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 log0001.
Part 1/1, total size 668990 bytes:
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jan  1 09:09:11 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAAll918 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Jan 2000 09:09:10 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA01486 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Jan 2000 09:09:10 -0800 (PST)
Date: Sat, 1 Jan 2000 09:09:10 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: HAPPY NEW YEAR!
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001010820000.619-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

HAPPY NEW YEAR!
May we AAPORNETters, and all AAPOR members, continue to listen to--and to respect--everyone's opinions, however different they might be from our own, for at least the next millennium--regardless of which millennium (or millennia) we might happen to find ourselves in.
Think of it...if they couldn't get the issue number of the NY Times right, and
that mistake was made only 100 years ago....how could we expect them to get the
millennium date right?

Happy New Year anyway!

Dick Halpern

http://www.nytimes.com/00/01/01/news/national/nytimes-issue-number.html
A Correction: Welcome to 51,254
NEW YORK—For those who believe that in the good old days --
before calculators, before computers -- people were better at mental arithmetic,
On Feb. 6, 1898, it seems, someone preparing the next day's front page tried to add 1 to the issue number in the upper left corner (14,499) and came up with 15,000. Apparently no one noticed, because the 500-issue error persisted until Friday (No. 51,753). Saturday The Times turns back the clock to correct the sequence: this issue is No. 51,254.
Thus an article on March 14, 1995, celebrating the arrival of No. 50,000 was 500 days premature. It should have appeared on July 26, 1996.
The error came to light recently when Aaron Donovan, a news assistant, became curious about the numbering, which he updates nightly when working at the news desk. He wondered about the potential for self-perpetuating error. Using a spreadsheet program, he calculated the number of days since The Times' founding, on Sept. 18, 1851.
Through the newspaper's archives, he learned that in its first 500 weeks, The Times published no Sunday issue. Then, for 2,296 weeks from April 1861 to April 1905, the Sunday issue was treated as an extension of the Saturday paper, bearing its number. In the early days, the paper skipped publication on a few holidays. No issues were published for 88 days during a strike in 1978. (During five earlier labor disputes, unpublished issues were assigned numbers, sometimes because catch-up editions were later produced for the archives.)
Finally, by scanning books of historic front pages and reels of microfilm, Donovan zeroed in on the date of the 500-issue gap. "There is something that appeals to me about the way the issue number marks the passage of time across decades and centuries," said a memo from Donovan, who is 24. "It has been steadily climbing for longer than anyone who has ever glanced at it has been alive. The 19th-century newsboy hawking papers in a snowy Union Square is in some minute way bound by the issue number to the Seattle advertising executive reading the paper with her feet propped up on the desk."
As for the other number on the front page -- the volume, in Roman numerals -- it remains CXLIX. It will change to CL on Sept. 18, when The Times enters its 150th year.
I, too, am delighted the New Year has arrived. It sure will be nice to just put "MM" on my checks instead of trying to fit "MCMXCIX" into that little space they give you.

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
Jim Wolf              Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net
>From lmcgill@mediastudies.org Mon Jan  3 14:11:50 2000
Received: from mscmail.mediastudies.org (mscmail.mediastudies.org [205.136.27.120])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
      id OAA28837 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Jan 2000 14:11:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: by MSCMAIL with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
   id <CH13X5AT>; Mon, 3 Jan 2000 17:05:50 -0500
Message-ID: <690C736F7A13D311BD2100902771A1661897AE@MSCMAIL>
From: Larry Mcgill <lmcgill@mediastudies.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: Sheila Owens <sowens@mediastudies.org>
Subject: Jan 6 conference on media coverage of polls
Date: Mon, 3 Jan 2000 17:05:49 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

FYI, here is some information about a public conference taking place this Thursday in
Arlington, Virginia, which may be of interest to AAPORNETters. Some space is still
available for those interested in attending (please RSVP--see below).

NEWS MEDIA COVERAGE OF POLLS & PRIMARIES
A conference on Thursday, Jan. 6, 2000

ARLINGTON, Va. -- Journalists are inundated with poll results daily. As the primary
season unfolds, the demands upon journalists to make sense of this welter of information will only increase. Moreover, dramatic changes in the polling environment
- the advent of the Internet and increased public hostility toward pollsters- are complicating the already challenging task of covering poll results accurately and fairly.

On Thursday, January 6, 2000, The Freedom Forum, the American Association for Public
Opinion Research (AAPOR) and the National Council on Public Polls (NCPP) will co-sponsor a conference on "Media Coverage of Polls & Primaries."

Thursday, Jan. 6, 2000
Breakfast     8:30 a.m.
Program 9 a.m. - 3 p.m. (includes lunch)
The Freedom Forum World Center
Rosslyn Metro Stop (orange line)
(703) 528-0800

Program highlights:
* Announcement of a major NCPP initiative to monitor the conduct and
  reporting of polls
* New findings on what the public thinks about public opinion polls
* A discussion among journalists and pollsters on polling and the
  primaries
* An assessment of the possibilities and limitations of online polls
* The release of a handbook for journalists on "Media Coverage of Polls"

Conference sessions will feature many of the country's most prominent
pollsters and journalists, including: Andrew Kohut (president, NCPP),
Michael Traugott (president, AAPOR), Murray Edelman (editorial director,
Voter News Service; president-elect, AAPOR), Kathleen Frankovic (director
of polling, CBS), Harry O'Neill (vice chairman, Roper Starch Worldwide),
Warren Mitofsky (president, Mitofsky International), Humphrey Taylor (chairman,
Louis Harris & Associates), Jim Norman (USA Today) and
Will Lester (Associated Press).

There is no fee for this conference. Space for the session is limited. To
reserve a seat, please call 703-284-3576, or e-mail talk@mediastudies.org

Contact: Sheila Owens, Media Studies Center
212-317-6517; sowens@mediastudies.org
Jeffrey Pattit, Media Studies Center
212-317-6531; pattitj@mediastudies.org
Larry McGill, Media Studies Center
212-317-6530; lmcgill@mediastudies.org

>From jdfranz@earthlink.net Mon Jan  3 15:22:34 2000
Received: from scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net (scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[207.217.121.49])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA14170 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Jan 2000 15:22:34 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from jdf (sdn-ar-020casfrMP174.dialsprint.net [158.252.248.176])
    by scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA03397;
    Mon, 3 Jan 2000 15:22:30 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <38712E1A.409A@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 2000 15:17:46 -0800
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@earthlink.net>
Reply-To: jdfranz@earthlink.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0C-NSCP (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Ferry Travel
I am looking for any surveys or other research about the desire to travel by ferry, either for commute or recreation trips. Does anyone have any leads or suggestions?

Jennifer Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.
jdfranz@earthlink.net

Colleagues,

I am preparing a short talk on Internet Surveys for the conference on Media coverage of Polls this Thursday.

I thought it might be fun to pass out a sheet listing some of the findings from what are being called Internet Polls - the kind that say "Come to my web site, answer my questions, and we'll pretend it's a poll."

I am sure that some of you are keeping a record of your favorites, so I would appreciate if you could share them with me. I am looking for specific citations; a comparison of that "finding" with a real survey makes it even better.

Please reply to me directly at murray.edelman@vnsusa.org.

Thanks,
Murray Edelman

>From mtrau@umich.edu Tue Jan  4 06:51:10 2000
Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35])
One of my current favorites is David Greenfield's survey on Internet addiction, conducted in conjunction with ABC News and following a TV show on the topic. He received 17,251 "responses" on the abcnews.com Web site and concluded, based upon a set of items modeled after measures of gambling compulsion, that 6% of Internet users were addicted. Among the conclusions - with an estimated 200 million Internet users worldwide, that would mean there are 11.4 million addicts.
Susan

At 09:54 AM 1/4/2000 -0500, you wrote:
> One of my current favorites is David Greenfield's survey on Internet
> addiction, conducted in conjunction with ABC News and following a TV
> show on the topic. He received 17,251 "responses" on the abcnews.com
> Web site and concluded, based upon a set of items modeled after
> measures of gambling compulsion, that 6% of Internet users were
> addicted. Among the conclusions
> -- with an estimated 200 million Internet users worldwide, that would mean
> there are 11.4 million addicts.
>
> If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

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

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000
850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

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

> From daves@startribune.com Tue Jan  4 11:10:59 2000
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com
[132.148.80.211])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
      id LAA23470 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jan 2000 11:10:54 -0800
(PST)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id NAA23398; Tue, 4 Jan 2000 13:10:35
-0600
Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by
firewall2.startribune.com via
smap (V4.2)
   id xma023020; Tue, 4 Jan 00 13:10:16 -0600
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
   with Novell GroupWise; Tue, 04 Jan 2000 13:06:34 -0600
Message-Id: <s871f05a.043@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Tue, 04 Jan 2000 13:05:42 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, murray.edelman@vnsusa.org
Subject: Re: Internet Surveys
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-NIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id LAA23514

Murray and AAPORites...

My favorite bad Internet poll was one launched in early 1998 by Success
Magazine
(http://www.successmagazine.com) and heralded by a press release, which one of our business reporters kindly shared with me.

The press release's headline:
According to a poll by Success Magazine, 69% of US entrepreneurs claim their sex lives improve as their business grows.

The question: "As an entrepreneur, do you find that as your business grows, your sex life: A) Gets better; B) Gets worse; C) Stays the same."

Thus far, the press release wrote, 69 percent of all respondents claim their sex life gets better, 13% claimed it gets worse, while 19% said it stayed the same.

Being a curious sort, I went to the web site and found that indeed, there was an online survey, and took the poll it½ several times. Seems that anyone who visited could participate it½ still can, as a matter of fact it½ whether or not they are entrepreneurs, and as many times as they wish.

Obviously this points to any number of methodological flaws and mischaracterizations of poll information that already have been discussed on the list. But I thought you could add it to your shopping basket of bad polls. (BTW, the current question is much more business-oriented, and deals with how often participants contact former clients. Ho hum.)

Best wishes,

Rob

---

Robert P. Daves, Director
Polling & News Research          v: 612.673-7278
Star Tribune                     f: 612.673-4359
425 Portland Av. S.               e: daves@startribune.com
Minneapolis MN 55419 USA

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jan 4 13:20:27 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA23223 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jan 2000 13:20:27 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA26381 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jan 2000 13:20:26 -0800 (PST)
----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Tue, 04 Jan 2000 13:37:44 -0600
From: James Seroka <serokjh@groupwise1.duc.auburn.edu>
To: Beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: Position Vacancy - Auburn University Manager Survey Research Laboratory

Position Announcement
Manager, Survey Research Laboratory
Center for Governmental Services
Auburn University

The Center for Governmental Services at Auburn University is seeking a growth-oriented professional to direct the operations and provide leadership and vision for Auburn University's Survey Research Laboratory. The SRL engages in contract research involving telephone and mail surveys, data entry projects, and focus groups for academic clients, public sector groups, trade associations, nonprofit groups, and private sector clients. Poised for significant growth, the SRL maintains 14 automated telephone carrels, using the CASES software.

The successful candidate should possess a minimum Masters degree and have significant experience in managing survey research projects and marketing these services. Please send a letter of interest, resume/vitae, list of three references, and sample of appropriate work, to: Dr. Jim Seroka, Director, Center for Governmental Services, 2236 Haley Center, Auburn University AL 36849. Applications received by January 9, 2000 will receive full consideration, but applications will be considered until the position is filled. Auburn University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Minorities and women are encouraged to apply.

*******
Thanks for your input. I will see you on Thursday./murray

-----Original Message-----
From: Rob Daves [mailto:daves@startribune.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2000 2:06 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu; murray.edelman@vnsusa.org
Subject: Re: Internet Surveys

Murray and AAPORites...

My favorite bad Internet poll was one launched in early 1998 by Success Magazine
(http://www.successmagazine.com) and heralded by a press release, which one of our business reporters kindly shared with me.

The press release's headline:
According to a poll by Success Magazine, 69% of US entrepreneurs claim their sex lives improve as their business grows.

The question: "As an entrepreneur, do you find that as your business grows, your sex life: A) Gets better; B) Gets worse; C) Stays the same."

Thus far, the press release wrote, 69 percent of all respondents claim their sex life gets better, 13% claimed it gets worse, while 19% said it stayed the same.

Being a curious sort, I went to the web site and found that indeed, there was an online survey, and took the poll several times. Seems that anyone who visited could participate still can, as a matter of fact whether or not they are
entrepreneurs, and as many times as they wish.

Obviously this points to any number of methodological flaws and mischaracterizations of poll information that already have been discussed on the list. But I thought you could add it to your shopping basket of bad polls. (BTW, the current question is much more business-oriented, and deals with how often participants contact former clients. Ho hum.)

Best wishes,

Rob

Robert P. Daves, Director
Polling & News Research v: 612.673-7278
Star Tribune f: 612.673-4359
425 Portland Av. S. e: daves@startribune.com
Minneapolis MN 55419 USA

CHECK THIS ONE OUT. I JUST FOUND IT TODAY AND IT IS A GREAT EXAMPLE.

FRANCIS FULLAM

http://www.essential.com/promotion/tmsurvey.asp?CID=lycos_tmsurvey_02

Colleagues,

I am preparing a short talk on Internet Surveys for the conference on Media coverage of Polls this Thursday.

I thought it might be fun to pass out a sheet listing some of the findings from what are being called Internet Polls - the kind that say "Come to my web site, answer my questions, and we'll pretend it's a poll.}"
I am sure that some of you are keeping a record of your favorites, so I would appreciate if you could share them with me. I am looking for specific citations; a comparison of that "finding" with a real survey makes it even better.

Please reply to me directly at murray.edelman@vnsusa.org.

Thanks,
Murray Edelman
video courses, or you may contact the Joint Program directly at (301) 314-7911.)

Courses are offered with or without graduate credit in eight-week, four-week, two-week, and one-week formats. Course topics include survey research techniques, questionnaire design, cognition and survey measurement, survey sampling, and analysis of survey data. Check the Summer Institute website at http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/si for a list of courses and registration details. A brochure containing application materials will be available in February, 2000.

The Summer Institute also includes an eight-week in-depth program of study in sampling methods. The Sampling Program for Survey Statisticians combines university classes with practical application in research methods and office practice.

To receive a copy of our brochure, send an email message to summers@isr.umich.edu, or contact James M. Lepkowski, Director, or Andrea Johns, Program Associate, at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (734) 764-6595; fax (734) 764-8263.

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Wed Jan 5 13:23:40 2000
Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.3]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id NAA22163 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Jan 2000 13:23:39 -0800 (PST)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
by imo13.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.6.) id 5.14.14d33061 (3959) for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Jan 2000 16:22:55 EST
Message-ID: <14.14d33061.25a5102f@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 5 Jan 2000 16:22:55 EST
Subject: DIGGING INTO CONSUMER BEHAVIOR -- 1/19 NYAAPOR WORKSHOP
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 229

NEW YORK AAPOR & the MEDIA STUDIES CENTER
present an Afternoon Workshop

Date ............................... Wednesday, 19 January 2000

Presentation ................... 2:30 p.m. -- 5:00 p.m.

Place .............................. Newseum/NY (The Media Studies Center)
                                  580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Mezzanine

Level

DIGGING DEEPER INTO CONSUMER BEHAVIOR
    with ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Dr. John Carey, Greystone Communications

This multi-media workshop will show how ethnographic research -- intensive
observation of consumers in natural settings -- complements surveys and other
research tools. Some of the topics to be covered in the workshop include:

* The use of ethnography to study behavior, particularly use of new products
  (e.g.,
  cable modems, interactive tv, teleconferencing)

* Examples (with audio and visuals) of ethnographic research studies

* How an ethnographic researcher observes behavior and gathers info

* Tools of the trade

* How to analyze this information

* Combining ethnographic research with other research techniques

Ethnography was developed in the 19th century as a way to study distant
cultures. In
the past two decades, it has been adapted as a tool for qualitative analysis
of
consumer behavior.

The workshop will be conducted by John Carey, Ph.D. in Communications
Research, who
has undertaken ethnographic research studies for AT&T, Cablevision, the
Corporation
for Public Broadcasting, the National Science Foundation, and Statistical
Research
Inc., among others.

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.
So, reserve now! E-MAIL GEOFF FEINBERG (gfeinberg@guidelineresearch.com), or
call if
you must (212/329-1031).

Return the form below with your cheque by Tues., 11 Jan. Pre-paid fees are on
the
return form below. Fees at the door are: $50 (members), $65 (nonmembers),
$30
(student members), $40 (student nonmembers, HLMs).
Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

I will attend the NYAAPOR afternoon workshop on Wed., 19 Jan. 2000 with ___ additional guests.

NAME: ____________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ____________________________
HOME PHONE: _____________________________
E-MAIL: _________________________________
AFFILIATION: ____________________________
GUEST'S NAME: __________________________

PREPAID FEES:
MEMBERS: $40 ___    NONMEMBERS: $55 ___    STUDENT MEMBERS: $25 ___    STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: $35 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 11 Jan. to: Geoff Feinberg, Guideline Research Corp., 3 West 35th St., NY, NY 10001-2284

This is test to see if I am still on the list.

Another set of network problems!!!
How come we don't hear from Beveridge anymore?

Only kidding.

Andrew Beveridge wrote:

> This is test to see if I am still on the list.
> 
> Another set of network problems!!!
> 
> Andrew A. Beveridge
> 209 Kissena Hall
> Department of Sociology
> Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY
> Flushing, NY 11367-1597
> Phone: 718-997-2837
> Fax: 718-997-2820
> E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
> Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Thu Jan  6 05:53:42 2000
Received: from mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.38])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA21041 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jan 2000 05:53:41 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from default ([12.75.221.40]) by mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net
    (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP
    id <20000106135157.GTPV2478@default> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
    Thu, 6 Jan 2000 13:51:57 +0000
More Y2Koas? But yes, you are not only still on the list, but you are on the same program committee as Eleanor Lyon, Jerry Krause and me (for the ASA Soc Practice Section). Look forward to working with you this year.

Jim

At 06:48 PM 1/5/00 -0500, you wrote:
> This is test to see if I am still on the list.
> 
> Another set of network problems!!!
>

I recently heard that the DNC (Democrat National Committee?) had mounted a web-site "poll", with choices deliberately worded in such a way as to bias responses toward the Democrat point of view (e.g., "... George W. Bush's risky scheme ... "). The motive obviously was not legitimate opinion research, but rather to create propaganda backing the DNC agenda. The report I heard was that, contrary to their expections, the site was flooded with respondents favoring George W, to an extent that caused the DNC to shut the poll down.

Does anyone know anything about this? Perhaps it suggests that there are self-corrective mechanisms operating to discourage these sorts of fraudulent
polls? If the reports I heard are accurate, bringing this fiasco to light will help.

Ray Funkhouser

I saw a news blurb on it on one of the internet news sites (don't recall which), and the text was indeed slanted toward the Democratic view. It said something like would the respondent prefer a plan to save Social Security, etc., etc. or an unfair plan that helps the rich. (you know the drill). The amazing thing was their poll backfired and a majority favored the GOP oriented plan.

The DNC blamed it on Republicans who had nothing better to do than answer their survey in exaggerated numbers.

Those who live by the sword...
Folks,

There is no need to bother each of 900 individuals with a message merely to see if you are still on AAPORNET.

Should you suspect that you are not, simply contact a friend also on the list (or two or three on the Cc--even I will do) to ask when our last message was posted or to alert you when the next one is.

If it takes, say, 30 seconds to spot, open, read, grumble about and delete a test message, and you force each of 900 people to do this, you are wasting 450 of our minutes--7.5 hours of our collective time.

Shall we ask that the AAPOR Council bill you for this time, at the currently prevailing consulting rate, and use the money (plus interest) to throw ourselves an AAPORNET party at the next annual conference?

Short of that, the best remedy, when you receive a test message, on AAPORNET or any other list, is simply to send it back to the sender. Your own time is already wasted, after all--why not spend a few additional seconds to cause him to pay roughly the same price?

Symmetry of exchange, the network theorists call this--it might also be seen as poetic justice, or an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, or fighting unwanted bits by byting back.

I leave you with the ethical challenge my dear mother once needed to use on me relentlessly: Just think what would happen if everyone wanted to do this!

    -- Jim

*****

>From mkshares@mcs.net Thu Jan  6 08:31:07 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA06560 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jan 2000 08:31:06 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mcs.net (P43-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.107])
    by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA50290
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jan 2000 10:31:05 -0600 (CST)
    (envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <3874B528.C1EC8DD6@mcs.net>
Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2000 10:30:55 -0600
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Testing to see if you are still on a list
References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001060746100.27917-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
    x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

James Beniger wrote:

> Folks,
> 
> There is no need to bother each of 900 individuals with a message
> merely to see if you are still on AAPORNET.
> 
> Should you suspect that you are not, simply contact a friend also on
> the list (or two or three on the Cc--even I will do) to ask when our
> last message was posted or to alert you when the next one is.

My test is to see if I am missing any recent message by simply accessing the
listserv archives for the current month. This does not waste anyone's time.

Accessing the archives was described by Jim last July.....

James Beniger wrote:

Folks,

Yesterday I responded to a query from one of us about how to access the
AAPORNET archives. I have just learned that, despite my usually impenetrable prose,
what I wrote was actually understood, and the directions did in fact produce access
to our archives.

For those who don't know this, every last word and punctuation mark that has been
ever been posted to AAPORNET, since its beginning at 2:29:24 pm PST on
Tuesday, November 22, 1994, has been archived forever (even extended power failures
have not taken one byte) on our server--may history judge us kindly.
To access these archives, I now have good evidence, you need only to follow the instructions below:

HOW TO ACCESS THE AAPORNET ARCHIVES

AAPORNET archives are chunked by calendar months. Below is the list, from AAPORNET's beginning in November 1994 (log9411); I've just fetched this list by E-mail command from the server. After June 1995 (log9506), as you can see, the titles in the list are automatically the first words of the subject header of the first message posted in each month (worthless, of course, but probably some programmer's term paper).

To get the archive for any given month, send E-mail to listproc@usc.edu with NO subject header and the one-line command:

get aapornet log9907

[this will get you back, within perhaps 10 seconds, either this current month's archive (still in progress) up to the time of your request or else an error message; hint: about the only mistake possible is to misspell "aapornet"--best to check that first]

For multiple months, use multiple lines, each command on a separate line.

As I'm sure you'd guess, the lists are then searchable by letters, words and phrases, just as you'd search any other digital message on whatever system you are using at your end.

I'd wish you good luck, but only typing skill really matters here...
Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])
    by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA09803
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jan 2000 18:48:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.2.2.2000010610175348.00a741e0@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2
Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2000 18:47:52 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: Internet Surveys ("Survey2000")
In-Reply-To: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571C8E48C610@nts_1.vnsusa.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id PAA02381

At 09:29 PM 1/3/00 -0500, Murray Edelman wrote:
>Colleagues,
>
>I am preparing a short talk on Internet Surveys for the conference on
>Media coverage of Polls this Thursday. ......

Found this too late for Murray's talk, but what is really annoying about
this one, is that an otherwise well-respected and at least semi-scholarly
organization is behind this (The National Geographic Society. "The National
Geographic Society is the world's largest
nonprofit scientific and educational organization." -- according to their
self-description.).

And here is what they have to say about their "groundbreaking" Survey 2000
project (members of the scholarly advisory board below), I quote from:

> Survey 2000 has ended.
> We received more than 50,000 responses-twice the minimum required for
> scientific validity-and we thank everyone who contributed to this
> pioneering project.
> The information you provided will help our team of scholars answer a
> key question: How does where you live shape who you are? We'll look at
> how mobility has affected-or hasn't-respondents' sense and reading.

So, the minimum for "scientific validity" is 25,000?? Good grief. In case
you wonder, here are the members of the "scholarly advisory board", see

> Jim Witte, Chairman, Clemson University
> William Bainbridge, National Science Foundation
> Bonnie Erickson, University of Toronto
> Joe Germuska, JGSullivan Interactive, Inc.
> Wendy Griswold, Northwestern University
> Keith Hampton, University of Toronto
> Malcolm Parks, University of Washington
> Richard Peterson, Vanderbilt University
> Barry Wellman, University of Toronto

And don't think that these people are not aware of what went on:
>But would information gathered from a Web survey be valid? After all, 
>participants would self-select and need access to a computer. Advisory 
>board members concluded that if the survey met several criteria, among 
>them a large sample size, the effort would be a valuable scientific 
>undertaking.

Quoted from http://survey2000.nationalgeographic.com/about.html

Again, the myth that if only the sample size is large enough, all is fine. 
And, while the final analysis will "take years" here are some of the 
profound preliminary findings (from the same source):
+ Thirteen percent of those asked "strongly agree" that "people are kind."
+ Seventy-two percent of those who did the kids survey believe that people 
should accept a lower standard of living to protect the environment.
+ South Africa was the only African nation with more than a hundred survey 
respondents.

But visit the site and see for yourself. You can even download the complete 
data file (all is in the public domain) from:
http://business.clemson.edu/socio/s2kdata211.htm

I am sure that some of the work in progress like 
Bainbridge, William. "Validity of Web-Based Surveys: Explorations with Data 
from 2,382 Teenagers."
will measure up to scholarly standards, and it may be unfair to hold an 
advisey board responsible for the nonsense some PR guy (or webmaster) 
produces, but -- still -- should not at least someone on the board stand up 
and object to such blatant nonsense?

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) 
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Thu Jan  6 16:17:52 2000 
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net 
[199.45.39.156]) 
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP 
  id QAA21189 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jan 2000 16:17:51 -0800 
(PST) 
Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net 
[151.202.23.5]) 
  by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA26643 
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jan 2000 19:17:42 -0500 (EST) 
Message-Id: <4.2.2.20000106195355.00a76b10@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> 
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu 
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2 
Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2000 19:16:49 -0500 
To: aapornet@usc.edu 
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> 
Subject: Re: Internet Surveys ("Survey2000") -- PS 
Mime-Version: 1.0 
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

   In case you wondered who actually did the data collection for Survey2000,
it was a company called "e.datum" -- apparently an enterprise started by some people from Northwestern (again good academic pedigree). And here is the "lead designer" for the project, Prof. James Witte (Sociology, Northwestern):

James Witte, Survey Developer

Jim brings to e.Datum's clients a wealth of experience in designing, managing, and analyzing surveys. Most recently he was the lead designer for the National Geographic Society's Survey 2000. Survey 2000 is the largest Web survey mounted to date, with over 50,000 respondents from all over the world. Jim continues to be involved in the analysis of the Survey 2000 data, and is also helping National Geographic to design the next phase of the survey. Jim, a professor in the Department of Sociology at Northwestern University, also brings to his role at e.Datum over a decade of experience in complex survey design and analysis in the U.S. and Germany. He sees the Web as the next frontier for information gathering, and is excited about his opportunity to put his experience to work at e.Datum.

http://www.edatum.com/exp_witte.html

Not surprisingly, I could not find the word "sampling" even once on the edatum site. Now, these guys have some good stuff about the design of the instrument, but any survey is only good as its weakest link and plain convenience samples simply do not cut it. And no amount of "analysis" can change this.

Just as a reminder to where I come from, in contrast to many prominent AAPOR members like Jim Beniger or Warren Mitofski, I think that the future belongs to web surveys, that even today they can be successfully employed in many situations, but I am deeply annoyed by the often irresponsible and misleading use of this new tool today.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html
Kudos to the Media Studies Center, Freedom Forum, AAPOR, NCPP, and all the panelists for a most enjoyable and educational conference in Roslyn today!  
Hope NCPP will soon share details of the new monitoring initiative with everybody on AAPORnet. 
A forum like this one really helps to strengthen our collective commitment to quality polling--and our public image for being so committed.  
(It will remain to be seen what effect this has on the media's use of polls.)

... and let it be noted that Murry Edelman made excellent use of the examples gleaned from colleagues on this list in recent days.  
Larry: do let us all know when this will be seen on C-SPAN!  And don't fail to tell the list about any other media coverage of the event.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock .................... Voice:(804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia .........................
539 Cabell Hall .........................
Charlottesville, VA 22903 ......... e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Thank you for your very kind remarks about the conference.  I will keep AAPORNET up to date on media coverage as I learn of it.

Larry
-----Original Message-----
From: Thomas M. Guterbock [mailto:tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu]
Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 11:37 PM
To: AAPORnet List server
Cc: Sheila Owens
Subject: Re: Jan 6 conference on media coverage of polls

Kudos to the Media Studies Center, Freedom Forum, AAPOR, NCPP, and all the
panellists for a most enjoyable and educational conference in Roslyn today!
Hope NCPP will soon share details of the new monitoring initiative with
everybody on AAPORnet.
A forum like this one really helps to strengthen our collective
commitment to quality polling--and our public image for being so committed.
(It will remain to be seen what effect this has on the media's use of polls.)
. . . and let it be noted that Murry Edelman made excellent use of the
examples gleaned from colleagues on this list in recent days.
Larry: do let us all know when this will be seen on C-SPAN! And don't
fail to tell the list about any other media coverage of the event.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock .................... Voice:(804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia .................................
539 Cabell Hall ............. Charlottesville, VA 22903 ......... e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From alldredg@reda-intl.com Fri Jan  7 07:40:08 2000
Received: from ns.gcol.com (ns.gcol.com [205.177.170.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA25796 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 07:40:03 -0800
(PST)
Received: from redal.reda-intl.com ([205.177.170.41]) by ns.gcol.com
(8.9.0/8.7.3)
with SMTP id KAA24085 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 10:36:55 -0500
(EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.200000107104225.02f5a3d0@gcol.com>
X-Sender: alldredg@gcol.com
Date: Fri, 07 Jan 2000 10:42:25 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Elham-Eid Alldredge <alldredg@reda-intl.com>
Subject: SAS programmers
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

We have several opening for SAS programmers and we are having a very hard
time finding any. The positions are here in Maryland.

Here are the details:

<b-bold>Announcement:<br/>
</b-bold>REDA International, Inc.
Positions: Senior SAS Programmers and Mid-level SAS Programmers. These positions are for 5 years.

Starting Date: Immediate

Duties: work with large, complex health care data files.

Qualifications: Senior positions require 5-10 years of experience, mid-level positions require up to 5 years of experience in SAS applications programming and proficiency in using SAS Data Step to perform complex file manipulation. Experience with data editing, statistical analysis, and large health care data bases preferred. A degree in mathematics, statistics, quantitative social sciences, or related fields is required.

Salary: Competitive, commensurate with background and experience

Please fax resumes to (301) 946-1911
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Call - French Public Opinion Data Requested (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001070808160.15831-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 7 Jan 2000 12:09:26 +0100 (CET)
From: BMS - RC33 <bms@ext.jussieu.fr>
To: beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu, luchou@dpls.dacc.wisc.edu
Subject: Call - French Public Opinion Data Requested

Thanks to Claire Durand -----

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1999 09:03:21 -0800 (PST)
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: REQUEST: French public opinions data needed
DO *NOT* REPLY TO AAPORNET--Please send all replies directly to Lu Chou at luchou@dpls.dacc.wisc.edu

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Wed, 08 Dec 1999 10:44:59 -0600
From: Lu Chou <luchou@dpls.dacc.wisc.edu>
Subject: French public opinions data needed

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

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

*******************************************************************************
*                                                                             *
* BMS                                                                         *
* (Bulletin de Methologie Sociologique)                                      *
* (Bulletin of Sociological Methodology)                                    *
* bms@ext.jussieu.fr                                                        *
* http://www.ccr.jussieu.fr/bms                                            *
*                                                                             *
* RC33                                                                       *
* (Research Committee "Logic & Methodology"                                  *
* of the International Sociological Association)                           *
* rc33@ext.jussieu.fr                                                        *
The C-Span program schedule indicates that the Freedom Forum/NCPP/AAPOR conference on "Media Coverage of Polls and Primaries" (held yesterday in Arlington, VA) will be aired at 2:43 p.m. this afternoon. From my reading of the schedule, it looks like they plan to air the entire 4 plus hours of the conference.

Larry
Greenberg Quinlan Research has a number of positions open in their Washington, DC office. GQR is an internationally recognized firm specializing in work across the globe for political campaigns and parties, public interest organizations and foundations as well as corporate crisis management and positioning. We are expanding our staff and have immediate openings for the following:

SENIOR RESEARCH ANALYST to assist in the development and analysis of polls and focus groups. The position requires an ability to work on a variety of qualitative and quantitative projects for political, corporate, and public policy clients. Ideal candidate will have 5 to 10 years experience in quantitative and/or qualitative analysis. Analyst works with firm principals in the development of questionnaires and focus groups guidelines and interpretation of results. Analyst works as Project Manager with computing and field departments. Superior oral and written communication skills required. International position requires international travel and after hours availability to work with international clients. Great opportunity for international travel. Competitive salary and excellent benefits. Submit cover letter, resume and salary requirements to joe@greenbergresearch.com or fax to 202-289-8648.

We also have a number of entry level positions open in our computing and production departments.

Greenberg Quinlan Research specializes in strategic research for campaigns, organizations and corporations. The firm has worked for a broad range of public interest organizations, foundations, unions, political campaigns and parties across the globe. The firm's chairman, Stanley B. Greenberg, has served as pollster to President Bill Clinton, President Nelson Mandela, Prime Minister Tony Blair and Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder. The firm was a major part of the recent upset victory of Prime Minister Ehud Barak in Israel. You can learn more about Greenberg Quinlan Research at www.greenbergresearch.com.

--
Joe Goode
Executive Director
Greenberg Quinlan Research
10 G St NE, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20002

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Fri Jan  7 09:40:00 2000
Received: from mailgate.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.19])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA29613 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 09:39:59 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from conversion.mailgate.nau.edu by mailgate.nau.edu
    (PMDF V5.2-32 #39840) id <0FNZ00LO17QLRT@mailgate.nau.edu> for
    aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 10:39:59 -0700 (MST)
Received: from pc176.sbs.nau.edu (pc176.sbs.nau.edu [134.114.152.191])
    by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #39840)
    with SMTP id <0FN20071L7QJBPA@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri,
    07 Jan 2000 10:39:57 -0700 (MST)
Date: Fri, 07 Jan 2000 10:41:22 -0700
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>
I was disturbed to see that the Commission on Presidential Debates is requiring potential debate participants to have at least 15 percent in the national polls (Washington Post-ABC News, New York Times-CBS News, USA Today-CNN and Fox News-Opinion Dynamics) in order to be included in the general election debates. Is this 15 percent plus or minus a 5 percent margin of error? I don't think so. What if a candidate has an average of 14 percent in the national polls? It looks like they'd be excluded based on the established criteria.

What do others think about this? Is there support for AAPOR releasing a statement to the media protesting the rules?

Fred Solop

Fred Solop, Ph.D.
Director
Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6654 -- fax
www.nau.edu/~srl
Presidential Debates is requiring potential debate participants to have at least 15 percent in the national polls (Washington Post-ABC News, New York Times-CBS News, USA Today-CNN) and Fox News-Opinion Dynamics) in order to be included in the general election debates.

Is this 15 percent plus or minus a 5 percent margin of error? I don't think so. What if a candidate has an average of 14 percent in the national polls? It looks like they'd be excluded based on the established criteria.

What do others think about this? Is there support for AAPOR releasing a statement to the media protesting the rules?

Fred Solop

Director
Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6654 -- fax

www.nau.edu/~srl

From Barbara.O'Hare@arbitron.com Fri Jan  7 11:00:42 2000
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (firewall-user@vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id LAA17055 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 11:00:41 -0800 (PST)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id OAA12756; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 14:00:25 -0500 Received: from arbdmex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via smtp (V5.5) id xma012718; Fri, 7 Jan 00 14:00:22 -0500 Received: by arbdmex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) id <CLP66Y0R>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 14:01:17 -0500 Message-ID: <411EA40BC162B292B0008C7B2B302B529AA@arbdmex.arbitron.com> From: "O'Hare, Barbara" <Barbara.O'Hare@arbitron.com> To: ""aapornet@usc.edu"" <aapornet@usc.edu> Cc: "Mello, Wendy" <Wendy.Mello@arbitron.com>
Arbitron is looking for a Project Leader, for Methods Development and Evaluation in its Columbia, MD office. Arbitron is a leading media information services company providing solutions that will shape the future of the broadcasting industry. Our organization is constantly growing and changing to meet the needs of the media industry.

Responsibilities include:

* Evaluates and recommends survey methods to enhance the existing syndicated survey product and to support custom surveys and assesses risks/benefits associated with new survey methods prior to adoption
* Assumes primary role in designing and managing experimental research to evaluate proposed changes to syndicated survey procedures
* Assumes primary role in development of custom surveys to meet needs of internal company clients
* Conducts complex statistical analyses and prepares detailed written reports to support findings of experimental research and custom surveys
* Hires and supervises external contractors to obtain necessary field support to conduct custom surveys
* Manages multiple projects on a daily basis to ensure project timeliness and goals are met in an effective and efficient manner
* Identifies and utilizes appropriate computer software and software applications to meet project needs

Requirements:

* Minimum BS/BA degree. Masters or higher preferred in Survey Methods, Sociology, Statistics, Market Research, or related field
* 7+ years of professional experience in applied survey research setting
* Excellent written and oral communication skills
* Excellent computer skills with working knowledge of SPSS and/or SAS and Oracle applications in a UNIX environment
* Prior project management experience
* Strong statistical analysis skills including in-depth knowledge of complex multivariate analysis techniques and interpretation
* In-depth knowledge in all aspects of survey design and analysis (e.g., sample and instrument design; methods of optimizing response; data preparation and reporting conventions, etc.)

Arbitron offers a comprehensive employment package, including competitive compensation, excellent dental, medical and vision care plans, 401(k) matching, tuition assistance, stock purchase and a series of work/family resources. Check us out at www.arbitron.com. Send resumes to: opsjobs@arbitron.com FAX 410-312-8607, or snail mail OE Recruiter, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046
This puts AAPOR in an interesting situation. The two major political parties are essentially using public opinion polls as a means of shutting out third-party challengers from a vital part of the presidential race, the debates. Fifteen percent? I don't know much more about their decision-making process than what I've skimmed in the papers, so I'm confused. Is there something magic about 15 percent as compared to, say, 10 percent?

This partisan tiff is not about survey methodology—doing it well versus doing it poorly. So I'm not convinced AAPOR should be involved. But it does touch on how you interpret and weigh poll data, and whether or not such a level (15 percent) is meaningful at the stage in which they would view the polls, which I assume would be in September.

Interesting. AAPOR can hardly come out against the meaningfulness of poll data, especially given the polls the Commission will use. If AAPOR argues the 15 percent question, then it gets into the partisan fray. I don't see the organization taking a stand on that one unless it is based on some careful study of previous presidential elections and whether 15 percent in September is a good guide toward viability in November. Even so, the organization should probably avoid the partisan nature of the fight.
If individual members want to join the spat, so be it. As an organization I'm not sure what position AAPOR would want to take. Polls are good? Polls are bad? Polls are being misused?

Barry A. Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Phone: 706.542.5027 | FAX: 706.542.2183
Email: barry@arches.uga.edu
http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander
The University of Southern California, School of Medicine, has an immediate opening for an Assistant or Associate Professor of Research in Preventive Medicine, or Research Associate (depending on qualifications). The position requires a Ph.D. degree and experience in longitudinal analysis of data from large community or school prevention trials with youth, preferably in, but not limited to, the area(s) of tobacco, alcohol, drug abuse, policy, or violence. Responsibilities include directing a psychometrics team, research protocol design, data management and analysis, and reporting of study results. The position may also involve graduate and undergraduate teaching in Health Behavior, depending on interest and qualifications. Interested candidates should mail or fax curriculum vitae to Katie Davis at the following address:

University of Southern California
Department of Preventive Medicine
Institute for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research
Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center
1441 Eastlake Avenue, MS-44
Room 3414
Los Angeles, CA  90089-1976
FAX: (323) 865-0134

******

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Jan  7 12:30:47 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA17887 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 12:30:47 -0800
(PST)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
    by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id MAA17846
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jan 2000 12:28:51 -0800
Message-Id: <200001072028.17846@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
There may be a methodological issue here though. If you take the purpose of the Presidential Debates to be to provide information for undecided voters, then it might very well be that results of legitimate opinion polls asking about voting intentions would not be the best way to select candidates to present to the audience. In other words, if someone came to us with the question, who are the candidates that undecided voters would most like to see in the presidential debates, we probably would use different survey questions from those used in a survey of voter intentions. We might focus exclusively on the responses of undecided voters; and we might ask them to name the candidates they are considering. This information could be used to identify a short list of participants that would certainly include the major party candidates without automatically excluding those who are not representing the two major parties.

