Public Affairs Act of 1975. Researchers made

it up

to see how willing people were to express opinions on things they knew

absolutely

nothing about.=20

I duplicated that experiment a few years ago in a national survey, and

obtained

about the same result: Forty-three percent expressed an opinion, with 24

percent

saying it should be repealed and 19 percent saying it should not.=20

But enough about the problems. In hindsight, most experts say that the

polls

have held up remarkably well. Within a month of the = =DErst disclosure, the

public

moved quickly to this consensus, as captured by the polls: Clinton's a good

president

but a man of ghastly character = who can stay in the White House but stay

away from

my house, don't touch = my daughter and don't pet the dog.=20

"It is so striking. The public =DEgured this one out early on and stuck

with

it," said Thomas E. Mann, director of governmental studies = at the Brookings

Institution. "If anything, the only changes were these upward blips in support

for

Clinton in the face of some dramatic development that was certain to presage

his

collapse."=20

Mann and others argue that public opinion polls may never have played a

more

important role in American political life. "This last = year illustrates the

wisdom

of George Gallup's optimism about the use of polls in democracy: to discipline

the

elites, to constrain the activists, to allow ordinary citizens to register

sentiments

on a = matter of the greatest public importance," Mann said.=20

Well, hooray for us pollsters! Actually, there is evidence suggesting

that all

the attention in the past year may have improved = the public's opinions of

opinion

polls and pollsters. And why shouldn't they? These polls have had something

for

everyone: While Democrats = revel in Clinton's high job-approval ratings and

otherwise bulletproof presidency, Republicans can point to the equally

lopsided

majority who think Clinton should be censured and formally reprimanded for his

behavior.=20

A few weeks ago, as bombs fell in Baghdad and talk of impeachment roiled

Washington, pollster Nancy Belden took a break from business to attend the

annual

holiday pageant at her 10-year-old son's school. As she left the auditorium,

the

steadfast Republican mother of one of her son's classmates approached Belden

and

clapped her on the shoulder. "Thank heavens for you pollsters," she said.=20

    "I was stunned. I was delighted," Belden laughed. "I've spent many years

being

beat up on by people who complain that public opinion polling is somewhat

thwarting

the political process, as opposed to helping it. Suddenly, people are coming

up to me

at parties and saying thanks for doing what you do. What a relief!"=20

    Richard Morin is director of polling for The Washington Post. "What

Americans

Think" appears Mondays in The Washington Post National Weekly Edition. Morin

can be

reached at morinr@clark.net.=20

    Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company=20
>From Mark@bisconti.com Mon Jan 11 08:48:20 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA25060 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Jan 1999 08:48:18 -0800

(PST)

In addition to Morin's article is one by his colleague Claudia Deane =

answering the

question frequently asked "Who are the pollsters talking = to?-I've never been

called!" The tone of the article is really nice = Sunday reading (copy of

article

follows below).

With reference to people "Inside the Beltway" not knowing what's going = on in

the

country... this may be partly true, but it is my impression = that people

here,

especially the federal establishment, (Bias alert-I'm = a long-term District

resident, but not of the federal establishment!), = are on average more

attentive to

national and international issues than = elsewhere. It's certainly not for

lack of

trying to understand what = "the country" is thinking. And it's not just that

special and public = interest lobbyists "confuse" our decision-makers about

what the

public = really thinks. In general, Congressmen and women are willing to

listen = to

anyone who takes the time to articulate a position ($ play a big = role).

And, many

(especially special and public interest groups) use = polling to see how to be

most

persuasive in their public and = decision-leader lobbying efforts--just look

at the

differences in = response due to issue framing/wording!--the way one explains

an

issue = matters.

But decision-makers listen most of all to their constituents (especially =

those that

provide jobs to their voter base)-with the caveat that "they = make decisions

on

behalf of the nation as a whole" (conscience). I = guess it is not surprising

that

the President, the House, and the Senate = frequently arrive at different

conclusions, simply because of the issue = of SCALE. Only the President is

required

to look at the aggregate = opinions of the whole country. And those in the

House

have a much = smaller constituent base than the Senate, which has a bit more

leeway

in = decision-making than House members, who are on a shorter leash. I'm =

always

amazed when they all agree.

Our federal system is structurally very interesting-it acts as a kind of =

filtration

system by using three scales on which to test ideas. If they = all agree, a

Bill is

passed.

Mark Richards

mark@bisconti.com

WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE:

Don't Worry, We've Got Your Number

By Claudia Deane

Sunday, January 10, 1999; Page C04=20

Though there have been stacks of polls on the Clinton scandal these past =

months, no

media pollster has ever called you, right? At least, no = pollster has called

you yet.

I know the feeling. I haven't gotten a call, either.=20

But every year, about 20 million Americans participate in opinion = surveys,

one-fourth of these in surveys sponsored by the federal = government (and

this, of

course, does not count that ultimate survey, = the decennial census). In 1998,

interviewers working on behalf of The = Washington Post talked to about 25,000

people.

So why haven't you and your opinions on impeachment and infidelity made = the

cut?

The simplest answer is that the people who conduct each poll = need only

contact a

very small proportion of Americans to represent the = opinions of the whole

country.

A typical Post survey includes about = 1,000 people.

Can the opinions of just 1,000 accurately reflect those of millions of =

Americans?

Yes--according to statistical and probability theory--if the = right methods

are used

to choose the sample of people. Stripped of its = math-o-magic, sampling the

population is like testing the temperature of = a pot of soup--you don't need

to eat

the whole bowl, just stir it up and = slurp a spoonful or two . . . or 1,000,

if

you're sampling national = attitudes.

One key element of probability sampling is that poll respondents must be =
chosen
randomly. Pollsters can't just survey their 1,000 closest friends = or the
people
logged in to their statistics chat room. Many accomplish = this by using
computers to
generate random phone numbers, which ensures = that people with unlisted
numbers are
included. Each adult in the = population should also have an equal chance of
being
included in the = poll.

The resulting sample should closely mirror the diversity of the country, =
including
people from all parts of the nation, of varying ages, racial = backgrounds and
party
affiliations.

Polls aren't always a perfect measure of national opinion. There is some =
error
associated with sampling, as well as some caused by such factors = as the
occasional
poorly worded question or large numbers of respondents = who refuse to answer.
Some
of this error is measurable, some is not. = Polling is part science, part
art.=20

Those caveats aside, well-designed polls work. You don't have to take my =

word for

it: Every four years, pollsters predict support for = presidential candidates,

and

then an election comes along and proves = them right or wrong. With a few

memorable

exceptions (President Thomas = Dewey, for example, who existed only in the

minds of

pollsters), most = polls are close to the mark. The National Council on Public

Polls

= reported that the average error of the major polls conducted in the days =

immediately prior to the 1996 election was 1.7 percent. Not bad.

If you are at least 18 years old, reside in the lower 48 states and live = in

a home

with a phone, there's a chance you could be contacted for the = next

Washington Post

poll. So, if you want to be polled, keep the phone = on the hook and don't

hang up on

strangers. We might need to reach you.

Claudia Deane is The Post's assistant director of polling.=20

>From LYNDA.CARLSON@hq.doe.gov Mon Jan 11 12:10:03 1999

Received: from hqwss.hr.doe.gov (hqwss-01.hr.doe.gov [146.138.1.107])

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

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) has legal authority to require

mandatory

reporting to its energy surveys and uses this authority in most of

its

establishment surveys.   Currently, we still have a small number of surveyed

companies who choose to not respond. We are considering additional

materials

that may be sent to respondents to remind them of the reporting requirement

and

the sanctions for noncompliance. These materials may include a letter from

our

legal office, supplements to a letter from our agency that more directly and

forcefully address the legal authorities and sanctions, and other steps to

improve

reporting.

I would appreciate any information concerning experiences in nonresponse

follow-up

for mandatory surveys. Also, I would be very interested in

others'

experiences with the use of sending legal arguments to nonrespondents as a

tool

for resolving nonresponse to mandatory surveys.

Thanks,

Lynda Carlson

lcarlson@eia.doe.gov

>From featherstonf.rced@gao.gov Tue Jan 12 05:37:17 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 FAA12691 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 05:37:16 -0800

(PST)

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

  Does anyone know any literature or have any experience using

  postage stamps compared to "machine postage" on the survey

  mailing? (not the reply envelope, but the outgoing envelope). We

  are especially interested in surveys sent to businesses, but any

  citations or anecdotes are of interest.

   Please reply to me at the e-mail address below and I'll post the

  results to AAPORNET.

  Thanks,

  (fran)

Fran Featherston

U.S. General Accounting Office

Washington, DC 20548

E-mail: FEATHERSTONF.RCED@GAO.GOV

Phone: 202.512.4946

You might want to talk to various fund raising operations. My own experience,

admittedly a bit anecdotal, is that envelopes bearing a real postage stamp in

contrast to "machine postage" are better received because their use suggests a

more

personal touch, especially these days when everything is so mechanical and

impersonal. Further, I suspect there may be a difference between a letter received in

a business setting in contrast to one received at home. In a home setting, the

reception given to a note or letter with the personal touch of a real stamp will

probably receive a more favorable response.

In a business setting, the personal touch may not be so important a) because mail is

generally opened by secretaries meaning that the intended recipient never sees the

envelope; and b) A postage metered stamp or printed return envelope is probably seen

as more "business like". Getting something with a personal stamp on it in a business

setting suggests a small time operation, not especially business like and therefore

probably not important. My comments, of course, should be seen as hypotheses for

testing. That should be easy using a split sample approach.

Dick Halpern

At 08:36 AM 1/12/1999 -0500, you wrote:

> Does anyone know any literature or have any experience using

> postage stamps compared to "machine postage" on the survey

> mailing? (not the reply envelope, but the outgoing envelope). We

>   are especially interested in surveys sent to businesses, but any

>   citations or anecdotes are of interest.

>   Please reply to me at the e-mail address below and I'll post the

>   results to AAPORNET.

>   Thanks,

>   (fran)

>Fran Featherston

>U.S. General Accounting Office

>Washington, DC 20548

>E-mail: FEATHERSTONF.RCED@GAO.GOV

>Phone: 202.512.4946

>

>

>From BROH@pucc.Princeton.EDU Tue Jan 12 12:15:40 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 MAA20026 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 12:15:36 -0800

(PST)

Received: from lightpost by outbound.Princeton.EDU with SMTP id <67262-690>;

Tue, 12

Jan 1999 15:14:42 -0500

Received: from pucc.Princeton.EDU (pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99]) by

outbound.Princeton.EDU (8.8.8/8.6.12) with SMTP id PAA24405 for

<aapornet@USC.EDU>;

Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:14:37 -0500 (EST)

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (NJE origin VMMAIL@PUCC) by

PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU

(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 2961; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:17:10 -0500

Long ago in one of my methods courses, I recall a discussion about the number

of

points on a scale affecting the distribution of responses to a question item.

In

other words, is the overall mean for all responses affected when a respondent

has the

opportunity to rate an item on a scale from 1 to 100 rather than a scale from

1 to

10? I would appreciate help with any references or citations to this topic.

Thanks.

Tony Broh

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

C. Anthony Broh, Registrar   "Princeton sent me a rejection letter

Princeton University   so elegantly worded that I still

Princeton, NJ 08542   think of myself as an alumnus."

