

=====
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: July 1999 archive - one BIG message

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

Turning this into individual messages that ASU's Listserv software can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits.

New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly, and I have converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to the present.

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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9907.

Part 1/1, total size 647386 bytes:

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

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Jun 30 17:31:43 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id RAA07750 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 17:31:42 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp36.vgernet.net [205.219.186.136])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA28991

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 21:05:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <377AB718.AA895351@jwdp.com>

Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 20:32:24 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Weighting Procedures Question

References: <19990630194901.4149.rocketmail@web305.yahoo.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Weighting only changes the proportions of the strata to match those in a target population. Inference depends only on the probability of selection, which in turn depends only on the sample sizes of the subgroups, and on the weights, which are ratios and independent of absolute size, so the actual number that one projects to is completely arbitrary and irrelevant to any statistical analysis of the results.

That said, there are only two numbers which make sense as projection

targets:

1) the sample size, which preserves the "feel" for the validity of the results for a properly designed and executed probability sample, and is therefore the preferred weighting target.

2) the population size, most often used to show how many actual people (or whatever one is sampling) the results apply to in the overall population, as in your second example.

Jan Werner

jwerner@jwdp.com

Isabelle Spencer wrote:

>

> I have a question regarding weighting procedures in survey sampling.

> I took a class in which the teacher explained that when weighting, "n"

> does not change. For example:

>

> # of Survey Respondents Actual Pop. # weight assigned

> 50 women 40 women .8

> 50 men 60 men 1.2

>

> This makes sense. However, I need to understand how this differs from

> the following weighting procedure:

>

> At work, we had a survey that used a 4 segment weighting procedure to

> weight and project survey returns to reflect the actual population.

> Please see example below:

> Unweighted Census Pop Weighting

> HH return #HH Factor

> Brooklyn County

> Affluent Segment 86 115,708 1345.441

> Middle segment 109 106,880 980.550

> Senior 94 89,910 956.489

> Mass 405 490,529 1211.182

>

> Here after you use the weighting factor, "n" does change. Am I

> confusing two concepts or weighting procedures? Can someone please

> explain the difference?

>

> _____

> Do You Yahoo!?

> Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com> From

>mcohen@inet.ed.gov Thu Jul 1 08:42:51 1999

Received: from inet.ed.gov (inet.ed.gov [165.224.217.64])

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

id IAA10349 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 08:42:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (mcohen@localhost)

by inet.ed.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA04546

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 11:42:58 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1999 11:42:58 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Michael P. Cohen" <mcohen@inet.ed.gov>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Weighting Procedures Question

In-Reply-To: <s77a5cdf.088@langate.gsu.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907011126500.4018-100000@inet.ed.gov>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Wed, 30 Jun 1999, Gary T. Henry wrote:

[snip]

> The difference in our comments has mainly to do with the role of the
> stratification at the time of design, I believe and perhaps terminology.
> Warren assumes that the stratification was done during design and is
> correct if that is the case. I made the assumption that they were being
> suggested as a post hoc procedure.
> If the strata were not used in the design phase then I usually refer
> to that as poststratification weighting and is done for a number of
> issue but mainly differential nonresponse. If the weights are based on
> disproportionate stratified sampling, then they are probability
> weights, done for reduction in sampling error.

There are really three cases to distinguish:

(1) stratification built into the survey design

(2) post-stratification planned in advance

(3) ad hoc post-stratification.

The reason one would do (2) instead of or in addition to (1) is that one can

use variables not available at the design stage (e.g. variables collected in the survey). (3) is usually done as a "fix" to some unanticipated problem. (2) is done for a number of reasons but mainly to reduce variance.