This puts AAPOR in an interesting situation. The two major political parties are essentially using public opinion polls as a means of shutting out third-party challengers from a vital part of the presidential race, the debates. Fifteen percent? I don't know much more about their decision-making process than what I've skimmed in the papers, so I'm confused. Is there something magic about 15 percent as compared to, say, 10 percent?

This partisan tiff is not about survey methodology--doing it well versus doing it poorly. So I'm not convinced AAPOR should be involved. But it does touch on how you interpret and weigh poll data, and whether or not such a level (15 percent) is meaningful at the stage in which they would view the polls, which I assume would be in September.

Interesting. AAPOR can hardly come out against the meaningfulness of poll data, especially given the polls the Commission will use. If AAPOR argues the 15 percent question, then it gets into the partisan fray. I don't see the organization taking a stand on that one unless it is based on some careful study of previous presidential elections and whether 15 percent in September is a good guide toward viability in November. Even so, the organization should probably avoid the partisan nature of the fight. If individual members want to join the spat, so be it. As an
organization I'm not sure what position AAPOR would want to take. Polls are good? Polls are bad? Polls are being misued?

Barry A. Hollander  
Associate Professor  
College of Journalism and Mass Communication  
The University of Georgia  
Athens, GA  30602  

Phone: 706.542.5027 | FAX: 706.542.2183  
Email: barry@arches.uga.edu  
http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander

What I'd also like to know, if I might piggyback on Fred's interesting questions, is how much public support there might be for *raising* the cutoff *higher* than 15 percent. Is there anyone around who'd care to put this in a national survey? Has anyone asked about this before?  

-- Jim

On Fri, 7 Jan 2000, Fred Solop wrote:
> 
> I was disturbed to see that the Commission on
Presidential Debates is requiring potential debate participants to have at least 15 percent in the national polls (Washington Post-ABC News, New York Times-CBS News, USA Today-CNN and Fox News-Opinion Dynamics) in order to be included in the general election debates. Is this 15 percent plus or minus a 5 percent margin of error? I don't think so. What if a candidate has an average of 14 percent in the national polls? It looks like they'd be excluded based on the established criteria.

What do others think about this? Is there support for AAPOR releasing a statement to the media protesting the rules?

Fred Solop
Fred Solop, Ph.D.
Director
Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6654 -- fax
www.nau.edu/~srl

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

Date: Fri, 7 Jan 2000 19:10:36 +0100 (CET)
From: AIMS - INT <aims@ext.jussieu.fr>
Subject: Call - Sunbelt 2000 Social Network Conf (13-16 Apr Vancouver)

Thanks to Bill Richards
and Social Network Researchers <SOCNET@LISTS.UFL.EDU>
Here is the second call for papers for Sunbelt 2000. The deadline for abstract submission is fast approaching. The tickets for the free breakfast on the 35th floor are going fast. Let's hear from you soon!

Now is the time to let me know if you are willing to organize a paper session on your favorite network topic. See who has already put their name in at http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunover.html

Check out The Lin Freeman Festschrift: the Original Net Surfer Event on Sunday April 16 afternoon and evening. Presentations and a special banquet followed by a Luau at which the main dish will be a juicy roast of The Big Kahuna himself, Lin Freeman. http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunover.html

Order a commemorative Sunbelt Original Net Surfer tee-shirt on the conference registration form at http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunreg.html

See where conference registrants are from at http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunwhowhere.html

Bill Richards

SUNBELT XX
INTERNATIONAL SUNBELT SOCIAL NETWORK CONFERENCE
http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/

Coast Plaza Inn, Vancouver, British Columbia
April 13-16, 2000
Deadline for abstracts: January 15, 2000

The International Sunbelt Social Network Conference is a major forum for social scientists, mathematicians, computer scientists, and all others interested in social networks. The conference provides an opportunity for individuals interested in theory, methods, or applications of social networks to share ideas and common concerns. Sponsors of Sunbelt XX are the International Network for Social Network Analysis (INSNA) and the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University.
Current session topics include:

1. Sessions looking for organizers
   - Corporate and Inter-organizational Networks
   - Intra-organizational Networks
   - Personal Community Networks
   - Networks and Health
   - Diffusion
   - Networks Through Time
   - Social Support
   - Cognitive Networks
   - Biological Networks
   - Infectious Diseases and Social Networks
   - Communication Networks
   - Network Exchange
   - Methods and Statistics for Network Analysis
   - Networks and Needles
   - Infectious Diseases and Social Networks

2. Sessions with organizers
   - Networks and Game Theory organized by Phil Bonacich
   - Organizational Networks organized by Cathleen McGrath
   - Network Visualization organized by Ulrik Brandes
   - Evolution of Social networks organized by Frans N. Stokman and Pat Doreian
   - International Networks organized by George Barnett

This list is preliminary. If you wish to organize a session, contact the organizers at the addresses below.

The keynote speaker for this year's conference will be Lin Freeman, Research Professor, Department of Sociology and Institute for Mathematical Behavioral Sciences at the University of California Irvine. His address is entitled "The History of Social Network Analysis."

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

http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunpaper.html

To submit a paper for the conference, send an abstract of no more than 200 words by e-mail or diskette (ASCII text or WordPerfect, please) and a hard copy to the program committee by January 15, 2000. Abstracts will be published and distributed at the conference. Participants may give one single-authored paper or its equivalent (two papers on which they appear as co-authors).

Abstracts should be sent to either Bill Richards or Andrew Seary:
Bill Richards
(604) 251-3272
richards@sfu.ca
School of Communication
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Canada

Andrew Seary
(604) 298-3081
seary@sfu.ca
The Conference Hotel
http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunhotel.html

The conference will be held at the Coast Plaza Suite Hotel at Stanley Park, 1763 Comox Street, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Rates are $125.00 Cdn (about $85 US) for a room, single or double occupancy, and $145.00 Cdn (about $99 US) for a suite plus taxes of 17%. (There is an extra charge of $20 Cdn (about $14 US) for each additional person sharing a room.) These rates are available from April 10 through April 19. Call 1-800-663-1144 with a credit card number to make reservations at the Coast Plaza Suite Hotel at Stanley Park. Or fax your request to 1-604-688-5934. Be sure to mention the International Network for Social Network Analysis to get the conference rate.

Please make your reservations early. The hotel says that reservations must be confirmed no later than 45 days prior to arrival date -- February 27 if you are arriving April 13. Any reservation not confirmed at this time will be automatically released and may be resold by the hotel. Any additional guest rooms will be provided on a space availability basis, at the regular published hotel rate. The room blocks will be held only until 12 March, 2000.

Where is the Coast Plaza Suite Hotel at Stanley Park?
To see a map, go to:  http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/where-9.html

Conference Registration
http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunreg.html

Pre-registration is $50.00 for INSNA members, $75.00 for non-members, $25.00 for students, and $15.00 for registration-in-absentia for INSNA members ($30.00 for non-members). All fees will be $10.00 higher for registration at the conference. Deadline for preregistration is 27 February 2000.

The first 90 people to register for Sunbelt XX will receive a ticket for a free breakfast on the 35th floor of the hotel with stunning views of the mountains, the city, Stanley Park, and the sea.

You can update your INSNA membership and your subscription to Social Networks when you fill out the registration form on the web.

Deadlines
http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sundead.html

-- Abstract Submission  January 15, 2000
-- Hotel Reservation  February 27
-- Conference Registration  February 27, 2000
Workshop Details
http://www.sfu.ca/~insna/sunwork.html

Tom A.B. Snijders: "The analysis of longitudinal social network data."
   Thursday 9:00-12:30   Cost: ($30)

Barry Wellman: "A Non-Technical Introduction to Social Network Analysis."
   Friday 1:30-4:30    Cost: $30

Stephen Borgatti and Martin Everett: "Introduction to the Analysis of Network Data."
   Thursday 8:30-4:00    Cost: $50 for students, $100 for all others

Dudley Girard, David Willer, Robert Ware at U of South Carolina: "The Web-Lab"
   Thursday 8:30-4:00    Cost: $xx

Andrew Seary, Bill Richards at Simon Fraser University: "MultiNet"
   Thursday 1:30-4:00    Cost: free

Kathleen Carley at Carnegie Mellon University: "Computational Modeling and Analysis"
   Thursday 1:30-4:00    Cost: $XX

   Noshir Contractor, Ann Mische, Laura Koehly, Pip Pattison, Garry Robins, and Stanley Wasserman: "Introduction to and Applications of p*"
   Friday 12:30 - 3:30    Cost: free.

--

Bill Richards, Professor
School of Communication, Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, B.C. Canada  V5A 1S6
Phone (604) 291-4119, secretary 291-3687, fax 291-4024, home 251-3272
e-mail: richards@sfu.ca
Web site: http://www.sfu.ca/~richards

**************************************************************|**************************************************************|
*                                                            *
*                                BMS                                *
*                                (Bulletin de Methologie Sociologique) *
*                                (Bulletin of Sociological Methodology) *
*                                bms1@ext.jussieu.fr                        *
*                                http://www.ccr.jussieu.fr/bms                    *
*                                                            *
*                                RC33                                *
*                                (Research Committee "Logic & Methodology" *
*                                of the International Sociological Association) *
*                                rc33@ext.jussieu.fr                             *
*                                http://local.uaa.alaska.edu/~aaso353/isa/index.htm *
*                                                            *
*                                Karl M. van Meter                            *
*                                email bms@ext.jussieu.fr                       *
*                                tel/fax 33 (0)1 40 51 85 19 59 rue Pouchet    *
*                                75017 Paris, France           LASMAS, IRESCO-CNRS  
**************************************************************|**************************************************************|
> This puts AAPOR in an interesting situation. The two
> major political parties are essentially using public opinion
> polls as a means of shutting out third-party challengers
> from a vital part of the presidential race, the debates.
> Fifteen percent? I don't know much more about their
> decision-making process than what I've skimmed in the
> papers, so I'm confused. Is there something magic about
> 15 percent as compared to, say, 10 percent?
>
> This partisan tiff is not about survey methodology--doing
> it well versus doing it poorly. So I'm not convinced AAPOR
> should be involved. But it does touch on how you interpret
> and weigh poll data, and whether or not such a level (15
> percent) is meaningful at the stage in which they would
> view the polls, which I assume would be in September.
>
> Interesting. AAPOR can hardly come out against the
> meaningfulness of poll data, especially given the polls the
> Commission will use. If AAPOR argues the 15 percent
> question, then it gets into the partisan fray. I don't see the
> organization taking a stand on that one unless it is based
> on some careful study of previous presidential elections
> and whether 15 percent in September is a good guide
> toward viability in November. Even so, the organization
> should probably avoid the partisan nature of the fight.
If individual members want to join the spat, so be it. As an organization I'm not sure what position AAPOR would want to take. Polls are good? Polls are bad? Polls are being misued?

____________________________

Barry A. Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Phone: 706.542.5027 | FAX: 706.542.2183
Email: barry@arches.uga.edu
http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander

Dear Colleagues

Anybody tape it? We'd love to see it here in Britain. Thanks.

Bob Worcester

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry McGill <lmcgill@mediastudies.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: Sheila Owens <sowens@mediastudies.org>; Jeffrey.Pattit@usc.edu
Subject: Re: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
Date: 07 January 2000 17:35
Subject: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference

Anybody tape it? We'd love to see it here in Britain. Thanks.

Bob Worcester

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry McGill <lmcgill@mediastudies.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: Sheila Owens <sowens@mediastudies.org>; Jeffrey.Pattit@usc.edu <Jeffrey.Pattit@usc.edu>
Date: 07 January 2000 17:35
Subject: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference

The C-Span program schedule indicates that the Freedom Forum/NCPP/AAPOR conference on "Media Coverage of Polls and Primaries" (held yesterday in Arlington, VA) will be aired at 2:43 p.m. this afternoon. From my reading
of the schedule, it looks like they plan to air the entire 4 plus hours of
the conference.
>
> Larry

> From jwerner@jwdp.com Sat Jan 8 15:35:17 2000
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA23109 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Jan 2000 15:35:16 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp14.vgernet.net [205.219.186.114])
   by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id SAA15187
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Jan 2000 18:38:38 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3877C9A0.9497413A@jwdp.com>
Date: Sat, 08 Jan 2000 18:34:56 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
References: <024701bf5a26$93cb6220$6b04dec2@worc.demon.co.uk>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The videotape may be purchased from the C-Span web site
(http://www.cspan.org), for a fairly steep price.

The tape name and ID are:

Forum
Media Coverage of Presidential Primaries
Freedom Forum
Arlington, Virginia (United States)
ID: 154561 - 01/06/2000 - 4:26 - $135.00

Jan Werner

______________________________

Robert M Worcester wrote:
>
> Dear Colleagues
>
> Anybody tape it? We'd love to see it here in Britain. Thanks.
>
> Bob Worcester
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Larry Mcgill <lmcgill@mediastudies.org>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Cc: Sheila Owens <sowens@mediastudies.org>; Jeffrey.Pattit@usc.edu
> <Jeffrey.Pattit@usc.edu>
> Date: 07 January 2000 17:35
> Subject: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
>
> >The C-Span program schedule indicates that the Freedom Forum/NCPP/AAPOR
conference on "Media Coverage of Polls and Primaries" (held yesterday in Arlington, VA) will be aired at 2:43 p.m. this afternoon. From my reading of the schedule, it looks like they plan to air the entire 4 plus hours of the conference.

Larry

From mtrau@umich.edu Sun Jan 9 06:58:10 2000
Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP id GAA23323 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 06:58:09 -0800 (PST)
Received: from s-isr-ml.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
    by vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.9.1/3.1r) with ESMTTP id JAA22744 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 09:58:13 -0500 (EST)
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) id <2N3SW1A6>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 10:01:07 -0500
Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0321083F@isr.umich.edu>
From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
Date: Sun, 9 Jan 2000 10:01:06 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
It should be on at almost a decent time in the UK tomorrow as it seems to be scheduled next at 2 am here. The schedule of all their programming on their various channels is at www.cspan.org.

From jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Jan 9 16:15:54 2000
Received: from jwdp.com (plp3.vgernet.net [205.219.186.103])
    by vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP id QAA21793 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 16:15:53 -0800 (PST)
Received: by jwdp.com (plp3.vgernet.net [205.219.186.103])
    by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id TAA1763 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 19:20:29 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3879249D.2CDB9C1E@jwdp.com>
Date: Sun, 09 Jan 2000 19:15:25 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
References: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0321083F@isr.umich.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
For those of you who do not receive C-Span (I do not, because Time-Warner does not see fit to include it in their basic package in my area), their programming is streamed simultaneously via RealAudio on the web. The result is a postage stamp sized picture that jumps and starts, but the audio is usually fine, even with a 28.8k connection.
C-Span has a page listing the participants, with their pictures, at:


They misidentify some of the participants: Murray Edelman is listed as "Representative, Edison Electric Institute," possibly because Evans Witt seems to have taken his job away from him, being listed as "Executive Director, Voter News Service" while Warren Mitofsky has been whisked back in time to "Executive Producer, CBS."

Jan Werner
______________________

Michael Traugott wrote:
>
> It should be on at almost a decent time in the UK tomorrow as it seems to be
> scheduled next at 2 am here. The schedule of all their programming on their
> various channels is at www.cspan.org.
>
> From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Sun Jan 9 17:48:19 2000
>
> Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net
> [199.45.39.156])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id RAA13645 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 17:48:00 -0800
> (PST)
> Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net
> [151.202.23.5])
> by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA16705
> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jan 2000 20:46:32 -0500 (EST)
> Message-Id: <4.2.2.20000109202539.00a8d150@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
> X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2
> Date: Sun, 09 Jan 2000 20:45:11 -0500
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
> Subject: Re: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
> In-Reply-To: <3879249D.2CDB9C1E@jwdp.com>
> References: <5D28BEE5CAE8D119F5700A0C9B4268E0321083F@isr.umich.edu>
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 07:15 PM 1/9/00 -0500, Jan Werner wrote:
> For those of you who do not receive C-Span .... their programming is
> streamed simultaneously via RealAudio on the
> web. The result is a postage stamp sized picture that jumps and starts,
> but the audio is usually fine, even with a 28.8k connection.

A very useful hint. And those of you who have ventured further into modern technology and have a DSL connection may find both video and audio quality rather good (but this depends on Internet traffic; and Sunday evening you have a much better chance to get good quality than on a weekday afternoon). In addition to the simulcast of all *three* C-SPAN channels, quite a bit of programming is archived and is available "on demand" for at least one month. Unfortunately, the Jan 6 event on "media coverage" does not fall
into this category. Guess, C-SPAN figured that there are enough people out there willing to spend to $135 for the videotape. But check the "streaming video" offerings at http://www.c-span.org/watch/

PS: C-SPAN does not let record their streaming video presentations. In principle, you can record with the RealPlayer Plus (but not the free player), if the producer does not protect the video cast -- a producer choice not available in cable TV.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)  
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

>From nancybelden@brspoll.com Mon Jan 10 08:51:31 2000
Received: from dbls.com ([209.8.216.50])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA15344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jan 2000 08:51:29 -0800
   (PST)
Received: by dbls.com from localhost
   (router,SLMail V3.1); Mon, 10 Jan 2000 11:59:05 +0500
Received: by dbls.com from Nancy [209.9.139.86]
   (SLmail 3.1.2948 (Release Build)); Mon, 10 Jan 2000 11:59:04 -0500
Message-ID: <007d01bf5b88$ce06df60$568b09d1@brs.com>
From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>
To: "aapornet" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Innovators take note
Date: Mon, 10 Jan 2000 11:36:09 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="----=_NextPart_000_007A_01BF5B5E.E3C73540"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-------_NextPart_000_007A_01BF5B5E.E3C73540
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Friends ---

What cool things in public opinion research should get recognition? Have you or your colleagues -- or someone you know of -- done a piece of work that is particularly creative? Put the art of asking questions to some good use, that advances the understanding of public opinion in this country or abroad? Do you know of a remarkable advancement you are using to make your research better, easier, more efficient? What do you think is the most important application in our field that has come forth in the last 5 years? Has anyone written a really informative report on what the public thinks that has changed public policy for the better?

---

Think of the 2000 AAPOR INNOVATOR'S AWARD
=20
As many of you will recall, last year AAPOR established the Innovator's Award. May 2000 will be the first time we present this award to one or more individuals or teams.

It is designed to highlight important contributions in the field of public opinion research. The award may be made for research studies and new research techniques that improve the understanding of public opinion. We hope that the award will help expand AAPOR's role as a forum for ideas about public opinion research and lead to recognition of the value of this research for the development of good public policy, governance and private enterprise.

The award is to be made to individuals or teams for work that has been made publicly available, either by virtue of publication or wide circulation of books, reports, articles or other methods for disseminating information. It is not necessary to be a member of AAPOR either to make nominations or to receive the award.

To be eligible, a contribution (or some aspect of it) must have been made public within the last five years. Use this form, a separate letter, or email to nominate a candidate. You need not sign the nomination. Please include a statement in support of your nomination as well as a copy of the work for which the nominee is being honored. Also if convenient, include supporting documentation—for example, book reviews, press releases, and news stories—anything that will make it easier to evaluate the contribution. Please feel free to nominate yourself.

Nominations must be received by February 1st in order to be considered for the Year 2000 Award. If you have questions please contact Nancy Belden = [nancybelden@brspoll.com; (202) 822-6090] or Murray Edelman = [murray.edelman@vnsusa.org; (212) 947-0983]

Nominations should be made by February 1, 1999 and sent to:
Nancy Belden
AAPOR Councilor at Large
c/o Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW Suite 700
Washington, DC  20036

Nominee:

STATEMENT:

----------=NextPart_000_007A_01BF5B5E.E3C73540
Content-Type: text/html;
Friends --

What cool things in public opinion research should get recognition? Have you or your colleagues -- or someone you know of -- done a piece of work that is particularly creative? Put the art of asking questions to some good use, that advances the understanding of public opinion in this country or abroad? Do you know of a remarkable advancement you are using to make your research better, easier, more efficient? What do you think is the most important application in our field that has come forth in the last 5 years? Has anyone written a really informative report on what the public thinks that has changed public policy for the better?

Think of the 2000 AAPOR INNOVATOR'S AWARD FOR SIGNIFICANT INNOVATION OR CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF PUBLIC OPINION.

As many of you will recall, last year AAPOR established the Innovator's Award. May 2000 will be the first time we present this award to one or more individuals or teams. It is designed to highlight important contributions in the field of public opinion research. The award may be made for research studies and new research techniques that improve the understanding of public opinion. We hope that the award will help expand AAPOR's role as a forum for ideas about public opinion research and...
lead to recognition of the value of this research FOR the development of good public policy, governance and private enterprise. The award is to be made to individuals or teams for work that has been made publicly available, either by virtue of publication or wide circulation of books, reports, articles or other methods for disseminating information. It is not necessary to be a member of AAPOR either to make nominations or to receive the award.

To be eligible, a contribution (or some aspect of it) must have been made public within the last five years. Use this form, a separate letter, or email to nominate a candidate. You need not sign the nomination. Please include a statement in support of your nomination as well as a copy of the work for which the nominee is being honored. If convenient, include supporting documentation-for example, book reviews, press releases, and news stories-anything that will make it easier to evaluate the contribution. Please feel free to nominate yourself.

Nominations must be received by February 1st in order to be considered for the Year 2000 Award. If you have questions please contact Nancy Belden [nancybelden@brspoll.com; (202) 822-6090] or Murray Edelman [murray.edelman@vnsusa.org; (212) 947-0983]

Nominations should be made by February 1, 1999 and sent to: Nancy Belden, AAPOR Councilor at Large, c/o Belden Russonello &amp; Stewart, 1320 19th Street NW Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036. Nominee:

STATEMENT:

---_NextPart_000_007A_01BF5B5E.E3C73540--
Please circulate—we are still looking for submissions!

Lutz Kaelber

The third revision of the ASA teaching resource Instructor's Resource Manual on Social Problems is currently being put together. Any of the following contributions will be considered: syllabi, assignments, teaching hints, classroom activities, teaching aids (handouts, questions, other materials), research projects and instructions, and recommended (and preferably annotated) books, internet sites, and audiovisual materials. Illustrations (cartoons, drawings, tables and graphs) may be included if they photocopy well and don't require copyright clearance.

Send both a hard copy and an electronic file (in MS Word or RTF format) to the editors. Send the hard copy of your materials to Walter Carroll, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, 131 Summer Street, Bridgewater State College, Bridgewater, MA 02325.

Send your electronic file(s) attached to an email to Lutz Kaelber, Assistant Professor of Social Science, Lyndon State College, KAELBERL@MAIL.LSC.VSC.EDU and copy it to Walter Carroll (wcarroll@bridgew.edu).

*****
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Call - ASA Mathematical Sociology (12-16 Aug Washington) (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001100908220.19469-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 10 Jan 2000 16:08:11 +0100 (CET)
From: AIMS - INT <aims@ext.jussieu.fr>
To: AIMS Listserv <aims1@ext.jussieu.fr>
Subject: Call - ASA Mathematical Sociology (12-16 Aug Washington)

Thanks to Carter Butts
and Social Network Researchers <SOCNET@LISTS.UFL.EDU>

I would like to emphasize that submissions from graduate students and
those outside the mathematical sociology community are particularly
encouraged... please feel free to forward this CFP to others who might be
interested in this session.

-Carter

Call for Papers ASA 2000:

-----------------------------------------------------------------------
Section on Mathematical Sociology Roundtable Session
at the 95th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association
To be held in Washington, D.C., August 12-16, 2000

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

Information:

Submissions are solicited for the ASA Section on Mathematical
Sociology's roundtable session at the Y2K annual meeting of the ASA. All
papers dealing with the formal treatment of social structures or phenomena
are welcome; possible topic areas include (but are not limited to):

- Adaptive Systems and Machine Learning
- Analytical Modeling
- Empirical Examination of Formal Theory
- Formal Metatheory
- Game or Decision Theoretic Analysis
- Group Process Simulation or Modeling
- Logical Modeling
- Formal Theory-Driven Methodology
- Model Testing and Validation
- Multi-Agent Simulation
- Organizational Simulation or Modeling
- Social Network Analysis
Submissions should be postmarked by January 10, 2000; for more information, see the ASA meeting CFP at:

http://www.asanet.org/convention/call.html

or the web site of the ASA Section on Mathematical Sociology:

http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/groups/mathsoc/mathsoc.htm

>From lmcgill@mediastudies.org Mon Jan 10 10:18:21 2000
Received: from mscmail.mediastudies.org (mscmail.mediastudies.org [205.136.27.120]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA13170 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jan 2000 10:18:20 -0800 (PST)
Received: by MSCMAIL with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <CH13X8YT>; Mon, 10 Jan 2000 13:11:54 -0500
Message-ID: <690C736F7A13D311BD2100902771A1661897FB@MSCMAIL>
From: Larry Mcgill <lmcgill@mediastudies.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: c-span coverage of Jan 6 conference
Date: Mon, 10 Jan 2000 13:11:52 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Just FYI, according to the C-Span schedule, the Freedom Forum/AAPOR/NCPP conference on "Media Coverage of Polls and Primaries" (held last Thursday) will be re-broadcast today at 2:04 p.m. on C-Span 2.
For those of you who are interested in seeing more about the January 6 conference on "Media Coverage of Polls and Primaries," co-sponsored by The Freedom Forum, NCPP and AAPOR, please see the Freedom Forum's website at http://www.freedomforum.org/professional/2000/1/7polls.asp

and

http://www.freedomforum.org/professional/2000/1/6pollsters.asp

The audio from this program will also be available at the Freedom Forum's website, beginning this Wednesday, January 12. For details, see http://www.freedomforum.org/freeradio/schedule/jan2000.asp
STATISTICAL REPORTS on a number of topics have been released recently by the Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the agency responsible for gathering & reporting statistics on education in the U.S.

Topics of recent NCES reports include...

- Advanced Placement
- civics assessment
- community service
- compendiums of statistics
- distance education
- dropout rates
- early childhood
- elementary & secondary education
- Internet access
- libraries
- school safety
- spending disparities
- teacher preparation & learning
- postsecondary education
- writing assessment

Below are titles, descriptions & URLs for the full text or highlights of many (but not all) of these NCES reports. New publications from NCES can always be found online at:


=============================================  
Recent Publications from NCES (Sept-Dec 1999)  
=============================================  

Advanced Placement  
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

"Indicator of the Month: Students Who Took Advanced Placement (AP) Examinations" shows that since 1984 the number of students who took AP examinations has increased dramatically from 50 to 131 students per 1,000 12th graders. In 1997 more females than males took AP examinations.


Civics Assessment  
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

"NAEP 1998 Civics Report Card Highlights" describes the content & major findings from 1998 NAEP Civics assessment. It also looks at students' experiences at home & school that are associated with achievement in the study of civics.


"NAEP 1998 Civics Report Card for the Nation" presents results from this national assessment of 4th-, 8th-, & 12-grade students' knowledge in civics. Among the findings: about two-thirds of students at each grade performed at or above the "basic" level. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the nation's
only ongoing survey of what students know & can do in various academic subject areas.

Community Service
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
 "Service-Learning & Community Service among 6th- through 12th-Grade Students in the U.S.: 1996 & 1999" examines reports by students on community service participation, school practices that promote community service, & service-learning experiences, in relation to student & school characteristics.

 "Service-Learning & Community Service in K-12 Public Schools" is the first national study of service-learning in America's K-12 public schools (in the spring of 1999). Among the results: roughly one-third of these schools provide service-learning to some extent & most that do also give teachers help integrating service-learning into curricula.

Compendiums
~~~~~~~~~~~~
 "Mini-Digest of Education Statistics 1998" is a pocket-sized compilation of statistics covering the broad field of American education (kindergarten through graduate school).

 "Education Statistics Quarterly -- Fall 99 Issue" provides an overview of all NCES products released in a 3-month period. Each issue includes short publications (under 15 pages long), executive summaries of longer publications, descriptions of other NCES products, notices about training & funding opportunities, & papers on a featured topic (in this issue, "Life After College"), & more.

 "The Condition of Education" describes the status & recent progress of education in the U.S. It features an overview essay & 60 indicators in 5 areas of education.

Distance Education
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
 "Distance Education at Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1997-98" provides estimates of the number of postsecondary institutions offering distance education courses, the number of distance education course offerings & enrollments, & the number of degree & certification programs offered. It is based on data collected from both 2- & 4-year postsecondary institutions in the 1997-98 academic year.

Dropout Rates
~~~~~~~~~~~~
 "Dropout Rates in the United States: 1998" presents national data on high school dropout rates & high school completion rates from 1972 to 1998 & state-level data for the 1990s. The report examines the
relationship between student characteristics & the likelihood of dropping out & of completing high school.

Elementary & Secondary Education
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Key Statistics on Public Elementary & Secondary Schools & Agencies: School Year 1995-96" offers detailed information (from the 1995-96 & 1994-95 Common Core of Data) about our nation's 16,000 school districts & 87,000 public schools. Topics include the number, size, & location of schools & school districts; enrollment & schools by student grade; selected student characteristics; high school completers; dropouts; numbers of instructional, support & administrative staff; staff ratios; & revenues & expenditures. Much of the information is broken out by school or district size & urbanicity (e.g., rural, central city).

Early Childhood
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Home Literacy Activities & Signs of Children's Emerging Literacy, 1993 & 1999" examines: the extent to which families are engaged in literacy activities with their 3- to 5-year-olds, signs of children's emerging literacy (such as recognizing letters, writing their own names, reading or pretending to read), changes in home literacy activities & signs of children's emerging literacy between 1993 & 1999, & the association between home literacy activities & signs of emerging literacy in 1999.

Internet Access
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Indicator of the Month: Internet Access in Public & Private Schools" shows that between 1994 & 1998 the percentage of public schools with Internet access increased from 35% to 89%.