(609) 258-6191 Fax: (609) 258-6328   -- Newt Gingrich --

http://NTigger2.princeton.edu/registrar/

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

>From jbason@arches.uga.edu Tue Jan 12 12:44:12 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 MAA13707 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 12:44:10 -0800

(PST)

Received: from archa7.cc.uga.edu (arch7.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu

(LSMTP for

Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.006A0C2A@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan

1999

15:44:04 -0500

Received: from jud.ibr.uga.edu (jud.ibr.uga.edu [128.192.63.15])

    by archa7.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA21394;

    Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:39:55 -0500

From: James Bason <jbason@arches.uga.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Measurement issue

In-Reply-To: <19990112201442Z67262-690+1492@outbound.Princeton.EDU>

Message-ID: <SIMEON.9901121525.C@jud.ibr.uga.edu>

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:38:25 -0800 (Pacific Standard Time)

X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.3 Build (39)

X-Authentication: IMSP

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Tue, 12 Jan 99 15:09:46 EST "C. Anthony Broh"

<BROH@pucc.Princeton.EDU> wrote:

> Long ago in one of my methods courses, I recall a discussion about the

> number of points on a scale affecting the distribution of responses to

> a question item. In other words, is the overall mean for all

> responses affected when a respondent has the opportunity to rate an

> item on a scale from 1 to 100 rather than a scale from 1 to 10? I

> would appreciate help with any references or citations to this topic.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Tony Broh

>

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

> C. Anthony Broh, Registrar   "Princeton sent me a rejection letter

> Princeton University   so elegantly worded that I still

> Princeton, NJ 08542   think of myself as an alumnus."

> (609) 258-6191 Fax: (609) 258-6328   -- Newt Gingrich --

> http://NTigger2.princeton.edu/registrar/

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

> >>

>

>

>

I am in fact reading an article as we speak concerning this very issue.

Alwin and Krosnick (1991) "The Reliability of Survey Attitude

Measurement" Sociological Methods and Research V.20, 139 - 181

essentially found that response scales with more categories are more

reliable and fully labeled response scales are more reliable than

unlabeled ones. There are a number of cites for other research on the

topic, but there may be more recent studies as well. Hope this is

helpful.

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 BROH@pucc.Princeton.EDU Tue Jan 12 13:28:01 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 NAA07563 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 13:27:57 -0800

(PST)

Received: from lightpost by outbound.Princeton.EDU with SMTP id <68579-688>;

Tue, 12

Jan 1999 16:27:08 -0500

Received: from pucc.Princeton.EDU (pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99]) by

outbound.Princeton.EDU (8.8.8/8.6.12) with SMTP id QAA21161 for

<aapornet@USC.EDU>;

Tue, 12 Jan 1999 16:26:55 -0500 (EST)

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (NJE origin VMMAIL@PUCC) by

PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU

(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 5454; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 16:29:28 -0500

Received: by PUCC (Mailer R2.10 ptf008) id 0002; Tue, 12 Jan 99 16:29:27 EST

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 99 16:29:19 EST

From: "C. Anthony Broh" <BROH@pucc.Princeton.EDU>

Subject: Re: Measurement issue

To: aapornet@USC.EDU

In-Reply-To: Message of Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:38:25 -0800 (Pacific Standard

Time)

from <jbason@arches.uga.edu>

Message-Id: <19990112212708Z68579-688+1817@outbound.Princeton.EDU>

thanks for the citation.

Tony Broh

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

C. Anthony Broh, Registrar   "Princeton sent me a rejection letter

Princeton University   so elegantly worded that I still

Princeton, NJ 08542   think of myself as an alumnus."

(609) 258-6191 Fax: (609) 258-6328   -- Newt Gingrich --

http://NTigger2.princeton.edu/registrar/

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

>From CaplanJR@aol.com Tue Jan 12 14:11:45 1999

Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])

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

    id OAA25060 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 14:11:29 -0800

(PST)

From: CaplanJR@aol.com

Received: from CaplanJR@aol.com

    by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOv18.1) id 0UDLa18628

     for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 17:02:19 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <13ed0fda.369bc66b@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 17:02:19 EST

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Re: Using postage stamps on mail surveys

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows sub 230

In a message dated 1/12/99 2:35:30 PM EST, rshalpern@mindspring.com writes:

<< My own experience, admittedly a bit anecdotal, is that envelopes bearing a
real
postage stamp in contrast to "machine postage" are better received because
their use
suggests a more personal touch, especially these days when everything is so
mechanical and impersonal. >>

My own experience is the same. Furthermore, with mail sent to individual

homes,

anything you can do to show individual effort (hand lettered addresses, personal

notes on the cover, stamped reply envelope, etc.) seems to increase response.

Jim Caplan

BSR

Miami

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jan 12 15:02:47 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 PAA23325 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:02:46 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

    id PAA18647 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:02:46 -0800

(PST)

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 15:02:46 -0800 (PST)

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Measurement issue

In-Reply-To: <SIMEON.9901121525.C@jud.ibr.uga.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9901121423440.3508-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Reply to James Bason:

The real issue here, as it is in Tony Broh's original query, is the amount of

information collected vs. the costs of collecting it.

Aside from mundane issues like visibility, readability, etc., a ten-point

scale is

conceptually nothing more nor less than a 100-point scale collapsed, that is,

the

data points grouped, that is, information discarded. And the point

generalizes...

The practical methodological problem, then, is not to determine the best

possible

measure, but rather not to waste money--on design, testing,

collection, processing and analysis time, among other things--on scales any

better

than the very best one that we need to achieve our particular purpose or goal.

Easier said than done, of course. The difficulty is that information can

always be

destroyed (ignored), but it cannot ever be created once measurement/collection

has

ended. This leads us to waste money and other resources on better measures

than we

need or ever use. In applications where the nature of research questions or

measures

is not yet well known, however, the essential nature of information as

described two

sentences earlier suggests that it is wiser to err on the side of measurements

much

too good--with a waste of resources--than on the side of measurements which

turn out

to be not good enough.

As a general point, however, I think methods research will be improved to the

extent

that both information theory and the economic trade-offs in decision-making

are

routinely taken into consideration.

                     -- Jim

****

On Tue, 12 Jan 1999, James Bason wrote:

> I am in fact reading an article as we speak concerning this very

> issue.

> Alwin and Krosnick (1991) "The Reliability of Survey Attitude

> Measurement" Sociological Methods and Research V.20, 139 - 181

> essentially found that response scales with more categories are more

> reliable and fully labeled response scales are more reliable than

> unlabeled ones. There are a number of cites for other research on the

> topic, but there may be more recent studies as well. Hope this is

> helpful.

>

> 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

****

A meta-analysis by Armstrong & Lusl (POQ 51; 233-48) included the stamp issue.

Results weren't too helpful, but the studies are there.

>   Does anyone know any literature or have any experience using

> postage stamps compared to "machine postage" on the survey

> mailing? (not the reply envelope, but the outgoing envelope). We

> are especially interested in surveys sent to businesses, but any

> citations or anecdotes are of interest.

>   Please reply to me at the e-mail address below and I'll post the

> results to AAPORNET.

> Thanks,

> (fran)

>Fran Featherston

>U.S. General Accounting Office

>Washington, DC 20548

>E-mail: FEATHERSTONF.RCED@GAO.GOV

>Phone: 202.512.4946

Janet A. Bridges, Graduate Coordinator and

Associate Professor of Communication;

BoRSF Professor in Communication

Box 43650

University of Southwestern Louisiana

Lafayette LA 70504-3650

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT (JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY)

Position Title: Project Manager

Position Description:

Full-time position to assist in the management of a four-year study of the effects of welfare reform laws on children and families whose major component is a longitudinal survey of low income families in three cities.   Help monitor on-going household surveys by Research Triangle Institute. Assist in questionnaire development and revision and in preparation of reports. Position based at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore but some travel to field sites in Boston, Chicago, and San Antonio, and to RTI's headquarters in North Carolina required.

Knowledge of the following preferred: survey research methods,

collection and statistical analysis of survey research data,

welfare policy, interviewing low-income families and service

providers.

Project Manager will work closely with Professors Andrew Cherlin

and Robert Moffitt of Johns Hopkins University. M.A. or Ph.D

preferred. Salary range is low to mid-40's, depending upon

experience. Position to begin as soon as feasible.

Johns Hopkins University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative

Action employer. We actively encourage women and minorities

to apply.

Submit application, including letter of interest and a current resume, to:

Dr. Andrew Cherlin,

Department of Sociology

Johns Hopkins University

Baltimore, MD 21218

Email: cherlin@jhu.edu

telephone: 410-516-7632

fax: 410-516-7590

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Wed Jan 13 13:55:47 1999

Received: from cicero.src.uchicago.edu (cicero.src.uchicago.edu

[128.135.232.3])

FINAL NOTICE!

General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of

Chicago

announces the fifth annual General Social Survey (GSS) Student Paper

Competition. To

be eligible papers must:

1) be based on data from the 1972-1998 GSSs or from the GSS's cross-national

component, the International Social Survey Program (any year or combination of

years

may be used), 2) represent original and unpublished work, and 3) be written by

a

student or students at an accredited college or university. Both

undergraduates and

graduate students may enter and college graduates are eligible for one year

after

receiving their degree.

The papers will be judged on the basis of their: a) contribution to

expanding

understanding of contemporary American society, b) development and testing of

social

science models and theories, c) statistical and methodological sophistication,

and d)

clarity of writing and organization. Papers should be less than 40 pages in

length

(including tables, references, appendices, etc.)and should be double spaced.

Paper will be judged by the principal investigators of the GSS (James

A. Davis

and Tom W. Smith) with assistance from a group of leading scholars. Separate

prizes

will be awarded to the best undergraduate and best graduate-level entries.

Entrants

should indicate in which group they are competing. Winners will receive a cash

prize

of $250, a commemorative plaque, and the MicroCase Analysis System, including

data

from the 1972-1998 GSSs (a $1,395 value). The MicroCase software is donated by

the

MicroCase Corporation of Bellevue, Washington. Honorable mentions may also be

awarded

by the judges.

Two copies of each paper must be received by February 15, 1999. The

winner

will be announced in late April, 1999. Send entries to:

          Tom W. Smith

        General Social Survey

     National Opinion Research Center

        1155 East 60th St.

        Chicago, Il 60637

  For further information:

         Phone: 773-256-6288

         Fax: 773-753-7886

         Email: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jan 15 17:48:05 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 RAA00994 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 17:48:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

   id RAA19109 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 15 Jan 1999 17:48:04 -0800

(PST)

Date: Fri, 15 Jan 1999 17:48:04 -0800 (PST)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: KIIS: Kiev Omnibus Survey

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9901151743210.15872-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

Date: Sat, 16 Jan 1999 00:17:24 +0200 (UKR)

From: "Volodymyr Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>

To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu,

Subject: KIIS

Dear Colleagues,

   Between February 18 and March 2, 1999 the Kiev International Institute of

Sociology will conduct an omnibus-survey of the adult population of

Ukraine (16+). A large part of the questionnaire is reserved for

potential

clients. We are inviting you to take part in this survey.

   Enclosed you will find information about survey and about conditions of

including your questions in the questionnaire;

We would be glad to cooperate with you.

Sincerely yours,

Director, doctor of science

Vladimir Paniotto

For more information, write or call

Vladimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS

(Kiev International Institute of Sociology)

Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-253002, UKRAINE

Phone (380-44)-517-3949

Fax (380-44)-263-3458

http://www.dkmedia.com/kiis/

E-mail: paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua

copy to: khmelko@kiis-1.kiev.ua

ellen@i.am

KIIS UKRAINE OMNIBUS SURVEY

The Kiev International Institute of Sociology informs that between
February
18 and March 2, 1999 it will conduct an omnibus survey of the adult population
of
Ukraine.

Sample:
   1600 respondents aged 16 years and older, living in Ukraine.
Sample is
based on random selection of 150 sampling points (post-office
districts) all over the Ukraine (in all 24 oblasts of Ukraine and Crimea). The
sampling process consists of random selection of streets, buildings and
apartments inside each post-office district. The last stage - random
selection of respondents from families.

Our sample has more respondents and more sampling points than any other sample for

omnibuses in Ukraine, it is representative not only for Ukraine as a

whole but

for separate regions and groups of regions.

Closing Date for Questions: 11 February 1999

Results Available: 21 February 1999

          (Marginals and the data in SPSS-file)

Costs:

$260 per closed (pre-coded) question (one variable in SPSS), $100 per closed

question

in the battery of 3 and more questions $440 for open-ended question

Discount:

  - for clients who will purchase more than 10

   questions - 10% discount;

  - for clients who purchased data of one previous omnibus -

   $200 per closed question and $370 per open-ended question.

Demography, included in price above: sex, age, education.

Other demography: ethnicity, socio-economic status, income, language,

religiousness, place of residence - oblast, city or village, size of

settlement

(every question - $45)

Comments for our regular clients: we refused from $370 entry fee as it was

before,

and have instead payment for additional demography questions, it's much

comfortable

for the clients, who included just a few questions

 ****

 Vladimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS

 (Kiev International Institute of Sociology)

 Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-253002, UKRAINE

 Phone (380-44)-517-3949

 Fax (380-44)-263-3458

 E-mail: paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua

 http://www.dkmedia.com/kiis/

 ****

****

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Jan 17 13:07:09 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 NAA02052 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 17 Jan 1999 13:07:08 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp4.vgernet.net [205.219.186.104])

    by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id RAA12501

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 17 Jan 1999 17:29:59 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <36A2510E.27BDD26F@jwdp.com>

Date: Sun, 17 Jan 1999 16:07:26 -0500

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Washington Post on polling

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The following "Ombudsman" column appears in the Outlook section of the Washington

Post for Sunday, January 17, 1999. It should be of particular interest to members of

AAPOR.

Do Numbers Lie?

By E. R. Shipp

Sunday, January 17, 1999; Page B06

The proliferation of public opinion surveys has
produced a concomitant level of skepticism --
especially where the presidential sex scandal is
concerned. That President Clinton seems to be so
well regarded is, many readers say, baffling -- and
a sign that someone's fiddling with the numbers.

"Ms. Shipp," wrote one reader, "I am white, married, have two children, three grandchildren, [am] Jewish, the sole proprietor of a small business, make in excess of $25,000 a year and live in the (southern) Midwest. In my entire life, no one has ever called, written or approached me about my opinion on anything. So, my question to you is: How are the 'polls' taken?"

The Post regularly uses scientific surveys based on calls to 1,000 or more randomly dialed residential telephones. It is literally the luck of the draw whether you are called, but the random nature of the calls and the size and distribution of the sample ensure that someone like you is included.

Another wary reader suggested that "the media and poll takers are controlling the results by asking questions in such a way as to maneuver the answers to support a position."

Not so, says Richard Morin, the polling director at The Post. "Our goal is to accurately capture and reflect public opinion. We want to get it right." Polling professionals know that not only are their reputations on the line but also that competitors will pounce on any sign of skewed research.

Institutions such as the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, located at the University of Connecticut in Storrs, exist to promote the responsible use of polls. Its archives, which are available for public scrutiny, include all the polls conducted for The Post and other major news organizations and commercial polling operations dating back to 1935. Organizations such as the American Association for Public Opinion Research, which has 1,400 members from government, academe and media, demand that members adhere to a code of ethics. Of course, none of this guarantees perfection in the ranks, but the mechanisms are in place to expose any wrongdoing.

Readers of The Post's online version have the opportunity to read all the paper's survey questions and responses to them (with a breakdown by sex, race, education and other factors). To do so, just navigate your way through washingtonpost.com's politics section to an archive called "Poll Vault."

Some readers have challenged the results of random-sample polling reported by mainstream news organizations because the polls consistently find that most Americans want the president to remain in office. Some online polls show otherwise. Here is an example: The Post's poll of 1,285 adults

last month showed that 42 percent said Clinton should resign rather than fight the charges in the Senate; when the question was worded slightly differently, 33 percent said he should resign rather than face trial. In either case, well under half of the populace wanted him to leave office.

In contrast, a week earlier -- after the House Judiciary Committee had voted -- an online poll, Harris/Excite, asked: "Now that four articles of impeachment have been approved, should Clinton resign?" Of 86,756 responses, 64 percent were "yes." But nothing limited the number of times a single person voted, and, of course, only people with Internet access could participate. For these reasons and others, the sponsors of that poll note that it is "not scientifically projectable to any population" and is simply an opportunity for users "to share their opinions." In other words, it's just for fun.

A serious poll strives for more than that. When done properly, a poll gives average citizens a voice right up there with the pundits -- often proving them to be more sensible than those who are paid to sound off.

>From tsilver@CapAccess.org Mon Jan 18 14:30:04 1999

I am forwarding the query below for Curtis, who is not a member of

AAPORNET. Please respond directly to him.

Tom Silver

PollingReport.com

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

From: curtis <curtis@stats.gov.lc>

Subject: Consumer Confidence Survey

Dear Sir/Madame,

The St. Lucia Government Statistics Department is in the process of planning

to

conduct a Consumer Confidence Survey and is imploring your

assistance in any way possible. We are particularly interested in the

methodology and having/seeing an actual questionnaire for such a survey.

We would also be grateful if you can refer us to someone who will be able

to assist us.

I am looking forward to further communication on this matter with you.

Regards,

Curtis

(Statistician)

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Jan 19 08:49:13 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

    id IAA29857 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 08:49:10 -0800

(PST)

Received: from lavrakas.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])

    by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA26928

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 11:49:08 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19990119164909.00ba13c4@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

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

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 11:49:09 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

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

Subject: Submissions to the 1999 AAPOR conference

If you submitted a proposal for a panel, paper, poster or roundtable for the

1999

AAPOR conference and have not received the confirmation that we received your

submission, please send a mesaage to that effect ASAP to:

    aapor99@osu.edu

Also, if possible, please attach a file with your original submission to your

message.

Thanks, and I hope we don't hear from anyone...

****

Prof. Paul J. Lavrakas <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

1999 AAPOR Conference Committee Chair

>From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Tue Jan 19 10:43:10 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

To AAPOR members:

I am forwarding an article from the Chicago Tribune about the firing of George

Lundberg, M.D. as editor of JAMA, the Journal of the American Medical

Association.

Dr. Lundberg is a colleague of mine who has been a great supporter of the

publication

of health-related survey research and polls. At his instigation, JAMA now has

a

section on Public Opinion and Health Care and JAMA frequently publishes papers

on

surveys of professionals and the public.

Dr. Lundberg lost his job after he and his editorial staff decided to publish

results

from a Kinsey Institute survey of college students about sex that was

conducted in

1991. Dr. Lundberg has always advocated the publication of data that can

inform or

be relevant to current policy debates. There is no doubt that this

publication was

timed to coincide with the impeachment hearings, but the normal peer review

and

editorial process was followed. In any case, JAMA is supposed to have

editorial

independence from the AMA. Indeed, editorial positions of JAMA's have often

been at

odds with stated AMA positions. Dr. Lundberg, who has been the editor of JAMA

for 17

years, was fired by a Vice-President who has been at the AMA for 8 months.

The article appears as a brief report, and despite the age of the data there

are some

interesting lessons about question wording and underlying attitudes for people

who do

surveys on sexual behavior. The article can be read in its entirety at

www.ama-assn.org then go to JAMA page.

If you would like to join me in protesting the decision of the AMA, please

email:

E Radcliffe Anderson, Jr.M.D.,AMA Executive Vice President at

ER_Anderson@ama-assn.org

Please include a subject line registering your opinion since it is likely that

Dr.

Anderson will not be reading all messages in their entirety.

Thank you.

Karen Donelan Sc.D.

Harvard Opinion Research Program

Department of Health Policy and Management

Harvard School of Public Health

677 Huntington Avenue

Boston, MA 02115

phone:617 432 3829

email kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu

> AMA fires editor of its journal

>

> By Bruce Japsen

>

> Tribune Staff Writer

>

> The American Medical Association fired the editor of its prestigious

> medical journal Friday, accusing him of publishing an article on the

> definition of sex

> at a time chosen to correspond with President Clinton's impeachment trial.

>

> The firing of Dr. George Lundberg, 65, who has been editor of The

> Journal of the American Medical Association for 17 years, embroils the

> Chicago-based physicians' organization in yet another controversy.

>

> Lundberg has been widely considered one of the AMA's most respected

> and

> well-

> known leaders, responsible for more than 50 of its medical journals and

> credited with elevating JAMA from mediocrity to one of the world's leading

> authorities on medicine and science.

>

> At a time when the AMA is losing members and is recovering from a loss

> of credibility over an ill-fated product endorsement deal with Sunbeam

> Corp., Lundberg's dismissal has engulfed the 151-year-old physicians'

> group in a national debate about the AMA's credibility and the

> journalistic independence of JAMA.

>

> Dr. E. Ratcliffe ``Andy'' Anderson, executive vice president of the

> Chicago-

> based AMA, said Lundberg went a step too far by publishing the

> article, which reported a 1991 study showing 60 percent of college

> students surveyed did not

> define having had oral sex as having ``had sex.''

>

> The current trial to remove President Clinton centers, in part, on

> whether he lied about having sex with former intern Monica Lewinsky.

> During his grand jury testimony, Clinton said oral sex was not one of

> the acts covered in his

> definition of sexual relations.

>

> Anderson said the AMA's journal shouldn't be thrust into the

> impeachment saga, which he called ``the most important debate of this

> century.''

>

> ``Dr. Lundberg, through his recent actions, has threatened the

> historic tradition and integrity of the Journal of the American

> Medical Association by inappropriately and inexcusably interjecting

> JAMA into a major political debate that has nothing to do with science

> or medicine,'' Anderson said at a

> Friday press conference packed with reporters at the AMA's downtown

> Chicago

> headquarters. ``This is unacceptable.''

>

> The Jan. 20 JAMA issue, already in the mail to subscribers, contains

> the three-page research report entitled, ``Would you say you `had sex'

> if . . . ?'' In the article, researchers from The Kinsey Institute for

> Research in Sex,

> Gender and Reproduction at Indiana University evaluated what 600

> undergraduate

> college students interviewed in 1991 said ``constituted having `had sex.'

> ''

>

> Although the interviews are eight years old, authors Stephanie Sanders

> and June Machover Reinisch say the context of the article is relevant

> because the current debate ``regarding whether oral sex constitutes

> having `had sex' or

> sexual relations has reflected a lack of empirical data on how Americans

> as a

> population define these terms.''

>

> ``These data indicate that prior to the current public discourse, a

> majority of college students attending a major midwestern state

> university, most of whom identified themselves as politically moderate

> to conservative, with more

> registered Republicans than Democrats, did not define oral sex as having

> `had

> sex,' '' the article says.

>

> ``I don't question the science. I don't question the material,''

> Anderson said. However, the publishing cycle of the article was

> ``accelerated'' so that the article would appear during the

> impeachment proceedings, Anderson said.

>

> Reinisch confirmed the article was submitted in November after being

> completed in October. She said the article then went through three

> JAMA peer review boards, and four to seven weeks passed before the

> authors were told the article would be published in January or

> February.