Libraries
~~~~~~~
"Evaluation of the NCES State Library Agencies Survey" looks at selected fiscal data collected on NCES's State Library Agencies Survey.

Postsecondary Education
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Fall Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, 1997" presents student enrollments in postsecondary institutions in the 50 states & D.C. for fall 1997. It focuses primarily on degree granting institutions eligible for Title IV federal financial aid & includes summaries of enrollment by race/ethnicity, gender, age, & state.

"Degrees & Other Awards Conferred by Title IV Eligible, Degree-Granting Institutions: 1996–97" tells the number of degrees & other awards conferred by Title IV eligible, degree-granting institutions in the 50 states & D.C. during academic year 1996–97. It includes
summaries by level of degree, field of study, race/ethnicity of recipients, & state.

"Participation in Adult Education in the U.S.: 1998-1999" provides the latest estimates of the level of adult participation in Adult Basic Education & English as a Second Language programs, work related education activities, postsecondary credential programs, apprenticeship programs, personal development classes, & other education activities.

"Indicator of the Month: Enrollment Patterns of First-Time Beginning Postsecondary Students" offers findings such as in 1995-96 about 40% of all first-time beginning postsecondary students enrolled in public & private 4-year institutions. Others enrolled in public 2-year institutions, or private for-profit institutions.

School Safety
~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Indicators of School Crime & Safety, 1999" presents data on crime at school from the perspectives of students, teachers, principals, & the general population from an array of sources. A joint effort by the Bureau of Justice Statistics & National Center for Education Statistics, the report examines crime occurring in school as well as on the way to & from school. Data for crime away from school are also presented to place school crime in the context of crime in the larger society. This report provides the most current detailed statistical information on the nature of crime in schools.

Spending Disparities
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Trends in Disparities in School District Level Expenditures per Pupil" examines disparities between districts in instructional expenditures in elementary & secondary schools for each state & also for geographic regions & the nation as a whole for the period from 1979-80 to 1993-94. Six alternative disparity measures were used.

Teacher Preparation & Learning
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
"Progress Through the Teacher Pipeline: 1992-93 College Graduates & Elementary/Secondary School Teaching as of 1997" is the second in a series of reports that follows 1992-93 college graduates' progress through the teacher pipeline. This report focuses on the academic characteristics & preparation for teaching of those who took various steps toward teaching. It is organized by a conceptual "teacher pipeline" that represents a teacher's career. The pipeline includes preparatory activities -- considering teaching, student teaching as an undergraduate, becoming certified to teach, applying for teaching jobs -- as well as teaching experiences & plans for teaching in the future.

Writing Assessment
"NAEP 1998 Writing Report Card Highlights" presents highlights from the 1998 NAEP writing assessment, describing its content, major findings at the national & state levels, & student experiences at home & in school that appear to be associated with achievement in writing. 

"NAEP 1998 Writing: Report Card for the Nation & the States" presents the results of the NAEP 1998 writing assessment for the nation & for participating states & jurisdictions. It includes results for subgroups of students defined by various background & contextual characteristics. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the nation's only ongoing survey of what students know & can do in various academic subject areas. 


Call for Papers:
Papers are requested for a panel focusing on the intersection of religion and race in the black community. The paper presentations will take place at the annual meeting of the Association of Social and Behavioral Sciences in Jackson, Mississippi, March 23-25, 2000.

If you are interested in presenting contact Dr. Robert Silverman by January 28, 2000 at the following address:
The latest issue of PC Magazine (cover date: Feb. 8, 2000) contains a review of six commercially available web-based survey packages. As of today, the review is not available at their web site (http://www.zdnet.com/pcmag), although I would expect to see it there eventually.

The editors, whose primary concern seems to be the ease of use for corporate users, pick Perseus SurveySolutions for the Web 2.0 as their top choice, but they also state that Raosoft EZSurvey 99 for the Internet provides more robust capabilities for advanced users.

The article provides a useful table comparing some of the major features of the packages reviewed, and another rating them on various subjective topics.

Jan Werner
The 15% threshold stipulated by the Presidential Debates Commission raises many of the same issues faced in 1980 when the League of Women Voters invoked a similar standard regarding John Anderson's inclusion in the debates.

At the time we were deeply involved in the issue both as concerned researchers and in our capacities as officers of the National Council on Public Polls. We take the liberty of attaching a file (WordPerfect) that includes three items that tried to identify the issues involved.

The first is the press release issued by the National Council on Public Polls on August 22, 1980: "Polling Association Cautions League of Women Voters on Use of Polls for Debates Decision."

The second is an op-ed piece that appeared in the New York Times on September 7, 1980: "The Polls Shouldn't Govern the Debate."

The third is a Washington Post letter to the editor on October 22, 1980 after the League of Women Voters reversed itself twice on whether to employ the 15% threshold.

The first two items had some impact and we would urge AAPOR to work through a clear formulation of the issues the 15% raises in today's environment and issue a public statement.

Albert H. Cantril
Susan Davis Cantril
Folks,

Those of you who study aging or the aged—or who have students or colleagues who do—might wish to watch this program and visit its website. None of us is aging, of course, so nothing personal.

-- Jim
The next installment of the tenth season of the science series SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN FRONTIERS -- "Never Say Die" (Show 1003) -- will air on Tuesday, January 25, 2000, at 8 p.m. ET on PBS. Hosted by Alan Alda, this show reveals the latest discoveries made in the science of aging.

In the not-so-distant future, we may all get to live a lot longer! Scientists' understanding of the aging process is growing at an astonishingly rapid pace. Already, humble lab animals like worms and fruit flies are living twice as long as nature normally allows, and there seems to be no reason why the same results cannot be achieved in humans. Soon it may be possible to grow spare body parts to replace hearts or joints that wear out. The real challenge? Fixing worn-out brains!

An informative website has been established to promote this show at:

http://www.pbs.org/saf/neversay.html

Following the show, viewers may visit this site to participate in a variety of show-related interactive activities -- including an opportunity to correspond with Alan Alda and scientists who appeared on the show -- and find out more about robotic science.

If you would like to publicize "Never Say Die" to your members, subscribers and/or website visitors, please visit http://www.pbs.org/saf/promo, where a linked button is available for online placement. Educators may call 800-315-5010 or e-mail saf@pbs.org to request a FREE, 12-page companion teaching guide, featuring hands-on classroom activities.

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN FRONTIERS is a production of The Chedd-Angier Production Company in association with Scientific American magazine. Presented to PBS by Connecticut Public Television, it is wholly underwritten by GTE Corporation.

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

*****

>From chase@csra.uconn.edu Tue Jan 11 10:02:00 2000
Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id KAA03513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 10:01:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from *unknown [137.99.84.44] by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via
   TCP with SMTP ; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 13:01:51 EST
X-Warning: UCONNVM.UConn.Edu: Could not confirm that host [137.99.84.44] is chase
From: "Chase Harrison" <chase@csra.uconn.edu>
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Masters Degree in Survey Research at the University of Connecticut
Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 13:03:56 -0500
Message-ID: <NDBBIAJCGKIDOEBHBNPOLAEIACGAA.chase@csra.uconn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
**The following is being posted for Martha Gibson. Please forgive cross-postings, and please reply to Dr. Gibson at mgibson@uconnvm.uconn.edu**

The University of Connecticut's Center For Survey Research and Analysis, in conjunction with the Department of Political Science and the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research offers a one-year intensive, professional program specifically designed to meet the needs of survey research practitioners. Offering the leading graduate program in survey research and design, with the most comprehensive curriculum, faculty available in the field, the program boasts a 100% placement record with major survey firms. Cutting edge training offered in internet polling, as well as national and special sample survey techniques for the fields of market research, consumer behavior, public opinion and political polling.

Assistantships are available.

For further information about the Graduate Program in Survey Research contact Dr. Martha Gibson, Director, at (860)486-3362, mgibson@uconnvm.uconn.edu.

>From Mike_Battaglia@abtassoc.com Tue Jan 11 10:06:42 2000
Received: from abtassoc.com (abtmail.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.7]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA07153 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 10:06:40 -0800 (PST)
Received: from hadrian.abtassoc.com (hadrian.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.2]) by abtassoc.com (8.9.1/8.9.1/Cohesive-2.3 (1998-08-10)) with SMTP id NAA22178 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 13:06:24 -0500 (EST)
Received: from [10.121.0.2] by hadrian.abtassoc.com via smtpd (for abtmail.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.7]) with SMTP; 11 Jan 2000 18:12:50 UT
Received: from ccMail by abtgwy.abtassoc.com (IMA Internet Exchange 3.11) id 000C6D37; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 13:07:42 -0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 13:01:55 -0500
Message-ID: <000C6D37.C22051@abtassoc.com>
From: Mike_Battaglia@abtassoc.com (Mike Battaglia)
Subject: Téléphone Interviewing Question
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: Jeffrey_Dreyfus@abtassoc.com (Jeffrey Dreyfus)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: ccMail note part
A colleague asked me to post the following questions related to telephone interviewer-household respondent emergency situations and maintaining confidentiality in an RDD survey.

How should our telephone interviewers handle dialing into an emergency situation? That is, when there is an emergency situation with a respondent. Should we dial 911 in the locality and request help? Must we only do so when asked to provide emergency help by the respondent? Does anyone have any experience with this situation?

Please respond to Jeff Dreyfus: jeffrey_dreyfus@abtassoc.com

Jan Werner writes...

The editors, whose primary concern seems to be the ease of use for corporate users, pick Perseus SurveySolutions for the Web 2.0 as their top choice, but they also state that Raosoft EZSurvey 99 for the Internet provides more robust capabilities for advanced users.

Please forgive me for getting on my soapbox, but the review rattles a sore spot with me that I would like to share with this group. Just so you know where I am coming from, our company has done hundreds of web surveys using a system that is part of our product line called Web Survent. It is based on the most widely used CATI system in the U.S.

As the PC magazine article points out, there are lots of simple PC survey systems on the market. Many of the projects we do are for clients who have used these products and then come to us to clean up the mess they have created. Conducting web surveys is not as easy as some may think. Composing questions for self-administered on-line surveys takes a different skill than questions for other mediums. Putting easy to use software in the hands of someone who hasn't thought seriously through the respondent's experience usually creates frustration which in turn leads to the questionnaire being completed with erroneous answers. In my opinion, poorly designed surveys are doing more damage for the industry than they are worth.

A case in point. My wife inadvertently got enrolled on the panel of a popular web survey company that recruits its members through Excite.com.
She has a Ph.D in psychology which motivated her to go ahead and participate in the weekly surveys she gets from them. Every single survey has made her angry, caused her to finish with absurd responses, and to email a lengthy critique to the survey company. They have yet to respond to her comments and continue to send out surveys that are seriously flawed. In addition, even though she is part of a panel, they ask the same demographic questions over and over (age, sex, income, etc).

In short, our clients tell us they like our product because it does everything a CATI system does and still has all the capabilities necessary to manage a professional on-line project. So ease-of-use should not be the most significant feature for a complex process.

Richard Rands
Computers for Marketing Corp.
http://survey.cfmc.com

>From armiller@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu Tue Jan 11 10:35:38 2000
Received: from zeus.ia.net (IDENT:root@zeus.ia.net [205.160.208.33])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA27300 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 10:35:37 -0800
(PST)
Received: from pswails (dip330.inav.net [205.160.208.200]) by zeus.ia.net
   (8.8.7/8.6.12) with SMTP id MAA30720 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000
   12:35:28 -0600
Message-Id: <200001111835.MAA30720@zeus.ia.net>
X-Sender: armiller@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 12:46:45 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Arthur's Mail" <armiller@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu>
Subject: Re: The Vanishing Voter Project (fwd)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9912161455280.16950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Dear Tami,

You seem to pop up where ever there is a great voting behavior study taking place.

Happy New Year to you. I hope all is going well. Let me know.

Best wishes,
Art

At 02:57 PM 12/16/99 -0800, you wrote:
>
>---------- Forwarded message ----------
>Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 14:39:00 -0500
>From: Tami_Buhr/FS/KSG@ksg.harvard.edu
Dear Colleague,

We write to inform you about a Campaign 2000 research project that is underway at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. We invite you to make use of the study's findings in your teaching and research. We encourage you to visit the project web site (http://www.vanishingvoter.org) and subscribe to the free weekly releases that are part of the study.

Funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, the project includes weekly national polls of the American electorate that are designed to measure the public's interest and involvement in the presidential campaign. We seek to understand the factors that encourage and discourage public engagement. We began our weekly surveys a month ago, and our findings thus far include, for instance, a belief among most Americans that the campaign is too long and has begun too early. Our surveys have also uncovered more week-to-week variation in voter engagement (paying attention to election news and talking and thinking about the campaign) than might be expected. Between now and the November election, we will closely examine the impact of the key primaries, the conventions, the general election debates, and other events on the public's campaign interest and involvement. These findings will be the basis of recommendations for structural changes in the presidential selection process.

We welcome recommendations you might have that would strengthen the study. Our only restriction on suggestions is that they fall within the general area of public interest and engagement and not, for instance, the horserace.

Our web site (http://www.vanishingvoter.org) has additional information on the study and contains results from the first five weekly surveys.

Thank you.

Thomas E. Patterson Tami Buhr
Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press Research Coordinator
Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy Shorenstein Center
Kennedy School of Government Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138 Cambridge, MA 02138
Over the past 20 years, I've had three instances at my survey units in which an "emergency" took place while the respondent was being interviewed via telephone. In each case it was an instance in which a woman was being interviewed and a man in her household appeared to start physically abusing her. In one of these cases, the man apparently started beating up the woman because he didn't want her to do the interview (at least at that time).

In each case, the interviewer brought this to the supervisor's immediate attention and the supervisor called the local police department (different cities in each case, thus 911 would not work) to report the apparent victimization. We called the local police because we had the local number but knew the local police could match that with an address. We never learned the outcome for any of these instances.

At 01:01 PM 1/11/00 -0500, you wrote:
> A colleague asked me to post the following questions related to
telephone interviewer-household respondent emergency situations
> and maintaining confidentiality in an RDD survey.
How should our telephone interviewers handle dialing into an emergency situation? That is, when there is an emergency situation with a respondent. Should we dial 911 in the locality and request help? Must we only do so when asked to provide emergency help by the respondent? Does anyone have any experience with this situation?

Please respond to Jeff Dreyfus: jeffrey_dreyfus@abtassoc.com

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jan 11 10:46:10 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA04645 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 10:46:10 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA10934 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 10:46:10 -0800 (PST)
Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 10:46:10 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Fine Contributions Deserve Thanks
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001111027341.1030-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

AAPORNETters,

We have earlier today received a most magnificent contribution to AAPORNET, to the research and study of AAPOR members generally, to the field at large (for I'm sure the message will be widely circulated on the Net), and to public opinion itself in the months ahead. I'm sure you all know the message to which I refer.

I have just sent my own personal note of gratitude and appreciation to thesenders, who obviously took considerable time and trouble to send their message—work on our behalf that ought to be greatly appreciated by many people. If you feel as I do, I encourage you to do the same (off-list, of course, as did I). I think we all know that the more we express our thanks for the generous contributions of especially those members who do not often post, the more valuable our list will become to us all.

-- Jim

******

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jan 11 11:42:08 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA14303 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 11:42:07 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
In my opinion, Jeff Dreyfus's question is not "Should we dial to request help?" but rather "How could anyone possibly not?"

We are all of us citizens, and no less so when we are on the job. As citizens, we each have a moral responsibility at least to report threats to our fellow citizens to the appropriate authorities (heroism is personal and therefore an extra--me, I suspect I'm a coward).

Were I to hear trouble during a call to or from a colleague or student, however, of course I would not hesitate an instant to call for police emergency help. Do our respondents deserve any less from us? I can't imagine any employer even thinking about taking any other position, whether for legal or ethical reasons, or both.

Consider the 2x2 paradox box: If you phone, you either minimize an emergency or else (if it's only a misunderstanding) you are greatly embarrassed. If you don't phone, however, you either never hear another thing about the incident, or else you learn of the terrible results of your inaction in the media the next day, and have to live with it for the rest of your life. Do you feel lucky enough to wish to risk that?

If such obviously moral questions, not to mention simple questions of good citizenship and sound judgment, can be made into professional or bureaucratic questions, however, the ultimate consequences are not likely to be very pretty. Human societies have several times in history gone far down this path, most blatantly in Europe in the century just past--and we learn nothing from that history except what we--each of one of us--do bother to apply in our own professions and to our own work.

Which is why I think the question must be, on an admittedly much more modest level, but nevertheless toward the same ends, "How could anyone possibly not phone for help?"

-- Jim

*******

On Tue, 11 Jan 2000, Mike Battaglia wrote:

> A colleague asked me to post the following questions related to telephone interviewer-household respondent emergency situations
> and maintaining confidentiality in an RDD survey.
>
> How should our telephone interviewers handle dialing into an emergency
> situation? That is, when there is an emergency situation with a
> respondent. Should we dial 911 in the locality and request help? Must
> we only do so when asked to provide emergency help by the respondent?
> Does anyone have any experience with this situation?
> 
> Please respond to Jeff Dreyfus: jeffrey_dreyfus@abtassoc.com

The following message is forwarded to AAPORNET at the invitation of its
sender, George Terhanian.

To answer a question George asks which others might also have: AAPORNET
messages are *not* screened--if you are a member, whatever you send to
aapornet@usc.edu goes immediately to all 900 other members (whether it
goes any further is up to each one of you, acting individually).

AAPORNET messages are not screened because, well, who would you have
screen them--and who among us would be crazy enough to accept that job?

-- Jim

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

Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 11:42:45 -0800 (PST)
From: George Terhanian <georget@harrisinteractive.com>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: Re: PC Magazine reviews Web Survey Software
Resent-Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 13:07:39 -0500
Resent-From: georget@harrisinteractive.com

Jim,

With all due respect AAPORNET's efforts, I must say I'm surprised that
Richard Rand's little message that I'm forwarding made it through
your screening system, assuming that you have a screening system. Seems
like blatant self-promotion (and utter nonsense) at the expense of "a
popular web survey company that recruits its members through Excite.com."
Feel free to forward my reaction to AAPORNET's members.

George
The editors, whose primary concern seems to be the ease of use for corporate users, pick Perseus SurveySolutions for the Web 2.0 as their top choice, but they also state that Raosoft EZSurvey 99 for the Internet provides more robust capabilities for advanced users.

Please forgive me for getting on my soapbox, but the review rattles a sore spot with me that I would like to share with this group. Just so you know where I am coming from, our company has done hundreds of web surveys using a system that is part of our product line called Web Survent. It is based on the most widely used CATI system in the U.S.

As the PC magazine article points out, there are lots of simple PC survey systems on the market. Many of the projects we do are for clients who have used these products and then come to us to clean up the mess they have created. Conducting web surveys is not as easy as some may think. Composing questions for self-administered on-line surveys takes a different skill than questions for other mediums. Putting easy to use software in the hands of someone who hasn't thought seriously through the respondent's experience usually creates frustration which in turn leads to the questionnaire being completed with erroneous answers. In my opinion, poorly designed surveys are doing more damage for the industry than they are worth.

A case in point. My wife inadvertently got enrolled on the panel of a popular web survey company that recruits its members through Excite.com. She has a Ph.D in psychology which motivated her to go ahead and participate in the weekly surveys she gets from them. Every single survey has made her angry, caused her to finish with absurd responses, and to email a lengthy critique to the survey company. They have yet to respond to her comments and continue to send out surveys that are seriously flawed.

In addition, even though she is part of a panel, they ask the same demographic questions over and over (age, sex, income, etc).

In short, our clients tell us they like our product because it does everything a CATI system does and still has all the capabilities necessary to manage a professional on-line project. So ease-of-use should not be the most significant feature for a complex process.

Richard Rands
Computers for Marketing Corp.
http://survey.cfmc.com

*****
The stock verbal formula that has taken root for surveys and media discussion of "gays in the military" brought to mind a device used in my earliest work as an interviewer. I had noticed the formula yesterday in a Washington Post op ed piece giving results on "allowing gays to serve openly in the military." from a survey of military officers. "Allowing gays to serve" was also how two of three letters favoring open service by gays in this morning's NY Times put the issue. (I had to overcome hesitancy about posting this item because it involves interviewing experience in which Nazism was the issue and I do not for a second wish to link anyone's attitudes on this issue to Nazism and fear that someone might accuse me of this.)

What rang my bell was the word "allowed." For both opinion surveys and media personnel vetting when we first moved into Germany, we used "projective questions" (devised mainly by Janowitz and Shils) to reveal camouflaged or repressed pro-Nazi attitudes. One device to tap authoritarian inclinations was use the word "erlaupt" (=allowed) in designing questions. For instance, if you asked: "What kind of government should the Germany of the future have?" the answer would invariably be, "A democracy." If you asked, "How many political parties should be allowed?" however, the revealing answer sometimes would be "One only, the Democratic one." To get at anti-Semitism when talking to a "some of my best friends were Jews" subject, among the questions I would ask was, "Should a Jew be allowed to hold high political office in the future Germany?"

Of course, there are many ways of formulating the gays matter that would be calculated to produce more liberal answers. "Should sexual orientation be a basis for excluding otherwise qualified recruits from the military?" or "Should an otherwise qualified gay men or women be denied the right to serve their country in the military?" or "Should only heterosexuals, onanists and celibates be allowed to serve in the military?" or "Should anti-gay attitudes of military authorities be allowed to determine the personnel policies of the armed forces?"
The "openly" word in the current formula also loads the issue with implicit endorsement of the de-legitimation of gays. Consider the question, "Should a gay serviceman or servicewoman be thrown out of the service for not hiding and lying about being gay?" (Also, "openly" may suggest flashers, flies and flirts.)

Once off on that train of thought, I was reminded by Peter Feaver's couching the issue in terms of "military effectiveness" of another way we loaded questions to get at otherwise hidden attitudes. These items gave the Subject the out of instrumental neutralization to dodge moral judgment of Nazism, for instance: "Do you think Nazism was an evil policy or a good policy badly carried out?" The open-ended question, "What do you think of how Jews were treated in the Third Reich?" would evoke from the pro-Nazi German replies such as, "It was a horrible mistake that caused us to lose the war because it turned against us the rich countries of the world in which Jews are strong." Both (all of the many?) sides of the "gays in the military" issue use instrumental neutralization to dodge the intense moral sentiments that motivate them and their opponents.

Not that Peter Feaver's piece always dodges moral question formulations. He writes:
"An astonishing 49 percent of those [officers] we surveyed said they would leave the military if 'the senior military leadership does not stand up for what is right in military policy.'" I am astonished by what astonishes Prof. Feaver as well as by how we allow "allow" to load issue formulation.

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Jan 11 15:46:39 2000
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA08554 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 15:46:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3-fi.acns.fsu.edu [192.168.197.3])
   by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id SAA30380
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 18:46:37 -0500
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial754.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.35.144])
   by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA10836
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jan 2000 18:46:35 -0500
Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2000 18:46:35 -0500
Message-Id: <2000011112346.SAA10836@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Telephone Interviewing Question

When I direct a local survey at FSU's RDD Center, we post the number of the Telephone Counseling and Referral Service in every booth. While this isn't quite a 911 situation if something comes up, interviewers are trained not to "play psychologist" but to immediately give out the TCRS number. In several thousand surveys I never had 911 (maybe we are just lucky in Tallahassee) but have given out the TCRS number several dozen times.
Susan

At 01:01 PM 1/11/2000 -0500, you wrote:
> A colleague asked me to post the following questions related to
> telephone interviewer-household respondent emergency situations
> and maintaining confidentiality in an RDD survey.
>
> How should our telephone interviewers handle dialing into an emergency
situation? That is, when there is an emergency situation with a
respondent. Should we dial 911 in the locality and request help? Must
we only do so when asked to provide emergency help by the respondent?
Does anyone have any experience with this situation?
>
> Please respond to Jeff Dreyfus: jeffrey_dreyfus@abtassoc.com
>
If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

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

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000
850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

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

>From jmsullivan@ibm.net Wed Jan 12 04:35:43 2000
Received: from prserv.net (out4.prserv.net [165.87.194.239])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id EAA17382 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jan 2000 04:35:43 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from thinkpad ([32.100.190.56]) by prserv.net (out4) with SMTP
   id <2000011212354123902kp4cte>; Wed, 12 Jan 2000 12:35:41 +0000
   From: "Michael Sullivan" <jmsullivan@ibm.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: mailing software
Date: Wed, 12 Jan 2000 06:27:35 -0600
Message-ID: <000201bf5cf9$4f7bd1b0$a60ca8c0@thinkpad>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

At a medium sized social service organization, we are looking for an off the
shelf software package to manage our bulk mailing. Some of this is for
donation requests, but mostly it is for bulletins on early childhood program
We need to be able to assign people to various multiple categories: board members, state legislator, etc. and print labels or mail merges without duplicates. Also, we need the capacity for at least two addresses: primary and secondary.

We have not had much success with custom built packages.

If you know of or could recommend such an application, I'd really appreciate any info.

You can send directly to me at msullivan@ounceofprevention.org

Thanks.
The stock verbal formula that has taken root for surveys and media
discussion of "gays in the military" brought to mind a device used in
my earliest work as an interviewer. I had noticed the formula
yesterday in a Washington Post op ed piece giving results on "allowing
gays to serve openly in the military." from a survey of military
officers. "Allowing gays to serve" was also how two of three letters
favoring open service by gays in this morning’s NY Times put the issue.
(I had to overcome hesitancy about posting this item because it
involves interviewing experience in which Nazism was the issue and I do
not for a second wish to link anyone's attitudes on this issue to Nazism
and fear that someone might accuse me of this.)

What rang my bell was the word "allowed." For both opinion surveys and
media personnel vetting when we first moved into Germany, we used
"projective questions" (devised mainly by Janowitz and Shils) to reveal
camouflaged or repressed pro-Nazi attitudes. One device to tap
authoritarian inclinations was use the word "erlaupt" (=allowed) in
designing questions. For instance, if you asked: "What kind of
government should the Germany of the future have?" the answer would invariably be, "A democracy." If you asked, "How many political parties should be allowed?" however, the revealing answer sometimes would be "One only, the Democratic one." To get at anti-Semitism when talking to a "some of my best friends were Jews" subject, among the questions I would ask was, "Should a Jew be allowed to hold high political office in the future Germany?"

Of course, there are many ways of formulating the gays matter that would be calculated to produce more liberal answers. "Should sexual orientation be a basis for excluding otherwise qualified recruits from the military?" or "Should an otherwise qualified gay men or women be denied the right to serve their country in the military?" or "Should only heterosexuals, onanists and celibates be allowed to serve in the military?" Or "Should anti-gay attitudes of military authorities be allowed to determine the personnel policies of the armed forces?"

The "openly" word in the current formula also loads the issue with implicit endorsement of the de-legitimation of gays. Consider the question, "Should a gay serviceman or servicewoman be thrown out of the service for not hiding and lying about being gay?" (Also, "openly" may suggest flashers, flies and flirts.)

Once off on that train of thought, I was reminded by Peter Feaver's couching the issue in terms of "military effectiveness" of another way we loaded questions to get at otherwise hidden attitudes. These items gave the Subject the out of instrumental neutralization to dodge moral judgment of Nazism, for instance: "Do you think Nazism was an evil policy or a good policy badly carried out?" The open-ended question, "What do you think of how Jews were treated in the Third Reich?" would evoke from the pro-Nazi German replies such as, "It was a horrible mistake that caused us to lose the war because it turned against us the rich countries of the world in which Jews are strong." Both (all of the many?) sides of the "gays in the military" issue use instrumental neutralization to dodge the intense moral sentiments that motivate them and their opponents.

Not that Peter Feaver's piece always dodges moral question formulations. He writes: "An astonishing 49 percent of those [officers] we surveyed said they would leave the military if 'the senior military leadership does not stand up for what is right in military policy.'" I am astonished by what astonishes Prof. Feaver as well as by how we allow "allow" to load issue formulation.
I couldn't agree more with Jim's comments. As moral human beings we do have a responsibility toward others.

Dick Halpern

At 02:42 PM 1/11/00, you wrote:

>In my opinion, Jeff Dreyfus's question is not "Should we dial to request help?" but rather "How could anyone possibly not?"
>
> We are all of us citizens, and no less so when we are on the job. As citizens, we each have a moral responsibility at least to report threats to our fellow citizens to the appropriate authorities (heroism is personal and therefore an extra--me, I suspect I'm a coward).
>
> Were I to hear trouble during a call to or from a colleague or student, however, of course I would not hesitate an instant to call for police emergency help. Do our respondents deserve any less from us? I can't imagine any employer even thinking about taking any other position, whether for legal or ethical reasons, or both.
>
> Consider the 2x2 paradox box: If you phone, you either minimize an emergency or else (if it's only a misunderstanding) you are greatly embarrassed. If you don't phone, however, you either never hear another thing about the incident, or else you learn of the terrible results of your inaction in the media the next day, and have to live with it for the rest of your life. Do you feel lucky enough to wish to risk that?
>
> If such obviously moral questions, not to mention simple questions of good citizenship and sound judgment, can be made into professional or bureaucratic questions, however, the ultimate consequences are not likely to be very pretty. Human societies have several times in history gone far down this path, most blatantly in Europe in the century just past--and we learn nothing from that history except what we--each of one of us--do bother to apply in our own professions and to our own work.
>
> Which is why I think the question must be, on an admittedly much more modest level, but nevertheless toward the same ends, "How could anyone
>possibly not phone for help?"
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more modest level, but nevertheless toward the same ends, "How could
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http://www.slate.com/netelection/entries/00-01-11_68660.asp

For a really chilling view of polling from the public perspective click on over to
Or click on the read message button at the bottom of this Slate article "Why Online Polls Are Bunk."

For example
"Pollsters have many chances to refine their questions and answers so that they can get exactly the response they want. This is called "making the poll objective"; if the poll results are unexpected, or produce a result that the pollster doesn't want, then the questions and answers must be tweaked until the results conform to what is being purchased."

--
Leo G. Simonetetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com
Dear Professor Witte:

Under separate cover I will forward to you two postings to the AAPORNET list I have made on the issue of "Survey 2000". I hope you will take the time to read these statements before you continue to spread hearsay. What I have called "blatant nonsense" refers to statements such as:

> We received more than 50,000 responses-twice the minimum
> required for scientific validity-and we thank everyone who contributed to this pioneering project.

I have read Bainbridge's essay in the latest issue of Contemporary Sociology, and I have followed the methodology of web surveys very closely for quite some time. And for my generally positive attitude towards the potential of web surveys, I have been accused of not having mastered even the contents of an elementary methods class (on the same list). On the other hand, many of the "web surveys and polls" today are little more than a sham. So, it is important to separate the good from the bad, i.e., to separate legitimate explorations of an emerging methodology from pure convenience samples (in the "tradition" of the Hite Report), and to exercise great caution in making claims about the validity and representativity of web surveys.

You and I may not agree on this point, but I feel that scholars on "scientific" or "scholarly" advisory boards have an obligation to see to it that their professional reputation is not abused by the sponsor or the funding agency in making grossly misleading claims to the public.

As my previous postings to AAPORNET indicate, I am well aware of work in progress in connection with "Survey 2000" and you can rest assured that I will study such work with great interest and an open mind when it becomes available.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

---

Is anyone aware of any polling in Florida on the Elian Gonzalez case?
For a CDC feasibility study we are investigating cultural barriers to participation in telephone surveys among racial/ethnic minorities in the U.S. and would appreciate references to useful studies and reviews.
Colleagues ...

Many of you have indicated an interest in Jesse Ventura or a connection with Minnesota. For the latest Minnesota Poll results, point your web browser to http://www.startribune.com

Cheers.

Rob

---------

Robert P. Daves, Director
Polling & News Research v: 612.673-7278
Star Tribune f: 612.673-4359
425 Portland Av. S. e: daves@startribune.com
Minneapolis MN 55419 USA
Princeton Data Source LLC is seeking an experienced, dedicated survey research professional to be the Operations Director in its state-of-the-art interviewing facility in Fredericksburg, Va. The PDS Operations Director is responsible for the day-to-day operations of a 100-seat telephone room, conducting top-quality interviews on public policy and social issues for a variety of clients in a charming Virginia city one hour south of Washington, D.C. The Operations Director is the hands-on manager of all aspects of PDS projects and is the main executive responsible for meeting clients' requirements. This position, a new one, will be one of the top PDS executives. The ideal candidate should have at least ten years of field house experience. Salary and benefits are competitive.

PDS is an affiliate of Princeton Survey Research Associates. Please send resumes to Evans Witt, Princeton Data Source LLC, 2300 Fall Hill Avenue, Fredericksburg, Va., 22401 or fax to (540) 368-1967.

Evans Witt
evans.witt@psra.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jan 14 08:04:40 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA22785 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 08:04:31 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA16146 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 08:04:33 -0800
   (PST)
Date: Fri, 14 Jan 2000 08:04:33 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Conference on Sample Surveys (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001140801210.15606-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 14 Jan 2000 13:12:27 +0100
From: Mohammed El Haj Tirari <melhajti@ULB.AC.BE>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: Conference on Sample Surveys

Société Française de Statistique
Conference on Sample Surveys
Brussels, June 21-24, 2000
In 1997, the Société Française de Statistique (French Statistical Society) held its first Conference on sample surveys (in French) at Rennes. A second conference on the same subject will be held on Thursday, the 22nd and Friday, the 23rd of June by the Institute of Statistics and Operational Research of the Université Libre de Bruxelles. The conference will be preceded and followed by two teaching/information and discussion sessions:
(1) Sample Surveys and Politics, in collaboration with CRAPS (Université de Lille 2), on Wednesday, 21 of June 2000 at EUDIL (Université de Lille 1);
(2) Sample Surveys and Enterprises, on Saturday, 24 of June 2000, at the Solvay Business School of the Université Libre de Bruxelles.

The conference is sponsored by the Belgian Statistical Society, the International Association of Survey Statisticians, the Association des Statisticiennes et Statisticiens du Québec and the Belgian Institute of Statistics. It is organised by the Université Libre de Bruxelles, Université de Lille 1 and Lille 2 and by the Haute Ecole Francisco Ferrer of Brussels.

The conference will focus on topics such as: sampling issues (sample design, modelling, variance calculation ...), repeated surveys, estimation methods (local data, calibration, adjustments ...), software, sample surveys and politics, sample surveys in and with enterprises, media ratings, sample surveys in epidemiology, sample surveys in accounting audit, sample surveys in public statistics, sample surveys in developing countries, geomarketing and geostatistics, sample surveys and archives, surveys on sites, surveys on Internet, deontology and democracy, mega-databases (confidentiality, reliability, storage and extraction of pertinent information), data processing, file fusion, missing data, ...

The scientific program will cover all aspects of these issues; the participants can put forward other themes. The conference is open to all persons interested in sample surveys, be they from universities, national statistical institutes, businesses or industry.

For further information, please contact:

Jean-Jacques Droesbeke, Université Libre de Bruxelles
LMTD - CP 124, Avenue Jeanne 44, B - 1050 Bruxelles
Tel:(32-2) 650.32.74; Fax (32-2) 650.34.66
E-mail : psemerar@ulb.ac.be

*****

>From lvoigt@fhcrc.org Fri Jan 14 12:19:35 2000
Received: from fhcrc.org (bug1.fhcrc.org [140.107.10.110])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA26126 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 12:19:34 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from moe.fhcrc.org (moe [140.107.10.42])
    by fhcrc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA09161
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 12:19:32 -0800 (PST)
Received: by moe.fhcrc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <C9KSKJZS>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 12:19:31 -0800
I would appreciate any literature references that compare data quality of interviews conducted using CAPI to in-person interviews using pencil and paper.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
lvoigt@fhcrc.org
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

SAMPLING STATISTICIANS

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) has these openings in its Washington, DC and Princeton, NJ offices for statisticians to support its survey sampling and statistical analysis activities:

Senior Sampling Statistician: requires a Ph.D. degree in statistics and at least five years of experience or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

Sampling Statistician: requires a Ph.D. degree in statistics or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

Survey Sampling Specialist: requires a Masters degree in statistics or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

These positions involve the creation and implementation of sample designs, including activities such as frame construction, sample selection, weight calculation, missing data imputation, methodological and statistical analyses, and report and proposal preparation. Strong communication skills,
familiarity with statistical software, and knowledge of sampling methodologies are highly desirable, as well as additional years of experience and computer programming skills.

One of the foremost public policy research organizations in the United States, MPR attracts clients from federal and state government agencies, foundations, universities, professional associations, and businesses. MPR's extensive contributions to public policy formation crisscross the nation's social policy agenda—from child care to elder care, from job training to retirement. Our projects typically require interdisciplinary teams composed of subject matter specialists, statisticians, data collectors, and systems analysts. Please visit our web site at http://www.mathematica-mpr.com for additional information.

An employee owned company, Mathematica offers a competitive salary and benefits package, on-site fitness centers, and three weeks vacation in the first year of employment. Qualified candidates should submit a resume, salary requirements, DC or NJ location preference, and references to:

Esther Siach-Bar-Human Resources Dept.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Fax: (609) 799-0005
e-mail: Personnel-NJ@mathematica-mpr.com

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Jan 14 13:12:21 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id NAA28546 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 13:12:19 -0800
(PST)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
  by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA31607
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jan 2000 13:09:49 -0800
Message-Id: <200001142109.NAA31607@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 14 Jan 2000 13:11:50 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: PC International Market Penetration
In-reply-to: <09F7D5E5A777D3118DF90008C7CFEE373D121F@MATH3A>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Does anybody know a good publically available source of statistical information concerning the market penetration of PCs in developing countries?

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
I am planning to purchase a survey software package for a small program evaluation consulting business and would like recommendations from AAPOR members. The capabilities I am seeking in a software package include the following integrated functions:

* Questionnaire page layout that can accommodate Spanish as well as English
* Entry of numeric and text data (for samples less than 2,000), with capacity for key entry verification
* Options to purchase additional modules for off-site data entry
* Analysis of numeric data
* Analysis of text data (if possible)
* Table production
* Color graphics
* Ability to convert data to text format so that the data can be read by SAS or SPSS.

CATI and CAPI capabilities are not required. Please send the recommendations directly to me at wconstantine@home.com and I will be glad to summarize the recommendations I receive. Thank you.

Wendy Constantine
Research and Evaluation Systems
Lafayette, CA
924-284-8193
I am teaching an introductory American Government Class this Spring, and I anticipate the Ventura campaign for Governor will come up when my focus shifts to elections involving "celebrity" candidates (Actors, Athletes and Astronauts.)

I am very interested in using video tapes of the Ventura Campaign ads (SPECIAL INTEREST MAN, etc.), news reports featuring these ads and/or his rather unconventional below the radar campaign.

Does anyone know if such material exists, and if so, how I may go about obtaining it for use this semester. Thank you.

PATRICK HOEY
Nassau Community College, NY

PATRICKPOA@AOL.COM
You might inquire at MICROTAB, inc. in Georgia somewhere.

>===== Original Message From aapornet@usc.edu =====
>I am planning to purchase a survey software package for a small program
>evaluation consulting business and would like recommendations from AAPOR
>members. The capabilities I am seeking in a software package include
>the following integrated functions:
>
>* Questionnaire page layout that can accommodate Spanish as well as English
>* Entry of numeric and text data (for samples less than 2,000), with
> capacity for key entry verification
>* Options to purchase additional modules for off-site data entry
>* Analysis of numeric data
>* Analysis of text data (if possible)
>* Table production
>* Color graphics
>* Ability to convert data to text format so that the data can be read by SAS
> or SPSS.
>
>CATI and CAPI capabilities are not required. Please send the recommendations
directly to me at wconstantine@home.com and I will be glad to summarize
>the recommendations I receive. Thank you.
>
>Wendy Constantine
>Research and Evaluation Systems
>Lafayette, CA
>924-284-8193
Last year I presented a lecture to the Royal Statistical Society in London, UK, titled "The effect of computer-assisted interviewing on data quality: A review of the evidence".

If you are interested, I can send you a copy. In that case, please send me your paper (snail) mail address.

Best regards, Edith de Leeuw

At 12:19 PM 1/14/00 -0800, you wrote:
>(The following request was also sent to SRMS list-serve)
> >I would appreciate any literature references that compare data quality of >interviews conducted using CAPI to in-person interviews using pencil and >paper.  > >thanks!
> >Lynda Voigt
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
> Seattle, WA

As preparation for 2001 and the new millennium
Happy new beginnings....
I would love to have a copy also....thanks for the courtesy...
Joe Catania, jcatania@PSG.UCSF.edu

>  ----------
>  From:     Edith de Leeuw
>  Reply To:       aapornet@usc.edu
>  Sent:     Monday, January 17, 2000 5:10 AM
>  To:       aapornet@usc.edu
>  Subject:  RE: question
>  
>  Last year I presented a lecture to the Royal Statistical Society in
>  London,
>  UK, titled "The effect of computer-assisted interviewing on data quality:
>  A
>  review of the evidence".
>  
>  If you are interested, I can send you a copy. In that case, please send me
>  your paper (snail) mail address.
>  
>  Best regards, Edith de Leeuw
>  
>  At 12:19 PM 1/14/00 -0800, you wrote:
>  >(The following request was also sent to SRMS list-serve)
>  >
>  >I would appreciate any literature references that compare data quality of
>  >interviews conducted using CAPI to in-person interviews using pencil and
>  >paper.
>  >
>  >thanks!
>  >
>  >Lynda Voigt
>  >lvoigt@fhcrc.org
>  >Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
>  >Seattle, WA
>
>  As preparation for 2001 and the new millennium
>  Happy new beginnings....
>
>From afbowers@email.unc.edu Mon Jan 17 10:23:19 2000
Received: from smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA00547 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jan 2000 10:23:17 -0800
(PST)
Received: from fblgq (sru-28.sru.unc.edu [152.2.58.221])
by smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA13289;
Message-ID: <003801bf6118$40b9efe0$dd3a0298@sru.unc.edu>
From: "Ashley Bowers" <afbowers@email.unc.edu>
The Survey Research Unit (SRU) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill currently has an opening for Data Collection Director. The SRU is a growing operation conducting mail and telephone surveys ranging from population-based epidemiological studies to marketing and needs assessments in areas covering economic, health, social, medical, and environmental issues.

The Data Collection Director position requires a Bachelor's degree in Sociology, Economics, Psychology or related social science, including coursework in statistics, research methodology, computer science, and/or other coursework related to survey research and methodology, and one year of experience in gathering, editing, and analyzing data for social and economic research. (Coursework toward a Master's degree in an area related to survey research and methodology may be substituted for some or all of the experience.)

The major responsibilities of this position include preparing budgets for proposals, managing mail and telephone surveys from the planning stage to data cleaning and analysis, overseeing operations in our calling room (20 station CATI facility), serving as survey methods resource person for students and other staff working on methods projects, and suggesting methods experiments where possible.

UNC offers a competitive salary and excellent benefits.

Interested applicants may submit their resume or request additional information about the position by email to ashley_bowers@unc.edu, by fax (919-966-2221), or by mail to:

Survey Research Unit
Attn. Ashley Bowers
730 Airport Road, Suite 103
CB #2400, UNC-CH
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-2400

Interested applicants also must submit an application to the UNC Employment Department. An application can be downloaded from http://www.ais.unc.edu/hr/ or one can be requested by calling =
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is an equal opportunity employer.

The Survey Research Unit (SRU) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill currently has an opening for Data Collection Director. The SRU is a growing operation conducting mail and telephone surveys ranging from population-based epidemiological studies to marketing and needs assessments in areas covering economic, health, social, medical, and environmental issues.

The Data Collection Director position requires a Bachelor's degree in Sociology, Economics, Psychology or related social science, including coursework in statistics, research methodology, computer science, and/or other coursework related to survey research and methodology, and one year of experience in gathering, editing, and analyzing data for social and economic research. (Coursework toward a Master's degree in an area related to survey research and methodology may be substituted for some or all of the experience.)

The major responsibilities of this position include preparing budgets for proposals, managing mail and telephone surveys from the planning stage to data cleaning and analysis, overseeing operations in our calling room (20 station CATI facility), serving as survey methods resource person for students and other staff working on methods projects, and suggesting methods experiments where possible.
I HAVE A DREAM TODAY

Martin Luther King Jr.

[Delivered on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial during
the March on Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963]

"I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But 100 years later, the Negro still is not free; 100 years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination; 100 years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity; 100 years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself in exile in his own land.

So we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note in so far as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check; a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. And so we've come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy; now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice; now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood; now is the time to make justice a reality for all God's children. It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end, but a beginning. And those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content, will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of the revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something that I must say to my people, who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice. In the process of
gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plain of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force; and the marvelous new militancy, which has engulfed the Negro community, must not lead us to a distrust of all white people. For many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize their destiny is tied up with our destiny. And they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone. And as we talk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.

There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, "When will you be satisfied? We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality; we can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of cities; we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one; we can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their selfhood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating "For Whites Only;' we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No! no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until "justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Go back to Mississippi. Go back to Alabama. Go back to South Carolina. Go back to Georgia. Go back to Louisiana. Go back to the slums and ghettos of our Northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal." I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood. I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama - with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification - one day right there in Alabama, little
black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day "every valley shall be exalted and every hill and mountain shall be made low. The rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.'

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we shall be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day. And this will be the day. This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning, 'my country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrim's pride, from every mountain side, let freedom ring.' And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true.

So let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire; let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York; let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado; let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California. But not only that. Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia; let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee; let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

And when this happens, and when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all God's children, black men and white men, Jews and gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: "Free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, we are free at last.'

******

>From albright@field.com Mon Jan 17 11:19:51 2000
Received: from mail.brainstorm.net (root@ns.brainstorm.net [205.178.112.2])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id LAA25469 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jan 2000 11:19:50 -0800
(PST)
Received: from PC52 ([205.178.66.44])
  by mail.brainstorm.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id LAA16343
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jan 2000 11:19:49 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20000117111637.008283b0@pop.field.com>
X-Sender: albright@pop.field.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Mon, 17 Jan 2000 11:16:37 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Victoria Albright <albright@field.com>
Subject: Child Psychologist Consulting Needed
In-Reply-To: <003801bf6118$40b9efe0$dd3a0298@sru.unc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Hi, AAPORNET

A colleague asked if I could help him locate a child psychologist consultant with experience studying/surveying 6 to 10 year old. The study involves preparation of survey-based evidence for litigation.

Please send referrals to my personal address (ALRIGHT@FIELD.COM). If it would be helpful for us to talk, please feel free to call me at 415 392 5763.

Best, Vicky

Victoria Albright
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
San Francisco, CA  94108
415 392 5763
ALRIGHT@FIELD.COM
Victoria Albright
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
550 Kearny Street
San Francisco, CA  94108
415 392 5763

The man who does not read good books has no advantage over the man who can't read them.

--Mark Twain

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Jan 17 12:34:58 2000
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.5])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA00746 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jan 2000 12:34:57 -0800 (PST)
From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
    by imo15.mx.aol.com (mail out v24.6.) id 5.af.6493a5 (9638)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jan 2000 15:34:14 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <af.6493a5.25b4d6c5@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 17 Jan 2000 15:34:13 EST
Subject: My Thanks for Helping Us to Remember Dr. King
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 44

Jim -

It was extremely thoughtful of you to circulate the moving words Dr. King delivered at the Lincoln Memorial just over 36 years ago and, sadly, a too-short five years before his violent death in Memphis. Upon re-reading those words, we remember both the remarkable vision of the man and how well
he was able to express it. You've unquestionably done us a great service by enabling us to remember what the dream, and I thank you for that.

Phil Harding

---

On Mon, 17 Jan 2000 PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote:

> Jim -
> > It was extremely thoughtful of you to circulate the moving words Dr. King delivered at the Lincoln Memorial just over 36 years ago and, sadly, a too-short five years before his violent death in Memphis. Upon re-reading those words, we remember both the remarkable vision of the man and how well he was able to express it. You've unquestionably done us a great service by enabling us to remember what the dream, and I thank you for that.
> >
> Phil Harding

---
Thanks, Jim. Very appropriate.

Dick Halpern

At 01:37 PM 1/17/00, you wrote: (James Beniger)

> I HAVE A DREAM TODAY
> Martin Luther King Jr.
> [Delivered on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial during
> the March on Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963]
> "I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the
> greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.
> Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand
> today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came
> as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been
> seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak
> to end the long night of their captivity.

Etc etc.
Call for papers

The journal Field Methods announces a special issue on RESEARCH METHODS IN PRODUCT AND SERVICE DEVELOPMENT.

Articles should describe and explain qualitative and/or quantitative methods (or a mix of those methods) developed for data collection, management, and/or analysis. Authors are especially encouraged to examine recent methodological innovations in such areas as:

- experience sampling (so-called beeper studies)
- time allocation/time management methods
- scenario and task analysis
- network analysis
- computer assisted domain analysis
- direct observation
- unobtrusive observation
- object manipulation
- usability analysis
- proximity studies
- decision-tree analysis
- archival methods

Each article should accomplish the following objectives.

1. Identify the name or names given to the method.
2. Identify the purpose and likely outcome of the method.
3. Describe the method in detail including its assumptions and working processes.
4. Delineate the conditions and phases of product development in which the method is most and least useful.
5. Outline resource requirements (time, resources, equipment, and labor).

This is only a suggested list of topics. Please feel free to call to discuss.
your ideas for contributions to this special issue. Contact Bryan Byrne at aguas@ix.netcom.com.

The projected publication month is February, 2001. Please submit the articles and reviews by June, 2000 on a standard 3.5 floppy along with one hard copy version. Mail all submissions to: Bryan Byrne, Special Issue Editor, Field Methods, 3895 La Selva Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306. Phone: (650) 565.8489

**************************|**************************
*                                                                *
*                                           BMS               *
*                                           (Bulletin de Methologie Sociologique) *
*                                           (Bulletin of Sociological Methodology) *
*                                           bmsl@ext.jussieu.fr *
*                                           http://www.ccr.jussieu.fr/bms *
*                                                                *
*                                           RC33              *
*                                           (Research Committee "Logic & Methodology" *
*                                           of the International Sociological Association) *
*                                           rc33@ext.jussieu.fr *
*                                           http://local.ualaska.edu/~aas353/isa/index.htm *
*                                                                *
*                                               Karl M. van Meter *
*                                                                *
*                           email bmsl@ext.jussieu.fr   LASMAS, IRESCO-CNRS *
*                           tel/fax 33 (0)1 40 51 85 19 59 rue Pouchet *
*                                                                *
*                           75017 Paris, France *
*                           http://www.iresco.fr/labos/lasmas/accueil_f.htm *
*                                                                *
**************************|**************************

******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jan 18 12:17:39 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA01610 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jan 2000 12:17:37 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
   id MAA19826 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jan 2000 12:17:36 -0800 (PST)
Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2000 12:17:36 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001181000480.29199-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
Why should we AAPOR members care about last week's $165 billion merger of America Online and Time Warner?

America Online, the world's single largest gateway to the Internet, currently has 20 million subscribers, each one paying $21.95 a month for its E-mail, chat rooms, and Instant Messaging. Approximately half of U.S. households see the Internet and Web only through the filters and frames of AOL. This includes more American subscribers than use the dozen or so next most popular Internet service providers (ISPs) combined. Indeed, some experts cite AOL as a leading cause of the rapid penetration of personal computers into American households.

So we in AAPOR should not forget that so-called "Internet surveys" of American citizens and consumers must necessarily be surveys of AOL households--families likely to see the Internet and Web largely as packaged and presented--or not--by AOL.

While online, AOL customers' every movement and stopover throughout the various offerings of the service is automatically and continuously tracked. As a result, AOL has undoubtedly the single most extensive database on consumer behavior and preferences ever to exist on this planet--especially for online behavior and choices.

Do subscribers mind? A Forrester Research study released last year estimated AOL's annual cancellation rate for paid subscribers at 2.5 percent.

And now AOL's $165 billion merger with Time Warner, if consummated, would enhance its offerings to customers with one of the world's largest storehouses and factories of consumer content: coverage of news, weather, sports and popular culture more generally--not to mention movies and animated cartoons (many American classics), recorded music, and both popular and serious magazines and books.

Although it is the content cache that is Time Warner (one cache cow, it would appear) which has been given the most attention in recent news coverage, much more important to AAPOR's interests--were AOL.Time Warner to become reality--is that the Time Warner half of the new company already owns among the world's most extensive means of distributing that content via cable television.

Even more important, that same cable system is already being retrofitted with the Time Warner Roadrunner (beep, beep--get it?) high-speed cable-modem service, expected to deliver up to 21 million subscribers a continuous broadband service.

And surprise, surprise! Although AOL had only recently issued outraged demands for open access to all such cable systems, in the name of the free flow of
information online, the company has now--since its merger announcement--backed off all such demands, in the name of free market solutions, but of course.

So, where does all this leave us AAPOR members, with our interests in the future of survey, market and consumer research, and also in the dynamics of public opinion formation and change more generally?

It leaves us facing the prospects of a single national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm the likes of which we could not have imagined even, say, a week ago.

Even to think about it is to take one's breath away:

* continuous high-speed cable access to more than half of American households (just for starters), households that actually pay *you* for the privilege

* the technological capability to monitor each household member's every movement and stopover, automatically and continuously, throughout an entire range--designed by you--of Internet and Web offerings

* the enticements to keep and move subjects online with perhaps the single most popular cache of news, entertainment, arts and literature in American history

* the ability to release the results of this research continuously to marketers, and also as consumer content on web sites and news outlets with the reputation of, say, CNN and Time Magazine

Would *you* wish to be conducting overnight telephone surveys when all this comes to pass?

As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can always hope that it never occurs to AOL.TimeWarner to become America's only national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm.

If it does choose to do this, perhaps during its off-peak moments, however, I hope as many of you AAPORNERTers as possible can find work with the new company--to infuse it with healthy doses of AAPOR integrity, as represented in our code.

As for the rest of us--focus groups, anyone?
Oh dear, now that this has gone out to AAPOR-NET, how long will it take Time-Warner to find out?

Yours in sorrow for this new millenium.

Susan

At 12:17 PM 1/18/2000 -0800, you wrote:

> THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
> Why should we AAPOR members care about last week's $165 billion merger of America Online and Time Warner?
> Would *you* wish to be conducting overnight telephone surveys when all this comes to pass?
> As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can always hope that it never occurs to AOL.TimeWarner to become America's only national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm.
> If it does choose to do this, perhaps during its off-peak moments, however, I hope as many of you AAPORNETters as possible can find work with the new company--to infuse it with healthy doses of AAPOR integrity, as represented in our code.
> If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Academic Year 1999-2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208

No time at all. I work at MovieFone, which is part of AOL. And I am sure that the scenario envisioned here will never come to pass.

Jay

In a message dated 1/18/00 3:45:26 PM Eastern Standard Time, slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu writes:

<< Subj: Re: THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
Date: 1/18/00 3:45:26 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu (Susan Losh)
Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

No time at all. I work at MovieFone, which is part of AOL. And I am sure that the scenario envisioned here will never come to pass.

Jay
Oh dear, now that this has gone out to AAPOR-NET, how long will it take Time-Warner to find out?

Yours in sorrow for this new millennium.

Susan

At 12:17 PM 1/18/2000 -0800, you wrote:

> THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?

> Why should we AAPOR members care about last week's
> $165 billion merger of America Online and Time Warner?
> Would *you* wish to be conducting overnight telephone
> surveys when all this comes to pass?
> As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can
> always hope that it never occurs to AOL.TimeWarner
> to become America's only national survey-market-
> consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm.
> If it does choose to do this, perhaps during its
> off-peak moments, however, I hope as many of you
> AAPORNETters as possible can find work with the new
> company--to infuse it with healthy doses of AAPOR
> integrity, as represented in our code.

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

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Academic Year 1999-2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208
From Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Tue Jan 18 18:19:40 2000
Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id SAA23516 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jan 2000 18:19:32 -0800 (PST)
Received: from w5y0s9 (user-38lc5mn.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.22.215])
  by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA27930
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jan 2000 21:19:29 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.2000118205731.00a2c220@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2000 21:18:43 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
In-Reply-To: <9a.15fffa.25b638ea@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Jim painted what I think is a prophetic although troubling picture of the future with respect to polling when he said:

"As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can always hope that it never occurs to AOL.Time Warner to become America's only national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm."

After the merger is completed, it could take AOL Time Warner a very short time to incorporate what could become a dominant national survey/market research and polling operation. This, I think, is pretty obvious. Our speaking up would probably have little impact. If we were living in an authoritarian, police state, this would be scary because of the potential possibilities for abuse. On the other hand, AOL Time Warner might realize that from a strictly business viewpoint, it might be wiser to depend more on independent information gathering sources than running an in-house operation. It could go either way. of course but over time it is reasonable to expect that both ways will be experimented with and that some sort of middle road will be arrived at. In the meantime I agree completely with Jim when he encourages us "to infuse it with healthy doses of AAPOR integrity, as represented in our code." Maintaining a consciousness of AAPOR standards will become more important than ever. Yes, we should care!

Dick Halpern

Jim --

You provide an interesting and insightful perspective on the AOL-Time Warner merger as it relates to AAPOR interests. Perhaps the future for opinion research is not as dismal as you paint it. I think there will always be a market for high quality (i.e., respectable probability samples) research on variables whose data cannot be collected via mechanical methods, but must be taken straight from the respondent's mouth -- opinions, attitudes, images, knowledge, intentions etc. In other words, the very core of AAPOR's interests. I doubt that such a merger would disemploy very many people
engaged in that sort of work.

And if your scenario holds true, perhaps AOL-Time Warner would eventually establish such a monopoly on schlocky research that anti-trust enforcement would be forced to step in, à la Microsoft, ultimately creating employment not only for more researchers, but also for myriad attorneys.

Ray Funkhouser
>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed Jan 19 06:31:01 2000
Received: from smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.157])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
    id GAA09891 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Jan 2000 06:31:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (adsl-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])
    by smtp-out2.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMT id JAA20207
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Jan 2000 09:30:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.2.2.20000119090325.00a45f00@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2
Date: Wed, 19 Jan 2000 09:29:42 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001181000480.29199-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 12:17 PM 1/18/00 -0800, James Beniger wrote:
> ...  
> ...  
> So, where does all this leave us AAPOR members, with our
> interests in the future of survey, market and consumer
> research, and also in the dynamics of public opinion
> formation and change more generally?
> ...  
> ...  
> As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can
> always hope that it never occurs to AOL.TimeWarner
> to become America's only national survey-market-
> consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm.

Of course, Jim got it right -- except for the rather naive assumption that all this had not yet occurred to the people behind such mergers. And with such a huge subscriber base (translate into decent "coverage") even some form of random sampling will become possible. There are two rays of hope in this:
1. As in other industries, monopolies may be stopped. There will come a time when AOL dominating market position will be contested by other major players. Maybe with ATT or some other phone company as one nucleus.
2. Doing sloppy opinion polls is one thing (and in part these may serve your political agenda), doing sloppy market research is quite another (because if you get it wrong it will cost your own money). So, there is an incentive for proper sampling and proper survey/poll work more general. The "gold rush" phase in web surveys will be over in another year or two, and the sooner the people who have the survey methodology knowledge are willing to face the technological changes and put their talents to developing these methods, the quicker the quacks will be eliminated.
But, though proper methods will prevail in the long run based on
self-interest (not because of some code of ethics), in the short run there
will be adversity. Recently, we talked about Survey 2000 sponsored by the
National Geographic Society. And here is more by one of its scientific
advisors:

In his recent essay (in Contemporary Sociology 28, p.664-7, 1999) William
Bainbridge -- a senior officer at the National Science Foundation (NSF) --
seems to suggest that all that is needed to "fix" the convenience sampling
in Survey2000 is to apply weights derived from known distributions of basic
variables like sex (male/female). And then he continues to question the
sampling of the GSS. After some discussion (one of his complaints is that
"not a single one of its more than 35,000 respondents (aggregated across
the 1972-1996 surveys) was over age 89 or under 18") he concludes: "With
such a "sample", it is hard to see what tests of statistical significance
can validly be applied." Take this, Tom Smith!
His vision for the future of the GSS is a recruited panel of 100, 000
family polled monthly via the Web like "the families who currently provide
ratings of television programs."

So, maybe I need to correct my prediction about the "gold rush" phase of
web surveys, let's make this 3-5 years.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

As long as I still work here, I will do my best to maintain AAPOR's
standards, but I really don't think AOL Time Warner will ever be the Big
Brother gateway into America's homes that prior contributors to this
discussion seem to fear. After all, Time Warner's 21 million cable homes
constitute less than a third, I believe, of the entire cable market. Even
AOL is less dominant in its market than Microsoft . . .
Jim painted what I think is a prophetic although troubling picture of the future with respect to polling when he said:

"As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can always hope that it never occurs to AOL.Time Warner to become America's only national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm."

After the merger is completed, it could take AOL Time Warner a very short time to incorporate what could become a dominant national survey/market research and polling operation. This, I think, is pretty obvious. Our speaking up would probably have little impact. If we were living in an authoritarian, police state, this would be scary because of the potential possibilities for abuse. On the other hand, AOL Time Warner might realize that from a strictly business viewpoint, it might be wiser to depend more on independent information gathering sources than running an in-house operation. It could go either way. of course but over time it is reasonable to expect that both ways will be experimented with and that some sort of middle road will be arrived at. In the meantime I agree completely with Jim when he encourages us "to infuse it with healthy doses of AAPOR integrity, as represented in our code." Maintaining a consciousness of AAPOR standards will become more important than ever. Yes, we should care!

Dick Halpern
Why should we assume that an ISP is a natural monopoly? We made that mistake at Knight Ridder when we were inventing Viewtron back in the late 70s. The computer that stored the data seemed to us like a printing press and the telephone lines were the analog of the trucks that hauled the papers. We never envisioned the cost of both computing and communication getting so low that it would hardly pay to meter it.

It's still not clear whether, in the long run content will be paid for by advertisers or by end users. AOL now gets 30 percent of its revenue from advertising, up from 21 percent two years ago. If the advertising model dominates, content will mostly be given away like open-source code, and ISP's will compete on the basis of service, not content. That will create some sampling problems, but domination of access to customers by a single ISP doesn't seem likely.
There is a fundamental misconception at work here. Opinion research and statistical profiling of consumer behavior are not at all the same thing.

It is true that AOL has access to an extraordinary subscriber pool, but it really doesn't have enough information on users to track individual preferences, except in a very limited manner. The most it can do is to associate visits to one location with visits to another, and in some very limited circumstances (e.g., purchases made through AOL), with other consumer behavior. This can be very useful for establishing advertising rates and marketing strategies, but it doesn't replace opinion research, except insofar as it competes for the marketing research dollar.

Furthermore, AOL can only track user actions reliably insofar as they remain within the AOL network itself, which is, at the present time, roughly 40% of its own traffic, which, in turn, is less than a third of Internet traffic within the US, and far less outside this country.

When you registered for free access to the NY Times online, you gave up far more information and therefore far more of your privacy than any AOL subscriber, and the NY Times is much more savvy and aggressive in marketing this fact to potential advertisers.

Jan Werner

James Beniger wrote:
> THE BIG MERGER: Why Should AAPOR Care?
> Why should we AAPOR members care about last week's $165 billion merger of America Online and Time Warner?
> America Online, the world's single largest gateway to the Internet, currently has 20 million subscribers, each one paying $21.95 a month for its E-mail, chat rooms, and
Instant Messaging. Approximately half of U.S. households see the Internet and Web only through the filters and frames of AOL. This includes more American subscribers than use the dozen or so next most popular Internet service providers (ISPs) combined. Indeed, some experts cite AOL as a leading cause of the rapid penetration of personal computers into American households.

So we in AAPOR should not forget that so-called "Internet surveys" of American citizens and consumers must necessarily be surveys of AOL households--families likely to see the Internet and Web largely as packaged and presented--or not--by AOL.

While online, AOL customers' every movement and stopover throughout the various offerings of the service is automatically and continuously tracked. As a result, AOL has undoubtedly the single most extensive database on consumer behavior and preferences ever to exist on this planet--especially for online behavior and choices.

Do subscribers mind? A Forrester Research study released last year estimated AOL's annual cancellation rate for paid subscribers at 2.5 percent.

And now AOL's $165 billion merger with Time Warner, if consummated, would enhance its offerings to customers with one of the world's largest storehouses and factories of consumer content: coverage of news, weather, sports and popular culture more generally--not to mention movies and animated cartoons (many American classics), recorded music, and both popular and serious magazines and books.

Although it is the content cache that is Time Warner (one cache cow, it would appear) which has been given the most attention in recent news coverage, much more important to AAPOR's interests--were AOL.Time Warner to become reality--is that the Time Warner half of the new company already owns among the world's most extensive means of distributing that content via cable television.

Even more important, that same cable system is already being retrofitted with the Time Warner Roadrunner (beep, beep--get it?) high-speed cable-modem service, expected to deliver up to 21 million subscribers a continuous broadband service.

And surprise, surprise! Although AOL had only recently issued outraged demands for open access to all such cable systems, in the name of the free flow of information online, the company has now--since its merger announcement--backed off all such demands, in the name of free market solutions, but of course.

So, where does all this leave us AAPOR members, with our interests in the future of survey, market and consumer
research, and also in the dynamics of public opinion formation and change more generally?

It leaves us facing the prospects of a single national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm the likes of which we could not have imagined even, say, a week ago.

Even to think about it is to take one's breath away:

* continuous high-speed cable access to more than half of American households (just for starters), households that actually pay *you* for the privilege

* the technological capability to monitor each household member's every movement and stopover, automatically and continuously, throughout an entire range--designed by you--of Internet and Web offerings

* the enticements to keep and move subjects online with perhaps the single most popular cache of news, entertainment, arts and literature in American history

* the ability to release the results of this research continuously to marketers, and also as consumer content on web sites and news outlets with the reputation of, say, CNN and Time Magazine

Would *you* wish to be conducting overnight telephone surveys when all this comes to pass?

As long as none of us speaks up, I suppose we can always hope that it never occurs to AOL.TimeWarner to become America's only national survey-market-consumer-public-opinion-research-and-polling firm.

If it does choose to do this, perhaps during its off-peak moments, however, I hope as many of you AAPORNETters as possible can find work with the new company--to infuse it with healthy doses of AAPOR integrity, as represented in our code.

As for the rest of us--focus groups, anyone?

-- Jim

*******
An interesting piece from today's NY Times............... 
http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/19zogb.html
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<meta name="NYT_HEADLINE" content="A Real Race: McCain vs. Bradley">  
<meta name="BY_LINE" content="By JOHN J. ZOGBY">  
<meta name="FIRSTPAR" content="What does this mean for the 2000 campaign? Let's look at the two candidates with the broadest appeal to independent voters."">  
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American voters aren't mad anymore, but they remain alienated from politics. Party affiliation means less to them now than it has in a long time.
What does this mean for the 2000 campaign? Let's look at the two candidates with the broadest appeal to independent voters.

Candidate A has a detailed health plan that includes spending billions from the projected budget surplus. Candidate B seems to avoid any detailed discussion of health reform.

Candidate A voted against the Persian Gulf war and recoils from unilateral intervention abroad. Candidate B supported the gulf war and called for ground troops in Kosovo. Candidate A voted against welfare reform in 1996; Candidate B voted for it.

Candidate A is aloof, private and intellectual in demeanor; he won't even answer innocuous questions, like what his favorite book is. Candidate B is an open book who is happy to dissect his personal flaws.

Candidate A, Bill Bradley, and Candidate B, John McCain, could not be more different. Their point of convergence is on campaign finance reform, and voters have indicated that this is not an important issue for them.

Yet my polls in New Hampshire reveal that these two men may well fish in the same pond. Each draws more support from independents than from his own party's voters. Among independents who say they'll vote in the Democratic primary, 55 percent support Mr. Bradley; 35 percent back Al Gore. Among independents who say they'll vote in the Republican primary, 48 percent back Mr. McCain; only 31 percent support Mr. Bush.

More surprising, two in five registered independents who back Mr. Bradley said Mr. McCain was their second choice. Only one in four would support Mr. Gore. And 32 percent of independents who back Mr. McCain said that Mr. Bradley was their second choice; only 12 percent would choose George W. Bush.

Independents will be particularly vital to victory in the primaries this year. In New Hampshire, some 38 percent of voters are independent, and they may vote in either one of the party's primaries. In California, for the first time, independents can vote
in the primaries; and in South Carolina, an independent need only declare a party preference before voting in the primaries. In Michigan, independents can vote in both the Democratic and Republican primaries.

<p>At this time, independent voters are not moved by any particular issue. I poll early in a campaign to get a handle on what issues might dominate until Election Day. In April 1999, the top three were violent crime, foreign policy and the breakdown of morality -- all issues that traditionally favor Republican candidates. These concerns were directly related to the news of the moment -- the Columbine High School shootings, the war in Kosovo, the China spy scandal and the Clinton impeachment.</p>

<p>By August the top three issues were health care, education and Social Security, issues that favor Democrats. Today, voters say they are concerned about education, health care and foreign policy. But this could change next week.</p>

<p>So what do voters really care about? So far, it seems, they just want a different kind of leader from President Clinton. Though generally happy, they say they want someone who tells them the truth and who is willing to defy the establishment. Hence, the popularity of plainspoken mavericks like Mr. McCain and Mr. Bradley.</p>

<p>So while they differentiate themselves from rivals in their own parties, Mr. McCain, the conservative Republican, and Mr. Bradley, the liberal Democrat, are competing against each other, too, for independent voters. Indeed, the real wild card in this year's primaries is the unofficial race between these two remarkably different candidates who need to appeal to the same voters to win.</p>

<i>John Zogby is president of Zogby International, an independent polling company.</i>
If you are interested in TIME's take on Internet research, check out the article in this week's TIME Magazine.

Richard Rands

At 01:30 PM 1/19/00 -0800, Richard Rands wrote:
> If you are interested in TIME's take on Internet research, check out the article in this week's TIME Magazine.

And here is the URL for the article:
http://www.pathfinder.com/time/magazine/articles/0,3266,37635,00.html

Not terribly much news, but more examples. Here is a quote:
> .... A project might cost at least $25,000 and take months to complete.
> Conventional research firms like Market Facts go through a process that typically involves research design, approval from layers of management, the creation of a survey, selection of a sample population and analysis.
> By contrast, an InsightExpress survey costs only about $1,000 and takes just a few days.

And here is the web site for this company:
http://www.insightexpress.com/

As someone pointed out before, the current (hard copy dated Feb 8) issue of PCMagazine has a comparative review of web survey software and their "Editor's Choice" product sells for under $200. Check it out online (was just posted today):
http://www.zdnet.com/pcmag/stories/reviews/0,6755,2414899,00.html

So, it does not take much to set up a web survey company .... the "gold rush" is on.
This brief piece in Time was brought to my attention on AAPORNET. You might want to check it out.

Hi, Gang,

I wrote to the woman who wrote Job Searching Online for Dummies -- as well as a number of other instructional books on activities that could be made faster, more pleasurable, etc., by imaginative use of the web -- because the experience of doing just that over the past several months has been so unrewarding. Besides, I seem to fit the target audiences suggested by its title.

One point she made in response was that "the folks running the sites would view [me] as a specialist," and she doubted that the people looking to hire someone with my background "would post a job at, for example, Monster.com." Considering how few of these sites list "research" or "survey research" or
even "market research" as a closed-end function (leaving it up to you to find the proper keyword combination to clue them in -- no walk in the park), I'm inclined to agree with her fully.

Her recommendation: that I "go off-track and look for higher-level, more specialized sites." Which makes sense conceptually, but I know of only two such sites: (1) aapornet, which doesn't exist to post research jobs and does so one-at-a-time and only occasionally, and (2) worldopinion.com, which allows the job-seeker to post his or her self-promotional statements and has millions of job listings, many of which are research in nature. But the heavy emphasis there is upon corporate market research rather than survey or public opinion research, which seem to have fallen from favor in corporate settings.

I've therefore been obliged to concentrate my fire on the not-for-profits, the public sector, and research firms which do work for either or both. Which is fine with me, but not easy to find web-sites for, if such sites even exist. The reason I'm writing to you is to learn of any that are likely to present research jobs of a non-marketing (other than social marketing) nature, i.e., the "more specialized sites" the person I consulted was talking about.

I'll be grateful for any suggestions that may be forthcoming. Looking for work is a miserable way to spend time, on the web or via the older-fashioned paths.

Thanks much.

Phil Harding
paharding@aol.com

Hi Phil,

Check out MGTAmerica. I don't have their WEBsite handy but I assure you they are on there. For some reason they rarely post to us but they do a variety of research, much of it related to public opinion.
The downside for some: one of their major branches is in Tallahassee. They advertise a lot for analysts in the Tallahassee Democrat.

Susan

At 02:20 PM 1/21/2000 EST, you wrote:
>Hi, Gang,
>
> I wrote to the woman who wrote Job Searching Online for Dummies -- as well as
> a number of other instructional books on activities that could be made
> faster, more pleasurable, etc., by imaginative use of the web -- because the
> experience of doing just that over the past several months has been so
> unrewarding. Besides, I seem to fit the target audiences suggested by its
> title.
>
> One point she made in response was that "the folks running the sites would
> view [me] as a specialist," and she doubted that the people looking to hire
> someone with my background "would post a job at, for example, Monster.com."
> Considering how few of these sites list "research" or "survey research" or
> even "market research" as a closed-end function (leaving it up to you to find
> the proper keyword combination to clue them in -- no walk in the park), I'm
> inclined to agree with her fully.
>
> Her recommendation: that I "go off-track and look for higher-level, more
> specialized sites." Which makes sense conceptually, but I know of only two
> such sites: (1) aapornet, which doesn't exist to post research jobs and
does
> so one-at-a-time and only occasionally, and (2) worldopinion.com, which
> allows
> the job-seeker to post his or her self-promotional statements and has
> zillions of job listings, many of which are research in nature. But the
> heavy emphasis there is upon corporate market research rather than survey or
> public opinion research, which seem to have fallen from favor in corporate
> settings.
>
> I've therefore been obliged to concentrate my fire on the not-for-profits,
> the public sector, and research firms which do work for either or both.
> Which is fine with me, but not easy to find web-sites for, if such sites
even
> exist. The reason I'm writing to you is to learn of any that are likely to
> present research jobs of a non-marketing (other than social marketing)
> nature, i.e., the "more specialized sites" the person I consulted was
talking
> about.
>
> I'll be grateful for any suggestions that may be forthcoming. Looking for
> work is a miserable way to spend time, on the web or via the older-fashioned
> paths.
>
> Thanks much.
>
> Phil Harding
> paharding@aol.com
If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Academic Year 1999-2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270
850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208

>From jbason@arches.uga.edu Fri Jan 21 13:16:40 2000
Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
   id NAA15754 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jan 2000 13:16:40 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from archa9.cc.uga.edu (arch9.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu
   (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.017D756A@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jan 2000 16:14:32 -0500
Message-ID: <3888CC37.C4BF6B7D@arches.uga.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Jan 2000 16:14:32 -0500
From: Jim Bason <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Readability Program
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
   boundary="-------------AB417FC2B4A7CD38344DE6CF"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
-------------AB417FC2B4A7CD38344DE6CF
A colleague has asked me if I know of a program specifically for surveys that can test the reading level of a survey instrument. I told her I did not, other than the program in Word which tests reading level of text.

Is there any program like this one knows of? Any help would be most appreciative.

Sincerely,

Jim.

---

A friend in the public relations field sent this to me....a new service which some of you may already know about...but which I just found out about. All the usual concerns about re non-representative samples are
evident. On the other hand, if you know your audience members, have an actual list of them and are not attempting to project the findings to the population at large, such a service might be useful. I can think of many legitimate applications. If anyone knows more about Zoomerang or had any experience with them I would appreciate your sharing that information.

Thanks

Dick Halpern

Here's the info supplied by Zoomerang to my friend:

Earlier this week, we shared word with you about the Zoomerang (http://www.zoomerang.com) online survey tool. We hope some of you have had a chance to try it out.

So will online polling destroy the survey business? In late September 1999, the New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research conducted a forum on "The Perils and Potential of Online Polling."

http://www.freedomforum.org/technology/1999/10/1onlinepolling.asp

Among some of the benefits cited were: access to a varied and sizable population that actually wants to be polled, the capacity to survey large numbers of people simultaneously, the ability to use more sophisticated tracking tools, and innovative opportunities to conduct more detailed focus groups.

The chairman of Harris Interactive (formerly Louis Harris and Associates) summed up the unique nature of online polling at the New York forum by noting that it is visual and interactive medium that allows for open-ended (and in many cases) more candid responses with a greater degree of anonymity, more than telephones do.

On the reverse side, the chairman also conceded adequate cross-samples are not guaranteed, because some groups might be underrepresented in a raw data. The argument follows that, since there are more people who have telephones than have Internet access, for example, a sample pool may not be sufficiently representative of a particular population. In addition, there is a tendency to draw more moderate or unsure responses than those reflecting a strong positive or negative opinion. Also, online surveys do not rely on random samples of e-mail addresses or on-screen identities (which can be unreliable), so they invariably involve people who self-elect to participate.

The risk, simply, is that online polling might result in a lot of data that ultimately does not yield accurate or useful results. On the other hand, even telephone surveys have their share of difficulties, especially the murky problem of non-responses that disrupts whatever sampling method you use. Also, no matter how big your sample size, you still do not guarantee that your results
Harris Interactive, however, has stated that out of some 200 parallel surveys involving polling on the same issues using both the Internet and traditional phone interviews, there was almost no noticeable difference.

Online polling and surveying was also the focus of Robert Schlesinger’s January 5, 2000 piece in the newspaper The Hill. In it, he mentions how public response rates to traditional polls and surveys have fallen over the last 15 years, from a range of 55 to 65%, to 25 to 35%.

Schlesinger points to an intertwined set of influences responsible for the dip. It costs more to conduct polls today because it is harder to reach people. Many people are hard to reach because they are so used to receiving calls from telemarketers, they refuse to respond to telephone calls that sound remotely like solicitations. In addition, to meet demands to be protected from telemarketers, consumer technology advanced such that screening and blocking devices (including answering machines and caller ID) now allow potential respondents to screen out telemarketers--and pollster calls. Pollsters now need to make more calls, and spend more time and money, to get better representative samples.

One big obstacle to widespread Internet polling firms on the landscape is the capitalization costs required to build a strong potential base of respondents for sampling and cross-samples. Harris Interactive cites that it spent some $18 million over two years to build a respondent base of 5 million.

The cost of conducting polls or surveys, however, goes down for each activity. This can be attributed, in part, to the reduced cost of sending an e-mail request to respond to an in-person meeting, e-mail survey, or web-based poll. Compare this to printing, mailings, follow-up phone calls, etc. So instead of the traditional order of representative samples of 500-1000 responses, you might instead yield respondent bases in the tens of thousands. The larger numbers might also ensure better representation of answers in particular response subcategories.

So what do we do with the opportunities online polling might allow, especially in the public policy arena? Jon Katz offers some ideas (http://www.freedomforum.org/technology/1999/1/27katz.asp) especially in light of the reliability afforded by computer-aided models and design that help make polls more accurate in their interpretation, as well as the Internet’s ability to present multimedia and interactive surveys to a wider audience in a shorter amount of time for less money.

Eli Noam, the director of the Columbia Institute for Tele-Information, points to the ultimate downside of online polling in his speech, "Why Information Technology is Bad for Democracy." Technology, he argues, allows for more voices to participate in public discourse. Yet as more and more of those voices strive to be heard, two things happen: (1) the content
from those voices becomes simpler, and (2) the incidence of
information overload increases. It is for this reason, Katz
points out, that both media and politicians argue that the
course of their respective institutions should not be
determined by public opinion.

Citing the Monica Lewinsky episode, Katz notes that in the
wake of the release of the Starr report, some 200 newspaper
editorial boards called for the president to resign, as opposed
to the estimated 55 million Americans that read the Starr
report online, endured a year's worth of testimony, news, and
opining, and came to the conclusion that the
president should not resign. The opinion of the latter group,
however, was only partially reflected by the conclusion of the
impeachment process.

A number of members of Congress at the time, however, expressed
disdain for polls that dictated a specific course of action,