>

> Anderson said he had conversations earlier this week with the JAMA

> editorial board about the article but made the decision to dismiss

> Lundberg on his own.

> ``I happen to believe that Dr. Lundberg was focused on sensationalism, not

> science,'' Anderson said.

>

> Lundberg, who was recuperating at his North Side residence from a

> broken elbow and a bruised back after slipping Wednesday on an icy

> sidewalk, said Anderson

> called him at 8:15 a.m. Friday and informed him he was terminated.

>

> Through his Chicago attorney, William Walsh, Lundberg issued a

> statement saying the AMA has ``jeopardized the editorial integrity and

> scientific credibility of the Journal of the American Medical

> Association and related AMA journals for political ends.''

>

> ``Through its actions today, the AMA has inappropriately intruded into

> the historically inviolable ground of editorial independence in

> scientific journalism,'' the statement said.

>

> Lundberg is considering legal action against the AMA, Walsh said.

>

> Some AMA members were outraged when word spread of Lundberg's

> dismissal, saying Anderson's decision contradicted itself and pointed

> to only the latest lapse in AMA management.

>

> ``Dr. Anderson is a former aviator, and I think he has just flown the

> plane into the mountain,'' Dr. Raymond Scalettar, a Washington, D.C.,

> physician and

> former AMA board chairman, said, referring to Anderson's previous career

> as

> surgeon general of the Air Force.

>

> Scalettar said the AMA doesn't want to offend the

> Republican-controlled Congress.

>

> ``This has now been politicized into a Republican-Democrat thing,''

> Scalettar said. ``The AMA seems to have placated the Republicans to

> get more Medicare

> reimbursement, and now they have placated the Republicans and fired George

> Lundberg.''

>

> According to federal campaign finance reports, one of the AMA's

> federal political action committees has heavily favored Republicans

> over Democrats. Since 1989, the American Medical Association Political

> Action Committee has

> donated $9.3 million to Republican House and Senate candidates. During the

> same period, the PAC donated $4.8 million to Democratic House and Senate

> candidates. The GOP has generally backed the society's legislative agenda.

>

> Anderson denied his decision to fire Lundberg had anything to do with

> possibly jeopardizing AMA lobbying efforts.

>

> ``Over time . . . I have lost confidence and trust in Dr. Lundberg's

> ability to preserve that high level of credibility and integrity,''

> said Anderson.

>

> Sources close to the AMA said board members were upset at many recent

> actions by Lundberg, including an appearance last fall on the CBS news

> show ``60 Minutes,'' when he was interviewed without board members'

> knowledge for a program on autopsies. The program was largely critical

> of hospitals and other

> providers of medical care for not doing more autopsies.

>

> AMA members said board members have been angry at Lundberg in the past

> about other JAMA articles, but that termination was extreme.

>

> ``If (Anderson) made this call on his own, he doesn't understand

> medical journalism or editorial discretion,'' said Dr. Jerry Schenken,

> an Omaha pathologist and former AMA board member. ``Someone should

> have said, `Hey George, this one needs a counterpoint,' but I don't

> think we should be firing people over subject matter.''

>

> Tribune reporters Tim Jones and Ray Gibson contributed to this report

> Stephen Barrett, M.D. Board Chairman, Quackwatch, Inc.

> email: sbinfo@quackwatch.com

> Telephone: (610) 437-1795

> URL#1: http://www.quackwatch.com

> URL#2: http://www.chirobase.org

>

> **

> ***

> * Send mail to healthfraud-help@ssr.com for a list of available commands,

> * including help in UNSUBSCRIBING...

> *

> * DO NOT, NOT, NOT, SEND SUBSCRIBE/UNSUBSCRIBE REQUESTS TO THE LIST.

> **

>

> ----------------- End Forwarded Message -----------------

>

>   --

> To join the Clinical-Psychologists forum, send the command

>   SUBSCRIBE CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS YOURFIRSTNAME YOURLASTNAME; to

> leave the forum, send the command

>   SIGNOFF CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS

> to LISTSERV@LISTSERV.NODAK.EDU or, if you experience difficulties,

> write to CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS-request@LISTSERV.NODAK.EDU.

--------------8BE3A44517450F98CA45710B

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu ([128.103.76.227])

    by hsph.harvard.edu (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA14597

    for <kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 11:06:51 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <36A4BBCE.8D407E08@hsph.harvard.edu>

Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 11:07:27 -0600

From: Kimberly Scoles <kscoles@hsph.harvard.edu>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: [Fwd: Fwd: [healthfraud] Please protest JAMA Editor Firing!!!]

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="------------D205C3996D87C240FB647863"

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

D205C3996D87C240FB647863

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

--------------D205C3996D87C240FB647863

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from listserv.nodak.edu (listserv.NoDak.edu [134.129.111.8])

   by hsph.harvard.edu (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id DAA23200

   for <kscoles@HSPH.HARVARD.EDU>; Mon, 18 Jan 1999 03:02:21 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199901180802.DAA23200@hsph.harvard.edu>

Received: from listserv (134.129.111.8) by listserv.nodak.edu (LSMTP for

Windows NT

v1.1a) with SMTP id <0.8F3D57A0@listserv.nodak.edu>; Mon, 18 Jan 1999 2:02:11

-0600

Date: Mon, 18 Jan 1999 01:05:03 -0600

Reply-To: Clinical Psychologists <CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS@listserv.nodak.edu>

Sender: Clinical Psychologists <CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS@listserv.nodak.edu>

From: Paul Bernhardt <pbern7@earthlink.net>

Subject: Fwd: [healthfraud] Please protest JAMA Editor Firing!!!

To: CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS@listserv.nodak.edu

---------------- Begin Forwarded Message ----------------

Date: 01/17 8:25 PM

Received: 01/17 10:51 PM

From: Stephen Barrett, M.D., sbinfo@quackwatch.com

To: Healthfraud, healthfraud@ssr.com

I believe that George Lundberg, M.D., who has done a superb job as editor of

the

Journal of the American Medical Association (and is a staunch foe of

quackery) was unfairly fired. I would appreciate it very much if everyone on

this

list would send a protest letter to E Radcliffe Anderson, Jr. M.D., AMA

Executive

Vice President. It does not matter what you say. Short is as good as long. The

important thing is to make sure you have a subject line with a clear protest

message

because it is possible that the messages won't be read. Anderson's email

address is

ER_Anderson@ama-assn.org

If any of you are on other pertinent professional lists, please ask the list

members

to do the same.

AMA fires editor of its journal

By Bruce Japsen

Tribune Staff Writer

The American Medical Association fired the editor of its prestigious medical

journal

Friday, accusing him of publishing an article on the definition of sex at a

time

chosen to correspond with President Clinton's impeachment trial.

The firing of Dr. George Lundberg, 65, who has been editor of The Journal of the

American Medical Association for 17 years, embroils the Chicago-based physicians'

organization in yet another controversy.

Lundberg has been widely considered one of the AMA's most respected and well-

known leaders, responsible for more than 50 of its medical journals and credited with

elevating JAMA from mediocrity to one of the world's leading authorities on medicine

and science.

At a time when the AMA is losing members and is recovering from a loss of credibility

over an ill-fated product endorsement deal with Sunbeam Corp., Lundberg's dismissal

has engulfed the 151-year-old physicians' group in a national debate about the AMA's

credibility and the journalistic independence of JAMA.

Dr. E. Ratcliffe ``Andy'' Anderson, executive vice president of the Chicago-

based AMA, said Lundberg went a step too far by publishing the article, which

reported a 1991 study showing 60 percent of college students surveyed did not define

having had oral sex as having ``had sex.''

The current trial to remove President Clinton centers, in part, on whether he
lied
about having sex with former intern Monica Lewinsky. During his grand jury
testimony,
Clinton said oral sex was not one of the acts covered in his definition of
sexual
relations.

Anderson said the AMA's journal shouldn't be thrust into the impeachment saga,
which
he called ``the most important debate of this century.''

``Dr. Lundberg, through his recent actions, has threatened the historic
tradition and
integrity of the Journal of the American Medical Association by
inappropriately and
inexcusably interjecting JAMA into a major political debate that has nothing
to do
with science or medicine,'' Anderson said at a Friday press conference packed
with
reporters at the AMA's downtown Chicago headquarters. ``This is
unacceptable.''

The Jan. 20 JAMA issue, already in the mail to subscribers, contains the
three-page
research report entitled, ``Would you say you `had sex' if . . . ?'' In the
article,

researchers from The Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender and
Reproduction at
Indiana University evaluated what 600 undergraduate college students
interviewed in
1991 said ``constituted having `had sex.' ''

Although the interviews are eight years old, authors Stephanie Sanders and
June
Machover Reinisch say the context of the article is relevant because the
current
debate ``regarding whether oral sex constitutes having `had sex' or sexual
relations
has reflected a lack of empirical data on how Americans as a population define
these
terms.''

``These data indicate that prior to the current public discourse, a majority
of
college students attending a major midwestern state university, most of whom
identified themselves as politically moderate to conservative, with more
registered
Republicans than Democrats, did not define oral sex as having `had sex,' ''
the
article says.

``I don't question the science. I don't question the material,'' Anderson
said.
However, the publishing cycle of the article was ``accelerated'' so that the
article

would appear during the impeachment proceedings, Anderson said.

Reinisch confirmed the article was submitted in November after being completed in

October. She said the article then went through three JAMA peer review boards, and

four to seven weeks passed before the authors were told the article would be

published in January or February.

Anderson said he had conversations earlier this week with the JAMA editorial board

about the article but made the decision to dismiss Lundberg on his own. ``I happen to

believe that Dr. Lundberg was focused on sensationalism, not science,'' Anderson said.

Lundberg, who was recuperating at his North Side residence from a broken elbow and a

bruised back after slipping Wednesday on an icy sidewalk, said Anderson called him at

8:15 a.m. Friday and informed him he was terminated.

Through his Chicago attorney, William Walsh, Lundberg issued a statement saying the

AMA has ``jeopardized the editorial integrity and scientific credibility of the

Journal of the American Medical Association and related AMA journals for political

ends.''

``Through its actions today, the AMA has inappropriately intruded into the historically inviolable ground of editorial independence in scientific journalism,''
the statement said.

Lundberg is considering legal action against the AMA, Walsh said.

Some AMA members were outraged when word spread of Lundberg's dismissal, saying
Anderson's decision contradicted itself and pointed to only the latest lapse in AMA
management.

``Dr. Anderson is a former aviator, and I think he has just flown the plane into the
mountain,'' Dr. Raymond Scalettar, a Washington, D.C., physician and former AMA board
chairman, said, referring to Anderson's previous career as surgeon general of the Air
Force.

Scalettar said the AMA doesn't want to offend the Republican-controlled Congress.

``This has now been politicized into a Republican-Democrat thing,'' Scalettar said.
``The AMA seems to have placated the Republicans to get more Medicare reimbursement,

and now they have placated the Republicans and fired George Lundberg.''

According to federal campaign finance reports, one of the AMA's federal political

action committees has heavily favored Republicans over Democrats. Since 1989, the

American Medical Association Political Action Committee has donated $9.3 million to

Republican House and Senate candidates. During the same period, the PAC donated $4.8

million to Democratic House and Senate candidates. The GOP has generally backed the

society's legislative agenda.

Anderson denied his decision to fire Lundberg had anything to do with possibly

jeopardizing AMA lobbying efforts.