citing them as (a) the impulsive response of an ill-informed
electorate, (b) not-representative of their constituents' will, or
(c) a political (or partisan) tool which should not be allowed to
determine the course of policy.

Katz identifies one root of the distrust for online polling, namely
its commingling with market research. The latter is used to gauge
what news to broadcast or what votes to cast in an elective body
on a constant (and now instantaneous) basis. He also notes a
difference between using one poll and many surveys, as well as
the frequency with which a groups is polled.

Another possible source of distrust for online polling might also
be the convener of the polls. A large number of online polls are
sponsored by online media entities, which might lead some credence
to the "poll as marketing tool" suspicion that exists.

As online polling and surveying becomes informed by better tools, better
methodologies, and better analytical frameworks, is it correct to ask if
it will serve as a more legitimate and reliable mechanism to help inform
public discourse?

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
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RESEARCH POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

The company, O'Neil Associates Inc. is a full service public opinion/market research firm with an excellent reputation and a 20 year history. The firm is small, entrepreneurial, nonbureaucratic and growing. We are continuously searching for energetic, ambitious persons who can help us continue to grow. It is recommended that all candidates view our web page located at http://www.oneilresearch.com to find out more about our company.

Candidate profile. Should be among the "best and brightest" with a career interest in opinion research and a foundation in social science research methods and the logic of social science data processing.

Positions available. We have both part and full-time positions available at both the entry and more advanced levels.

The location. The firm is located in Tempe, Arizona, a university town in metropolitan Phoenix - an area with one of the nation's most vibrant economies (and 350 sunny days a year).

Duties. Most positions include some combination of project management, client contact, proposal writing, project design, data processing, and writing analytical reports. Positions such as Analyst or Account Executive typically require a graduate degree and significant relevant...
experience but we are far more concerned with competency than academic degree. Requirements for other positions vary.

Computer skills. Most positions require a high degree of microcomputer literacy. A thorough mastery of Microsoft Word is presumed; desirable competencies include proficiency with CATI systems, SPSS, Access or dBase, PowerPoint or Harvard Graphics, Web page design, PC networks, and BASIC or FORTRAN programming.

Project Manager. The preferred candidate profile for a Project Manager with our firm is an individual with Social Science research and survey research training as well as some statistics training. The candidate will have had exposure to opinion research interviewing either as an interviewer or in a supervisory capacity. The candidate will be highly computer literate (see above paragraph). Project Managers are involved with client contact, research design, data processing and field supervision.

Field Operations. The ideal candidate will have had exposure to opinion research interviewing either as an interviewer or in a supervisory capacity. These positions, however, could be suitable entry-level positions for motivated recent graduates lacking specific prior experience. We promote from within whenever possible.

Analyst. An analyst candidate will typically have a graduate degree, significant relevant experience in the industry, even more advanced computer skills, and impeccable writing skills. Writing skills will include the ability to decipher crosstabular data and efficiently distill the essential findings. Analyst candidates must submit a single-authored writing sample of analysis of crosstabular data (described elsewhere). This is a position for an experienced professional, not an entry-level position.

To apply. To apply for a position, you should submit a brief cover letter indicating the nature of your professional interests and a resume to: surveys@oneilresearch.com, fax 480.967.6171, or to Michael J. O'Neil, Ph.D., President, O'Neil Associates Inc., 412 E. Southern Ave., Tempe, AZ 85282.
The company. O’Neil Associates Inc. is a full service public opinion/ market research firm with an excellent reputation and a 20 year history. The firm is small, entrepreneurial, nonbureaucratic and growing. We are continuously searching for energetic, ambitious persons who can help us continue to grow. It is recommended that all candidates view our web page located at http://www.oneilresearch.com to find out more about our company.

Candidate profile. Should be among the "best and brightest" with a career interest in opinion research and a foundation in social science research methods and the logic of social science data processing.

Positions available. We have both part and full-time positions available at both the entry and more advanced levels.

The location. The firm is located in Tempe, Arizona, a university town in metropolitan Phoenix — an area with one of the nation's most vibrant economies (and 350 sunny days a year).

Duties. Most positions include some combination of project management, client contact, proposal writing, project design, data processing, and writing analytical reports. Positions such as Analyst or Account Executive typically require a graduate degree and significant relevant experience but we are far more concerned with competency than academic degree.

Requirements for
other=20
positions vary.</P>
<P class=3DMsoNormal style=3D"LINE-HEIGHT: 95%"><B=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-weight: normal"><I=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-style: normal">Computer skills.</I></B><SPAN=20
style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
Most positions require a high =
degree of=20
microcomputer literacy.<SPAN style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
A =
thorough=20
mastery of Microsoft Word is presumed; desirable competencies include=20
proficiency with CATI systems, SPSS, Access or dBase, PowerPoint or =
Harvard=20
Graphics, Web page design, PC networks, and BASIC or FORTRAN =
programming.</SPAN></P>
<P class=3DMsoNormal style=3D"LINE-HEIGHT: 95%"><B=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-weight: normal"><I=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-style: normal">Project Manager.</I></B>The preferred =
candidate profile=20
for a Project Manager with our firm is an individual with Social Science =
research and survey research training as well as some statistics =
training.<SPAN style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
The candidate will have had =
exposure to=20
opinion research interviewing either as an interviewer or in a =
supervisory=20
capacity.<SPAN style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
The candidate =
will be=20
highly computer literate (see above paragraph).<SPAN style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
Project Managers are involved =
with=20
client contact, research design, data processing and field =
supervision.</SPAN></P>
<P class=3DMsoNormal style=3D"LINE-HEIGHT: 95%"><B=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-weight: normal"><I=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-style: normal">Field Operations.</I></B>The ideal candidate will have =
exposure to opinion research interviewing either as an interviewer or in =
approximately=20
positions, however, could be suitable entry-level positions for =
motivated recent=20
graduates lacking specific prior experience.<SPAN style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
We promote from within =
whenever=20
possible.<B style=3D"mso-bidi-font-weight: normal"><I=20
style=3D"mso-bidi-font-style: normal">Analyst.</I></B><SPAN style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">
An analyst candidate will =
typically have=20
a graduate degree, significant relevant experience in the industry, even more advanced computer skills, and impeccable writing skills. Writing skills will include the ability to decipher crosstabular data and efficiently distill the essential findings. Analyst candidates must submit a single-authored writing sample of analysis of crosstabular data (described elsewhere). This is a position for an experienced professional, not an entry-level position.

To apply, you should submit a brief cover letter indicating the nature of your professional interests and a resume to: surveys@oneilresearch.com, fax 480.967.6171, or to Michael J. O'Neil, Ph.D., President, O'Neil Associates Inc., 412 E. Southern Ave., Tempe, AZ 85282.

Nancy & Phil Teed

------=_NextPart_000_0008_01BF6460.ACA9A420--
I am in the process of converting a pencil/paper system to an internet-based one, which raises many of the same questions about the role of methodology on data quality. A copy of your paper would be great!

Thanks.

Nancy Teed  
Integrated Management Solutions  
Houston Associates, Inc.  
4601 N. Fairfax Dr., Suite 1200  
Arlington, VA  22203

----- Original Message -----  
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Monday, January 17, 2000 8:10 AM  
Subject: RE: question

> Last year I presented a lecture to the Royal Statistical Society in London,  
> UK, titled "The effect of computer-assisted interviewing on data quality: A  
> review of the evidence".  
> If you are interested, I can send you a copy. In that case, please send me  
> your paper (snail) mail address.  
> Best regards, Edith de Leeuw

> At 12:19 PM 1/14/00 -0800, you wrote:  
> >(The following request was also sent to SRMS list-serve)

> I would appreciate any literature references that compare data quality of  
> interviews conducted using CAPI to in-person interviews using pencil and  
> paper.

> Thanks!

> Lynda Voigt  
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org  
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

> Seattle, WA

> As preparation for 2001 and the new millennium

> Happy new beginnings....

> From ande271@attglobal.net Sun Jan 23 12:35:47 2000  
Received: from prserv.net (out1.prserv.net [165.87.194.252])
To whom was this addressed?

Nancy & Phil Teed wrote:

> I am in the process of converting a pencil/paper system to an internet-based
> one, which raises many of the same questions about the role of methodology
> on data quality. A copy of your paper would be great!
> >
> > Thanks.
> >
> > Nancy Teed
> > Integrated Management Solutions
> > Houston Associates, Inc.
> > 4601 N. Fairfax Dr., Suite 1200
> > Arlington, VA 22203
> >
> > ----- Original Message ----- 
> > From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl> 
> > To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Sent: Monday, January 17, 2000 8:10 AM
> > Subject: RE: question
> >
> > > Last year I presented a lecture to the Royal Statistical Society in
> > London, 
> > > UK, titled "The effect of computer-assisted interviewing on data quality:
> > A 
> > > review of the evidence".
> > >
> > > If you are interested, I can send you a copy. In that case, please send me
> > your paper (snail) mail address.
> > >
> > > Best regards, Edith de Leeuw
> > >
> > > At 12:19 PM 1/14/00 -0800, you wrote:
> > > >(The following request was also sent to SRMS list-serve)
> > >
> >
> >
I would appreciate any literature references that compare data quality of interviews conducted using CAPI to in-person interviews using pencil and paper.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
lvoigt@fhcrc.org
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

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@xs4all.nl

As preparation for 2001 and the new millennium
Happy new beginnings....

PHILIP MORRIS MANAGEMENT CORP.
JOB DESCRIPTION

TITLE: Public Policy and Opinion Research Internship

HOURS: Approx. 20 hours per week during school year;
Approx. 40 hours per week when school is not in session

ORGANIZATION: Philip Morris Management Corp.

DEPARTMENT: Issues Management
LOCATION: New York Office: 120 Park Ave (at 41st Street)

I. TITLE DESCRIPTION

Provide support to the Director and Manager of Public Policy and Research on public opinion research projects and ongoing department research efforts.

II. SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Involvement with numerous phases and types of public opinion research including issue-advertising development, strategic issues research, communications research, omnibus tracking studies, etc.;
2. Involvement in both quantitative and qualitative research including the development and implementation of survey instruments and focus group guidelines;
3. Conduct basic analysis of research results, including summary write-ups of previous studies;
4. Conduct ongoing, systematic review of publicly released polling data from Internet polling sources;
5. Assist with the development, maintenance and dissemination of a periodic, secondary public opinion data tracker;
6. Assist with the development of creating a functional research library;
7. Assist with planning and implementation of inter-department special events and research sharing workshops, and;
8. Attend focus groups where/when appropriate.

III. QUALIFICATIONS:

Skills and Abilities:

1. Basic familiarity with survey research methodology;
2. Familiarity with survey development and analysis;
3. Ability to succinctly summarize survey results;
4. Excellent writing skills. Must have excellent command of English language, grammar and spelling;
5. Good organizational skills;
6. Ability to work well under pressure, ability to handle multiple projects;
7. Must be Internet proficient, and;
8. Must use tact and good judgment interacting with all levels of management.

Knowledge:

1. Must be interested and well informed on current events, politics and public policy issues;
2. Interest in political poll results and candidate races helpful, and;
3. Must have knowledge of IBM computer applications including word-processing (Microsoft Word), graphics layout (Microsoft PowerPoint) and the Internet.

IV. SALARY:
Salary starts at $15/hour.

Contact: David.Sylvia@pmmc.com

David Sylvia
Director Public Policy & Research
Philip Morris Management Corporation
120 Park Ave.
New York, NY 10017
ph- 617.663.2175
fx- 617.663.5379
pager - 888.578.7415
David.Sylvia@pmmc.com

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
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From today's Capitol Watch............(For further information contact CapitolWatch Customer Service at http://www.capitolwatch.com/contactus.html )

--------------------CapitolWatch Insider---------------------

On January 19 Republican pollster Ed Goeas and Democratic pollster Celinda Lake announced the results of their 13th jointly conducted "Battleground" poll. The Battleground polls are very highly regarded by both partisan and
nonpartisan analysts for the insights they give into the mood and
mood-currents of the electorate.
The poll sampled 1,000 likely voters nationwide during January 3-5,
2000. There was also a deliberate "oversampling" of 250 likely Hispanic
voters because of the increasing importance and volatility of that portion
of the electorate.
Today's column will recite some of the poll's findings concerning the
Presidential race. The next will highlight findings concerning the battle
for Congress. And the third will note some of the poll's findings about
Hispanic voters.
The full text of the poll's questions and answers and the partisan analyses
by Goeas and Lake are available at www.tarrance.com/Battleground.
Respondents were asked whether they had favorable or unfavorable
impressions of five Presidential candidates: Bush, McCain, Gore, Bradley
and Pat Buchanan. Here were the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Pct. Favorable</th>
<th>Pct. Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Gore</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among members of their own political party (in the case of Buchanan, among
voters who said they had voted for Ross Perot), Bush and Gore did much
better. The results were these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Pct. Favorable</th>
<th>Pct. Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Gore</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the "head-to-head" or "ballot-test" question, Bush led Gore by 51-38 and
Bradley by 49-37. McCain was not tested against either.
On the "generic" Presidential question, where voters were asked to choose
between "the Republican candidate" for President and "the Democratic
candidate," the Republican was favored by 44-37.
Democratic pollster Lake noted that Gore was "under-performing among
constituencies who call themselves Democrats."

Dick Halpern
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Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
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Last year I presented a lecture to the Royal Statistical Society in London, UK, titled "The effect of computer-assisted interviewing on data quality: A review of the evidence".

If you are interested, I can send you a copy. In that case, please send me your paper (snail) mail address.

Best regards, Edith de Leeuw

If you are interested, I can send you a copy. In that case, please send me your paper (snail) mail address.

Best regards, Edith de Leeuw

At 12:19 PM 1/14/00 -0800, you wrote:

I would appreciate any literature references that compare data quality of interviews conducted using CAPI to in-person interviews using pencil and paper.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
lvoigt@fhcrc.org
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

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@xs4all.nl |

As preparation for 2001 and the new millennium
Happy new beginnings....
The NJ Department of Human Services (DHS) in conjunction with the NJ Department of Education (DOE), located in Trenton, NJ, seeks a Project Manager to oversee and administer a 60-month evaluation of the Abbott Early Childhood Education Evaluation. This position offers a substantial challenge to a seasoned manager with professional experience in program evaluation related to education or social services.

**Responsibilities:**
- The Project Manager of the Abbott Early Childhood Education Evaluation serves under the direction of the Supervisor of the Research and Evaluation Unit.
- Responsibilities include being the key liaison between the external evaluation contractor, the Departments of Education and Human Services and the 30 local Abbott school districts. In addition, the Project Manager will:
  - Oversee and have responsibility for the day-to-day management of the Abbott evaluation;
  - Develop and/or approve work plans, project schedules, and project updates;
  - Prepare summary reports for key DHS and DOE management;
  - Prepare summary reports for use by the 30 Abbott District Superintendents;
  - Preparing briefings and articles on the evaluation;
  - Identify and resolve project problems as they occur;
  - Facilitate project management meetings and briefings;
  - Facilitate and staff the project's External Advisory Group;
  - Respond to private and public inquiries regarding matters related to the Abbott evaluation;

**Requirements:**
- Master's Degree plus eight years experience in program evaluation, preferably in education, early childhood education, social services or related fields.
- A Ph.D./Ed.D., or significant credits toward a Ph.D., in education, social work, economics, public policy, planning, political science, sociology, or a related field is preferred. Excellent writing and oral presentation skills, including strong knowledge of evaluation methods and research techniques, are essential. Successful candidates must be able to communicate research findings as well as methodological and statistical concepts.
To Apply:
Mail or e-mail a current resume, list of three references, salary requirements, and cover letter no later than February 4, 2000 to:

Dr. Leonard Feldman, Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 700, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0700
Phone: 609-984-4392
E-mail: lfeldman2@dhs.state.nj.us

The State of New Jersey is an Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Employer

Rachel A. Hickson, M.A. (609) 984-8198
"A SOCIAL SCIENTIST TELLS YOU THINGS YOU ALREADY KNOW
IN WORDS YOU CAN'T UNDERSTAND"
rhickson@dhs.state.nj.us
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X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu
Message-Id: <v0421010db4b2d117e18b@[24.10.212.149]>
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E023E2937@isr.umich.edu>
References: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E023E2937@isr.umich.edu>
Date: Mon, 24 Jan 2000 22:14:40 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject: Telemarketing legislation for Wisconsin
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Dear AAPORNET,

Tuesday morning, our state-wide public radio station here in Wisconsin is going to air yet another discussion about public policy related to unwanted telemarketers. I figure that Wisconsin can't be alone in pushing for similar legislation. Naturally, one wonders what provisions are made for social science research etc. and if there are enough eyes and ears out there throughout the land to head off any potentially poorly written legislation elsewhere.

The text for the program announcement reads as follows:

*People are tired of receiving unwanted solicitations from telemarketers over the dinner hour. That's one of the reasons BEN MERENS' guest after six is sponsoring legislation to beef up the state's telemarketing laws with the creation of a "no-call" list for people who want to avoid calls from telemarketers altogether. (VR 1/25)
Jon Erpenbach, Democratic State Senator from Middleton, sponsor of Senate Bill 267

From edithl@xs4all.nl Tue Jan 25 03:24:31 2000
Received: from smtp3.xs4all.nl (smtp3.xs4all.nl [194.109.127.49])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
FYI, Apologies for any cross-posting

>As current RC33 Communications Coordinator
>and a former RC33 President, I personally
>urge you to take up this last occasion to
>propose to make a presentation at the Fifth
>RC33 International Conference on Social
>Science Methodology. Please see the
>details below.
>
>Karl M. van Meter

>-----
>
>LAST CALL FOR PAPERS
>
>Fifth International Conference on Social Science
>Methodology of the Research Committee on Logic and
>Methodology (RC33) of the International Sociological
>Association (ISA)
>
>Cologne, October 3 - 6, 2000
>
>The Fifth International Conference on Social Science
>Methodology will combine all areas of quantitative and
>qualitative methods in empirical social research. Earlier
>conferences were held in Amsterdam, Dubrovnik, Trento, and
>Essex. The Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung
>(central archive for empirical social research) in Cologne
>(Germany) will be our host on 3-6 October 2000. The German
>Social Science Infrastructure Service (GESIS) will co-
>organize the conference, and Joerg Blasius of the
>Zentralarchiv of the University of Cologne will act as
>chair of the organizing committee.
>
>Cologne is an old city already prosperous in Roman times,
>and the remnants of ancient Cologne can still be seen not
Only in the archaeological museum, but also around the city. Cologne is famous for its Cathedral and its beer gardens.

Persons wishing to present a paper should send
- a title
- an abstract of no more than 200 words
- name(s) and affiliation(s) of the author(s)
- key-words

The deadline for abstracts is 31 January 2000. Papers which combine methods and empirical results are very welcome.

In case you are not a contributor to a session that already exists (please check our web pages for those sessions), please send your abstract or your session proposal to Joerg Blasius (see the address below). For detailed information and for e-mail registration please access the web page http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/rc33.

Conference language is English only.

Early registration fees (applicable till June 1, 2000): DM 200.- for RC33 members and DM 230.- for non-members; students pay 100.- DM. Participants from countries in monetary transition will have to pay a reduced fee of DM 100.- (RC33 members) or DM 130.- (non-members). After this date participants have to pay an additional 50.- DM.

Organizing committee: Nancy Andes, Joerg Blasius, Edith de Leeuw, Joop Hox, Peter Schmidt, Karl van Meter.

For further information, please access our web page (www.za.uni-koeln.de/rc33) or contact Joerg Blasius (Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung, University of Cologne, Bachemer Str. 40, D-50931 Koeln, Germany; email: rc33@za.uni-koeln.de).

Joerg Blasius
Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung
Universitaet zu Koeln
Bachemer Str. 40
50931 Koeln

Tel: ++49-221-476 94 46 oder ++49-221-470 31 55
Sek: ++49-221-476 94 33 (Frau Priemer)
Fax: ++49-221-476 94 44
email: blasius@za.uni-koeln.de

***********|***********
*BMS
(Bulletin de Methologie Sociologique)
(Bulletin of Sociological Methodology)
Gallup says in its weekly bulletin:

> Americans Positive About Presidential Candidates This Year,
> Enthusiastic About Voting
> > Three-quarters of Americans say that at least one candidate running
> > for president this year would make a good president, almost twice the number
> > who felt the same way exactly eight years ago. Americans are also
> > enthusiastic about this year's election, and two-thirds say they would be
> > satisfied if the race ultimately comes down to a contest between Al Gore and
> > George W. Bush. Voters are also more interested this year in the candidates'
> > vision and leadership, rather than candidates' positions on specific issues.
> >
> > View full release at
> > http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000117.asp

Yet the Vanishing Voter Project <http://www.vanishingvoter.org> describes massive apathy and disengagement.

Can anyone reconcile these positions?

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
AUTOMATICALLY BETTER? THE IMPACT OF AUTOMATION ON THE SURVEY PROCESS

26 April 2000 - Imperial College London

PRELIMINARY PROGRAMME

The next ASC one-day meeting will be held on Wednesday 26 April 2000 at our usual venue - Imperial College, London with the focus on developments in recent years which have reduced the amount of manual input into the survey process. There will also be an opportunity to debate the costs and benefits of this rush towards automation and to anticipate what further developments might be in the pipeline.
The conference programme is expected to include the following contributions:


* `Delivering Results' Phil Hearn, Marketing Research Data Consultants


* `A Software Suite and Extended Mark up Language for Intelligent Questionnaires' Joanne Lamb and Joan Fairgrieve, Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh

* `Make the Force Go With You' Sally Gale, Office for National Statistics

* `Automated Study Documentation: The Web and XML' Neil Walker, MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge

* `I know how to run faster but how can I think faster?' Ray Poynter, Managing Director Europe, Intelli Quest

This conference will interest survey directors, managers, researchers and users who need to be aware of the impact of these changes on the survey process and outputs.

Further details of the programme and registration will appear on the ASC's WWW site shortly - http://www.asc.org.uk

As usual, there will be an exhibition associated with the conference, and potential exhibitors, or anyone wanting more general information, should contact Diana Elder at PO Box 60, Chesham, Bucks, HP5 3QH or e-mail: admin@asc.org.uk

------------------------------------------------------------------------
This message has been sent on behalf the ASC by:
Randy Banks (randy@essex.ac.uk) tel: +44 (0)1206 873067
Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) fax: +44 (0)1206 873151
University of Essex
Colchester, Essex
United Kingdom CO4 3SQ http://www.asc.org.uk
------------------------------------------------------------------------

******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jan 25 10:00:03 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA07537 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jan 2000 10:00:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
As current RC33 Communications Coordinator and a former RC33 President, I personally urge you to take up this last occasion to propose to make a presentation at the Fifth RC33 International Conference on Social Science Methodology. Please see the details below.

Karl M. van Meter

-----

LAST CALL FOR PAPERS

Fifth International Conference on Social Science Methodology of the Research Committee on Logic and Methodology (RC33) of the International Sociological Association (ISA)

Cologne, October 3 - 6, 2000

The Fifth International Conference on Social Science Methodology will combine all areas of quantitative and qualitative methods in empirical social research. Earlier conferences were held in Amsterdam, Dubrovnik, Trento, and Essex. The Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung (central archive for empirical social research) in Cologne (Germany) will be our host on 3-6 October 2000. The German Social Science Infrastructure Service (GESIS) will co-organize the conference, and Joerg Blasius of the Zentralarchiv of the University of Cologne will act as chair of the organizing committee.

Cologne is an old city already prosperous in Roman times,
and the remnants of ancient Cologne can still be seen not only in the archaeological museum, but also around the city. Cologne is famous for its Cathedral and its beer gardens.

Persons wishing to present a paper should send
- a title
- an abstract of no more than 200 words
- name(s) and affiliation(s) of the author(s)
- key-words

The deadline for abstracts is 31 January 2000. Papers which combine methods and empirical results are very welcome.

In case you are not a contributor to a session that already exists (please check our web pages for those sessions), please send your abstract or your session proposal to Joerg Blasius (see the address below). For detailed information and for e-mail registration please access the web page http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/rc33.

Conference language is English only.

Early registration fees (applicable till June 1, 2000): DM 200.- for RC33 members and DM 230.- for non-members; students pay 100.- DM. Participants from countries in monetary transition will have to pay a reduced fee of DM 100.- (RC33 members) or DM 130.- (non-members). After this date participants have to pay an additional 50.- DM.

Organizing committee: Nancy Andes, Joerg Blasius, Edith de Leeuw, Joop Hox, Peter Schmidt, Karl van Meter.

For further information, please access our web page (www.za.uni-koeln.de/rc33) or contact Joerg Blasius (Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung, University of Cologne, Bachemer Str. 40, D-50931 Koeln, Germany; email: rc33@za.uni-koeln.de).

Joerg Blasius
Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung
Universitaet zu Koeln
Bachemer Str. 40
50931 Koeln

Tel: ++49-221-476 94 46 oder ++49-221-470 31 55
Sek: ++49-221-476 94 33 (Frau Priemer)
Fax: ++49-221-476 94 44
email: blasius@za.uni-koeln.de
January 25, 2000

Bob Squier Is Dead at 65;
Master of Political Imagery

By JOHN M. BRODER

WASHINGTON, Jan. 24 -- Bob Squier, one of the origins of modern political imagery and a close friend and adviser of Vice President Al Gore, died today after a six-month battle with colon cancer. He was 65 and lived in Millwood,
Mr. Squier brought his background as a documentary filmmaker with a fascination with American literary figures to his path-breaking role as political manipulator and marketer. His advertisements, always for Democrats, were marked by sharp-edged wit and a direct approach that contrasted with the gauzy morning-in-America style.

His clients included Hubert H. Humphrey in 1968, Jimmy Carter in 1976 and President Clinton and Mr. Gore in 1992 and 1996. He worked on dozens of Senate and governor contests and compiled a win-loss record envied by his competitors.

"His loyalty, talent and, above all, his perseverance helped Vice President Gore and me craft a winning re-election campaign when many had counted us out," President Clinton said today. "I owe him much."

Mr. Squier trained many of today's most prominent political consultants and was one of the first celebrity political advisers, winning a steady spot as a commentator on the NBC's "Today" program in the 1980's.

"He was a pioneer in this business of political communications," said Bill Knapp, a partner of Mr. Squier in the consulting firm Squier Knapp Dunn. "He helped create the modern campaign, for better or for worse."

Many of the legends of late-20th century politics were captured in Mr. Squier's camera and transformed into a form of visual persuasion that defines political speech in the modern era.

Mr. Squier filmed a young politician named Bob Graham as he spent a day working as a teacher, a laborer, a farmer and an egg-packer to persuade Florida voters that he was a regular guy who understood their concerns. They rewarded him with the governorship and, later, a seat in the United States Senate.

Mr. Squier also captured dozens of Mr. Gore's town meetings in Tennessee, turning them into a record of contact with voters that propelled Mr. Gore into the Senate and the vice presidency.

As the 1990's dawned and a younger crowd of consultants was making its mark in politics, some Democrats whispered that Mr. Squier had lost his edge. But Mr. Gore stuck with him and used him as
a consultant in the 1992 presidential campaign.

His advertisements for the Clinton-Gore ticket in 1996 visually linked the Republican nominee Bob Dole to the unpopular Speaker Newt Gingrich, and buried the Dole campaign before it had a chance to get off the ground.

"It was the first time paid advertising made a decisive difference in a presidential campaign," said Ronald Klain, Mr. Gore's former chief of staff.

Although he had worked with Mr. Gore almost from the beginning of the vice president's political career, Mr. Squier's role in the Gore campaign sharply diminished last summer after Mr. Gore brought in Carter Eskew as a top adviser.

Mr. Eskew and Mr. Squier had a bitter and well-publicized falling out in 1992 and refused to work together -- or even speak to each other. But the Mr. Gore continued to quietly seek Mr. Squier's counsel until illness incapacitated Mr. Squier a few weeks ago, aides said.

Mr. Eskew remains on the Gore campaign as senior media strategist and said Mr. Squier was an innovator to whom American politics owes a large debt.

"Bob understood that campaigns were dialogues and that a lot of that dialogue takes place through advertising," Mr. Eskew said. "I had some obvious differences with him professionally but I had the greatest times of my life with him as well."

Another Squier partner, Anita Dunn, is the chief communications consultant in the campaign of Mr. Gore's Democratic rival, former Senator Bill Bradley.

Mr. Squier was born in Brainard, Minn., on Sept. 21, 1934, and reared in Minneapolis. He was a top high school and collegiate swimmer and set a National Collegiate Athletic Association record for the butterfly when the stroke was still accompanied by a frog-kick, rather than the current dolphinlike method of propulsion.

He studied communications at the University of Minnesota and learned documentary filmmaking there and then at the public television stations WGBH in Boston and KLRN in Austin, Tex.

Mr. Squier made documentaries about President Lyndon B. Johnson after the Kennedy assassination
and filmed award-winning biographies of Herman Melville and William Faulkner before turning his transforming eye toward electoral politics.

His sons by his first marriage, Robert Squier and Mark Squier, followed their father into the business of political persuasion. Mark is a partner in a political consulting firm; Robert is a professional musician who produces music tracks for commercial films and political advertisements.

Mr. Squier is also survived by his wife, Prudence, and three grandchildren.

He died at his farm in the Virginia horse country west of Washington where he tended a garden and a small vineyard. Although Mr. Squier was a collector of art, a connoisseur of first-class travel and something of a clothes horse, he could not master his little vineyard, Mr. Knapp said.

"He planted it, hoed it, watered it," Mr. Knapp said, "and produced some of the worst wine imaginable."

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

*******
Presidential Campaign Gains Attention

Interest in the presidential election has risen slowly but steadily since last summer and is now higher than at a comparable period in past election cycles. Fully 19% are following news about this year's presidential election very closely, up from 11% in June 1999, when the Pew Research Center began asking whether Americans were following the campaign. *And the percentage following very closely is nine points higher than in January 1996 and eight points higher than in January 1992.*

http://www.people-press.org/jan00mor1.htm

Doug Henwood wrote:

> Gallup says in its weekly bulletin:
> >
> > Americans Positive About Presidential Candidates This Year,
> > Enthusiastic About Voting
> >
> > Three-quarters of Americans say that at least one candidate running
> > for president this year would make a good president, almost twice the
> > number
> > who felt the same way exactly eight years ago. Americans are also
> > enthusiastic about this year's election, and two-thirds say they would be
> > satisfied if the race ultimately comes down to a contest between Al Gore
> > and
> > George W. Bush. Voters are also more interested this year in the
> > candidates'
> > vision and leadership, rather than candidates' positions on specific
> > issues.
> >
> > View full release at
> > http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000117.asp
> >
> > Yet the Vanishing Voter Project <http://www.vanishingvoter.org>
> > describes massive apathy and disengagement.
> >
> > Can anyone reconcile these positions?
> >
> > 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 RFunk787@aol.com Wed Jan 26 09:45:59 2000
Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.3])
Jim --

I am puzzled by the item about Robert Squier on AAPORNET. AAPOR is, of course, concerned with public opinion RESEARCH, and there is nothing in the item to suggest that Mr. Squier ever contributed anything to our primary field of interest. Rather, it appears that his entire career was as a partisan political propagandist -- a type of work of which AAPOR has no tradition, to my knowledge. He is not listed in my directory, nor am I aware that he was ever a member. Is he well known to AAPOR members other than I? Perhaps some introductory remarks by you could have helped set the scene, as I cannot identify any cogent reason for your sharing this particular item with us.

Ray Funkhouser

He's probably only known to those of us who are or at one time were what the media would call "political pollsters". I don't recall seeing him, for example,
at AAPOR conferences though I, of course, haven't been to them all.

>From KropfM@umkc.edu Wed Jan 26 11:28:14 2000
Received: from UMKC-MAIL01.umkc.edu (email.exchange.umkc.edu [134.193.71.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA18768 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 11:28:13 -0800
(PST)
Received: by umkc-mail01 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
   id <DM4NN1ZW>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 13:28:08 -0600
Message-ID: <95A711A70065D111B58C00609451555C04PC170E@UMKC-MAIL02>
From: "Kropf, Martha E." <KropfM@umkc.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Arizona and Internet voting
Date: Wed, 26 Jan 2000 13:28:07 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

Hello all!

A while back, someone provided the website of the company who is implementing
Arizona's on-line primary. I failed to bookmark it, and now cannot find it!
Can someone please send it to me?

Thanks!
Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

>From tashjian@voyager.net Wed Jan 26 11:54:50 2000
Received: from mail1.voyager.net (mail1.voyager.net [209.153.128.76])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA12926 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 11:54:48 -0800
(PST)
Received: from 9u9lq ([216.93.22.252])
   by mail1.voyager.net (8.9.1/Voyager-MailX) with SMTP id OAA24916
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 14:55:32 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <388F5134.4B50@voyager.net>
Date: Wed, 26 Jan 2000 14:55:32 -0500
From: Dan Tashjian <tashjian@voyager.net>
Reply-To: tashjian@voyager.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KIT (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: campaign finance reasearch
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Hello All,

I'm looking for *quality* research (AAPOR standards) on the issue of political Campaign Finance Reform. Can anyone point me in the direction of any such research (including qualitative) accessible via the Internet? Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Cheers,

Dan Tashjian,  
President & Pollster,  
G.M.T. Strategies, Inc.

>From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Wed Jan 26 11:56:03 2000  
Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with ESMTP  
id LAAl4534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 11:56:02 -0800  
(PST)  
Received: from [24.10.212.149] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu  
id NAA246480 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 26 Jan 2000 13:55:53 -0600  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu  
Message-Id: <v04210100b4b4ffe13dcd@[24.10.212.149]>  
In-Reply-To: <v04220806b4b37056c989@[166.84.250.86]>  
References: <v04220806b4b37056c989@[166.84.250.86]>  
Date: Wed, 26 Jan 2000 13:55:46 -0600  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>  
Subject: Harris Sheds Old Ways  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

AAPORN,  

Did I miss something in the earlier postings on internet political polling or is this new information to everyone?  

Robert Godfrey  
UW-Madison  

==============  

Pollster Sheds Old Ways  
http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,33800,00.html?tw=wn20000124  
The Harris Poll won't be calling people up on the phone to query presidential voters anymore. The Internet is the only way to go now. By Lakshmi Chaudhry.

Pollster Sheds Old Ways  
by Lakshmi Chaudhry  

3:00 a.m. 24.Jan.2000 PST  
The Harris Poll, one of the oldest names in the political survey business, is throwing phone books out the window and going fully online for the 2000 campaign.

Harris is the first company to rely entirely on the Internet in the high-stakes game of predicting election outcomes. Polling online has
been considered particularly risky because of the thorny issues involved in using Internet samples to extrapolate results for the general US population.

But political pollsters claim Internet surveys are quick, cheap, and - gasp! - accurate.

Harris will be offering comprehensive polling at the national and state levels beginning in June, said Election 2000 director Jonathan Seigel. Also, Harris will conduct three pre-election polls in all 50 states this fall, including state and national "Outcome 2000" polls to be conducted two days before Election Day in November.

And all these surveys will be conducted entirely over the Internet using samples culled from a database of 5 million respondents.

Traditionally, polling firms get a list of residential phone numbers and dial at random to generate a statistically valid sample, said George Terhanian, vice president of Internet Research. The first six digits of a telephone number (area code and prefix) are selected to allow for every region to be well represented, while the remaining four digits are dialed at random.

"The problem is that there is no such registry [of email addresses] on the Internet, which makes it difficult to get random samples," Terhanian said.

And the rules on the Internet discourage unsolicited mass emailing which is considered spam, he said.

Harris resolved this problem by building a database of 5 million "cooperative respondents," or people who have agreed to be surveyed on a regular basis.

Terhanian said the company built its database through partnerships with television shows, Internet access companies like Excite, and online advertising agencies. For example, a person signing up for free email can say whether or not they want participate in online surveys, he said.

But political pollsters are skeptical about drawing a sample from a pre-existing database.

"There is a pre-selection bias because your sample is based on people who've agreed to be part of panel," said Mark Allen, a Republican pollster with Market Strategies. "It's not random. It's self-directed."

But the larger problem with online polling is getting statistically accurate results, experts say. A 1999 Jupiter Communications study says only 48 percent of all Americans had Internet access at home. The average Net user also looks nothing like the average American.

"They're just too white, too rich, and too male," Allen said.

And the demographic disparity is particularly worrisome in older segments of the population, who are also more likely to vote. "If you
look at the general US population, 17 percent are 65 or older, but that group is only 6 percent on the Net," said Terhanian.

Harris says it can adjust for such discrepancies through "weighting." The solution is to oversample those segments of the population that are underrepresented online. "We give less weight to the answers of typical Net users" and more weight to the answers of people who are less typical, said Terhanian.

The Harris methodology, however, has its fair share of critics.

"What they do is take some poor black person who happens to be on the Internet and count him 10 times," University of Pennsylvania communications professor W. Russell Neuman said. "It's taking a sample of convenience and using statistical controls to make it more representative."

Weighting can have an impact, but there will always be people who are not represented, Allen said.

Harris defends its techniques by pointing to the results. For the past two years, the company has been conducting parallel Internet and telephone surveys, asking the same question at the same time, Terhanian said. "And we've found few, if any, differences in the information."

The company suffered a major embarrassment during the 1998 elections when it incorrectly predicted the gubernatorial race in Mississippi. Seigel admits Internet surveys are less effective in Southern states with large rural black populations. "That's why we're not doing polls in every state," he said.

But Harris is confident that it has fixed the problems that caused the 1998 snafu, and will not be conducting parallel phone surveys to ensure accuracy in 2000.

Harris is one of the few polling firms to work entirely online. Most of the other big names in polling, including Gallup and Roper, have stayed away from the Internet due to sampling problems.

And that's why Harris' competitor Intersurvey, which is also an online polling firm, collects its samples the old-fashioned way - over the telephone.

"We select people through random-digit dialing and then provide them with WebTV," Intersurvey CEO Doug Rivers said. "This way we don't miss people who are not computer users."

The company provides all respondents with equipment - even those with computers at home - and sends them questions via email.

Intersurvey and Harris Interactive are betting that the future of polling is on the Internet because it's getting more difficult to get a representative sample even with phone interviews, Neuman said.

Most polling firms tend to call between 6-9 p.m. to maximize the breadth of their sample. "People don't want to spend five to 20
minutes answering questions during dinner time," Neuman said. "They're getting tired of it."

That's why response rates have declined steadily from about 80 percent to 30 percent over the past decade, he said.

Not only is an Internet survey less intrusive, it's also quick. Intersurvey will conduct an instant poll following the State of the Union address for CBS News next week. Rivers said the results will be available within 30 minutes.

And without interviewer costs it becomes a lot cheaper for the client, he added.

But for now, most party and candidate pollsters are still reluctant to go entirely online.

Allen, the Republican party pollster, admits Internet surveys are attractive, but does not recommend them as a solitary source. "I may use them to get a quick take on an ad or a slogan," he said. "But I have not seen anyone put all their energies into doing just online polling."

"It's kind of hard for people to make the jump. It's going to take a major educational effort," Harris director Seigel admitted.

The initial reluctance may also disappear as more households get online. "Right now, it's too early to go entirely online," Neuman said. "Harris is pushing the envelope. But you have to give them credit for bravely going ahead."

>From Jimlep@isr.umich.edu Wed Jan 26 13:34:00 2000
Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA04285 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 13:33:59 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
   by vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.9.1/3.1r) with ESMTP id QAA05941
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 16:34:03 -0500 (EST)
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
   id <ZN3SZHZ9>; Wed, 26 Jan 2000 16:37:07 -0500
Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E023E2A710@isr.umich.edu>
From: Jim Lepkowski <Jimlep@isr.umich.edu>
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: One week courses on survey methodology
Date: Wed, 26 Jan 2000 16:37:01 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

Apologies for cross-listing this notice on multiple list serves ...

Although we have previously sent a notice about training in survey research techniques at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research this summer, we thought full time professionals might be interested in a
subset of the courses that will be presented. In addition to four- and eight-week courses covering a range of survey research topics, the Summer Institute also will offer 12 one-week courses. Participants may concentrate study in a short period since at least two one-week courses are offered in each of six one-week periods. One-week course offerings include Event History Analysis (Jay Teachman), Testing Questions and Instruments (Nora Cate Schaeffer), Advanced Issues in Questionnaire Design (Jon Krosnick), Understanding and Interpreting Polls (Mike Traugott), Examining the Health and Retirement Study (Bill Rodgers and Dan Hill), Introduction to Survey Quality (Paul Biemer), Introduction to Small Area Estimation (Partha Lahiri), Event History Calendar Interviewing Methodologies (Bob Belli), Web Survey Design and Implementation (Mick Couper and Scott Crawford), Understanding Unit and Item Nonresponse (Edith de Leeuw), Evaluation Research Design (Bill Yeaton), Hierarchical Models for Survey Data (Joop Hox), and Designing Questionnaires for Elderly Populations (Barbel Knauper).

The fee for one one-week course is $700, and for two, $1,000. Graduate credit through the University of Michigan is also possible, although for a higher fee.

Several courses will be offered simultaneously in the Washington, D.C. area at the University of Maryland in College Park through the Joint Program in Survey Methodology via a two-way interactive video system.

Check the Summer Institute website at http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/si for more information, or contact us for a full brochure (summers@isr.umich.edu; (734) 764-6595; fax (734) 764-8263).

Jim Lepkowski

---

any of them look interesting to you?

>>> Jim Lepkowski <Jimlep@isr.umich.edu> 01/26/00 03:37pm >>>

Apologies for cross-listing this notice on multiple list serves ...

Although we have previously sent a notice about training in survey research techniques at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research this summer, we thought full time professionals might be interested in a subset of the courses that will be presented. In addition
to four- and eight-week courses covering a range of survey research topics, the Summer Institute also will offer 12 one-week courses. Participants may concentrate study in a short period since at least two one-week courses are offered in each of six one-week periods. One-week course offerings include Event History Analysis (Jay Teachman), Testing Questions and Instruments (Nora Cate Schaeffer), Advanced Issues in Questionnaire Design (Jon Krosnick), Understanding and Interpreting Polls (Mike Traugott), Examining the Health and Retirement Study (Bill Rodgers and Dan Hill), Introduction to Survey Quality (Paul Biemer), Introduction to Small Area Estimation (Partha Lahiri), Event History Calendar Interviewing Methodologies (Bob Belli), Web Survey Design and Implementation (Mick Couper and Scott Crawford), Understanding Unit and Item Nonresponse (Edith de Leeuw), Evaluation Research Design (Bill Yeaton), Hierarchical Models for Survey Data (Joop Hox), and Designing Questionnaires for Elderly Populations (Barbel Knauper).

The fee for one one-week course is $700, and for two, $1,000. Graduate credit through the University of Michigan is also possible, although for a higher fee.

Several courses will be offered simultaneously in the Washington, D.C. area at the University of Maryland in College Park through the Joint Program in Survey Methodology via a two-way interactive video system.

Check the Summer Institute website at http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/si for more information, or contact us for a full brochure (summers@isr.umich.edu; (734) 764-6595; fax (734) 764-8263).

Jim Lepkowski
At 02:55 PM 1/26/00 -0500, Dan Tashjian wrote:
> ...I'm looking for *quality* research (AAPOR standards)
> on the issue of political Campaign Finance Reform.
> Can anyone point me in the direction of any such research
> (including qualitative) accessible via the Internet?
> Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Check out the site of "PUBLIC CAMPAIGN" at
http://www.publicampaign.org/index.html
This includes links to previous polls on the issue.

The organization itself has a very impressive National Advisory Board
(details at
http://www.publicampaign.org/nablist.html )
and was founded by John B. Anderson, the former Congressman from IL (R).

That is at least a good starting point.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

The American Statistical Association has a job site on its web page as a
part of its AmStat Online initiative. See
http://www.amstat.org/opportunities/index.html for information and to view
the positions. These are online versions of the material published in the
paper version of AmStat News.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: PAHARDING7@aol.com [SMTP:PAHARDING7@aol.com]
> Sent: Friday, January 21, 2000 2:20 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Need for Job-Search Suggestions
> > Hi, Gang,
> > I wrote to the woman who wrote Job Searching Online for Dummies -- as well
> > as
> > a number of other instructional books on activities that could be made
> > faster, more pleasurable, etc., by imaginative use of the web -- because
experience of doing just that over the past several months has been so unrewarding. Besides, I seem to fit the target audiences suggested by its title.

One point she made in response was that "the folks running the sites would view [me] as a specialist," and she doubted that the people looking to hire someone with my background "would post a job at, for example, Monster.com." Considering how few of these sites list "research" or "survey research" or even "market research" as a closed-end function (leaving it up to you to find the proper keyword combination to clue them in -- no walk in the park), I'm inclined to agree with her fully.

Her recommendation: that I "go off-track and look for higher-level, more specialized sites." Which makes sense conceptually, but I know of only two such sites: (1) aapornet, which doesn't exist to post research jobs and does so one-at-a-time and only occasionally, and (2) worldopinon.com, which allows the job-seeker to post his or her self-promotional statements and has zillions of job listings, many of which are research in nature. But the heavy emphasis there is upon corporate market research rather than survey or public opinion research, which seem to have fallen from favor in corporate settings.

I've therefore been obliged to concentrate my fire on the not-for-profits, the public sector, and research firms which do work for either or both. Which is fine with me, but not easy to find web-sites for, if such sites even exist. The reason I'm writing to you is to learn of any that are likely to present research jobs of a non-marketing (other than social marketing) nature, i.e., the "more specialized sites" the person I consulted was talking about.

I'll be grateful for any suggestions that may be forthcoming. Looking for work is a miserable way to spend time, on the web or via the older-fashioned paths.

Thanks much.

Phil Harding
paharding@aol.com
The Arizona Democratic Party has contracted with Election.Com (formerly Votation.Com) and Verisign to administer the Internet voting component of their primary election. Election.com is responsible for the actual voting component. Verisign specializes in digital signaturing and is responsible for the voter ID component.

Election.com (www.election.com)

Verisign (www.verisign.com)

I've posted some findings from a pilot study looking at Arizonans' attitudes toward Internet voting. This information is available at:

www.nau.edu/~srl/releases/rel15oct99.htm

Fred Solop

At 01:28 PM 1/26/00 -0600, you wrote:
> Hello all!
> A while back, someone provided the website of the company who is implementing
Arizona's on-line primary. I failed to bookmark it, and now cannot find it!
Can
someone please send it to me?

Thanks!
Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

Frederic I. Solop, Ph.D.
Director
Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ  86011
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6654 -- fax
Fred.Solop@nau.edu
www.nau.edu/~srl

Tomorrow's Information ... Today!

--Boundary_(ID_tTwq0Z9kVZ4oDOjOxQniQg)
Content-type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<html><div>The Arizona Democratic Party has</div><div>contracted with Election.Com (formerly</div><div>Votation.Com) and Verisign to administer</div><div>the Internet voting component of their</div><div>primary election. Election.com is responsible</div><div>for the actual voting component. &nbsp;Verisign</div><div>specializes in digital signaturing and is responsible</div><div>for the voter ID component.</div><br/>
Election.com
(<a href="http://www.election.com/"
EUDORA=AUTOURL>www.election.com</a>)</div>
<br/>
Verisign
(<a href="http://www.verisign.com/"
EUDORA=AUTOURL>www.verisign.com</a>)</div>
<br/>
I've posted some findings from a pilot study</div>
looking at Arizonans' attitudes toward Internet voting.</div>
At 01:28 PM 1/26/00 -0600, you wrote:

Hello all!

A while back, someone provided the website of the company who is implementing Arizona's on-line primary. I failed to bookmark it, and now cannot find it!  

Can someone please send it to me?

Thanks!

Martha Kropf

Assistant Professor

Department of Political Science

University of Missouri-Kansas City

213 Haag Hall

5100 Rockhill Road

Kansas City, MO 64110-2499

816-235-5948

Fred Solop

Director

Social Research Laboratory

PO Box 15301

Northern Arizona University

Flagstaff, AZ 86011

(520) 523-3135 -- phone

(520) 523-6654 -- fax

Fred.Solop@nau.edu

www.nau.edu/~srl
The Center for Public Interest Polling at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ has a position open for a Project Assistant. The key qualifications for this position is someone with a minimum of 2 years of survey research experience in project direction, data analysis, questionnaire and report writing. An MA degree in the social sciences is desired, but a BA and related experience will also be considered. The person in this position will work with Project Directors to assist in the various aspects of conducting high quality research projects. The types of projects that the Center conducts are related to public policy issues and are generally for state agencies. Recent projects have focused on evaluation of HIV prevention programs, community needs assessments, assessment of early childhood education, and strategic planning studies. The candidate should have an excellent knowledge of Word and SPSS. Knowledge of Access and Excel are also desirable. The salary range for this position is $30,000-$40,000. Rutgers University offers excellent health and other benefits. Free tuition for faculty and staff families and for employees. New Brunswick is centrally located between New York and Philadelphia with easily accessible public transportation. To apply, submit a brief cover letter indicating your experience and interests and a resume to: jballou@rci.rutgers.edu, or fax to 732-932-1551, or mail to Janice Ballou, Director, Center for Public Interest Polling, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 185 Ryders Lane, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557.

From: oneil@speedchoice.com Thu Jan 27 07:10:27 2000
Received: from mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com [24.221.30.31]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA12865 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jan 2000 07:10:26 -0800 (PST)
Received: from phx35035.speedchoice.com (h-006-062.phoenix.speedchoice.com [24.221.6.62]) by mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (8.9.3/) with SMTP id IAA26003 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jan 2000 08:10:28 -0700 (MST)
Message-ID: <001a01bf68d8$33814e00$3e06dd18@speedchoice.com>
Reply-To: "Mike O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>
From: "Mike O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Need instruments measuring workforce skills
Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2000 08:07:16 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
We are working on a project for LA County Department of Health Services and Service Employees International Union on a Health Care Workers Retraining Project and are requesting assistance in attaining survey instruments used to assess workforce general basic skill levels overall and specifically in the Heath Care Industry. The skills assessment should establish the current skill-knowledge level of employees. This appraisal should help define goals and strategies while shaping the content for retraining workers at-risk of being displaced due to restructuring of the Health Care Industry. Instruments that measure basic skills are often transferable across disciplines so questionnaires not written specifically for health care but gauge basic skills would be applicable.

Along with assessing basic skill levels of workers we are also looking for instruments that measure workers' skill levels in specific healthcare positions. We are interested in gaining access to instruments that can measure not only employees' skill levels but also skills they enjoy and that are transferable such as communications, problem solving, and technical skills.

Any help in getting skill-assessment instruments or providing possible contacts to obtain such assessments would be greatly appreciated.

Many thanks.

Mike O'Neil, O'Neil Associates, Inc. 412 E. Southern Ave, Tempe AZ 85282
oneil@oneilresearch.com
888.967.4441
We are working on a project for LA County Department of Health Services and Service Employees International Union on a Health Care Workers Retraining Project and are requesting assistance in attaining survey instruments used to assess workforce general basic skill levels overall and specifically in the Health Care Industry. The skills assessment should establish the current skill-knowledge level of employees. This appraisal should help define goals and strategies while shaping the content for retraining. We are interested in gaining access to instruments that can measure not only employees' skill levels but also skills they enjoy and that are transferrable such as communications, problem solving, and technical skills.

Any help in getting skill-assessment instruments or providing possible contacts to obtain such assessments would be greatly appreciated.
Many thanks.

Mike O'Neill, O'Neil Associates, Inc.

412 E. Southern Ave, Tempe AZ 85282

oneil@oneilresearch.com

888.967.4441

----------

I for one was shocked to receive notice of Bob's death, but glad to be informed; Bob Squier was an important user of research, student of research, defender of research quality, and a gentleman, and I was proud to have known him and his wife, been at several conferences with him, stayed overnight at his home in Florida, and admired him for someone who was at the very top of his profession.

------Original Message------
>Jimm --
> I am puzzled by the item about Robert Squier on AAPORNET. AAPOR is, of
> course, concerned with public opinion RESEARCH, and there is nothing in the
> item to suggest that Mr. Squier ever contributed anything to our primary
> field of interest. Rather, it appears that his entire career was as a
> partisan political propagandist -- a type of work of which AAPOR has no
> tradition, to my knowledge. He is not listed in my directory, nor am I
> aware that he was ever a member. Is he well known to AAPOR members other
> than I? Perhaps some introductory remarks by you could have helped set
> the scene, as I cannot identify any cogent reason for your sharing this
> particular item with us.
>
> Ray Funkhouser

Hi Everyone,
I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the questionnaire, please let me know.
thanks,
Linda Owens
I would like to second Bob Worcester's comment about Bob Squier. We, and political research, were better off and well served by Bob Squier.

warren mitofsky

At 03:29 PM 1/27/00 +0000, you wrote:
> From: Robert M Worcester

> I for one was shocked to receive notice of Bob's death, but glad to be informed; Bob Squier was an important user of research, student of research, defender of research quality, and a gentleman, and I was proud to have known him and his wife, been at several conferences with him, stayed overnight at his home in Florida, and admired him for someone who was at the very top of his profession.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: RFunk787@aol.com <RFunk787@aol.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: 26 January 2000 17:46
> Subject: Robert Squier item
>
> >Jim --
> >
> >I am puzzled by the item about Robert Squier on AAPORNET. AAPOR is, of course, concerned with public opinion RESEARCH, and there is nothing in the item to suggest that Mr. Squier ever contributed anything to our primary field of interest. Rather, it appears that his entire career was as a partisan political propagandist -- a type of work of which AAPOR has no tradition, to my knowledge. He is not listed in my directory, nor am I aware that he was ever a member. Is he well known to AAPOR members other than I? Perhaps some introductory remarks by you could have helped set the scene, as I cannot identify any cogent reason for your sharing this particular item with us.
>
> >Ray Funkhouser

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

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com
Bob Squire was most helpful to me over the years as I followed the presidential debates and collected a variety of data, several of which he was instrumental in identifying and locating. My book, TELEVISED PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES AND PUBLIC POLICY, SECOND EDITION was just published by Erlbaum.

The earlier discussions about third party candidates and the use of polling to determine their "qualifications" to participate in general election presidential debates is a case in point. Bob Squire and other polling practioneers, gave a front-line view about the practice. My book has sections devoted to polling, third and minor party candidates, and the politics of political polling.

Anyone who has conducted research on campaigning, polling and elections, especially in presidential elections will appreciate the important role that people like Bob Squire occupied. He was respected by both major parties.

Jim's note, aside from providing the sad news, was in a little way, a tribute to Bob for his contribution to the field of campaigning and polling. We ought not to be reticent about contributing to his legacy.
WANTED: Director of Marketing Research

A Richmond, VA television station is currently seeking a marketing research professional. The ideal candidate would be proficient in all aspects of survey research including questionnaire design, basic statistical analyses, and data presentation. Applicants need a basic understanding of marketing principles or consumer behavior. Knowledge of SPSS and PowerPoint preferred.

Any serious inquiries should reply to the email address below.

Tracee Martin-Fries
tfries@nbcl2.com
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Tracee Martin-Fries
Director, Client Marketing Services
NBC12 - TV
Richmond, Virginia
(804) 230-2771 tfries@nbcl2.com
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

I'm not sure if he has specifically asked about this one but Alexander Astin at Education--USC (??) has done many surveys of undergraduates. If he hasn't done it, he will know who has.

Al Bayer--out there in AAPORland--will know how to reach Dr. Astin for sure.

Susan

At 11:12 AM 1/27/2000 -0600, you wrote:
>Hi Everyone,
> I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of
> undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their
> campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If
> you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the
> questionnaire, please let me know.
> thanks,
> Linda Owens
>
> If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Academic Year 1999-2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208

> From mark@bisconti.com Thu Jan 27 11:41:38 2000
Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA24370 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jan 2000 11:41:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from markbri (ip168.washington11.dc.pub-ip.PSI.NET [38.30.47.168])
by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service
Version 5.5.2232.9)
   id Z05YTLVB; Thu, 27 Jan 2000 14:41:11 -0500
From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Need instruments measuring student attitudes toward alcohol
Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2000 14:38:53 -0500
Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKPIIDCKOFNAEEIIHJCNA.A.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Try this:

UCLA, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies
Higher Education Research Institute
310/ 825-1925 or 8331 tel.
310/ 794-5004 fax

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Susan Losh
Sent: Thursday, January 27, 2000 2:35 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Need instruments measuring student attitudes toward alcohol

I'm not sure if he has specifically asked about this one but Alexander Astin
at Education--USC (??) has done many surveys of undergraduates. If he hasn't
done it, he will know who has.

Al Bayer--out there in AAPORland--will know how to reach Dr. Astin for sure.

Susan

At 11:12 AM 1/27/2000 -0600, you wrote:
>Hi Everyone,
> I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of
> undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their
> campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If
> you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the
> questionnaire, please let me know.
> thanks,
> Linda Owens
> >
> If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Academic Year 1999-2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
A colleague is considering using a monetary prize "raffle" as an incentive for participating in a subsequent wave of an in person panel study. I would greatly appreciate any information one could share about the impact of this approach on response rates, data quality, bias, and survey operations. If preferred, you may reply to me directly at chris_brogan@abtassoc.com
Hi, Linda -

The first name that popped into my mind as a resource person with whom to get in touch was Lloyd Johnson at the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/). Lloyd has been conducting annual surveys of high school seniors use of illicit drugs for years, under the aegis of the Center's Monitoring the Future project, which got its start in 1975.

Now, I realize that your interest is in college students' responses to changed alcohol consumption policies on campus. But if you'll check out the Center's MTF website -- http://monitoringthefuture.org/pubs.html -- you'll see a list of publications, some by Johnson et al., others by persons who may well also serve the resource function I have in mind.

I know of no more centralized grouping of such persons than this -- which doesn't mean that more don't exist. You have to start somewhere, though, and this set of scholars seems to me at least a promising beginning.

You're interested as well in the research instruments most appropriate for a study addressing the topic you have in mind. So go back a step to MTF's home page -- http://monitoringthefuture.org/ -- and on the right you'll see listed a section called "Purpose and Design," which gets into that and may stimulate you're thinking or even be semi-adaptable to your needs. It may also raise unenvisioned (I assume that word exists; Microsoft disagrees) questions, which you can then put to your subsequent contacts/targets.

I hope that the foregoing will be of help to you in the starting-point sense. With luck, they may even be able to do more.

Best of luck.

Phil Harding.
I am sending this by Email to AAPOR Members who subscribe to AAPORNET, and it is also going out by letter to all members.

Dear AAPOR Member,

I am writing to report on developments at the last Council meeting, held in New York on January 14 and 15. This was an unusual meeting because of the number of important items on the agenda and the fact that the Council spent almost two days on association business rather than one. There were two issues that were dealt with extensively in our discussions, and I want to tell you about the nature of the discussions and what we have decided to do.

Data Quality, Standard Definitions, and Disclosure

A good deal of our time was devoted to issues related to data quality and how significant that is an underpinning of all the work we do. Survey research or polling is a complex activity, involving a number of decisions along the way in any project that can have important ramifications for the quality of the data that result. We should acknowledge the complexity of survey data collection and analysis to people who are not engaged in the business. At the same time, we have to continue to educate consumers about how data are collected and the difference that alternative procedures can make in resulting data quality. A central element in this process is full disclosure of our data collection methods.

There currently are two committees working on issues of data quality that report to Council: one on the Standard Definitions and another on Disclosure Standards. Tom Smith, who has been spearheading the development of the standard definitions, joined the Council for this discussion. After extensive discussion, the Council agreed unanimously that, in light of the work of the Standard Definitions committee, the phrase "and if applicable, completion rates and information on eligibility criteria and screening procedures" in the Standards for Minimal Disclosure should be interpreted to mean all of the data associated with the standard disposition codes that have been developed by the committee and approved by previous AAPOR Councils. By providing information about what happened to every element in the sample, we would permit a knowledgeable consumer to calculate any of the different rates described at the end of the Standard Definitions document.

In a short period of time, the Council will agree on more precise language to describe this interpretation and to provide more guidance about how the information should be reported. This statement will be widely circulated and installed on the AAPOR Web site. We do not want any single number such as a contact or completion or response rate to become a simple-minded, short cut indicator of survey quality. But we do think that making this information available will help people to evaluate the quality of the data from any one survey or to compare the data from two or more surveys on the...
We also believe that we have begun a process by which we will be producing equivalent statements on other elements of survey design and methodology that should be disclosed as well. We discussed some concepts related to assessing Internet surveys, for example, that may be formulated into such a statement in the not too distant future. The Standards Chair, Warren Mitofsky, will be working with both committees and other organizations to develop these positions for consideration by your Council, and the results of their deliberations will be conveyed to you as soon as possible.

The Future of AAPOR
At its previous meeting, Council suggested that we devote attention to thinking about the future of AAPOR. This is a theme that builds directly on points that were raised in Diane Colasanto's presidential address in 1997. Diane raised a number of issues for consideration and discussion, especially about what the public role of AAPOR might be. The current Council is thinking about concrete ways that AAPOR might reconfigure itself, along a number of dimensions.

A Council subcommittee was formed that now consists of Nancy Belden, Mickey Blum, Murray Edelman, Cliff Zukin, and me. The subcommittee held two conference call meetings and prepared a memo for discussion by Council. At the meeting, we devoted part of each day and an intervening dinner to this planning document. At the end of the meeting, the Council asked the subcommittee to collect some data to inform another discussion at our March meeting.

The conversation was focused around a series of questions; we explicitly did not formulate any positions or proposals. Just to illustrate how far ranging the conversation was, let me indicate some of the topics covered. We talked about issues like the "appropriate" size of AAPOR and whether we should make a conscious effort to grow larger; whether the staff at the Secretariat should be increased or the composition changed; whether services for members should be increased and, if so, in what areas; and how AAPOR should communicate with journalists and other consumers of survey data on a more timely basis about what we do in general or on important issues of the day. We discussed the possibility of different length terms for various Council offices and an altered system of standing committees.

The plan is to have the subcommittee prepare another report for extended discussion at the March meeting. I am not sure what the result of that conversation will be, but we are thinking about engaging the membership in some way at the annual conference in Portland, certainly in the Business Meeting and possibly elsewhere in the program.

Let me close with the following comment. When I meet AAPOR members in my travels and they ask how I am doing as President, my first reaction is to let them know how pleased I am to be working with the current Council. They are hard working and extremely devoted to the organization. We have met together three times, and I continue to amazed and delighted at the amount of time they devote to AAPOR, all on a voluntary basis. They have been willing to tackle big issues on your behalf, and they do this in a very pragmatic way. When you get to see them next, please let them know that you appreciate their work.

>From robb@macroint.com Fri Jan 28 06:20:19 2000
Linda - I am managing a data collection on behaviors and attitudes towards drinking and driving, and the Zero Tolerance Law for the Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse

---

Author: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: Need instruments measuring student attitudes toward alcohol
01-27-2000 12:24 PM

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Hi Everyone,
I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the questionnaire, please let me know.

thanks,
Linda Owens

---

Author: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: Need instruments measuring student attitudes toward alcohol
01-27-2000 12:24 PM

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Hi Everyone,
I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the questionnaire, please let me know.

thanks,
Linda Owens

---

Author: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: Need instruments measuring student attitudes toward alcohol
01-27-2000 12:24 PM

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Hi Everyone,
I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the questionnaire, please let me know.

thanks,
Linda Owens
I am managing the data collection portion of a study looking at attitudes and behaviors related to alcohol use and New York's Zero Tolerance Law for the Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services. For this study we are interviewing both teens (ages 16-18) and their parents. If you are interested in the instrument you can contact John Yu, the Principal Investigator at the email above, or at (518) 485-7542.

William Robb
Project Manager, Macro International Inc.

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Hi Everyone,
I was wondering if anyone out there has done a survey of undergraduates' attitudes toward alcohol policies on their campus (e.g. parental notification, mandatory classes, etc). If you have done a survey like this and would be willing to share the questionnaire, please let me know.
thanks,
Linda Owens

yes, depending on the level at which it is taught, the unit and item non-response looks good. also, maybe the course on designing and implementing web surveys. I think this is something we all will need to become more knowledgable about, once they become more established and the sample control issues get worked out.

>>> Tim Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU> 01/26/00 03:47pm
>>> any of them look interesting to you?

>>> Jim Lepkowski <Jimlep@isr.umich.edu> 01/26/00 03:37pm
>>> Apologies for cross-listing this notice on multiple list serves ...

Although we have previously sent a notice about training in
survey research techniques at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research this summer, we thought full time professionals might be interested in a subset of the courses that will be presented. In addition to four- and eight-week courses covering a range of survey research topics, the Summer Institute also will offer 12 one-week courses. Participants may concentrate study in a short period since at least two one-week courses are offered in each of six one-week periods. One-week course offerings include Event History Analysis (Jay Teachman), Testing Questions and Instruments (Nora Cate Schaeffer), Advanced Issues in Questionnaire Design (Jon Krosnick), Understanding and Interpreting Polls (Mike Traugott), Examining the Health and Retirement Study (Bill Rodgers and Dan Hill), Introduction to Survey Quality (Paul Biemer), Introduction to Small Area Estimation (Partha Lahiri), Event History Calendar Interviewing Methodologies (Bob Belli), Web Survey Design and Implementation (Mick Couper and Scott Crawford), Understanding Unit and Item Nonresponse (Edith de Leeuw), Evaluation Research Design (Bill Yeaton), Hierarchical Models for Survey Data (Joop Hox), and Designing Questionnaires for Elderly Populations (Barbel Knauper).

The fee for one one-week course is $700, and for two, $1,000. Graduate credit through the University of Michigan is also possible, although for a higher fee.

Several courses will be offered simultaneously in the Washington, D.C. area at the University of Maryland in College Park through the Joint Program in Survey Methodology via a two-way interactive video system.

Check the Summer Institute website at http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/si for more information, or contact us for a full brochure (summers@isr.umich.edu; (734) 764-6595; fax (734) 764-8263).

Jim Lepkowski
A colleague is interested in constructing items for an employee attitude
survey. His client is concerned with the terms "adequate" and "sufficient" used in self-administered questionnaire items. Any help in locating an employee attitude survey instrument that uses those terms would be of great help.

Thank you.

Brett Zollinger, Ph.D.
Docking Institute of Public Affairs
Fort Hays State University
Hays, KS 67601
bzolling@fhsu.edu

I have just rejoined AAPORNET and would like to see any recent job listings posted here for a senior survey research professional.

Thanks,
Bob Lee
Since we seem to be in much the same boat, and I therefore put virtually the same question to AAPORNET a week or so ago, why don't you we do it the old-fashioned way for purposes of faster and more efficient two-way communication. Call me at 732-449-1483, and perhaps I can be of help. I'll try.

Phil Harding
paharding@aol.com

>From Bob33iam@aol.com Fri Jan 28 10:07:51 2000
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
    id KAA00554 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 10:07:49 -0800
(PST)
From: Bob33iam@aol.com
Received: from Bob33iam@aol.com
    by imo12.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.6.) id 5.ee.9fc9c7 (4381)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 13:06:55 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <ee.9fc9c7.25c334bf@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2000 13:06:55 EST
Subject: Re: Senior survey research professional available
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 45

Thanks, I'll give you a call later today. In which timezone are you?

>From HOneill536@aol.com Fri Jan 28 12:07:47 2000
Received: from imo-d01.mx.aol.com (imo-d01.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.33])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
    id MAA25799 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 12:07:46 -0800
(PST)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
    by imo-d01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.8.) id 5.la.544730 (3999)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 15:05:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <la.544730.25c35090@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2000 15:05:36 EST
Subject: Polling Review Board
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38

Andy Kohut, president of the National Council on Public Polls (NCPP) and director of the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, in anticipation of a political season with more polls tha ever, including a growing number of internet polls, announced the formation by NCPP of a Polling Review Board.

In keeping with NCPP's purpose to assist journalists and the public in the understanding, interpreting, and reporting of polls, the Polling Review Board will monitor the conduct and reporting of polls and issue clarifying comment when appropriate. Also, all three members of the Board will serve as a resource for journalists with questions about polling. Journalists and members of the public are invited to senf their polling questions to the
AAPORNETters,

Apparently the United States Census has a television commercial scheduled for the second quarter of Sunday's Super Bowl (although the actual air time is subject to some juggling, as breaking events warrant).

If I am correct in assuming that this commercial will attempt to increase
the response rate for this year's decennial census, AAPORNETters interested in survey methods, or who teach courses on survey research, mass media, or television advertising, might wish to videotape the Super Bowl broadcast. Although I suppose the Census might itself make copies of its commercial available to interested researchers and teachers, viewing it in its broadcast context—amid other commercials and Superbowl coverage and commentary—might be more enlightening for analysis and more interesting for classroom use.

We can only hope that the U.S. Census plans to ask at least a hefty subsample of its population survey whether it watched any part of the Superbowl and, of those who did, whether they can remember commercials aired during the Superbowl coverage, with the same questions also asked of a subsample of those who do not respond until the various subsequent waves of follow-ups by Census.

Only in this way could we know if the commercial was worth its costs, and whether the technique might be worth trying again for the 2010 Census, and also in other large-scale national and regional survey research efforts, is that not correct?

If you think this worth doing, and Census does not already intend to do it (which would surprise me, to be sure), I suppose the time to begin lobbying for it is now.

-- Jim

*******

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Jan 28 16:16:13 2000
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id QAA20160 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 16:16:11 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp10.vgernet.net [205.219.186.110])
   by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id TAA08887
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 19:45:27 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <389230D9.67BD0FDD@jwdp.com>
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2000 19:14:17 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Arizona and Internet voting
References: <4.1.20000126205928.00a37da0@jan.ucc.nau.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I tried looking at the election.com web site today with 3 different browsers, with the following results:

Internet Explorer 5.01 and Netscape Communicator 4.7 - Screen appears properly, but then slowly fills with garbage and becomes unreadable.
Opera 3.61 - Crashes.

This does not inspire a lot of confidence in a company that is about to conduct the first public election over the Internet.

Jan Werner
Jwerner@jwdp.com

Fred Solop wrote:
>
> The Arizona Democratic Party has
> contracted with Election.Com (formerly
> Votation.Com) and Verisign to administer
> the Internet voting component of their
> primary election. Election.com is responsible
> for the actual voting component. Verisign
> specializes in digital signaturing and is responsible
> for the voter ID component.
>
> Election.com (www.election.com)
>
> Verisign (www.verisign.com)
>
> I've posted some findings from a pilot study
> looking at Arizonans' attitudes toward Internet voting.
> This information is available at:
>
> www.nau.edu/~srl/releases/rel15oct99.htm
>
> Fred Solop
>
> From drivers@intersurvey.com Fri Jan 28 16:16:51 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.12])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id QAA20403 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 16:16:29 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <df1e98c65bc781065495120d9426ca0038923127@inter-survey.com>
From: Doug Rivers <drivers@intersurvey.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Census Does the Super Bowl
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2000 16:15:37 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"

InterSurvey is conducting several surveys on Super Bowl
advertising this weekend, including specific questions
about the impact of the Census ad.

For those unfamiliar with InterSurvey, we have recruited
a national panel of over 30,000 persons using RDD. All
selected households are provided with free hardware
(WebTV) and Internet access. Thus, we use probability
sampling with a frame that includes households without
computers or prior Internet access.
For an example of one of our surveys, see

http://cbsnews.cbs.com/now/story/0,1597,154215-412,00.shtml

Douglas Rivers
CEO
InterSurvey
1360 Willow Road
Menlo Park, CA 94325
(650) 289-2000
(650) 289-2020 (direct dial)
(650) 289-2001 (fax)

AAPORNETters,

Apparently the United States Census has a television commercial scheduled for the second quarter of Sunday's Super Bowl (although the actual air time is subject to some juggling, as breaking events warrant).

If I am correct in assuming that this commercial will attempt to increase the response rate for this year's decennial census, AAPORNETters interested in survey methods, or who teach courses on survey research, mass media, or television advertising, might wish to videotape the Super Bowl broadcast. Although I suppose the Census might itself make copies of its commercial available to interested researchers and teachers, viewing it in its broadcast context--amid other commercials and Superbowl coverage and commentary--might be more enlightening for analysis and more interesting for classroom use.

We can only hope that the U.S. Census plans to ask at least a hefty subsample of its population survey whether it watched any part of the Superbowl and, of those who did, whether they can remember commercials aired during the Superbowl coverage, with the same questions also asked of a subsample of those who do not respond until the various subsequent waves of follow-ups by Census.

Only in this way could we know if the commercial was worth its costs, and whether the technique might be worth trying again for the 2010 Census, and also in other large-scale national and regional survey research efforts, is that not correct?

If you think this worth doing, and Census does not already intend to do it (which would surprise me, to be sure), I suppose the time to begin lobbying for it is now.
Did anyone just feel an earthquake?

InterSurvey is conducting several surveys on Super Bowl advertising this weekend, including specific questions about the impact of the Census ad.

For those unfamiliar with InterSurvey, we have recruited a national panel of over 30,000 persons using RDD. All selected households are provided with free hardware (WebTV) and Internet access. Thus, we use probability sampling with a frame that includes households without computers or prior Internet access.

For an example of one of our surveys, see

http://cbsnews.cbs.com/now/story/0,1597,154215-412,00.shtml

Douglas Rivers
CEO
InterSurvey
1360 Willow Road
Menlo Park, CA 94325
(650) 289-2000
(650) 289-2020 (direct dial)
(650) 289-2001 (fax)
AAPORNETters,

Apparently the United States Census has a television commercial scheduled for the second quarter of Sunday's Super Bowl (although the actual air time is subject to some juggling, as breaking events warrant).

If I am correct in assuming that this commercial will attempt to increase the response rate for this year's decennial census, AAPORNETters interested in survey methods, or who teach courses on survey research, mass media, or television advertising, might wish to videotape the Super Bowl broadcast. Although I suppose the Census might itself make copies of its commercial available to interested researchers and teachers, viewing it in its broadcast context—amid other commercials and Superbowl coverage and commentary—might be more enlightening for analysis and more interesting for classroom use.

We can only hope that the U.S. Census plans to ask at least a hefty subsample of its population survey whether it watched any part of the Superbowl and, of those who did, whether they can remember commercials aired during the Superbowl coverage, with the same questions also asked of a subsample of those who do not respond until the various subsequent waves of follow-ups by Census.

Only in this way could we know if the commercial was worth its costs, and whether the technique might be worth trying again for the 2010 Census, and also in other large-scale national and regional survey research efforts, is that not correct?

If you think this worth doing, and Census does not already intend to do it (which would surprise me, to be sure), I suppose the time to begin lobbying for it is now.

-- Jim

******

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error,
please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
communication and all copies thereof, including
attachments.

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Fri Jan 28 16:49:14 2000
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net
[199.45.39.156])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
   id QAA10630 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 16:49:13 -0800
(PST)
Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (ads1-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net
[151.202.23.5])
   by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMT id TAA01328
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 19:48:53 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.2.2.20000126194541.00a52d50@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2000 19:48:40 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: Arizona and Internet voting
In-Reply-To: <389230D9.67BD0FDD@jwdp.com>
References: <4.1.20000126205928.00a37da0@jan.ucc.nau.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 07:14 PM 1/28/00 -0500, Jan Werner wrote:
> I tried looking at the election.com web site today with 3 different
> browsers, with the following results:
> Internet Explorer 5.01 and Netscape Communicator 4.7 - Screen appears
> properly, but then slowly fills with garbage and becomes unreadable.
> Opera 3.61 - Crashes.
> This does not inspire a lot of confidence in a company that is about to
> conduct the first public election over the Internet.

Hmm, strange, I am perusing the whole election.com site without any
difficulties -- using Netscape Communicator 4.7. All the pages that I
checked (several but not all) were last changed 2-3 days ago. This rules
out that they just fixed their pages. Also, there is nothing really fancy
in these pages (apart from some relative basic javascript) like java
applets, embedded objects, etc. which would make them vulnerable. I am
really curious what caused Jan's bad experience.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
   http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html

>From tduffy@macroint.com Fri Jan 28 18:41:56 2000
Received: from macroint.com (macroint.com [199.34.38.229])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
   id SAA06448 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 18:41:55 -0800
(PST)
Received: by gateway.macroint.com id <119052>; Fri, 28 Jan 2000 21:42:54 -
0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
Message-Id: <00Jan28.214254est.119052@gateway.macroint.com>
From: tduffy@macroint.com (Tom Duffy)
Subject: Re[2]: Census Does the Super Bowl
I found Intersurvey's idea intriguing, but then I looked at the example survey and their home page.

According to the page given below, 721 adults responded to the CBS/Intersurvey poll. However, I didn't see an explanation as to how these 721 responses were obtained: was this a randomly selected sample of the panel, with a decent non-response conversion protocol? What was the interviewing "window"? What was the response rate? Or was this a self-selected sample of a frame of 30,000 people? One or two additional lines of info at the bottom of the page would help some of us understand what these polls really mean.

Also, though a lot of work evidently went into recruiting a panel with the objective of having it be a "random" sample of Americans who are willing to trade poll participation for free access and hardware, are the probabilities of selection to this panel known? And are they used when weighting the data? Was any analysis conducted on the potential bias resulting from the above "trade" (simultaneous RDD "control" samples, cognitive testing)? And why is this panel methodologically superior to other panels that start with random recruitment? A panel is a panel, even if it is as large as 30,000 or more.

It would help to have this info in the methodological sections of the Intersurvey page. Otherwise, it is difficult to believe Intersurvey's claim that this methodology "makes existing research methodologies obsolete" (http://www.intersurvey.com).

________________

Tom Duffy
Macro International Inc.
New York, NY
tduffy@macroint.com

____________________________________________ Reply Separator

Subject: RE: Census Does the Super Bowl
Author: Doug Rivers <drivers@intersurvey.com> at Internet
Date: 1/28/00 7:18 PM

InterSurvey is conducting several surveys on Super Bowl advertising this weekend, including specific questions about the impact of the Census ad.

For those unfamiliar with InterSurvey, we have recruited a national panel of over 30,000 persons using RDD. All selected households are provided with free hardware (WebTV) and Internet access. Thus, we use probability sampling with a frame that includes households without computers or prior Internet access.
For an example of one of our surveys, see

http://cbsnews.cbs.com/now/story/0,1597,154215-412,00.shtml

Douglas Rivers
CEO
InterSurvey
1360 Willow Road
Menlo Park, CA 94325
(650) 289-2000
(650) 289-2020 (direct dial)
(650) 289-2001 (fax)

> AAPORNSETters,
> 
> Apparently the United States Census has a television
> commercial scheduled
> for the second quarter of Sunday's Super Bowl (although the actual air
> time is subject to some juggling, as breaking events warrant).
> 
> If I am correct in assuming that this commercial will attempt
> to increase
> the response rate for this year's decennial census, AAPORNSETters
> interested in survey methods, or who teach courses on survey research,
> mass media, or television advertising, might wish to
> videotape the Super
> Bowl broadcast. Although I suppose the Census might itself
> make copies of
> its commercial available to interested researchers and
> teachers, viewing
> it in its broadcast context--amid other commercials and
> Superbowl coverage
> and commentary--might be more enlightening for analysis and more
> interesting for classroom use.
> 
> We can only hope that the U.S. Census plans to ask at least a hefty
> subsample of its population survey whether it watched any part of the
> Superbowl and, of those who did, whether they can remember commercials
> aired during the Superbowl coverage, with the same questions
> also asked of
> a subsample of those who do not respond until the various
> subsequent waves
> of follow-ups by Census.
> 
> Only in this way could we know if the commercial was worth
> its costs, and
> whether the technique might be worth trying again for the
> 2010 Census, and
> also in other large-scale national and regional survey
> research efforts,
> is that not correct?
> 
> If you think this worth doing, and Census does not already
> intend to do
> it (which would surprise me, to be sure), I suppose the time to begin
> lobbying for it is now.
I agree with Ray that the piece on Robert Squier is out of place in AAPORNET.

Why should we celebrate an individual's "path-breaking role as a political manipulator and marketer?"

Or talent that "buried (the opponent's) campaign before it had a chance to get off the ground."

(Both quotes are from the Times piece.)

Is this what we stand for?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

---Original Message-----
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu <s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, January 27, 2000 1:36 PM
Subject: Bob Squire

> Bob Squire was most helpful to me over the years as I followed the presidential debates and collected a variety of data, several of which he
was instrumental in identifying and locating. My book, TELEVISED
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES AND PUBLIC POLICY, SECOND EDITION was just published
by Erlbaum.

The earlier discussions about third party candidates and the use of polling
to determine their "qualifications" to participate in general election
presidential debates is a case in point. Bob Squire and other polling
practitioners, gave a front-line view about the practice. My book has
sections devoted to polling, third and minor party candidates, and the
politics of political polling.

Anyone who has conducted research on campaigning, polling and elections,
especially in presidential elections will appreciate the important role
that people like Bob Squire occupied. He was respected by both major
parties.

Jim's note, aside from providing the sad news, was in a little way, a
tribute to Bob for his contribution to the field of campaigning and
polling. We ought not to be reticent about contributing to his legacy.

From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Sat Jan 29 05:03:48 2000
Received: from mail1.uts ohio-state.edu (mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.30])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA04268 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 05:03:29 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from lavrakaslaptop (ts3-1.homenet.ohio-state.edu
[140.254.112.56])
    by mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA02461
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 08:03:16 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 08:03:16 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <200001291303.IAA02461@mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Raffles as Incentives

Chris,

Over the years my survey organizations have on occasion used the
raffle/lottery technique (in fact we are going into the field next week with
four such surveys), but we've never implemented the technique using a
randomized experiment to reliably test its effects on response rates and
data quality.

Regardless, please consider posting a summary message back onto AAPORnet
that shows what you learned from the feedback you receive. Thanks.

Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2000 15:22:10 -0500
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
A colleague is considering using a monetary prize "raffle" as an incentive for participating in a subsequent wave of an in person panel study. I would greatly appreciate any information one could share about the impact of this approach on response rates, data quality, bias, and survey operations. If preferred, you may reply to me directly at chris_brogan@abtassoc.com.

Since several others have reported success with this site, I tried again this morning with the same results.

I normally filter cookies selectively using a security program called Cookie Pal, which allows me to track a site's cookie activity. The election.com site tried as many as 37 times to send a cookie on initial login! Accessing the site with security relaxed from my end did result in a single cookie, but didn't change the screen problems.

The screen problems appear immediately with Netscape Navigator 4.7, the same version used by Manfred Kuechler. With Internet Explorer 5.01 (the most recent release), there is no problem until I move the mouse over any of the javascript hotspots, at which point, the text starts to refresh in the wrong location, gradually causing the screen to fill with garbage.
These people are doing a lot javascript programming behind the scene to try and control from their end everything that you see in a browser at your end, and some of these efforts don't take into account some of my settings.

As a programmer, I have some ideas about what they are doing wrong, but as an end-user, my reaction is simply that I wouldn't trust these people to run a web site, let alone an election.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Manfred Kuechler wrote:
> At 07:14 PM 1/28/00 -0500, Jan Werner wrote:
> > I tried looking at the election.com web site today with 3 different browsers, with the following results:
> > Internet Explorer 5.01 and Netscape Communicator 4.7 - Screen appears properly, but then slowly fills with garbage and becomes unreadable.
> > Opera 3.61 - Crashes.
> > This does not inspire a lot of confidence in a company that is about to conduct the first public election over the Internet.
> > Hmm, strange, I am perusing the whole election.com site without any difficulties -- using Netscape Communicator 4.7. All the pages that I checked (several but not all) were last changed 2-3 days ago. This rules out that they just fixed their pages. Also, there is nothing really fancy in these pages (apart from some relative basic javascript) like java applets, embedded objects, etc. which would make them vulnerable. I am really curious what caused Jan's bad experience.
> > Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html
From mitofsky@mindspring.com Sat Jan 29 11:56:06 2000
Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA14076 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 11:56:05 -0800
(PST)
From: mitofsky@mindspring.com
Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.50])
    by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA29366
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 14:55:57 -0500 (EST)
Received: by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net id OAA0000032351; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 14:55:57 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 14:55:57 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Re: Bob Squier
Sender: mitofsky@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <Springmail.105.949175757.0.64008600@www.springmail.com>
X-Originating-IP: 170.20.95.13
I am appalled at the negativism over an obituary for someone a lot of us think was a fine gentleman and a good friend to legitimate survey research. If you think it was out of place hit your delete key. Many of us think it was appropriate and we appreciate having it posted.

warren mitofsky

aapornet@usc.edu wrote:
> I agree with Ray that the piece on Robert Squier is out of place in AAPORNET.

Why should we celebrate an individual's "path-breaking role as a political manipulator and marketer?"

Or talent that "buried (the opponent's) campaign before it had a chance to get off the ground."

(Both quotes are from the Times piece.)

Is this what we stand for?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thursday, January 27, 2000 1:36 PM
Subject: Bob Squire

> 
>
>Bob Squire was most helpful to me over the years as I followed the presidential debates and collected a variety of data, several of which he was instrumental in identifying and locating. My book, TELEVISIONED PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES AND PUBLIC POLICY, SECOND EDITION was just published by Erlbaum.
>
The earlier discussions about third party candidates and the use of polling to determine their "qualifications" to participate in general election presidential debates is a case in point. Bob Squire and other polling practicioners, gave a front-line view about the practice. My book has sections devoted to polling, third and minor party candidates, and the politics of political polling.