``Over time . . . I have lost confidence and trust in Dr. Lundberg's ability to

preserve that high level of credibility and integrity,'' said Anderson.

Sources close to the AMA said board members were upset at many recent actions by

Lundberg, including an appearance last fall on the CBS news show ``60 Minutes,'' when

he was interviewed without board members' knowledge for a program on autopsies. The

program was largely critical of hospitals and other providers of medical care for not

doing more autopsies.

AMA members said board members have been angry at Lundberg in the past about

other

JAMA articles, but that termination was extreme.

``If (Anderson) made this call on his own, he doesn't understand medical

journalism

or editorial discretion,'' said Dr. Jerry Schenken, an Omaha pathologist and

former

AMA board member. ``Someone should have said, `Hey George, this one needs a

counterpoint,' but I don't think we should be firing people over subject

matter.''

Tribune reporters Tim Jones and Ray Gibson contributed to this report Stephen

Barrett, M.D. Board Chairman, Quackwatch, Inc.

email: sbinfo@quackwatch.com

Telephone: (610) 437-1795

URL#1: http://www.quackwatch.com

URL#2: http://www.chirobase.org

----------------- End Forwarded Message -----------------

To join the Clinical-Psychologists forum, send the command

    SUBSCRIBE CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS YOURFIRSTNAME YOURLASTNAME; to leave

the

forum, send the command

            SIGNOFF CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS

to LISTSERV@LISTSERV.NODAK.EDU or, if you experience difficulties, write to

CLINICAL-PSYCHOLOGISTS-request@LISTSERV.NODAK.EDU.

--------------D205C3996D87C240FB647863--

--------------8BE3A44517450F98CA45710B--

>From Mark@bisconti.com Tue Jan 19 10:48:09 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 KAA20206 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 10:48:07 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000407752@medusa.nei.org> for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 13:46:18 -0500

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange

1. Can anyone describe (briefly, without lit review!) what is known = about
the
impact of Hollywood (both movies and TV) on public opinion, = and the
relationship to
voting? References? How it compares to = national TV news?

2. Is anyone aware of studies of perceptions/knowledge of U.S. citizens =
about
Native Americans, and opinions of Native Americans on any range of = issues?
Also,
opinions by U.S. citizens about casino's owned/operated = by Natives? =20

PS-thanks all for the China data contacts and references.

Mark Richards

mark@bisconti.com

Dear Dr. Lavarakas:

An abstract was submitted for Danna Moore and John Tarnai to be included in

the

Citzen Satisfaction session. it was called It was submitted by Tom Gutterbock

with

other abstracts for consideration as a session. We have not received a

confirmation

of receipt by AAPOR.

Danna Moore

ABSTRACT

Customer Satisfaction Surveys: The Dangers of Doing Too Good a Job

by

Danna Moore   John Tarnai

Social & Economic Sciences Research Center   Social & Economic

Sciences Research Center

Washington State University   Washington State

University

Pullman, WA 99164-4014   Pullman, WA 99164-4014

Tel: (509) 335-1511   Tel: (509) 335-1117

FAX: (509) 335-0116   FAX: (509) 335-0116

This paper describes our experiences with designing and conducting customer

satisfaction surveys for several different state agencies over the past

several

years. The research issues addressed by this paper include the following:

(1)

What are the unique design issues that are confronted by customer satisfaction

surveys, and how do these affect the survey process? (2) What happens when the

survey results run counter to what was expected, and portray the client agency in a

bad light? (3) What do agencies need to do in order to be able to translate survey

results into action plans for organizational change? Customer satisfaction surveys

are often more difficult to design and implement because there is usually a criterion

of satisfaction that is assumed. This may be explicit or implicit, and it may

require comparisons over time, against an objective standard, or with a normative

group. The results of customer satisfaction surveys are often used as measures of

the adequacy of performance of an agency. This aspect can cause problems if there

are consequences to the agency if customer satisfaction standards are not met.

Another potential problem arises when followup surveys are not conducted with same

rigor as prior surveys thereby inhibiting the ability to measure changes over time.

Finally, agencies sometimes don't know how to turn survey results into action plans

for change. This paper presents examples of these and other issues based on

experiences with a number of customer satisfaction surveys conducted for state

agencies. END

>

****

Danna L. Moore, Ph.D.

Research Coordinator

Social & Economic Sciences Research Center

Washington State University

P.O. Box 644014

Pullman, WA 99164-4014

Tel. 509-335-1117 VM/ 335-1511 Secretary

FAX 509-335-0116 email: moored@wsu.edu

****

>From HKassarj@ucla.edu Tue Jan 19 13:14:28 1999

Received: from theta2.ben2.ucla.edu (theta2.ben2.ucla.edu [164.67.131.36])

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

    id NAA15515 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 13:14:27 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ycxfssto (ts50-26.wla.ts.ucla.edu [164.67.22.151])

    by theta2.ben2.ucla.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id NAA30144

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jan 1999 13:14:25 -0800

Message-Id: <199901192114.NAA30144@theta2.ben2.ucla.edu>

X-Sender: hkassarj@164.67.131.34

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1

Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 13:14:49 -0800

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "H.H.Kassarjian" <HKassarj@ucla.edu>

Subject: Re: Inquiry--2 Questions

In-Reply-To: <01BE43B1.170F3EA0@mark-bri>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

    types="text/plain,text/html";

boundary="====================_2558317==_.ALT"

--====================_2558317==_.ALT

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

There is some good research on the impact of product placement in movies and

TV

shows. That is, the effect of the TV/Film characters driving a Ford, smoking

Marlboro cigarettes, drinking a Coke or Bud. I would expect that if such

placement

has an impact of "voting" for a brand with one's pocketbook, it also surely

must have

an effect on voting on political issues. Hal Kassarjian

****

At 01:39 PM 1/19/99 -0500, you wrote:

>1. Can anyone describe (briefly, without lit review!) what is known

>about

the

impact of Hollywood (both movies and TV) on public opinion, and the

relationship to

voting? References? How it compares to national TV news?

>

>2. Is anyone aware of studies of perceptions/knowledge of U.S.

>citizens

about

Native Americans, and opinions of Native Americans on any range of issues?

Also, opinions by U.S. citizens about casino's owned/operated by Natives?

>

>PS-thanks all for the China data contacts and references.

>

>Mark Richards

>mark@bisconti.com

>

****

Hal Kassarjian

HKassarj@ucla.edu

Phone: 1 (818) 784-5669

FAX: 1 (818) 784-3325

--=====================_2558317==_.ALT

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

<html>

There is some good research on the impact of product placement in

movies

and TV shows. That is, the effect of the TV/Film characters driving a

Ford,

smoking Marlboro cigarettes, drinking a Coke or Bud. I would expect that

if

such placement has an impact of "voting" for a brand with one's

pocketbook,

it also surely must have an effect on voting on political issues.
 Hal

Kassarjian
 ****

 At 01:39 PM 1/19/99 -0500,

you

wrote:
 >1. Can anyone describe (briefly, without lit review!)

what is

known about the impact of Hollywood (both movies and TV) on public opinion,

and the

relationship to voting? References? How it compares to national TV

news?
 >
 >2. Is anyone aware of studies of

perceptions/knowledge

of U.S. citizens about Native Americans, and opinions of Native Americans on

any

range of issues? Also, opinions by U.S. citizens about casino's

owned/operated

by Natives?
 >
 >PS-thanks all for the China data contacts

and

references.
 >
 >Mark Richards
 >mark@bisconti.com
 >

 <div>***************</div> <div>Hal Kassarjian</div>

<div>HKassarj@ucla.edu</div> <div>Phone: 1 (818) 784-5669</div>

FAX: 1 (818) 784-3325 </html>

--=====================_2558317==_.ALT--

Subject: JOB OPENINGS -- CBS NEWS

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

CBS NEWS FULL-TIME JOB OPENING, APRIL 1999

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF SURVEYS, CBS NEWS=20

The CBS News Election & Survey Unit is looking for a Deputy Director of =
Surveys to
begin work in April. The Deputy Director reports directly to = Dr. Kathy
Frankovic,
Director of Surveys, and works with her on designing = and analyzing all
national
public opinion CBS News and CBS/New York Times = polls, as well as exit polls
for
primaries and general elections in = election years.=20

Job description: Design national public opinion questionnaires and write =
analyses
of survey data. Work with The New York Times polling analysts to = design
joint
surveys. Manage Election & Survey Unit researchers and = oversee all aspects
of
field work, which CBS News and The New York Times = conduct internally. This
means
ensuring proper fielding of all surveys, = compilation of trends for each
survey, and

distribution of all press = releases. Represent CBS News on the Voter News

Service

exit poll = questionnaire committee. Respond to internal research requests

from =

reports and producers and external requests from interested organizations.=

=20

Requirements: At least 7 years experience in questionnaire design and =

survey

analysis. Strong knowledge of survey methods and sampling = required.

Previous work

dealing with print or television reporters or in = media necessary. Ability

to work

under short deadlines and to be flexible = in terms of work schedule critical.

Strong writing skills also critical. = Knowledge of electoral politics a

definite

plus.

Hours: 10 AM to 6 PM. Because we are responsive to news events, = additional

work

hours are on an as-needed basis. =20

Location: Manhattan, CBS News Broadcast Center, 524 West 57th Street = (west

of

Columbus Circle)

Salary: This is a staff contract position with full benefits.

Interested applicants: E-mail Cheryl Arnedt, Deputy Director of Surveys, =

at car=40cbsnews.com or Kathy Frankovic at kaf=40cbsnews.com -- or fax us =

at 212-975-5399.   All interested applicants must submit a cover letter =

with salary history, resume and references. =20

_____

TWO-YEAR TEMPORARY 1999-2000 JOB OPENING

MANAGER OF SURVEYS, CBS NEWS=20

The CBS News Election & Survey Unit is looking for a Manager of Surveys = from

January 1999 through the end of the election year in 2000. The = election
season is

a busy time for the Election Unit as we do national, = and sometimes state,
public

opinion polls for use on the multiple CBS News = programs. =20

Job description: Manage all aspects of field work for all surveys = conducted
by CBS

News =AF both on its own and in conjunction with The New = York Times. This
includes

finalizing survey instruments and checking CATI = programming before field
work

begins; briefing interviewers; monitoring = interviews as they=A2re conducted;
and

devising and overseeing open-end = coding.

Requirements: At least 1 to 2 years experience supervising computer-assist=
ed

telephone poll field work. Knowledge of questionnaire design a = definite

plus.

Proficiency in WordPerfect important. Ability to work = under short deadlines

and

have a flexible schedule critical.=20

Hours: 10 AM to 6 PM. Because we are responsive to news events, frequent =

night

and weekend work is required. (In 1998, CBS News conducted 50 =

polls.) There are standard holidays and vacation.

Location: Manhattan, CBS News Broadcast Center, 524 West 57th Street = (west

of

Columbus Circle)

Salary: To be determined. Pay is on a weekly basis with no overtime pay. =

Since

this is a temporary position, there are no benefits with it. =20

Interested applicants: E-mail Cheryl Arnedt, Deputy Director of Surveys, =

at car=40cbsnews.com or fax her at 212-975-5399.   All interested =

applicants must send a cover letter, resume, references and salary =

requirements. =20

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Jan 25 08:32:59 1999

Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com

[207.69.200.82])

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

    id IAA24817 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 08:32:58 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (user-38lcfef.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.61.207])

News flash from the NY TIMES:

January 25, 1999

Supreme Court Rejects Sampling for 2000 Census

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON -- The 2000 census cannot be adjusted to make up for an

expected undercount of minorities, the Supreme Court said on

Monday,

ruling for taxpayers who challenged the Clinton administration's

plan.

The federal census law bars use of statistical methods intended to

make the

national population count more nearly accurate, the justices said in
a
divided
ruling that could have a major effect on money and votes nationwide.

When the census law was amended in 1976, "At no point ...
did a single member of Congress suggest that the
amendments would so fundamentally change the manner in
which the (Census) Bureau could calculate the population for
purposes of
apportionment," Justice Sandra Day O'Connor wrote for the court.

O'Connor said "it tests the limits of reason" to suggest that
Congress would
have been silent in enacting "what would arguably be the single most
significant change in the method of conducting the decennial census
since
its
inception."

Adjusting the census likely would have helped Democrats because
minorities
and inner-city residents, who tend to vote Democratic, made up a
large
share of
the estimated 4 million people missed by the 1990 count.

Republicans oppose adjusting the numbers to make up for that
undercount

because people who tend to vote Republican also are more likely to voluntarily

respond to the census.

Joining O'Connor's decision that adjusting the census figures is unlawful

were

Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist and Justices Antonin Scalia, Anthony M.

Kennedy and Clarence Thomas.

Dissenting were Justices John Paul Stevens, David H. Souter, Ruth

Bader

Ginsburg and Stephen G. Breyer, who said the federal census law did not bar

the government from adjusting the figures.

Census counts have been imperfect since Thomas Jefferson oversaw the

first

one in 1790. All sides acknowledge that census-takers cannot expect to find

every American.

At issue in today's case was whether the government may use modern

statistical knowledge to estimate how many people were missed.

The Constitution requires an "actual enumeration" of the nation's population

every 10 years to help divide the 435 members of the House of

Representatives

among the states. Census figures also are used to draw

congressional, state

and local voting districts, and to hand out $180 billion in federal

funds

each

year.

Two lower courts ruled the government's proposal unlawful last year,

saying

a

federal census law barred adjustment of census figures used for

dividing the

House members among the states.

Clinton administration lawyers contended the government has

estimated at

least part of the population in each census since 1940, but

acknowledged the

new plan was a significant change.

The House Republicans' lawyers said the Constitution and federal

census law

allow only a one-by-one head count.

O'Connor said that because the census law barred the use of

statistical

sampling, the high court was not deciding whether such methods would

violate

the Constitution's "actual enumeration" language.

The government's census plans were challenged by taxpayers in six states --

Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin

-- who said adjusting the census would cost them federal money and political

power.

House Republicans also sued, saying the Constitution and federal census law

allow only a one-by-one head count.

The Supreme Court said the taxpayers had legal standing to sue, and today's

ruling was based on their case. The Republicans' appeal was dismissed.

The high court had aimed for an early decision in the case to give the

government time to plan for the census, scheduled for April 1, 2000.

The census is conducted by mail, and about two-thirds of Americans return

their forms. Census workers then begin knocking on doors to find the rest,
but

that does not always work.

The Clinton administration's plan would use those traditional

methods to

find

90 percent of Americans, then use a separate survey of 750,000

people across

the country as a "quality check" to decide where people were

overcounted or

undercounted.

Three years ago, the Supreme Court ruled the Bush administration

could

decide not to adjust the 1990 census figures even though a

disproportionate

share of those undercounted were minorities.

Today, the high court said the Clinton administration cannot decide

to

adjust

the figures when it wants to.

The census law "directly prohibits the use of sampling in the

determination

of

population for purposes of apportionment," O'Connor wrote. "When

Congress

amended ... (the law) in 1976, it did not in doing so alter the

longstanding

prohibition on the use of sampling in matters relating to

apportionment."

Because today's ruling only bars the use of adjusted census figures
for
allocating House members among the states, the government might
still be
able
to use adjusted numbers for drawing election districts and doling
out
federal
aid. However, Congress could refuse to pay for creating a second set
of
figures
for those purposes.

Last week, in his State of the Union address, President Clinton
said, "Since
every person in America counts, every American ought to be counted.
We need
a census that uses most modern scientific methods to do that."

In dissent, Stevens wrote, "The Census Act ... unambiguously
authorizes the
Secretary of Commerce to use sampling procedures when taking the
decennial
census." He also contended the Constitution allowed use of such
methods.

Joining the government's appeal were cities including New York, Los

Angeles,

Chicago, Detroit and others that said they would lose if the figures

were

not

adjusted.

The cases are Department of Commerce vs. House of Representatives,

98-404,

and Clinton vs. Glavin, 98-564.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jan 25 09:52:15 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 JAA19268 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 09:52:14 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id JAA22210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 09:52:12 -0800

(PST)

Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 09:52:12 -0800 (PST)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Supreme Court Census Ruling (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9901250951410.19044-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 11:53:17 EST

From: COPAFS@aol.com

Subject: Supreme Court Census Ruling

The Supreme Court has just rejected sampling for the 2000 Census. Details can

be

found on the COPAFS web site: http://members.aol.com/copafs. Click on What's

New on

our home page.

>From arumi@ppic.org Mon Jan 25 17:31:53 1999

Received: from [205.180.168.1] (ppic.org [205.180.168.1])

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

    id RAA21892 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 17:31:52 -0800

(PST)

Received: from eureka.ppic.org by [205.180.168.1]

        via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.19.136]) with SMTP; 26 Jan 1998

01:43:10 UT

Received: by eureka.ppic.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

    id <YQQNDBD1>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 17:34:49 -0800

Message-ID: <21358730B6BED011BDD500609714992268C2A7@eureka.ppic.org>

From: Ana Maria Arumi <arumi@ppic.org>

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

Subject: RE: Submissions to the 1999 AAPOR conference

Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 17:34:43 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

Hi -

I never received confirmation about this addition to our proposed panel:

" . . .

I spoke with you last week about adding another member to our "Diversity within

Latino Opinion" panel. (I'm afraid that this did end up falling through the cracks.)

The additional member will be Mark Baldassare, Public Policy Institute of California

and the University of California, Irvine. 500 Washington, #800 San Francisco, CA 94111

(415) 291-4427

baldassare@ppic.org

"Public Policy Attitudes Among California Latinos"

Focusing on such issues as Education, Race Attitides, and Immigration.

Data will be based on 5 state-wide surveys conducted in 1998. Each survey had n=2000

with Latino subsamples of at least 400.

I hope this is enough information to get Mark's proposal included in the review

process.

Many thanks,

Ana Maria Arumi

415-674-7750

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

> From: Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. [SMTP:lavrakas.1@osu.edu]

> Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 1999 10:49 AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Submissions to the 1999 AAPOR conference

>

> If you submitted a proposal for a panel, paper, poster or roundtable

> for the 1999 AAPOR conference and have not received the confirmation

> that we received your submission, please send a mesaage to that effect

> ASAP

> to:

>

>   aapor99@osu.edu

>

>

>

> Also, if possible, please attach a file with your original submission

> to your message.

>

>

> Thanks, and I hope we don't hear from anyone...

>

>

>

> **

> Prof. Paul J. Lavrakas <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

> 1999 AAPOR Conference Committee Chair

>From arumi@ppic.org Mon Jan 25 17:34:12 1999

Received: from [205.180.168.1] (ppic.org [205.180.168.1])

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

    id RAA23213 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 17:34:11 -0800

(PST)

Received: from eureka.ppic.org by [205.180.168.1]

      via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.19.136]) with SMTP; 26 Jan 1998

01:45:29 UT

Received: by eureka.ppic.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

    id <YQQNDBDJ>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 17:37:09 -0800

Message-ID: <21358730B6BED011BDD500609714992268C2A8@eureka.ppic.org>

From: Ana Maria Arumi <arumi@ppic.org>

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

Subject: Recall: Submissions to the 1999 AAPOR conference

Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 17:37:04 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

Ana Maria Arumi would like to recall the message, "Submissions to the 1999

AAPOR

conference".

>From yogi@vt.edu Tue Jan 26 08:32:33 1999

Received: from quackerjack.cc.vt.edu (root@quackerjack.cc.vt.edu

[198.82.160.250])

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

   id IAA24955 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:32:32 -0800

(PST)

Received: from sable.cc.vt.edu (sable.cc.vt.edu [128.173.16.30])

   by quackerjack.cc.vt.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA06919

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 11:32:29 -0500 (EST)

Received: from vtcsr.async.vt.edu (vtcsr.async.vt.edu [128.173.16.253])

   by sable.cc.vt.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id LAA20849

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 11:32:13 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990126113855.006df2fc@mail.vt.edu>

X-Sender: yogi@mail.vt.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 11:38:55 +0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Alan Bayer <yogi@vt.edu>

Subject: Job Opportunity

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Data Systems Manager, Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research. Minimum of

Bachelor's degree in a computational or social science required. Maintain

Center's

IBM-compatible hardware, local area networks, and Computer Assisted Telephone

Interviewing (CATI) software. Write DOS-based programs. Supervise support

staff.

Develop data base documentation and files, create SAS or SPSS statistical

programs,

and prepare statistical reports for approximately 35 project clients annually.

Beginning March 1, or as soon thereafter as possible. Virginia Tech is an

EO/AA

employer. Send resume and names of 3 references by Feburary 15 to Alan E.

Bayer,

Search Committee Chair, Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research, 207 W.

Roanoke

Street, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543.

```
                 \\|//
                 (@ @)
============================w===V===w============================
```

   Alan E. Bayer, Director   e-mail: yogi@vt.edu

   Center for Survey Research   phone: (540)231-3676

   207 W. Roanoke St.   fax: (540)231-3678

   Virginia Tech

   Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543 USA

     http://www.vt.edu:10021/centers/survey/index.html

```
=====================================================
```

```
=====================================================
```

The Washington Post editorial

A Limited Census Ruling

Tuesday, January 26, 1999; Page A18=20

A DIVIDED Supreme Court issued a limited ruling yesterday against the = use of

sampling and other statistical techniques to improve the accuracy = of the

year 2000

Census. The limits were the good news.

The 5 to 4 decision was based on a reading of relevant statutes rather = than

the

Constitution. That means Congress and the president have the = ability to

reverse it,

and last year's appropriations process was = arranged in such a way that they

will

have to face the issue again this = spring. Failure to pass a bill would leave

the

departments of State and = Justice as well as Commerce, in which the Census

Bureau is

housed, = without funds to carry out their duties. Congressional Republicans

will =

likely continue to resist the use of sampling, but the administration = will

press in

favor -- so the president indicated in the State of the = Union address -- and

it is

not clear how the issue will be resolved.

The decision was also limited to the figures that will be used in the =

reapportionment of House seats among the states after the next election. = Its

application to the redistricting that will follow within the states = is not

clear.

Legislatures may well be free to use statistically = adjusted figures in that

process, and the federal government apparently = remains free to use such

figures in

the allocation of federal funds as = well. For that to happen, the bureau

might have

to issue two sets of = figures, one adjusted, one not, but it would have the

data to

do so. The = administration yesterday was still reviewing the opinion, and

said only

= that it would strive to produce "the most accurate accounting of the =

American

people" possible while conforming to the law.

You would think that might be everyone's goal, but it is not, quite. The =

problem

with the census is an undercount of minority groups and poor = people

especially.

That's what the bureau would use sampling and = extrapolation to correct.