>
>Anyone who has conducted research on campaigning, polling and elections, especially in presidential elections will appreciate the important role that people like Bob Squire occupied. He was respected by both major parties.
>
>Jim's note, aside from providing the sad news, was in a little way, a tribute to Bob for his contribution to the field of campaigning and
Doug Rivers will be responding as well, but here are some details of Thursday night's CBS News Poll:

This survey was conducted in essentially the same way that CBS News has done telephone reaction panels in the past. Just as we would start with a randomly selected telephone sample of adults interviewed before a major event, in this case we began with a randomly selected subset of the InterSurvey panel.

This group was asked a set of politically-oriented questions in the week before the event, without being told that these questions were being asked for CBS News, and without being told that this was part of a special panel for the State of the Union address. In addition, they were sent a letter asking them to log in to their web TV at 10:15 p.m. ET on Jan. 27 (the night of the State of the Union address). No mention was made in that request of the speech itself. If selected respondents would not be able to log in from their WebTV at that time, they were given an 800 number to dial.

Respondents on Thursday night were subject to our usual weighting process to account for respondent differences in the probabilities of selection as well as the normal demographic weighting done on telephone samples. In addition, a non-response adjustment was made based on responses to the political questions asked before the speech in order to control for any political bias in the post-speech sample. We have followed similar procedures in the telephone reaction polls we've done for many years. We and InterSurvey will be reviewing the data in the next few weeks and we'll have a presentation on AAPOR about the poll.

The policy of CBS News is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS News Poll.
Today I completed telephone interview on the upcoming New York Senate race. About halfway through the survey I began to suspect it was a push poll. By the end of the interview I was fairly certain it was. So when the interview was finished, I got the name of the polling firm (PSA Interviewing, Denver) and called to lodge a complaint about the interview. The supervisor who I talked with said that PSA was under a confidentiality agreement with the client (which, as I understand it, is a violation of AAPOR's code of ethics) and could not tell me whether or not they were associated with either of the candidates.

AAPOR's statement condemning push polls seems to imply that push polls are fairly easy to spot. However, although my gut tells me this was a push poll, it's possible (since I don't know who commissioned the survey) that it was just a really (really really really) bad legitimate survey. After all, I couldn't spot any blatantly misleading statements. Instead, most of the questions were couched in a language that favored Mrs. Clinton's position (and was unfavorable towards Mayor Giuliani's), but, again, never in an obvious way. If this had only occurred once or twice, I'd have chalked it up someone not paying close enough attention during questionnaire construction. But the preponderance of these subtly biased questions leads me to believe that they were not there by mistake.

So, as I see it, there are three possibilities:

a) This was a legitimate survey to which I'm overreacting.

b) I underestimated the subtlety inherent in push polls and this was, in fact, a typical push poll.

c) Push polls have begun to adapt (either because of an increasingly poll-savvy public, because of increasing press exposure, or for some other reason) and are now a much more subtle tool.

I'd be quite happy if A were true. C scares me. If someone (me) with a fair amount of knowledge about the political race in question and a moderate amount of survey research training can't be sure if they are being misled, what chance does someone who has never heard of push
polling, much less the application of cognitive processes to survey methodology (to steal Sudman Schwarz and Bradburn's subtitle), have in spotting the deception?

I'm very interested to hear what others on the list think about this.

Best,
Martin Barron
SUNY Stony Brook

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jan 29 13:51:08 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA20733 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 13:51:07 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA02356 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 13:51:07 -0800
   (PST)
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 13:51:07 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Frankovic on CBS News Poll-Reply
In-Reply-To: <s8931295.039@cbsnews.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001291323160.28948-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Sat, 29 Jan 2000, Kathy Frankovic wrote:

> The policy of CBS News is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS
> News Poll.

Hey, I like this! Any other polling operations care to take the pledge?

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

OR, if you don't belong to a polling operation, you might care to sign on
to my own poll-consumer's pledge, which I--inspired by Kathy's example--do
first make here:

My own personal policy, as a consumer of the results of public opinion
polls and other survey and market research, is NEVER to give any credence to a non-probability sample survey, and NEVER to accept one as a scientifically valid inference to any larger population, nor to any population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled.

1. Jim Beniger
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.

******

>From tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu Sat Jan 29 14:19:00 2000
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id OAA27949 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 14:18:59 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa12184;
   29 Jan 2000 17:18 EST
Received: from bam8v95.virginia.edu (Dialin3117.cstone.net [208.170.144.117])
   by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id RAA25106
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 17:18:56 -0500 (EST)
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Push polling and subtlety
In-Reply-To: <38935D50.F391F338@ic.sunysb.edu>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10001291703.E@bam8v95.virginia.edu>
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 17:19:03 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Martin:
The AAPOR statement on push polls is directed against phone-bank activities that aren't really polls. When this deceptive practice is used in a campaign, the "poll" is usually short, a very large number of calls are made (as the goal is to influence voters by inducing them to change votes or to stay home), and the results may not actually be saved and analyzed. Such activity usually happens closer in time to the actual election.

It sounds like you were the respondent to a more legitimate form of persuasive polling. Sounds like somebody was testing the impact and marketability of alternative messages for Mrs. Clinton's campaign. In doing so, it is not surprising that the researchers would ask you to react to biased questions that make Mrs. Clinton look good and Mr. Giuliani look bad.

When I first got involved in the 'push-poll' issue, it was because polls of this latter nature had been used in Virginia, with the result that state legislators introduced a bill aimed at regulating polling here. It is an
interesting case study in the natural history of a social problem that AAPOR and the political consulting industry were able to join in condemning "push-polls" only after the target was redefined to include only the former, non-poll activity. This has left the field entirely open for the kind of polling you experienced. Personally, I think it's a bad thing for all of us when researchers conduct surveys that leave a bad taste in the respondent's mouth. But AAPOR's current official posture (as I understand it) is that the poll you responded to is OK, as long as the N was within reason and results were really analyzed for research purposes.

One other thing: as I understand it, it is permissible not to disclose sponsorship while a poll is in progress. AAPOR prohibits PUBLISHING results without disclosing sponsorship. This point was extensively argued earlier in the "push poll" debate and in subsequent AAPORnet exchanges, because the legislation (which was defeated) would have required disclosure of who paid for the poll to every respondent. I believe it is common practice in political polling to keep the sponsorship concealed, as it is in certain types of brand-related market research.

Tom Guterbock

On Sat, 29 Jan 2000 16:36:17 -0500 Martin Barron <mbarron@ic.sunysb.edu> wrote:

> Today I completed telephone interview on the upcoming New York Senate race. About halfway through the survey I began to suspect it was a push poll. By the end of the interview I was fairly certain it was. So when the interview was finished, I got the name of the polling firm (PSA Interviewing, Denver) and called to lodge a complaint about the interview. The supervisor who I talked with said that PSA was under a confidentiality agreement with the client (which, as I understand it, is a violation of AAPOR's code of ethics) and could not tell me whether or not they were associated with either of the candidates.

> AAPOR's statement condemning push polls seems to imply that push polls are fairly easy to spot. However, although my gut tells me this was a push poll, it's possible (since I don't know who commissioned the survey) that it was just a really (really really really) bad legitimate survey. After all, I couldn't spot any blatantly misleading statements. Instead, most of the questions were couched in a language that favored Mrs. Clinton's position (and was unfavorable towards Mayor Giuliani's), but, again, never in an obvious way. If this had only occurred once or twice, I'd have chalked it up someone not paying close enough attention during questionnaire construction. But the preponderance of these subtly biased questions leads me to believe that they were not there by mistake.

> So, as I see it, there are three possibilities:

> a) This was a legitimate survey to which I'm overreacting.

> b) I underestimated the subtlety inherent in push polls and this was, in fact, a typical push poll.

> c) Push polls have begun to adapt (either because of an increasingly poll-savvy public, because of increasing press exposure, or for some other reason) and are now a much more subtle tool.
I'd be quite happy if A were true. C scares me. If someone (me) with a fair amount of knowledge about the political race in question and a moderate amount of survey research training can't be sure if they are being misled, what chance does someone who has never heard of push polling, much less the application of cognitive processes to survey methodology (to steal Sudman Schwarz and Bradburn's subtitle), have in spotting the deception?

I'm very interested to hear what others on the list think about this.

Best,
Martin Barron
SUNY Stony Brook

---

Thomas M. Guterbock ................. Voice: (804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research .... FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia ..................
539 Cabell Hall ............................... Charlottesville, VA 22903 .....

---

At 04:51 PM 1/29/00 , you wrote:

> On Sat, 29 Jan 2000, Kathy Frankovic wrote:
> > The policy of CBS News is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS News Poll.
> > Hey, I like this! Any other polling operations care to take the pledge?
> > 1.
> > 2.
> > 3.
> > 4.
OR, if you don't belong to a polling operation, you might care to sign on to my own poll-consumer's pledge, which I--inspired by Kathy's example--do first make here:

My own personal policy, as a consumer of the results of public opinion polls and other survey and market research, is NEVER to give any credence to a non-probability sample survey, and NEVER to accept one as a scientifically valid inference to any larger population, nor to any population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled.

1. Jim Beniger
2. Dick Halpern
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.

*******

"Thomas M. Guterbock" wrote:
It sounds like you were the respondent to a more legitimate form of persuasive polling. Sounds like somebody was testing the impact and marketability of alternative messages for Mrs. Clinton's campaign. In doing so, it is not surprising that the researchers would ask you to react to biased questions that make Mrs. Clinton look good and Mr. Giuliani look bad.

Message and media tests are completely legitimate as a form of research for political campaigns (as well as for other Public Affairs and commercial activities.) Don't a lot of AAPOR members work for commercial ventures that have as clients other commerical ventures? Don't they sometimes test messages for banks, insurance companies, cigarette companies, etc. Isn't this all completely legitimate?

Am I missing something here?

Once I got such a call, early on in a campaign for Westchester County exec.

The question, still one of my favorites: "What if you knew that Richard Brodsky (a New York State Assembly member) had been selected as the most obnoxious Assembly member by the members of staff of the state Assembly, how would that affect your opinion of him."

My answer: "not a bit, I know Assemblyman Brodsky."

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge       Home Office
209 Kissena Hall          50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology   Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597   Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837       Fax: 718-997-2820
E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

>From mtrau@umich.edu Sat Jan 29 15:18:10 2000
Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with ESMTP
   id PAA07364 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 15:18:09 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
   by vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.9.1/3.1r) with ESMTP id SAA24193
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 18:18:14 -0500 (EST)
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
   id <ZN3SZYRN>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 18:21:19 -0500
Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E03BC68AC@isr.umich.edu>
From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Push polling and subtlety
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 18:21:18 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Mee-Eun Kang and I have a chapter about push polls in a new edited volume that Paul Lavrakas and I have coming out in a few weeks. It is titled "Election Polls, the News Media, and Democracy" and will be published by Chatham House. I will produce a couple of paragraphs below to illustrate and expand upon the point that Tom Guterbock made.

What some consider to be a true "push poll" is run out of a phone bank. Thousands of calls are made, and no data are usually recorded. This is "negative persuasion calling" rather than a poll. This is the kind of "push poll" that was the focus of the joint statement by AAPOR, NCPP, and the American Association of Political Consultants. In a poll that is used to evaluate strategies that might work in a campaign, several positive and negative themes might be evaluated. But the company/consultant is interested in collecting and analyzing the data to see what works and how. It is worth noting that you live in NY and the data were being collected on the New York race.

It is difficult for respondents to understand the difference between the two techniques, of course, and the resulting negative experience can have a detrimental consequence for all who conduct polls.

Here's the text from the introduction:
Push polling is a relatively new kind of campaign technique that is designed to move the support of voters away from one candidate and toward another. It has been adopted by candidates, political parties supporting a candidate, and organized interest groups supporting a candidate or an issue. Initially developed and employed with some success in presidential campaigns, especially in both the 1996 primaries and general elections, it has increasingly been used in contests for smaller constituencies and for many different kinds of contests, now including referenda and initiatives. The technique has raised alarms among advocates of good government and fair campaign practices as well as in the polling and survey research industry. Push polls simulate an interview on the telephone, but they often do not involve data collection or analysis. As a result, they have been labeled "pseudo polls" (Traugott and Lavrakas, 1996). The form of questioning can offend people who are subjected to it, and the fear of the polling business is that the technique will contribute further to already declining response rates and public trust in polls.

Many state legislatures have responded to the rise of push polling by drafting legislation to outlaw it, and a similar bill was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1997. Such legislation has proved problematical because many of these laws fly in the face of protected forms of political speech under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The key issue for legislators is defining an unacceptable practice with sufficient precision that the proposed "illegal" behavior does not include protected speech. In this chapter, we review the rise of push polling, paying attention to the distinctions between "negative persuasion telephoning" and strategic polling designed to assess the potential effectiveness of alternative campaign themes. We employ a systematic search of reported occurrences of push polls in the last few election cycles in order to develop a conceptual framework that describes who is using them and
under what electoral circumstances. We then review current attempts at the
development of legislation to regulate the technique, with an emphasis on
the level of specificity and targeting of unethical practices.

Re: Warren Mitofsky's comment on the Squier obituary

Thanks - I'm sure you expressed the feelings of many of us, especially those
of us who had the opportunity to work with Bob.
Gene Bregman

T here are many research projects, including most litigation research,
conducted among samples that are non-probability. These projects are very
useful' are not presented as projectible, and should not be summarily
condemned by academic purists - who, with the currently low response rates,
have probably not conducted a real probability survey in many years.

Harry O'Neil
please define non-probability sample. is a sample designed as a probability sample but ending with a cooperation rate (COOP1 in the standard definitions) of less than 50 percent a non-probability sample?

philip meyer, knight chair in journalism voice: 919 962-4085 cb 3365 carroll hall fax: 919 962-1549 university of north carolina cell: 919 906-3425 chapel hill nc 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

on sat, 29 jan 2000, james beniger wrote:

> date: sat, 29 jan 2000 13:51:07 -0800 (pst)
> from: james beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu
> to: aapornet@usc.edu
> subject: re: frankovic on CBS news poll-reply
> >
> >
> > on sat, 29 jan 2000, kathy frankovic wrote:
> >
> > > the policy of CBS news is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS news poll.
> >
> > > hey, I like this! any other polling operations care to take the pledge?
> >
> > 1.
> > 2.
> > 3.
> > 4.
> > 5.
> > 6.
> > 7.
> > 8.
> > 9.
> >
> > or, if you don't belong to a polling operation, you might care to sign on
to my own poll-consumer’s pledge, which I—inspired by Kathy’s example—do
first make here:

My own personal policy, as a consumer of the results of public opinion
polls and other survey and market research, is NEVER to give any
credence to a non-probability sample survey, and NEVER to accept one as
a scientifically valid inference to any larger population, nor to any
population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled.

1. Jim Beniger
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
. 
. 
.

*******

Harry,

I love you, and respect and admire you, as I think you must know.

But how could one ever know the extent to which one had conducted "a
real probability survey" unless he had set out to conduct one in the
first place?

At minimum, the "purists," as you call them, at least know the extent to
which—and the ways in which—their results are impure, i.e., the ways
(many of them, at least) in which their sample survey deviates from a
true probability one. And what do the impurists know?

And in the business of applying statistical theory--of making inferences from sample to population--how could "purist" possibly be a bad word? I can only hope, for your own sake, that at the casino table or while playing poker, you are yourself just such a purist, whether calculating or intuitive (I have no idea whether you do engage in activities such as these or not, I must hasten to add).

As for your word "academic," that clearly is a contemptible term. I think it only fair to warn the hordes of academics hanging around CBS News that their days are numbered—that their ivory tower is about to come crashing down about their ears. Are then do we picture the forces of news interest, consumer preferences and profitability as wearing the white hats or the black, come the end of the final reel, do you think? Might we not honor those, among our own membership, who fight on—for informative broadcast reporting and against infotainment—until their final shell is spent?

I do agree with you on your final point: No one has conducted a "real" probability survey in many years, probably ever—at least not for large and complex populations (where even a population census grows ever more difficult to conduct). But doesn't this make purity of inference increasingly more important, not less?

What besides statistical inference, after all, keeps modern survey research above the level of the newspaper clip-out, call-in and straw polls? And if we are not above, then what *do* we really know—and why bother at all?

-- Jim

P.S. I don't think that anyone intends to include litigation research among survey, market or public opinion research, nor would I condemn any "research" not presented by those who conduct it as projectable, out of my respect for free speech, nor do I find that this falls outside the common dictionary definition of "research." It is in fact the dictionary above which we must ever strive to rise, if we are to continue to hold the respect of our audiences, our students, and our clients—or at least all those among them worthy of our own respect.

******

On Sat, 29 Jan 2000 HOneill536@aol.com wrote:

> There are many research projects, including most litigation research,  
> conducted among samples that are non-probability. These projects are very  
> useful' are not presented as projectible, and should not be summarily  
> condemned by academic purists - who, with the currently low response rates,  
> have probably not conducted a real probability survey in many years.  
> > Harry O'Neill

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Jan 29 20:23:55 2000  
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])  
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id UAA22463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jan 2000 20:23:54 -0800
Beniger States:

P.S. I don't think that anyone intends to include litigation research among survey, market or public opinion research,

As a person who has done some litigation research and testified in court, about surveys, I take considerable umbrage about this characterization.

I guess everybody sees their own little corner of the world!! But surprise of surprises, the court system has adopted in a variety of contexts most of the canons of survey methods. If you want to generalize and introduce it into court, and there is an opposing expert, it is possible that the standards would be higher than those held by academics!!!

Andrew A. Beveridge

In a message dated 1/29/00 4:18:13 PM Eastern Standard Time, KAF@cbsnews.com writes:

<< The policy of CBS News is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS
I recall watching a CBS News program in 1992 immediately following Bush's State of the Union address that prominently featured the results of a call-in poll of over 300,000 viewers (and also, less prominently, the results of a traditional poll). Though CBS may not have officially labeled this call-in poll a "CBS News Poll," the attention it was given likely led many to conclude that it was.

Count me out of Dick's list!

In a fast moving, short (typically three week) election such as we have in Britain, the poll that polls last polls best, and probability samples empirically have a much poorer record of 'getting it right on the night' than do tightly controlled quota samples, '92 general election notwithstanding. I'll trade you well structured quota samples for 50% response rate, if that, probability samples in those circumstances any day.

Dick should know this, having lived in London for as long as he did, but maybe Kathy and Jim can be forgiven (but can read the MRS Inquiry into the '92 election for elucidation).

Bob Worcester

-----Original Message-----
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: 29 January 2000 23:13
Subject: Re: Frankovic on CBS News Poll-Reply

> At 04:51 PM 1/29/00 , you wrote:
> 
> >>On Sat, 29 Jan 2000, Kathy Frankovic wrote:
The policy of CBS News is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS News Poll.

Hey, I like this! Any other polling operations care to take the pledge?

OR, if you don't belong to a polling operation, you might care to sign on to my own poll-consumer's pledge, which I--inspired by Kathy's example--do first make here:

My own personal policy, as a consumer of the results of public opinion polls and other survey and market research, is NEVER to give any credence to a non-probability sample survey, and NEVER to accept one as a scientifically valid inference to any larger population, nor to any population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled.

1. Jim Beniger
2. Dick Halpern
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.

****
We plan on presenting a paper at the AAPOR meetings with a detailed description of the design and the results of methodological experiments that we have been conducting. Kathy Frankovic responded with some specific details about the CBS study, but here are a few quick answers to your questions about the InterSurvey panel:

1) To date, InterSurvey panel recruitment has been handled by NORC using a complex design. We normally use the probabilities of selection to weight subsamples from the panel. The initial response rate, using the CASRO definition (roughly, contact rate x cooperation rate), is about 56%.

2) All studies, including the CBS one that you ask about, use randomly selected subsamples from the panel, not self-selection. In rereading our marketing materials, I realize that this isn't explicitly stated. (The thought of using self-selection at the final stage never occurred to us!)

3) Your questions about panels are good ones. In terms of sampling, there is no fundamental methodological difference between InterSurvey and other high quality, randomly recruited panels. The difference is that interviewing is initiated by sending an e-mail message to the selected panel member and that the interview is conducted using a Web browser. Their device automatically downloads e-mail and turns on a red light on the WebTV box, notifying them that a message has arrived. This means that we don't have to call or mail panel members--much faster than mail and much less intrusive than calling. It also means that we can interview outside of normal interviewing hours (e.g., after 10 pm, as was required for the CBS survey). Furthermore, we can use visual content, including TV-quality video, as part of our surveys. We are trying to combine the Web with general population probability sampling.

I hope this is responsive to your questions.

Doug

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tom Duffy" <tduffy@macroint.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2000 6:42 PM
Subject: Re[2]: Census Does the Super Bowl

> I found Intersurvey's idea intriguing, but then I looked at the example survey and their home page.
> 
> According to the page given below, 721 adults responded to the CBS/Intersurvey poll. However, I didn't see an explanation as to how these 721 responses were obtained: was this a randomly selected sample of the panel, with a decent non-response conversion protocol? What was the interviewing "window"? What was the response rate? Or was this a self-selected sample of a frame of 30,000 people? One or two additional lines of info at the bottom of the page would help some of us understand what these polls really mean.
Also, though a lot of work evidently went into recruiting a panel with the objective of having it be a "random" sample of Americans who are willing to trade poll participation for free access and hardware, are the probabilities of selection to this panel known? And are they used when weighting the data? Was any analysis conducted on the potential bias resulting from the above "trade" (simultaneous RDD "control" samples, cognitive testing)? And why is this panel methodologically superior to other panels that start with random recruitment? A panel is a panel, even if it is as large as 30,000 or more.

It would help to have this info in the methodological sections of the Intersurvey page. Otherwise, it is difficult to believe Intersurvey's claim that this methodology "makes existing research methodologies obsolete" (http://www.intersurvey.com).

_____________________
Tom Duffy
Macro International Inc.
New York, NY
tduffy@macroint.com

>From Scheuren@aol.com Sun Jan 30 12:19:18 2000
Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.71])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA08833 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 12:19:17 -0800
(PST)
From: Scheuren@aol.com
Received: from Scheuren@aol.com
    by imo27.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.8.) id 5.db.9f9fee (1781);
    Sun, 30 Jan 2000 15:18:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <db.9f9fee.25c5f6a2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 15:18:42 EST
Subject: Posting on Angola Human Rights Awareness Survey
To: aapornet@usc.edu
CC: pball@umich.edu, howland@un.org
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 44

Dear Fellow Members of AAPOR:

I am posting a request concerning work that any of you might be aware of on human rights awareness surveys. Please reply directly to <howland@un.org>.

Thanks, Fritz Scheuren

Hello,

The Human Rights Division of the United Nations Office in Angola is
supporting a statistics institute at the National University of Angola to do a survey of human rights awareness.

The purpose is to both obtain a sense of what the current level of human rights awareness is in Angola and to create baseline data by which we can measure whether our human rights awareness work is having an impact.

We would very much appreciate it if you would forward to us information regarding any such survey that you are aware. It will help us to design the survey.

Thank you for your assistance.

Todd Howland
Deputy Chief
Human Rights Division
United Nations Office in Angola
howland@un.org

This is the same argument that Morris Hansen had at inveigh against at AAPOR's first meeting in 1947. Hasn't the field of survey research made enough progress since then to bury quota samples once and for all? It is conceivable that a poor probability design would not perform well, but as a principle I find it hard to accept this generalization in favor of quota sampling. Sorry Bob.

warren mitofsky

At 02:36 PM 1/30/00 +0000, Bob Worcester wrote:
> Count me out of Dick's list!
>
> In a fast moving, short (typically three week) election such as we have in Britain, the poll that polls last polls best, and probability samples empirically have a much poorer record of 'getting it right on the night' than do tightly controlled quota samples, '92 general election notwithstanding. I'll trade you well structured quota samples for 50% response rate, if that, probability samples in those circumstances any day.
Dick should know this, having lived in London for as long as he did, but maybe Kathy and Jim can be forgiven (but can read the MRS Inquiry into the '92 election for elucidation).

Bob Worcester

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

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: 29 January 2000 23:13
Subject: Re: Frankovic on CBS News Poll-Reply

At 04:51 PM 1/29/00 , you wrote:

On Sat, 29 Jan 2000, Kathy Frankovic wrote:

The policy of CBS News is NEVER to call a non-probability sample a CBS News Poll.

Hey, I like this! Any other polling operations care to take the pledge?

OR, if you don't belong to a polling operation, you might care to sign on to my own poll-consumer's pledge, which I--inspired by Kathy's example--do

first make here:

My own personal policy, as a consumer of the results of public opinion polls and other survey and market research, is NEVER to give any credence to a non-probability sample survey, and NEVER to accept one as a scientifically valid inference to any larger population, nor to any population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled.

Jim Beniger
dick halpern
Andy,

My words below have nothing to do with quality and standards, which might be high, low, or mediocre in any type of research, but of course.

My remark, in all innocence, was intended to make the simple point that litigation research is not ordinarily considered "survey, market, or public opinion research," the reasons being (what I took to be self-evident when I wrote) that litigation research does not usually involve commercial markets, consumer behavior, public opinion, mass media or news reporting on opinion, or--often--any surveys at all (all of which might or might not be true of your own particular research--I simply do not know).

You might well find my earlier remarks hasty, ill-informed, or even stupid--none of these conclusions would bother me. But I certainly did not intend to make anyone take offense at them, and I apologize to you here publicly because they did.

-- Jim

******
On Sat, 29 Jan 2000, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:

> > Beniger States:
> >
> > P.S. I don't think that anyone intends to include litigation research
> > among survey, market or public opinion research,
> >
> > As a person who has done some litigation research and testified in court,
> > about surveys, I take considerable umbrage about this characterization.
> >
> > I guess everybody sees their own little corner of the world!! But surprise
> > of surprises, the court system has adopted in a variety of contexts most
> > of the canons of survey methods. If you want to generalize and introduce
> > it into court, and there is an opposing expert, it is possible that the
> > standards would be higher than those held by academics!!
> >
> > Andrew A. Beveridge

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sun Jan 30 13:17:16 2000
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA24456 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 13:17:15 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-3.tuckahoe.bestweb.net [209.94.107.212])
   by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id QAA21730;
   Sun, 30 Jan 2000 16:17:13 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3894AA38.1C0310BF@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 16:16:41 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Apology to Andy Beveridge
References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001301227590.18257-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

James Beniger wrote:

> Andy,
> My words below have nothing to do with quality and standards, which might
> be high, low, or mediocre in any type of research, but of course.
> My remark, in all innocence, was intended to make the simple point that
> litigation research is not ordinarily considered "survey, market, or
> public opinion research," the reasons being (what I took to be self-
> evident when I wrote) that litigation research does not usually involve
> commercial markets, consumer behavior, public opinion, mass media or news
> reporting on opinion, or--often--any surveys at all (all of which might or
> might not be true of your own particular research--I simply do not know).
>
As Milt Gold points out, some research in the employment context involves surveys. A notable example is Crespi's survey of the attitudes of Sears workers and the use of archival survey material. But there is much work in this area.

Similarly, the use of surveys to understand the attitudes of potential jurors surely falls under the rubric of survey research, and indeed of public opinion research.

Many times in the case of survey research for litigation one needs to find out the incidence of something. Estimation in that context requires very good samples.

Indeed, it is in the litigation context (with respect to the tobacco industry) that the pressure for disclosure of names and instruments recently became of very serious concern.

Litigation research has been one element of the survey research business for years.

Andy

--
Andrew A. Beveridge              Home Office
209 Kissena Hall                 50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology          Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597          Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837              Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps
Fax: 718-997-2820

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Sun Jan 30 13:57:42 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA06459 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 13:57:42 -0800
    (PST)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
    by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA04564
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 13:54:26 -0800
Message-Id: <200001302154.NAA04564@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 13:57:23 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Litigation research
In-reply-to: <3893BCB9.85F2CE9E@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

With the exception of that last little swipe at the academic community, I have to agree. In my experience, the standards of
quality for survey research used in litigation can be considerably more strict than the ones normally used by journalists and journal reviewers.

The theme in litigation is combat rather than dispassionate deliberation. Moreover, the sight and smell of battle, and the prospect of huge consulting fees can tempt even the virtuous to commit heinous acts. Because they lack sophistication in the ways of research, judges and juries are sometimes easy prey for unscrupulous social science researchers. However, most of the time the presence of opposing experts creates inevitable and powerful pressure for researchers to conform to generally accepted epistemological and methodological canons; and the result is high quality survey research.

The first line of attack of an opposing survey expert is usually directed at the other expert's methodology. Correspondingly, the thing experts testifying about survey research have to worry about most is eliminating vulnerability to methodological criticisms. To proceed otherwise is to risk serious personal and professional embarrassment.

In closing, I don't believe it is appropriate to characterise survey research intended to inform litigation as somehow less robust or valid than other kinds of survey research. Indeed, it seems to me to be one of the most legitimate uses of such research.

Date sent: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 23:23:22 -0500
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Frankovic on CBS News Poll-Reply

> Beniger States:

> P.S. I don't think that anyone intends to include litigation research among survey, market or public opinion research,

As a person who has done some litigation research and testified in court, about surveys, I take considerable umbrage about this characterization.

I guess everybody sees their own little corner of the world!! But surprise of surprises, the court system has adopted in a variety of contexts most of the canons of survey methods. If you want to generalize and introduce it into court, and there is an opposing expert, it is possible that the standards would be higher than those held by academics!!!

Andrew A. Beveridge

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the
addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From HOneill536@aol.com Sun Jan 30 14:16:19 2000
Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.7])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA11386 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 14:16:18 -0800
(PST)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
    by imo17.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.8.) id 5.ba.1062a71 (4442)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 17:15:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <ba.1062a71.25c6120e@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 17:15:42 EST
Subject: Re: Frankovic on CBS News Poll-Reply
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38

Thank you and Amen!

>From HOneill536@aol.com Sun Jan 30 14:22:59 2000
Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.4])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA13511 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 14:22:58 -0800
(PST)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
    by imo14.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v24.8.) id 5.17.12b4800 (4442)
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 17:22:17 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <17.12b4800.25c61398@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 17:22:16 EST
Subject: Re: Apology to Andy Beveridge
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 38

Jim - You obviously don't know very much about litigation research. Until you do, don't mischaracterize it. Harry

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Sun Jan 30 14:56:56 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA23007 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 14:56:56 -0800
(PST)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
    by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA05106
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 14:53:50 -0800
Message-Id: <20000130145350.OAA05106@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 14:56:56 -0800
Lighten up Harry. Your characterization of litigation research as being largely based on non-probability sampling wasn't exactly a source of enlightenment in this conversation.

Jim - You obviously don't know very much about litigation research. Until you do, don't mischaracterize it. Harry

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

A question for anyone interested, not just for Doug Rivers:
While I understand the advantages of a randomly selected sample, a 56% CASRO rate (AAPOR #4, roughly) isn't that grand. I did a survey with NORC that achieved much higher cooperation last year. So to start with, can we quantify the non-response? Might those who are unwilling to participate be the same as those people who are generally unwilling to have computers/Internet in their homes? I would be especially interested in the UNWEIGHTED cooperation among persons 65+, low income, racial/ethnic minorities and others traditionally underrepresented on-line.

Second, I can't get past the idea that these respondents are, by definition, now "internet users"—self selected by virtue of their agreement to cooperate and introduce this technology into their homes and now capable of experiencing all of those wonderful things that make new Internet users different than other people. Does having the Internet in your home change your view of the world? In what ways? Are you not now somehow "different" than you were before?

How is this panel, now "exposed" to this technology, still representative of a national population of US adults? We may see that the selection is better than a volunteer sample—-but can we really say, after the first survey, that this will yield better data?

I applaud the innovation and the attempt to do better. I remain to be convinced that this will work longer term. I am still unclear, following the exchanges about making pledges and taking vows of purity, if CBSNews is calling this the CBSNews Poll or not, and if to the general public, that distinction would matter anyway.

What I am clear about is that we all learn more when we discuss issues without engaging in personal attacks.

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Doug Rivers <drivers@intersurvey.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Sunday, January 30, 2000 10:12 AM
Subject: RE: Re[2]: Census Does the Super Bowl

> We plan on presenting a paper at the AAPOR meetings with a detailed description of the design and the results of methodological experiments that we have been conducting. Kathy Frankovic responded with some specific details about the CBS study, but here are a few quick answers to your questions about the InterSurvey panel:
>
> 1) To date, InterSurvey panel recruitment has been handled by NORC using a complex design. We normally use the probabilities of selection to weight subsamples from the panel. The initial response rate, using the CASRO definition (roughly, contact rate x cooperation rate), is about 56%.
>
> 2) All studies, including the CBS one that you ask about, use randomly selected subsamples from the panel, not self-selection. In rereading our marketing materials, I realize that this isn't explicitly stated. (The thought of using self-selection at the final stage never occurred to us!)
3) Your questions about panels are good ones. In terms of sampling, there is no fundamental methodological difference between InterSurvey and other high-quality, randomly recruited panels. The difference is that interviewing is initiated by sending an e-mail message to the selected panel member and that the interview is conducted using a Web browser. Their device automatically downloads e-mail and turns on a red light on the WebTV box, notifying them that a message has arrived. This means that we don't have to call or mail panel members—much faster than mail and much less intrusive than calling. It also means that we can interview outside of normal interviewing hours (e.g., after 10 pm, as was required for the CBS survey). Furthermore, we can use visual content, including TV-quality video, as part of our surveys. We are trying to combine the Web with general population probability sampling.

I hope this is responsive to your questions.

Doug

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Tom Duffy" <tduffy@macroint.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2000 6:42 PM 
Subject: Re[2]: Census Does the Super Bowl

> I found Intersurvey's idea intriguing, but then I looked at the example survey and their home page.
> According to the page given below, 721 adults responded to the CBS/Intersurvey poll. However, I didn't see an explanation as to how these 721 responses were obtained: was this a randomly selected sample of the panel, with a decent non-response conversion protocol? What was the interviewing "window"? What was the response rate? Or was this a self-selected sample of a frame of 30,000 people? One or two additional lines of info at the bottom of the page would help some of us understand what these polls really mean.

Also, though a lot of work evidently went into recruiting a panel with the objective of having it be a "random" sample of Americans who are willing to trade poll participation for free access and hardware, are the probabilities of selection to this panel known? And are they
used
> > when weighting the data? Was any analysis conducted on the potential
> > bias resulting from the above "trade" (simultaneous RDD "control"
> > samples, cognitive testing)? And why is this panel methodologically
> > superior to other panels that start with random recruitment? A panel
> > is a panel, even if it is as large as 30,000 or more.
> > It would help to have this info in the methodological sections of the
> > Intersurvey page. Otherwise, it is difficult to believe Intersurvey's
> > claim that this methodology "makes existing research methodologies obsolete" (http://www.intersurvey.com).

__________________
Tom Duffy
Macro International Inc.
New York, NY
tduffy@macroint.com

>From russella@teleport.com Sun Jan 30 20:08:13 2000
Received: from smtp7.teleport.com (smtp7.teleport.com [192.108.254.51])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id UAA14810 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Jan 2000 20:08:12 -0800 (PST)
Received: (qmail 4585 invoked from network); 31 Jan 2000 04:08:09 -0000
Received: from user2.teleport.com (qmailr@192.108.254.12)
   by smtp7.teleport.com with SMTP; 31 Jan 2000 04:08:09 -0000
Received: (qmail 7152 invoked by uid 707); 31 Jan 2000 04:08:07 -0000
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 20:08:07 -0800 (PST)
From: Allen Russell <russella@teleport.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: Allen Russell <russella@teleport.com>
Subject: Litigation Research
In-Reply-To: <200001302253.OAA05106@web2.tdl.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10001302003440.5623-100000@user2.teleport.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

OK, I'll bite. Will someone please fill the rest of us in on the current status of litigation research, in particular on the use of survey research techniques and the study of public opinion in litigation research.
Thanks.

Allen Russell
Portland, Oregon
russella@teleport.com
Dear Allen:

I will give you the benefit of a private response. The bottom line, when you do social science research in a litigation context, you end up doing about the same sorts of things that you would do for other projects; you simply do it with the notion that another social scientist will show up and try to demolish whatever conclusions you might have drawn.

In my own case, I have done a number of employment cases, a number of jury wheel challenges, and a number of housing discrimination cases. Most of my own work includes the interpretation of Census data combined with other stuff.

It really depends upon the particularly setting and what you can do.

It usually revolves around a specific question that needs addressing.

I only reacted because Jim B. seemed to imply that such work was beneath contempt, at least his contempt. I found this a little curious since he had solicited questions from the list on what is the normal rate someone charges.

You might find it interesting to ply your trade in these sorts of contexts.

Andy

Allen Russell wrote:

> OK, I'll bite. Will someone please fill the rest of us in on the current status of litigation research, in particular on the use of survey research techniques and the study of public opinion in litigation research.
> Thanks.
>
On 30 Jan 00, at 23:16, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:

> [...] The bottom line, when you
> do social science research in a litigation context, you end up doing about
> the same sorts of things that you would do for other project, you simply
> do it with the notion that another social scientist will show up and try
> to demolish whatever conclusions you might have drawn.

How well put! And the in-person public nature of the attack can be a
little bit more devastating on the psyche than a journal rejection.

> In my own case, I have done a number of employment cases, a number
> of jury wheel challenges, and a number of housing discrimination
> cases. Most of my own work includes the interpretation of Census
> data combined with other stuff.

I was contacted by a lawyer in a copyright infringement case. The
plaintiff wanted a list study of potential customers, asking them which
company they connected with a certain logo, since it was a
competitor's use of a similar logo that had sparked the controversy. I
ended up not doing the work, but it sounded interesting and certainly a
legitimate use of research.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

--

Bob Worcester makes a valid point. In an ideal world probability sampling is obviously the way to go but are we being realistic when we insist on it in all situations and refuse to accept findings not based on probability samples? Bob's comment did inspire me to reflect a bit more on the issue.

Let's ask ourselves: IF we took seriously the idea of never giving any credence to the findings from a non-probability sample survey, and never accepted the findings from one as a scientifically valid inference to any larger population or to any population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled, how much survey or market research would there be left to talk or write about in this country or in any other? The question is more or less rhetorical and the answer should in no way affect our maintenance of the highest standards possible.

Quota sampling has long been the practice in most European countries and, when done properly, has proven to be quite accurate in the market research world despite all the problems of non-response. In my own experience, it was quite dependable as a solid basis for making intelligent marketing decisions. I think most of us would concede that this is equally true in the US. In my years with Coke during the 70's and early 80's, we tried probability sampling several times in a variety of countries. The findings
were no more accurate (and no different) than good quota samples and lots, lots more expensive. Further, during the 70's, obtaining good census data in most European countries in terms of which to base a good probability sample was almost impossible.

Finally, and this is not an excuse for poorly conducted research, IF we insisted that only probability sampling was acceptable as a basis for survey research findings, most market and opinion researchers would probably go out of business because the costs of conducting surveys based only on good probability samples would be unaffordable by most clients. Some day the Internet may change all that but we're not there just yet.

Dick Halpern
lowered their opinion of him.

Pre-trial publicity: Supporting a change-of-venue motion with a survey showing how many in the potential juror population have attended to news reports and made up their minds about a high-profile criminal case.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

On Sun, 30 Jan 2000, Allen Russell wrote:

> Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 20:08:07 -0800 (PST)
> From: Allen Russell <russella@teleport.com>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Cc: Allen Russell <russella@teleport.com>
> Subject: Litigation Research
> OK, I'll bite. Will someone please fill the rest of us in on the current status of litigation research, in particular on the use of survey research techniques and the study of public opinion in litigation research.
> Thanks.
> Allen Russell
> Portland, Oregon