Republicans

are opposed in part for fear that = an adjusted count could cost them seats,

and

perhaps their House = majority, in the next redistricting. They argue as well

that

statistical = adjustment could be subject to political manipulation, and that

the =

Constitution requires an "actual enumeration." The Supreme Court didn't = get

to the

constitutional question. Our sense is that the figures ought = to be as

accurate as

the statistical profession can produce. An = undercount of vulnerable groups

is

especially indefensible. Congress = ought to fix the law.=20

WASHINGTON TIMES ARTICLE 1-26-99

Court rules against census sampling

By August Gribbin

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Supreme Court yesterday ruled 5-4 that the Census Bureau cannot = execute
its

innovative plan to use limited "statistical sampling" when = counting the U.S.

population next year. The court thus handed Republican = congressional leaders
a huge

and hard-fought political victory.

The decision, written by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, states that = "in

calculating the population for purposes of apportionment," sampling = is
illegal

because it violates the 1954 Census Act and its 1976 = amendment, which guides

census-taking operations.

However, the ruling allows use of sampling as a basis for funding =
decisions

and possibly for state and local redistricting. The high court = thus dodged
the

separate and significant question of whether sampling is = unconstitutional.

Joining Justice O'Connor in the majority decision were Chief = Justice
William

H. Rehnquist, and Justices Antonin Scalia, Anthony = Kennedy and Clarence
Thomas.

Dissenting were Justices John Paul Stevens, = David H. Souter, Ruth Bader
Ginsburg

and Stephen G. Breyer.

Justice Stevens took the position that a strict face-to-face count =
would

"yield absurd results. ... Enumerators unable to gain entry to a = large and
clearly

occupied apartment complex would be required to note = zero occupants."

The sampling issue is enormously important because census results =
determine

how many of the 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives = will be
allotted to

each state. They also affect state and local = redistricting, and census
results are

the basis for distributing some = $180 billion in federal funds for minorities
and

the needy.

The court's decision says nothing directly about the use of = sampling
for

redistricting, and attorney Matthew Glavin, head of the = Southeastern Legal

Foundation, said in a phone interview that he would = sue, if necessary, to
prevent

sampling from being used for redistricting = at any level. It was Mr. Glavin
who

brought the suit the court yesterday = decided.

Neither redistricting nor sampling for funding were factors in the = GOP

leaders' objections to sampling. They fought against it because the = Census'
plan

threatened to increase the count of persons who = traditionally are missed or
fail to

participate in the census --mostly = urban blacks, immigrants, renters and

children.

Adults in such groups tend to vote as Democrats, and it was thought =
that the

Census Bureau's plan might cause Democrats to gain seats in the = U.S. House
of

Representatives at the GOP's expense.

Typically, the decennial national head count has been accomplished = by
mailing

questionnaires to all U.S. households, then sending = "enumerators" to visit
and

question nonrespondents.

As Justice O'Connor wrote, "Despite this comprehensive effort ... = the
bureau

has always failed to reach -- and has thus failed to count -- = a portion of
the

population." Indeed, the bureau missed some 4 million = people in the 1990
census.

To provide an accurate head count, the bureau planned to supplement = the
usual

procedure by getting information from a given number, or = sample, of
nonrespondents

whom enumerators could reach. The bureau then = would apply to the remaining

nonrespondents information the sample = people supplied. GOP leaders called
this

creating "virtual people."

In opposing the plan, the court upheld a decision last summer by =
Virginia's

Eastern District Court in a case brought by Mr. Glavin and 16 = plaintiffs
from 13

states and four county governments.=20

The district court and the Supreme Court declared they had a = legitimate

claim,

because, as Justice O'Connor wrote, appellees = demonstrated "it is a virtual

certainty that Indiana ... will lose a = House seat under the proposed census

2000

plan. That loss undoubtedly = satisfies the requirement for standing

[appropriateness

to sue] since = Indiana residents' votes will be diluted."

Mr. Glavin's suit was one of two against the use of sampling. The = House

initiated the second.

Like Mr. Glavin, House leaders argued sampling is illegal because =

federal law

requires the Census Bureau to actually "enumerate," or = physically count,

every U.S.

resident. The high court found that, since = its decision in Mr. Glavin's case

resolves the "substantive issues = presented," the House's case is dismissed.

A happy Mr. Glavin said yesterday: "The Census Bureau wanted to = create

30

million mythical people, deciding what they looked like and = where they

lived. This

would have made our representative democracy a = virtual representative

democracy."

House leaders applauded, too. Speaker Dennis Hastert, Illinois =

Republican,

said the high court "reaffirmed a basic constitutional = principle." And House

Appropriations Committee Chairman C.W. Bill Young, = Florida Republican,

declared

optimistically that the ruling "resolves = once and for all how the 2000

Census is to

be conducted."

House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt, Missouri Democrat, said = he was

"disappointed." And in a portent that the political battle isn't = over, Rep. Martin

Frost, Texas Democrat and chairman of the House = Democratic Caucus, said the

decision "makes clear that the Congress can = amend the federal census law and fix

the problem that prevents the = Census Bureau from accurately counting all

Americans."

In other action, the court:

.Agreed to wade back into the contentious issue of campaign finance by =

taking up a

ruling that invalidated Missouri's limits on contributions = to state

campaigns as a

violation of contributors' free-speech rights. .Agreed to decide whether state

employees who say they are victims of = age discrimination can make a federal

case of

it. At issue is whether a = federal anti-bias law wipes out the immunity that

states

and state = agencies enjoy against being sued in federal courts. .Rejected the

appeal

of Canadian Joseph Stanley Faulder, who was = convicted of murder in Texas. He

argued

that his death sentence should = be overturned because his rights under

international

law were violated.

>From yogi@vt.edu Tue Jan 26 08:59:34 1999

Received: from quackerjack.cc.vt.edu (root@quackerjack.cc.vt.edu

[198.82.160.250])

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

    id IAA07496 for <aapornet@vm.usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 08:59:32 -0800

(PST)

Received: from sable.cc.vt.edu (sable.cc.vt.edu [128.173.16.30])

    by quackerjack.cc.vt.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA12874

    for <aapornet@vm.usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 11:59:30 -0500 (EST)

Received: from vtcsr.async.vt.edu (vtcsr.async.vt.edu [128.173.16.253])

    by sable.cc.vt.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id LAA23394

    for <aapornet@vm.usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 11:59:29 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990126120620.00edd47c@mail.vt.edu>

X-Sender: yogi@mail.vt.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:06:20 +0500

To: aapornet@vm.usc.edu

From: Alan Bayer <yogi@vt.edu>

Subject: Job Opportunity

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

>Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 11:38:55 +0500

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>From: Alan Bayer <yogi@vt.edu>

>Subject: Job Opportunity

>

>

>Data Systems Manager, Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research.

>Minimum

of Bachelor's degree in a computational or social science required. Maintain

Center's

IBM-compatible hardware, local area networks, and Computer Assisted Telephone

Interviewing (CATI) software. Write DOS-based programs. Supervise support

staff.

Develop data base documentation and files, create SAS or SPSS statistical

programs,

and prepare statistical reports for approximately 35 project clients annually.

Beginning March 1, or as soon thereafter as possible. Virginia Tech is an

EO/AA

employer. Send resume and names of 3 references by Feburary 15 to Alan E.

Bayer,

Search Committee Chair, Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research, 207 W.

Roanoke

Street, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543.

```
                \\|//
                (@ @)
============================w===V===w============================
```

   Alan E. Bayer, Director   e-mail: yogi@vt.edu

   Center for Survey Research   phone: (540)231-3676

   207 W. Roanoke St.   fax: (540)231-3678

   Virginia Tech

   Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543 USA

      http://www.vt.edu:10021/centers/survey/index.html

```
===================================================
```

==

>From corninga@umich.edu Tue Jan 26 10:46:06 1999

Received: from m5.psc.lsa.umich.edu (root@[141.211.200.72])

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

    id KAA12490 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 10:46:05 -0800

(PST)

Received: from agency.psc.lsa.umich.edu (corninga@agency.psc.lsa.umich.edu

[141.211.200.184])

    by m5.psc.lsa.umich.edu (8.8.8/8.8.7/PSC 1.8 1997/09/25 12:39:50 jlarke)

with

ESMTP id NAA21787

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 13:45:38 -0500 (EST)

Received: from localhost (corninga@localhost)

    by agency.psc.lsa.umich.edu (8.8.8/8.8.5/DUMB 1.3 1997-02-15 01:21:15-05

jlarke) with SMTP id NAA11033

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 13:46:02 -0500 (EST)

X-Authentication-Warning: agency.psc.lsa.umich.edu: corninga owned process

doing -bs

Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 13:46:02 -0500 (EST)

From: Amy Corning <corninga@umich.edu>

X-Sender: corninga@agency.psc.lsa.umich.edu

Reply-To: Amy Corning <corninga@umich.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: incentives for refusal conversion

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.95.990126133028.10763A-

100000@agency.psc.lsa.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I am seeking information on the use of incentives by survey

organizations to

convert refusals; specifically, I'm interested in how widespread the practice

is. If

anyone has information on this, or could point me to potential sources, I'd

very much

appreciate it.

Many thanks!

Amy Corning

Institute for Social Research, 322

University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248

Tel. (734) 647-5380

In a message dated 1/26/99 1:46:45 PM, corninga@umich.edu wrote:

<<I am seeking information on the use of incentives by survey organizations to

convert refusals; specifically, I'm interested in how widespread the practice

is. If

anyone has information on this, or could point me to potential sources, I'd

very much

appreciate it.

>>

Have you looked in the AAPOR.org web site's Public Opinion Quarterly keyword

index of

past articles? There have been articles on incentives published in POQ by

Diane

Willimack, by Jeannine James and Richard Bolstein (two such by the latter

coauthors),

etc. You might also contact the Univ of Illinois Survey Research Laboratory,

which

has a web site I believe, that publishes a periodic newsletter on surveys

conducted

by academic survey organizations. They may know of some past projects focusing

on

refusal conversion, using incentives.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Past Survey Statistician, National Agricultural Statistics Service U. S. Dept

of

Agriculture Currently Research Statistician, U. S. Dept. of Justice

miltgold@aol.com

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Jan 27 09:14:07 1999

Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

    id JAA20471 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 09:13:57 -0800

(PST)

Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

    id <V848PSTH>; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 12:14:27 -0500

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9130913@AS_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: Census Plans to Release Two Sets of Numbers

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1999 12:14:25 -0500

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

According to the Washington Post:

Page A2

"But shortly after the ruling, the administration said the court's

language required it to use sampling for other purposes, including

the distribution of federal funds and to redraw political boundaries

within states."

"Republicans also drew up a proposal to improve census efforts to

reach more people. The plan, to be released today, would quadruple

to $400 million the funds available to promote the census, hire at

least 100,000 more census workers to visit difficult-to-count areas,

enlist the help of Americorps volunteers and make census forms available

in 33 languages."

The full story is available at

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/longterm/supcourt/stories/

census012799.htm

"so-called statistical sampling?"

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

>From rasinski@norcmail.uchicago.edu Wed Jan 27 15:08:41 1999

Received: from genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu

[128.135.45.28])

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

    id PAA00360 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 15:08:34 -0800

(PST)

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC), affiliated with the

University of Chicago, is accepting applications for the 1999 Summer

Intern Program. This internship is a full-time paid position lasting

10 weeks for upper-level undergraduates and graduate students with an

interest in social science research. Two cohorts are planned for this

summer. The first cohort will run from May 24 through July 30 and the

second, from June 21 through August 27.

Interns will be assigned to an ongoing NORC research study, attend a

seminar series on principles of survey research, and conduct a small

scale study of their own. The goal is to involve interns in all

aspects of the survey design and operations process. Interns work in

one of the two main Chicago offices of NORC_either downtown or in Hyde

Park, on the University of Chicago campus.