> russella@teleport.com
>
>
>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Mon Jan 31 08:57:11 2000
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA28009 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 08:57:10 -0800 (PST)
Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3-fi.acns.fsu.edu [192.168.197.3])
by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA20018
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 11:57:08 -0500
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial867.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.36.3])
by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA48392
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 11:57:06 -0500
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 11:57:06 -0500
Message-Id: <200001311657.LAA48392@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Litigation Research
And a tad more:

Voir dire surveys in general, now over 25 years old (my introduction to RDD).

Surveys to see how well *jurors* represent the jury wheel (just finished writing up two papers from a large study of that one).

My most vivid memories were of repeatedly being told surveys were "hearsay evidence" since I did not interview each respondent personally. However, that was always thrown out.

Susan

At 10:42 AM 1/31/2000 -0500, you wrote:
> I can add a couple of examples from my own experience with litigation research:
> Pornography: Use of poll data to help the court understand "prevailing community standards" which is one of the legal tests of pornography.
> Libel: Survey of the audience to establish whether its members believed the false information published by the defendant and whether it lowered their opinion of him.
> Pre-trial publicity: Supporting a change-of-venue motion with a survey showing how many in the potential juror population have attended to news reports and made up their minds about a high-profile criminal case.

>Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
>CB 3365 Carroll Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549
>University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425
>Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  
>http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

>On Sun, 30 Jan 2000, Allen Russell wrote:
> Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 20:08:07 -0800 (PST)
> From: Allen Russell <russella@teleport.com>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Cc: Allen Russell <russella@teleport.com>
> Subject: Litigation Research
> OK, I'll bite. Will someone please fill the rest of us in on the current status of litigation research, in particular on the use of survey research techniques and the study of public opinion in litigation research.
> Thanks.
> Allen Russell
> Portland, Oregon
> russella@teleport.com
If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
Academic Year 1999-2000 PHONE 850-385-4266
slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I AM NOW IN TRANSITION TO:

The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
850-644-4592 Educational Research Office
FAX 850-644-8776

FROM:

The Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270
850-644-6416 Sociology Office
FAX 850-644-6208

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Mon Jan 31 09:56:16 2000
Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA07423 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 09:56:15 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from warrenmi (user-2inizhkd.dialup.mindspring.com [165.121.70.141])
   by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA13593
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 12:56:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.200001311114108.01c90140@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 12:56:55 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Frankovic on CBS News Poll-Reply
In-Reply-To: <4.2.0.58.200001311092718.00a90450@mail.mindspring.com>
I do not believe Dick Halpern got Bob Worcester's point. While I am sure that quota sampling has a place for some researchers under some conditions, even though I have yet to find one, Bob was saying that quota sampling was a better alternative for British election surveys than probability sampling. I find that assertion hard to accept and difficult to believe.

warren mitofsky

At 10:23 AM 1/31/00 -0500, you wrote:
>Bob Worcester makes a valid point. In an ideal world probability sampling is obviously the way to go but are we being realistic when we insist on it in all situations and refuse to accept findings not based on probability samples? Bob's comment did inspire me to reflect a bit more on the issue.
>Let's ask ourselves: IF we took seriously the idea of never giving credence to the findings from a non-probability sample survey, and never accepted the findings from one as a scientifically valid inference to any larger population or to any population at all beyond those individuals actually sampled, how much survey or market research would there be left to talk or write about in this country or in any other? The question is more or less rhetorical and the answer should in no way affect our maintenance of the highest standards possible.
>Quota sampling has long been the practice in most European countries and, when done properly, has proven to be quite accurate in the market research world despite all the problems of non-response. In my own experience, it was quite dependable as a solid basis for making intelligent marketing decisions. I think most of us would concede that this is equally true in the US. In my years with Coke during the 70's and early 80's, we tried probability sampling several times in a variety of countries. The findings were no more accurate (and no different) than good quota samples and lots, lots more expensive. Further, during the 70's, obtaining good census data in most European countries in terms of which to base a good probability sample was almost impossible.
>Finally, and this is not an excuse for poorly conducted research, IF we insisted that only probability sampling was acceptable as a basis for survey research findings, most market and opinion researchers would probably go out of business because the costs of conducting surveys based only on good probability samples would be unaffordable by most clients. Some day the Internet may change all that but we're not there just yet.
>
>Dick Halpern
>
>
>*****************************************************************
>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
>Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Henry Rouanet       The Geometric Analysis of Questionnaires:
Werner Ackermann    The Lesson of Bourdieu's La Distinction . 5
Brigitte Le Roux
In this issue of the BMS, we publish three research articles and one ongoing research article, of which two are in English and two in French. In "The Geometric Analysis of Questionnaires - The Lesson of Bourdieu's La Distinction", Henry Rouanet (Universite Rene Descartes), Werner Ackermann (Centre de Sociologie des Organisations) and Brigitte Le Roux (Universite Rene Descartes) investigates the use of Correspondence Analysis (CA) in Pierre Bourdieu's La Distinction, showing that, for Bourdieu, CA is not simply a handy tool among others for visualizing data, but a unique instrument apt to uncover the two related spaces of individuals and of properties.

In "The Use of Multidimensional Partial-Order Scalogram Analysis with Base Coordinates (MPOSAC) in Portraying a Partially-Ordered Typology of City Wards by Social-Medical Criteria", Shlomit Levy and Reuven Amar (Hebrew University of Jerusalem) show that not two, but three dimensions are needed to represent the typology on the data of seven variables.
characterizing each of the 21 wards of the city of Hull, England.

In "A Sequence Analysis Method", Alain Dubus (Universite Lille III) uses data on the professional trajectories of 520 continuing education teachers, accumulated density matrices and classification analysis to produce ideal types and evocative, colored graphic representations of categories of sequences.

In the Ongoing Research article, "Verbatim, An Experiment in Capitalizing on Quantitative Interviews", Dominique Le Roux and Jean Vidal (EDF-DRD) present encouraging preliminary results from an experiment in archiving qualitative data for use in secondary analysis in France and carried out in a business environment.

On line one, page 89, of our last issue, a last-minute correction mistakenly transformed "SES" into "SEX". This was corrected in the email version, but not in the paper version. SES means "Socioeconomic Status".

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

EDITORIAL

Dans ce numero du BMS, nous publions trois articles de recherche et un article de recherche en cours, dont deux en francais et deux en anglais. Dans "L'analyse geometrique des questionnaires - La lecon de La Distinction de Bourdieu", Henry Rouanet (Universite Rene Descartes), Werner Ackermann (Centre de Sociologie des Organisations) et Brigitte Le Roux (Universite Rene Descartes) etudient l'usage de l'analyse des correspondances (AC) dans La Distinction de Pierre Bourdieu, montrant que, pour Bourdieu, l'AC n'est pas un outil parmi d'autres, commode pour visualiser les donnees, mais un instrument unique eminemment apte a decouvrir les deux espaces apparentes des individus et des proprietes.

Dans "L'utilisation du scalogramme multidimensionnel avec ordre partiel sur des scores de base (MPOSAC) pour construire une typologie sur ordre partiel des quartiers d'une ville, basee sur des criteres sociaux et de sante publique", Shlomit Levy et Reuven Amar (Hebrew University of Jerusalem) montrent que trois, et non deux dimensions sont necessaires pour rendre compte d'une typologie des donnees a sept variables sur les 21 arrondissements de la ville anglaises de Hull.

Dans "Une methode d'analyse des sequences", Alain Dubus (Universite Lille III) utilise des donnees sur les itineraires professionnels de 520 formateurs d'adultes, des matrices de dense cumulee et l'analyse classificatoire pour produire des idealtypes et des representations graphiques colorees de categories de sequences qui se revelent tres parlantes.
Dans l'article de Recherche en cours, "Verbatim - Une expérience de capitalisation d'entretiens qualitatifs", Dominique Le Roux et Jean Vidal (EDF-DRD) présentent les premiers résultats, encourageants, d'une expérience d'archivage de données qualitatives en vue de leur reexploitation menée en France dans le contexte de l'entreprise.

Sur la première ligne, page 89, du dernier numéro, une malheureuse correction de dernière minute a changé "SES" en "SEX". La faute a été corrigée dans la version email mais pas dans la version papier. SES veut dire "Socioeconomic Status".

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

BMS - AIMS

The BMS is a peer review trimestrial scientific journal published by the AIMS (International Association of Sociological Methodology, 45 rue Linne, 75005 Paris), a non profit organization. The BMS's parity number is 68812. All correspondence should be sent to the BMS, LASMAS-CNRS, 59 rue Pouchet, 75017 Paris; tel/fax 33 1 40 51 85 19 or tel 33 1 40 25 10 01 and fax 33 1 40 25 12 47; email bms@ext.jussieu.fr; web http://www.ccr.jussieu.fr/bms

The publishers of the BMS are: Philippe Cibois (University of Amiens), Karl M. van Meter (LASMAS-CNRS, Paris), Lise Mounier (LASMAS-CNRS, Caen) and Marie-Ange Schiltz (CAMS-EHESS, Paris). The director is Karl M. van Meter.

The Scientific Committee of the BMS is composed of Duane F. Alwin (University of Michigan), Alain Degenne (LASMAS-CNRS, Caen), Peter Ph. Mohler (ZUMA, Mannheim) and Henry Rouanet (Univ.ersite Paris V).

The BMS publishes twice a year the Newsletter of Research Committee (RC33) "Logic and Methodology" of the International Sociological Association. The BMS is abstracted by the three principal institutions concerned with sociological methodology: SRM (Sociological Research Methodology) Documentation Centre at the Erasmus University of Rotterdam; the INIST (Institut de l'Information Scientifique et Technique) of the CNRS in Nancy; and Sociological Abstracts in San Diego, California, which classes the BMS among "core sociology journals".

The BMS publishes in both English and French. The AIMS reserves all rights to translation, adaptation or reproduction in any form of all material published by the BMS. The BMS also maintains an Internet listserv open to its subscribers and a free Internet mailing list for interested readers.

To submit an article for peer review and possible publication in the BMS, send either four full hardcopies, or one hardcopy and one simple ASCII text copy by email or on a diskette. The article should include title, author, contact information
(post, tel, fax, email, web), a short one-paragraph abstract with key words, and, at the end of the article, all notes, references, tables and graphics. Further instructions for authors available at our web site, or by contacting the BMS.

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

BMS - AIMS

Le BMS est une revue scientifique trimestrielle a comite de lecteurs editee par l'AIMS (Association Internationale de Methodologie Sociologique, 45 rue Linne, 75005 Paris), une organisation sans but lucratif (loi 1901). Le BMS a le numero paritaire 68812. Toute correspondance doit etre envoyee au BMS, LASMAS-CNRS, 59 rue Pouchet, 75017 Paris; tel/fax 33 1 40 51 85 19 ou tel 33 1 40 25 10 01 and fax 33 1 40 25 12 47; courrier electronique bms@ext.jussieu.fr; web http://www.ccr.jussieu.fr/bms

Le comite de redaction du BMS est compose de: Philippe Cibois (Universite d'Amiens), Karl M. van Meter (LASMAS-CNRS, Paris), Lise Mounier (LASMAS-CNRS, Caen) et Marie-Ange Schiltz (CAMS-EHESS, Paris). Le responsable de la publication est Karl M. van Meter.

Le comite de conseil scientifique du BMS est compose de: Duane F. Alwin (University of Michigan), Alain Degenne (LASMAS-CNRS, Caen), Peter Ph. Mohler (ZUMA, Mannheim) et Henry Rouanet (Universite Paris V).

Le BMS publie deux fois par an la Newsletter du Comite de recherche (RC33) "Logique et Methodologie" de l'Association Internationale de Sociologie. Le BMS est analyse par les trois grands etablissements qui s'occupent de la methodologie sociologique: l'INIST (Institut de l'Information Scientifique et Technique) du CNRS a Nancy; le "SRM (Sociological Research Methodology) Documentation Centre" a l'Universite Erasmus de Rotterdam; et Sociological Abstracts a San Diego aux Etats-Unis, qui classe le BMS parmi les "journaux clefs de la sociologie".

Le BMS publie en francais et aussi en anglais. L'AIMS se reserve tous droits de traduction, d'adaptation et de reproduction de toute matiere publiee dans le BMS. Le BMS gere sur Internet un listserv ouverte a ces abonnes et une liste de distribution gratuite ouverte a tout lecteur interesse.

Pour soumettre un article au BMS, envoyez soit quatre exemplaires sur papier, soit un exemplaire papier et une copie format texte simple en ASCII sur disquette ou par email. L'article doit comprendre le titre, l'auteur, ses coordonnees (poste, tel, fax, email, web), un court resume d'un paragraphe avec mots-clefs, et, en fin d'article, tous les notes, references, tableaux et graphiques. Plus d'information est disponible sur notre site web, ou en contactant le BMS.
I don't know what the fuss is about litigation research. I have done about four years of consistent research for a law firm using litig. res. One must use the best of survey research methodology and other research approaches to bring about and present the research for the client's case. Ultimately the opposition will bring forth their experts to challenge whatever they can to refute the research results and support their case.

Deciding on the methodology is no different than in any other research situation. It requires an understanding of the problem, a determination of the best (and often cost-effective) way of obtaining the data, and the like.

The field is a legitimate one using scientific principles and applications, and is part of the conversations I've shared with AAPOR members over the past 40 years.
We want to thank Robert Godfrey for calling this article to the attention of AAPOR members. For those of you who went to read it, we want to set the record straight on one issue covered in the article.

Although we have established ourselves as a leader in Internet-based market research, we do not -- contrary to the contention in the article -- conduct our research entirely online. We continue to use telephone, in-person and mail surveys and in-person focus groups to meet the needs of our clients.

Jonathan W. Siegel
Harris Interactive

-------- Original Text --------

From: "Robert Godfrey" <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>, on 1/26/00 2:55 PM:

AAPORNET,

Did I miss something in the earlier postings on internet political polling or is this new information to everyone?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

--------------
Pollster Sheds Old Ways
http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,33800,00.html?tw=wn20000124
The Harris Poll won't be calling people up on the phone to query presidential voters anymore. The Internet is the only way to go now. By Lakshmi Chaudhry.

Pollster Sheds Old Ways
by Lakshmi Chaudhry

3:00 a.m. 24.Jan.2000 PST
The Harris Poll, one of the oldest names in the political survey business, is throwing phone books out the window and going fully online for the 2000 campaign.

Harris is the first company to rely entirely on the Internet in the high-stakes game of predicting election outcomes. Polling online has been considered particularly risky because of the thorny issues involved in using Internet samples to extrapolate results for the general US population.

But political pollsters claim Internet surveys are quick, cheap, and - gasp! - accurate.

Harris will be offering comprehensive polling at the national and state levels beginning in June, said Election 2000 director Jonathan Seigel. Also, Harris will conduct three pre-election polls in all 50
states this fall, including state and national "Outcome 2000" polls to be conducted two days before Election Day in November.

And all these surveys will be conducted entirely over the Internet using samples culled from a database of 5 million respondents.

Traditionally, polling firms get a list of residential phone numbers and dial at random to generate a statistically valid sample, said George Terhanian, vice president of Internet Research. The first six digits of a telephone number (area code and prefix) are selected to allow for every region to be well represented, while the remaining four digits are dialed at random.

"The problem is that there is no such registry [of email addresses] on the Internet, which makes it difficult to get random samples," Terhanian said.

And the rules on the Internet discourage unsolicited mass emailing which is considered spam, he said.

Harris resolved this problem by building a database of 5 million "cooperative respondents," or people who have agreed to be surveyed on a regular basis.

Terhanian said the company built its database through partnerships with television shows, Internet access companies like Excite, and online advertising agencies. For example, a person signing up for free email can say whether or not they want participate in online surveys, he said.

But political pollsters are skeptical about drawing a sample from a pre-existing database.

"There is a pre-selection bias because your sample is based on people who've agreed to be part of panel," said Mark Allen, a Republican pollster with Market Strategies. "It's not random. It's self-directed."

But the larger problem with online polling is getting statistically accurate results, experts say. A 1999 Jupiter Communications study says only 48 percent of all Americans had Internet access at home. The average Net user also looks nothing like the average American.

"They're just too white, too rich, and too male," Allen said.

And the demographic disparity is particularly worrisome in older segments of the population, who are also more likely to vote. "If you look at the general US population, 17 percent are 65 or older, but that group is only 6 percent on the Net," said Terhanian.

Harris says it can adjust for such discrepancies through "weighting." The solution is to oversample those segments of the population that are underrepresented online. "We give less weight to the answers of typical Net users" and more weight to the answers of people who are less typical, said Terhanian.

The Harris methodology, however, has its fair share of critics.
"What they do is take some poor black person who happens to be on the Internet and count him 10 times," University of Pennsylvania communications professor W. Russell Neuman said. "It's taking a sample of convenience and using statistical controls to make it more representative."

Weighting can have an impact, but there will always be people who are not represented, Allen said.

Harris defends its techniques by pointing to the results. For the past two years, the company has been conducting parallel Internet and telephone surveys, asking the same question at the same time, Terhanian said. "And we've found few, if any, differences in the information."

The company suffered a major embarrassment during the 1998 elections when it incorrectly predicted the gubernatorial race in Mississippi. Seigel admits Internet surveys are less effective in Southern states with large rural black populations. "That's why we're not doing polls in every state," he said.

But Harris is confident that it has fixed the problems that caused the 1998 snafu, and will not be conducting parallel phone surveys to ensure accuracy in 2000.

Harris is one of the few polling firms to work entirely online. Most of the other big names in polling, including Gallup and Roper, have stayed away from the Internet due to sampling problems.

And that's why Harris' competitor Intersurvey, which is also an online polling firm, collects its samples the old-fashioned way - over the telephone.

"We select people through random-digit dialing and then provide them with WebTV," Intersurvey CEO Doug Rivers said. "This way we don't miss people who are not computer users."

The company provides all respondents with equipment - even those with computers at home - and sends them questions via email.

Intersurvey and Harris Interactive are betting that the future of polling is on the Internet because it's getting more difficult to get a representative sample even with phone interviews, Neuman said.

Most polling firms tend to call between 6-9 p.m. to maximize the breadth of their sample. "People don't want to spend five to 20 minutes answering questions during dinner time," Neuman said. "They're getting tired of it."

That's why response rates have declined steadily from about 80 percent to 30 percent over the past decade, he said.

Not only is an Internet survey less intrusive, it's also quick. Intersurvey will conduct an instant poll following the State of the Union address for CBS News next week. Rivers said the results will be available within 30 minutes.
And without interviewer costs it becomes a lot cheaper for the client, he added.

But for now, most party and candidate pollsters are still reluctant to go entirely online.

Allen, the Republican party pollster, admits Internet surveys are attractive, but does not recommend them as a solitary source. "I may use them to get a quick take on an ad or a slogan," he said. "But I have not seen anyone put all their energies into doing just online polling."

"It's kind of hard for people to make the jump. It's going to take a major educational effort," Harris director Seigel admitted.

The initial reluctance may also disappear as more households get online. "Right now, it's too early to go entirely online," Neuman said. "Harris is pushing the envelope. But you have to give them credit for bravely going ahead."

>From drivers@intersurvey.com Mon Jan 31 11:43:13 2000
Received: from nt-exchange.intersurvey.com ([63.86.24.2])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id LAA18174 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 11:43:11 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <1502f623f798dc7d5afdab4c1aea0d9b3895e596@inter-survey.com>
From: Doug Rivers <drivers@intersurvey.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Re[2]: Census Does the Super Bowl
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 11:42:25 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"

More questions, which I'll do my best to answer.

1) RESPONSE RATES. I, too, would like to achieve a higher response rate than our current 56% and we are experimenting with some different procedures with the objective of raising the response rate about 60%. You don't state the nature of your study (Was it a RDD general population study? Who was the sponsor? Were respondents told that the study was being conducted for a government agency? etc.) The response rate we are achieving is typical of what high quality academic telephone surveys of similar populations are getting today. (For example, the 1998 NES Pilot Study reported a 41.5% response rate.)

2) COOPERATION RATES. It's difficult to calculate cooperation rates for specific demographic groups, since we do not have demographic information on respondents who do not agree to cooperate. (I don't know what you mean by an "UNWEIGHTED cooperation rate," but the sample selection probabilities in our panel do not vary much by strata and, among cooperating respondents, almost uncorrelated with any demographic characteristic that we have checked.) However, I can provide you with some panel demographics (which reflect the combination of contact and cooperation rates). Our panel is composed of about 50% computer-owing households (matching the CPS data).
African-Americans compose about 10% of our panel (compared to 12% in the adult population), while Asian Americans are slightly overrepresented. The age distribution of the panel matches the population closely, except among persons over 65 (8% of the panel vs. 16% of the population). In terms of education, 51% of the panel has a HS education or less (vs. 50% of the population), and 11% report having a graduate degree (vs. 8% of the population). I’d be interested in similar data from phone surveys.

3) INTERNET USERS. Yes, it's true that we have created Internet users and this could have some impact on behavior, which we are monitoring closely. (Every sample has a combination of new and older panel members, so the issue of panel effects is an empirical one.) However, WebTV is primarily an interactive TV experience, not an Internet experience. Furthermore, we have data on prior computer and Internet usage, so we can select subsamples of Internet users who we did not artificially create.

4) QUOTA SAMPLING. The answer is that it sometimes works, sometimes it doesn't. One place where it failed (and probability sampling performed well as usual) was the 1992 U.K. general election. Another, of course, was the 1948 U.S. presidential election.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Karen Donelan [mailto:kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu]
> Sent: Sunday, January 30, 2000 7:08 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Re[2]: Census Does the Super Bowl
>
> A question for anyone interested, not just for Doug Rivers:
>
> While I understand the advantages of a randomly selected sample, a 56% CASRO rate (AAPOR #4, roughly) isn't that grand. I did a survey with NORC that achieved much higher cooperation last year. So to start with, can we quantify the non-reponse? Might those who are unwilling to participate be the same as those people who are generally unwilling to have computers/Internet in their homes? I would be especially interested in the UNWEIGHTED cooperation among persons 65+, low income, racial/ethnic minorities and others traditionally underrepresented on-line.

> Second, I can't get past the idea that these respondents are, by definition, now "internet users"--self selected by virtue of their agreement to cooperate and introduce this technology into their homes and now capable of experiencing all of those wonderful things that make new Internet users different than other people. Does having the Internet in your home change your view of the world? In what ways? Are you not now somehow "different" than you were before?
How is this panel, now "exposed" to this technology, still representative of a national population of US adults? We may see that the selection is better than a volunteer sample--but can we really say, after the first survey, that this will yield better data?

I applaud the innovation and the attempt to do better. I remain to be convinced that this will work longer term. I am still unclear, following the exchanges about making pledges and taking vows of purity, if CBSNews is calling this the CBSNews Poll or not, and if to the general public, that distinction would matter anyway.

What I am clear about is that we all learn more when we discuss issues without engaging in personal attacks.

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

From Simonetta@artsci.com Mon Jan 31 11:48:39 2000
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id LAA22806 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 11:48:37 -0800 (PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
   id <DY00QB33>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 14:42:07 -0500
Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E6F6E8AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Another FAX "Survey"
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 14:42:04 -0500
X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
Content-Type: text/plain

Someone received this via email which reminds me of a less sophisticated (and successful) http://www.vote.com.

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
1. Should HAND GUN possession be limited to law enforcement officers?
   
   Yes   No

2. The second amendment states, "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed". Do you think this is being properly interpreted by our representative lawmakers?
   
   Yes   No

3. Do we need more laws controlling GUNS in the US?
   
   Yes   No

   If YES; these are my suggestions:

   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________

   I am a citizen of the State

   of:___________________________

   THE FOLLOWING ARE TOTALLY OPTIONAL RESPONSES

   My Name is:

   ____________________________________________________

   My e-mail address is:

   ____________________________________________________

(We will e-mail the results of this survey to those who choose to include their e-mail address)

YOUR OPINION IS NEEDED TO ENLIGHTEN OUR LAWMAKERS!
SPEAK NOW, BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!
FAX YOUR RESPONSE TO 1-900-420-2021 NOW!
Feel free to copy this message and pass it along to others who want
their voices heard on the issue of HAND GUN
CONTROL IN THE US.

Copyright, 1999. American Tabulation & Tracking Co-op, surveying the
American public on current issues and sending the results to the
President
and Members of Congress of the United States who have traditional e-mail
service so that they will understand the true feelings of the American
People.

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

I think this fascinating research, but I wonder if you could break out your
response rates for us so it would not be so confusing. What percent of the
people you contacted agreed to be in your panel? What percent of the
panelists
you send e-mail to agree to do each study within the time frame specified for
the study?

Can you tell yet if there is a fatigue effect for asking them to do so many
surveys (one a week maximum)?

This methodology has the added benefit of being a great natural experiment on
the effect of internet use. I hope you will ask a few attitudinal questions
about technology and information use to track it and then publish the
findings.

Doug Rivers wrote:
More questions, which I'll do my best to answer.

1) RESPONSE RATES. I, too, would like to achieve a higher response rate than our current 56% and we are experimenting with some different procedures with the objective of raising the response rate about 60%. You don't state the nature of your study (Was it a RDD general population study? Who was the sponsor? Were respondents told that the study was being conducted for a government agency? etc.) The response rate we are achieving is typical of what high quality academic telephone surveys of similar populations are getting today. (For example, the 1998 NES Pilot Study reported a 41.5% response rate.)

2) COOPERATION RATES. It's difficult to calculate cooperation rates for specific demographic groups, since we do not have demographic information on respondents who do not agree to cooperate. (I don't know what you mean by an "UNWEIGHTED cooperation rate," but the sample selection probabilities in our panel do not vary much by strata and, among cooperating respondents, almost uncorrelated with any demographic characteristic that we have checked.) However, I can provide you with some panel demographics (which reflect the combination of contact and cooperation rates). Our panel is composed of about 50% computer-owning households (matching the CPS data). African-Americans compose about 10% of our panel (compared to 12% in the adult population), while Asian Americans are slightly overrepresented. The age distribution of the panel matches the population closely, except among persons over 65 (8% of the panel vs. 16% of the population). In terms of education, 51% of the panel has a HS education or less (vs. 50% of the population), and 11% report having a graduate degree (vs. 8% of the population). I'd be interested in similar data from phone surveys.

3) INTERNET USERS. Yes, it's true that we have created Internet users and this could have some impact on behavior, which we are monitoring closely. (Every sample has a combination of new and older panel members, so the issue of panel effects is an empirical one.) However, WebTV is primarily an interactive TV experience, not an Internet experience. Furthermore, we have data on prior computer and Internet usage, so we can select subsamples of Internet users who we did not artificially create.

4) QUOTA SAMPLING. The answer is that it sometimes works, sometimes it doesn't. One place where it failed (and probability sampling performed well as usual) was the 1992 U.K. general election. Another, of course, was the 1948 U.S. presidential election.
A question for anyone interested, not just for Doug Rivers:

While I understand the advantages of a randomly selected sample, a 56% CASRO rate (AAPOR #4, roughly) isn't that grand. I did a survey with NORC that achieved much higher cooperation last year. So to start with, can we quantify the non-response? Might those who are unwilling to participate be the same as those people who are generally unwilling to have computers/Internet in their homes? I would be especially interested in the UNWEIGHTED cooperation among persons 65+, low income, racial/ethnic minorities and others traditionally underrepresented on-line.

Second, I can't get past the idea that these respondents are, by definition, now "Internet users"--self selected by virtue of their agreement to cooperate and introduce this technology into their homes and now capable of experiencing all of those wonderful things that make new Internet users different than other people. Does having the Internet in your home change your view of the world? In what ways? Are you not now somehow "different" than you were before?

How is this panel, now "exposed" to this technology, still representative of a national population of US adults? We may see that the selection is better than a volunteer sample--but can we really say, after the first survey, that this will yield better data?

I applaud the innovation and the attempt to do better. I remain to be convinced that this will work longer term. I am still unclear, following the exchanges about making pledges and taking vows of purity, if CBSNews is calling this the CBSNews Poll or not, and if to the general public, that distinction would matter anyway.

What I am clear about is that we all learn more when we discuss issues without engaging in personal attacks.

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

--

Monica Wolford mwolford@hers.com
Dear friends in the public opinion community,

There will be a memorial celebration of the life and scholarship of Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., a distinguished Professor of Political Science and former Director of the Institute for Social Inquiry and the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut. This tribute will be held on Thursday, February 10, 2000 at 3PM at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT

Please contact the Roper Center for directions if you wish to attend.
Telephone: 860-486-4440

A fellowship has been established and anyone wishing to contribute may send donations to:
The Everett Carll Ladd, Jr. Fellowship in American Politics
University of Connecticut Foundation
2131 Hillside Road, U-206
Storrs, CT 06269-3206.

Thank you,

Lois Timms-Ferrara

Lois Timms-Ferrara
Associate Director
I have been trying for years to convince Handgun Control, Inc. that frugging is a no-no. They apparently believe that their mission is pure and so their methods beyond question. This "survey" is undoubtedly a large-scale frugging campaign. Question: does it conclude with an invitation to send a contribution to handgun Control?

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Someone received this via email which reminds me of a less sophisticated (and successful) http://www.vote.com.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
> Please Help Us With This 'Hand Gun Control Survey'
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
> In his recent State of the Union address, President Clinton has proposed new HAND GUN CONTROL LAWS. We will contact 5,000,000 Americans and present the results of this Survey to Congress as soon as it is complete. We need your input!
> To have your voice heard on the issue of HAND GUN CONTROL IN THE US, you must be at least 18 years old and do/understand the following:
> Print this message, circle your responses, and FAX your survey to 1-900-420-2021. A charge of $9.95 for the first minute or fraction thereof, and $3.95 for each additional minute or fraction thereof will appear on your local phone bill to pay for the survey. The first 10 to 12 seconds of the call will not be billed to you, and your fax will not start until the message that plays during that 10 to 12 seconds has ended. Your billing will begin when your call connects to
1. Should HAND GUN possession be limited to law enforcement officers?
   (Circle your response)
   Yes  No

2. The second amendment states, "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed". Do you think this is being properly interpreted by our representative lawmakers?
   (Circle your response)
   Yes  No

3. Do we need more laws controlling GUNS in the US?
   (Circle your response)
   Yes  No

   If YES; these are my suggestions:
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

   I am a citizen of the State of:___________________________

   THE FOLLOWING ARE TOTALLY OPTIONAL RESPONSES
   My Name is:
   __________________________________________________
   My e-mail address is:
   __________________________________________________

   (We will e-mail the results of this survey to those who choose to include their e-mail address)

   YOUR OPINION IS NEEDED TO ENLIGHTEN OUR LAWMAKERS!
   SPEAK NOW, BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!
   FAX YOUR RESPONSE TO 1-900-420-2021 NOW!

Feel free to copy this message and pass it along to others who want their voices heard on the issue of HAND GUN CONTROL IN THE US.

Copyright, 1999. American Tabulation & Tracking Co-op, surveying the American public on current issues and sending the results to the President and Members of Congress of the United States who have traditional e-mail service so that they will understand the true feelings of the American
In don't think this has anything to do with Handgun Control, Inc., except that the solicitation is worded in such a way as to make the reader think that it comes from them.

These phony fax solicitations are being put out by sleazy operators who select issues likely to be of great importance to certain groups.

While the words "Handgun Control" are used repeatedly, you don't see "Handgun Control, Inc." anywhere, since that would leave the scam artists open to legal action.

Handgun Control, Inc. is just as much a victim of these scams as the people who fall for the pitch and are bilked.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Jeanne Anderson wrote:
> I have been trying for years to convince Handgun Control, Inc. that frugging is a no-no. They apparently believe that their mission is pure and so their methods beyond question. This "survey" is undoubtedly a large-scale frugging campaign. Question: does it conclude with an invitation to send a contribution to handgun Control?
Leo Simonetta wrote:

Someone received this via email which reminds me of a less sophisticated (and successful) http://www.vote.com.

In his recent State of the Union address, President Clinton has proposed new HAND GUN CONTROL LAWS. We will contact 5,000,000 Americans and present the results of this Survey to Congress as soon as it is complete. We need your input!

To have your voice heard on the issue of HAND GUN CONTROL IN THE US, you must be at least 18 years old and do/understand the following:

Please print this message, circle your responses, and FAX your survey to 1-900-420-2021. A charge of $9.95 for the first minute or fraction thereof, and $3.95 for each additional minute or fraction thereof will appear on your local phone bill to pay for the survey. The first 10 to 12 seconds of the call will NOT BE BILLED TO YOU, and your fax will not start until the message that plays during that 10 to 12 seconds has ended. Your billing will begin when your call connects to our fax facility.

(Circle your response)

1. Should HAND GUN possession be limited to law enforcement officers?
   Yes  No

2. The second amendment states, "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed". Do you think this is being properly interpreted by our representative lawmakers?
   Yes  No

3. Do we need more laws controlling GUNS in the US?
   Yes  No

If YES; these are my suggestions:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

I am a citizen of the State of: __________________________
THE FOLLOWING ARE TOTALLY OPTIONAL RESPONSES

My Name is:

__________________________________________________________

My e-mail address is:

__________________________________________________________

(We will e-mail the results of this survey to those who choose to include their e-mail address)

YOUR OPINION IS NEEDED TO ENLIGHTEN OUR LAWMAKERS!
SPEAK NOW, BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!
FAX YOUR RESPONSE TO 1-900-420-2021 NOW!

Feel free to copy this message and pass it along to others who want their voices heard on the issue of HAND GUN

CONTROL IN THE US.

Copyright, 1999. American Tabulation & Tracking Co-op, surveying the American public on current issues and sending the results to the President and Members of Congress of the United States who have traditional e-mail service so that they will understand the true feelings of the American People.

--

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

From caplanjr@bellsouth.net Mon Jan 31 14:27:48 2000
Received: from mail3.mia.bellsouth.net (mail3.mia.bellsouth.net [205.152.16.15])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id OAA05943 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 14:27:45 -0800 (PST)
Received: from bellsouth (ads1-61-115-26.mia.bellsouth.net [208.61.115.26])
by mail3.mia.bellsouth.net (3.3.5alt/0.75.2) with SMTP id RAA24121 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 17:25:17 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <005501bf6c3a$650fcae0$5393fea9@net.JRC>
Reply-To: "caplanjr@bellsouth" <caplanjr@iname.com>
From: "caplanjr@bellsouth" <caplanjr@bellsouth.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA922E6F6@AS_SERVER>
<38962958.DB5013EB@attglobal.net>
Subject: Re: Another FAX "Survey"
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 17:27:38 -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 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
At $10 a pop, why bother asking for a donation?

Jim Caplan,
Miami
----- Original Message -----
From: "Jeanne Anderson" <ande271@attglobal.net>

> I have been trying for years to convince Handgun Control, Inc. that
> frugging
> is a no-no. They apparently believe that their mission is pure and so
> their
> methods beyond question. This "survey" is undoubtedly a large-scale
> frugging campaign. Question: does it conclude with an invitation to send
> a
> contribution to handgun Control?
> > Leo Simonetta wrote:
> > > Someone received this via email which reminds me of a less
> > >
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>><<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
> > > Please Help Us With This 'Hand Gun Control Survey'
> > >
> > > In his recent State of the Union address, President Clinton has proposed
> > > new HAND GUN CONTROL LAWS. We will
> > > contact 5,000,000 Americans and present the results of this Survey to
> > > Congress as soon as it is complete. We need
> > > your input!
> > >
> > > To have your voice heard on the issue of HAND GUN CONTROL IN THE US, you
> > > must be at least 18 years old and do/understand the following:
> > >
> > > Please print this message, circle your responses, and FAX your survey to
> > > 1-900-420-2021. A charge of $9.95 for the
> > > first minute or fraction thereof, and $3.95 for each additional minute
> > > or fraction thereof will appear on your local phone
> > > bill to pay for the survey. The first 10 to 12 seconds of the call will
> > > NOT BE BILLED TO YOU, and your fax will not start
> > > until the message that plays during that 10 to 12 seconds has ended.
> > > Your billing will begin when your call connects to
> > > our fax facility.
> > >
> > > (Circle your response)
> > >
> > > 1. Should HAND GUN possession be limited to law enforcement officers?
> > >
> > > Yes  No
> > >
> > > 2. The second amendment states, "A well regulated militia being
> > > necessary to the security of a free state, the
> > > right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed". Do
> > > you think this is being properly
> > > interpreted by our representative lawmakers?
3. Do we need more laws controlling GUNS in the US?
   Yes  No
   If YES; these are my suggestions:

                       __________________________________________________
                       __________________________________________________
                       __________________________________________________

I am a citizen of the State of:___________________________

THE FOLLOWING ARE TOTALLY OPTIONAL RESPONSES

My Name is:

My e-mail address is:

(We will e-mail the results of this survey to those who choose to include their e-mail address)

YOUR OPINION IS NEEDED TO ENLIGHTEN OUR LAWMAKERS!
SPEAK NOW, BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!
FAX YOUR RESPONSE TO 1-900-420-2021 NOW!

Feel free to copy this message and pass it along to others who want their voices heard on the issue of HAND GUN CONTROL IN THE US.

Copyright, 1999. American Tabulation & Tracking Co-op, surveying the American public on current issues and sending the results to the President and Members of Congress of the United States who have traditional e-mail service so that they will understand the true feelings of the American People.

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

>From s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu Mon Jan 31 15:37:56 2000
Received: from notesmail1.csuohio.edu (csu-mail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.57]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id PAA25651 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jan 2000 15:37:54 -0800 (PST)
Has there been a posted Obit for Ev.? I don't recall seeing one on aapornet.

I would like to share a few thoughts and info in reply to some...

- On last polls being always better or explaining discrepancies: this seems to be a myth (see last POQ); unless an important campaign event can explain late shifts, no such last minute shift is likely to have occurred, and most probably not when vote intentions have been stable throughout the campaign.

- On prices and affordability: I checked in Canada for polls conducted for CBC: pollsters who use quotas do not charge less than those who use probability sampling. The main reason for differences in prices may be found in differences in modes of data collection and in the pricing of telephone communications in Europe.
- On quotas vs 50% response rates in prob. polls: Do we want to say that 50% response rate is not better than 20% (or God knows) response rates in quota polls?

- One quota poll may be better by chance, but on the long run quota polls are not. We conducted a study of all the polls conducted in the last Canadian federal election which shows that quota polls bring more error and show more variance in estimation than probability polls (Canadian public policy, last issue, sorry it is in French but it has an abstract in English).

- In France, they use quota polls BUT they do not speak about any so-called margin of error when they do so.

- anecdote: In France, they use quota polls based on occupation as one of the determinant of quota cells. At one point, they realised that they had a very proportion of "concierge" in their samples because they constituted an easy way to fill the quotas for men working in the services...

--

Claire Durand
durandc@socio.umontreal.ca
http://alize.ere.umontreal.ca/~durandc

dep. de sociologie, Université de Montréal,
C.P. 6128, succ. centre-ville,
Montreal, Quebec, H3C 3J7
Doug,

A very interesting discussion going on.....

I am curious as to whether your panel members are limited to those with WebTV access. I noticed below that you referred to the panelists "WebTV box." Is this something you give them or something they have had to purchase on their own. I'm assuming it was the former, but I thought perhaps you knew something about the actual consumer "use" of WebTV. Anyway, thanks for continuing the dialog with all of "us." This really is a very interesting endeavor.

Best Regards,

John

At 10:12 AM 1/30/00 -0800, you wrote:
> We plan on presenting a paper at the AAPOR meetings with a detailed description of the design and the results of methodological experiments that we have been conducting. Kathy Frankovic responded with some specific details about the CBS study, but here are a few quick answers to your questions about the InterSurvey panel:
>
>1) To date, InterSurvey panel recruitment has been handled by NORC using a complex design. We normally use the probabilities of selection to weight subsamples from the panel. The initial response rate, using the CASRO definition (roughly, contact rate x cooperation rate), is about 56%.
>
>2) All studies, including the CBS one that you ask about, use randomly selected subsamples from the panel, not self-selection. In rereading our marketing materials, I realize that this isn't explicitly stated. (The thought of using self-selection at the final stage never occurred to us!)
>
>3) Your questions about panels are good ones. In terms of sampling, there is no fundamental methodological difference between InterSurvey and other high-quality, randomly recruited panels. The difference is that interviewing is initiated by sending an e-mail message to the selected panel member and that the interview is conducted using a Web browser. Their device automatically downloads e-mail and turns on a red light on the WebTV box, notifying them that a message has arrived. This means that we don't have to call or mail panel members--much faster than mail and much less intrusive than calling. It also means that we can interview outside of normal interviewing hours (e.g., after 10 pm, as was required for the CBS survey). Furthermore, we can use visual content, including TV-quality video, as part of our surveys. We are trying to combine the Web with general population probability sampling.
>
>I hope this is responsive to your questions.
>
>Doug

>----- Original Message ----- 
>From: "Tom Duffy" <tduffy@macroint.com>
>To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
>Sent: Friday, January 28, 2000 6:42 PM
I found Intersurvey's idea intriguing, but then I looked at the example survey and their home page. According to the page given below, 721 adults responded to the CBS/Intersurvey poll. However, I didn't see an explanation as to how these 721 responses were obtained: was this a randomly selected sample of the panel, with a decent non-response conversion protocol? What was the interviewing "window"? What was the response rate? Or was this a self-selected sample of a frame of 30,000 people? One or two additional lines of info at the bottom of the page would help some of us understand what these polls really mean.

Also, though a lot of work evidently went into recruiting a panel with the objective of having it be a "random" sample of Americans who are willing to trade poll participation for free access and hardware, are the probabilities of selection to this panel known? And are they used when weighting the data? Was any analysis conducted on the potential bias resulting from the above "trade" (simultaneous RDD "control" samples, cognitive testing)? And why is this panel methodologically superior to other panels that start with random recruitment? A panel is a panel, even if it is as large as 30,000 or more.

It would help to have this info in the methodological sections of the Intersurvey page. Otherwise, it is difficult to believe Intersurvey's claim that this methodology "makes existing research methodologies obsolete" (http://www.intersurvey.com).

Tom Duffy
Macro International Inc.
New York, NY
tduffy@macoint.com
"The means by which we live have outdistanced the ends for which we live. Our scientific power has outrun our spiritual power. We have guided missiles and misguided men." - Martin Luther King Jr.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 20:11:13 EST
From: Rossi Hassad <Gradnet@AOL.COM>
Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
Subject: Re: research integrity

HIVtreatment.com

Rossi A. Hassad, MPH, Ph.D. Tel: 212-244-4266
E-mail: gradnet@aol.com

Dr. David Ho
Scientific Director
The Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center
New York

Dear Dr. Ho:

Re: Efficacy of Protease Inhibitors and Associated Quality of Life

Since your debut as "Time man of the year 1996" for your efforts in formulating the "cocktail therapy" for treatment of HIV/AIDS-related conditions, the public has heard little from you with respect to the above-mentioned subject.

Meanwhile, qualitative reports along with meta-analyses of data from other sources, appear inconclusive on the efficacy of the "cocktail therapy" in
particular, the protease inhibitor component.

I have noted your financial association with the pharmaceutical industry, and I consider this a potential conflict of interest with implications for reporting of research data.

In the interest of public health and safety, I am herewith requesting an immediate audit by the NIH and CDC, of your sources of funding, research protocols and findings related to AIDS/HIV treatment.

I look forward to your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
R.A. Hassad

CC: NIH, CDC, Pharmaceutical Companies

******