To apply, submit a cover letter, resume, and writing sample of

approximately five pages to Linda Sharp at 1155 E. 60th St., Chicago,

IL 60637; fax: 773-753-7808; or e-mail:

sharp-linda@norcmail.uchicago.edu. Applications will be accepted from

February 1 to April 15 for the Summer Intern Program.

For further information about NORC or the Summer Intern Program,

please visit our website at www.norc.uchicago.edu.

NORC is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer who values

diversity in our workforce and actively encourages all qualified

candidates to apply.

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Jan 27 18:31:27 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 SAA09534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 18:31:16 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (user-37kbbg9.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.174.9])

    by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id VAA27969

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Jan 1999 21:31:07 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990127171548.00801b20@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1999 17:15:48 -0500

>From NY TIMES.........................

January 27, 1999

1-Article

Census Ruling Reignites a Partisan Battle

By JAMES DAO

WASHINGTON -- Partisan lines hardened on Tuesday over the 2000 census, as the

White

House said it was strongly considering a proposal to produce census figures

using

statistical sampling that states could use for drawing legislative districts,

while

Republicans vowed to fight any such plan in the courts and Congress.

The new round of sparring came the day after the Supreme Court ruled that

sampling, a

statistical technique, could not be used to adjust the 2000 census for the

purposes

of apportioning seats in the House. The ruling was a victory for Republicans because

sampling tends to increase the count of Democratic-leaning groups, including

immigrants, ethnic minorities and city dwellers.

But the court left the door open to using sampling for other purposes, including

possibly redistricting and allocating federal money. And White House officials said

on Tuesday that the administration was considering plans to produce two sets of

official census data in 2001: one based on a traditional head count to be used for

apportioning congressional seats, and another adjusted by sampling that states could

use to draw lines for federal, state and local political districts.

"It's our understanding," said Barry Toiv, a White House spokesman, "that the court

affirmed the use of scientific sampling for allocating federal funds and providing

data to the states for redistricting. The president still believes that every

individual ought to be counted. And the Census Bureau has already begun working to

make sure the census is accurate but also accommodates the court's ruling."

But producing two sets of official census figures would increase the price of the

2000 census, now placed between $4 billion and $6 billion, by $1 billion or

more,

administration officials said. And on Tuesday, House Republicans said they would

fight any efforts to spend money on sampling.

"We will give them the money for an actual count, not a poll," said John Feehery, a

spokesman for Speaker Dennis Hastert, R-Ill.

Some Republican officials believe their party would lose control of several state

legislatures if sampling is used in redistricting. For that reason, many Democrats

and census experts said they expected House Republicans to make census financing a

major budget issue in the coming months.

And the leader of a conservative legal group said on Tuesday that his organization

would urge House Republicans to hold firm against sampling, even if it leads to a

budget impasse and shutdown of the federal government, similar to 1995.

"I can tell you Republicans don't have a good track record in standing up to this

president," said Matthew J. Glavin, president of the Southeastern Legal Foundation, a

conservative group in Atlanta that filed the legal challenge to sampling. "We have to

see whether the Republicans have the will to battle the president on this

one."

Asked if such an impasse were possible, Feehery said, "I certainly hope not.

But it

remains to be seen how this will play out."

Producing two sets of census data would be a major logistical problem for the

Census

Bureau, which is required to give census figures to the states for

redistricting by

April 1, 2001. And having two sets of data to choose from would create immense

political headaches for state legislatures.

"It would put the states in a very difficult position," said Tim Storey, a

redistricting expert for the National Conference of State Legislatures. "They

would

have to choose one, and there is no bright-line legal precedent to help. And

whichever unit they use, they will be sued."

Whether or not sampling is used, both the Clinton administration and

congressional

Republicans said they were developing plans designed to count traditionally

undercounted groups. In 1990, the census missed 8.4 million people and double

counted

4.4 million others, according to an analysis the government conducted later.

Commerce Secretary William M. Daley said in a telephone interview on Tuesday

that the

Census Bureau would be releasing a plan in the coming weeks that calls for spending

additional money on advertising in immigrant and minority communities, hiring

community residents to serve as enumerators and recruiting community groups to help

promote the census in hard-to-reach neighborhoods.

"There is no question that if somebody doesn't want to be found, they won't get

found," Daley said. "But that means we have to do more on outreach, more on

advertising, a better mailing list, greater outreach."

Republicans are also preparing a census outreach plan. In a speech he is scheduled to

give on Wednesday, Rep. Dan Miller of Florida, who is chairman of the House

subcommittee on the census, will call for adding $300 million to the federal budget

for promoting the census in undercounted communities.

Miller will also propose teaching about the census in schools, establishing a grant

program to help municipalities promote the census and hire at least 100,000

additional census enumerators to work in traditionally undercounted

communities.

But some Democrats and immigrant groups contend that without sampling, the Census

Bureau will still get a severe undercount no matter how much more it spends on

outreach. "History has shown that is not effective," said Rep. Carolyn

Maloney,

D-N.Y.

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

Editorial from NY Times

January 27, 1999

Taking the Census Two Ways

The Supreme Court's ruling against the use of statistical sampling to

supplement the

traditional head count in the 2000 census is disappointing. Sampling has long

been

endorsed by experts, including panels convened by the National Academy of

Sciences,

to produce an accurate population count. But the ruling, based on the wording

of the

Federal Census Act, is actually quite narrow.

The Court did not address the argument that sampling violates the "actual

enumeration" requirement in the Constitution. The Court held only that the

Federal

statute prohibits the use of sampling to determine population for purposes of

apportionment of Congressional seats among the states. That is a blow against

political fairness because states with immigrant, minority and low-income

populations

have suffered significant undercounts under traditional census-taking methods,

making

them likely to be shortchanged on seats in Congress. The 1990 census missed an

estimated 8.4 million Americans, a disproportionate number of them blacks and

Hispanics.

But the Court's ruling allows the use of sampling in collecting census data

for all

other government purposes, including Federal aid to state and local

governments. As

the majority opinion by Sandra Day O'Connor explains, the 1976 revisions to

the

Census Act actually require the use of sampling for non-apportionment purposes

if it

is deemed "feasible" by the Secretary of Commerce.

That means the more accurate, adjusted figures can be used in drawing within

each

state the Congressional, state and local legislative district lines. Using

better

data could affect the control of Congress by increasing the number of

districts with

substantial urban and minority populations. A more accurate count could also

affect

state legislatures by giving more voice to areas where undercounting has been

rampant. The adjusted data should also be used to determine distribution for

more

than 160 Federal aid programs. The Clinton Administration should move forward

with

sampling for those important uses while producing a separate set of unadjusted

figures for apportionment only. The Republicans will balk at the two-track

proposal,

but accuracy, fairness and the Census Act demand it.

>From nKjellson@kff.org Fri Jan 29 11:50:44 1999

Received: from kff.org ([205.187.85.100])

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

    id LAA08770 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jan 1999 11:50:42 -0800

(PST)

Received: from KAISER-Message_Server by kff.org

    with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 29 Jan 1999 11:50:10 -0800

Message-Id: <s6b1a072.028@kff.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1999 11:49:41 -0800

From: "Nina Kjellson" <nKjellson@kff.org>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Internet polling with kids and young adults

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I am looking for information about using the Internet (or merely computer =

administered questionnaires) to survey kids and young adults. In particular= ,
I seem

to recall the release last year of a study/survey/report = documenting high

participation in such Internet surveys and supporting the = hypothesis that

the

anonymity of this venue allows for more candid = questioning about sensitive

topics

(health behaviors, etc.). Can anyone = point me in the right direction? I'd be

grateful for any input on this = query. Thank you.

Nina Kjellson

Research Associate

Public Opinion and Media Research

Kaiser Family Foundation

(650) 854-9400 ext. 215

>From edithl@educ.uva.nl Fri Jan 29 12:24:30 1999

Received: from pooh.educ.uva.nl (pooh.educ.uva.nl [145.18.96.16])

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

    id MAA20145 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jan 1999 12:24:29 -0800

(PST)

Received: from minoes.educ.uva.nl (minoes [145.18.97.16])

    by pooh.educ.uva.nl (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id VAA14855

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jan 1999 21:24:26 +0100 (MET)

Received: from uva72.remote.uva.nl (uva72.remote.uva.nl [145.18.29.72]) by

minoes.educ.uva.nl (8.8.5/8.7.2) with SMTP id VAA06761 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Fri,

29 Jan 1999 21:24:23 +0100 (MET)

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1999 21:24:23 +0100 (MET)

Message-Id: <3.0.16.19990129212603.36a74aca@mail.educ.uva.nl>

X-Sender: edithl@mail.educ.uva.nl

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (16)

To: aapornet@usc.edu

In the last issue of POQ there was a very interesting test of computerassited

versus

paper and pen with sensitive topics. There was an interesting effect of more

open

answers in computerassisted data collection with the adolescents, the effect

was not

there for the young adults. (this evening I am working from home, so I do not

have

the reference here with me, but it was the last issue of POQ).

Furthermore, we had some very good experience with using self-administered

computer

assisted questionnaires with young children (less mistakes, more open

answers). The

ms is accepted by JOS, and if it will help I can send you a copy. We also

wrote a

short piece in the Sawtooth proceedings about overcoming the problems of

special

interviews on sensitive topics: computer assisted self-interviewing tailored

for

young children and adolescents.

We are working on a research project on surveying children (in general), and

would

like to share experiences.

Good luck,

EDITH ==

| Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA Amsterdam |

|Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN, Amsterdam, the Netherlands |

| phone + 31 20 622 34 38, Fax + 31 20 622 34 38 |

| e-mail edithL@educ.uva.nL |

==

As preparation for 2001 and the new millennium

Happy new beginnings....

>From JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu Fri Jan 29 12:36:29 1999

Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (ccvm.sunysb.edu [129.49.2.183])

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

id MAA00297 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 29 Jan 1999 12:36:23 -0800

(PST)

Received: by ccvm.sunysb.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id 2454

; Fri,

29 Jan 1999 15:34:44 EST

Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (NJE origin JTANUR@SBCCVM) by CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU

(LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 2892; Fri, 29 Jan 1999 15:34:45 -0500

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 99 15:33:04 EST

From: Judy Tanur <JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>

Subject: Re: Internet polling with kids and young adults

To: aapornet@usc.edu

In-Reply-To: <s6b1a072.028@kff.org>

I'd be interested in any responses to the request posted by Nina Kjellson. If you're

not sending to the whole list, will you please send to me too. Many thanks,

Judy

Tanur (jtanur@ccvm.sunysb.edu)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 09:24 PM 1/29/99 +0100, you wrote:

>

>...

>We are working on a research project on surveying children (in

>general), and would like to share experiences.

>

Hello, Edith:

I am the study director for a recently completed survey of adolescents (ages

12-17)

in Kentucky. The study is designed to estimate the prevalence of use of

certain

drugs (tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, hallucinogens, cocaine and heroin) and to

determine how many of these kids are in need of substance abuse treatment.

If I can be of assistance in your research on surveying kids, please let me

know.

You've been one of the more generous members of AAPOR in sharing your

research. I'd

be happy to repay the favor!

I'll look forward to hearing from you.

=-=

Jim Wolf   Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

Consulting Sociologist   Voice: (317) 255-9621

6332 N. Guilford - Suite #206   FAX: (317) 255-9714

Indianapolis, IN 46220-1768