Michael P. Cohen phone 202-219-1917
National Center for Education Statistics fax 202-219-1736
555 New Jersey Avenue NW #402 Internet mcohen@inet.ed.gov
Washington DC 20208-5654 USA

>From karl_feld@usa.net Thu Jul 1 08:55:34 1999

Received: from aw163.netaddress.usa.net (aw163.netaddress.usa.net [204.68.24.63])

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

id IAA13825 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 08:55:21 -0700 (PDT)

Received: (qmail 14648 invoked by uid 60001); 1 Jul 1999 15:54:08 -0000

Message-ID: <19990701155408.14647.qmail@aw163.netaddress.usa.net>

Received: from 204.68.24.63 by aw163 via web-mailer() on Thu Jul 1 15:54:08 GMT 1999

Date: 1 Jul 99 08:54:08 MST

From: Karl Feld <karl_feld@usa.net>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Looking for the Editor of POQ

X-Mailer: USANET web-mailer ()

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

After much calling and research, I'm still unable to find contact information for Vincent Price or the current editor of POQ. I have a manuscript to submit and discuss, but I can't find the appropriate person with number and address. =

This information is NOT inside the cover of POQ.

Can anyone help?

Karl

Get free e-mail and a permanent address at <http://www.amexmail.com/?A=3D1=>

>From daves@startribune.com Thu Jul 1 09:12:00 1999

Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com [132.148.80.211])

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

id JAA18109 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 09:11:58 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id LAA05613; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 11:19:12 -0500

Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V4.2)

id xma005356; Thu, 1 Jul 99 11:18:55 -0500

Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 01 Jul 1999 11:07:45 -0600

Message-Id: <s77b4c01.010@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Thu, 01 Jul 1999 11:07:18 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Looking for the Editor of POQ

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

In case Vince isn't online at the moment ...

Public Opinion Quarterly Telephone: (215) 573-1966
The Annenberg Public Policy Center Facsimile: (215) 573-1962
of the University of Pennsylvania
3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 POQ@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

Rob Daves

>From kagay@nytimes.com Thu Jul 1 09:12:24 1999

Received: from gatekeeper.nytimes.com (gatekeeper.nytimes.com
[199.181.175.201])

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

id JAA18485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 09:12:23 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mailgate.nytimes.com (mailgate.nytimes.com [170.149.200.253])

by gatekeeper.nytimes.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA27728

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 12:06:04 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from emailname.nytimes.com ([170.149.33.49])

by mailgate.nytimes.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA27162

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 12:13:10 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990701121128.00a1328c@mailgate.nytimes.com>

X-Sender: kagay@mailgate.nytimes.com

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Thu, 01 Jul 1999 12:11:28 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Mike Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com>

Subject: Re: Looking for the Editor of POQ

In-Reply-To: <19990701155408.14647.qmail@aw163.netaddress.usa.net>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Vincent Price

P.O.Q. Editor

Annenberg Public Policy Center

University of Pennsylvania

3620 Walnut Street

Philadelphia, PA 19104-6220

(215) 573-1966

vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

At 08:54 AM 7/1/99 MST, you wrote:

>After much calling and research, I'm still unable to find contact
>information for Vincent Price or the current editor of POQ. I have a
>manuscript to
submit
>and discuss, but I can't find the appropriate person with number and
address.
>This information is NOT inside the cover of POQ.

>

>Can anyone help?

>

>Karl

>

>

>Get free e-mail and a permanent address at <http://www.amexmail.com/?A=1>

>

>

>From rstuefen@usd.edu Thu Jul 1 09:15:19 1999

Received: from sunburst.usd.edu (sunburst.usd.edu [192.55.228.48])

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

id JAA19811 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 09:15:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from brb015 (bus6.bus.usd.edu [206.176.1.6])

by sunburst.usd.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA06311

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 11:15:14 -0500 (CDT)

Reply-To: <rstuefen@usd.edu>

From: "Randall M. Stuefen" <rstuefen@usd.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Weighting Procedures Question

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1999 11:15:13 -0500

Message-ID: <000001bec3dc\$e795fae0\$0601b0ce@brb015.bus.usd.edu>

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 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

There are a number of demographic questions common to most general population surveys and yet I doubt that all demographics receive the same amount of attention when it is time to add the weights. Is the under representation of the younger demographic as important as the gender representation, income, race or education? One might say that it depends on the study and the question but others may question if it depends on the sponsor or the analysts personal bias. I think both views lend support for seeing the outcomes presented unweighted with demographic concerns pointed out along side the weighted findings.

>From mcohen@inet.ed.gov Thu Jul 1 09:57:21 1999

Received: from inet.ed.gov (inet.ed.gov [165.224.217.64])

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

id JAA02186 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 09:57:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (mcohen@localhost)

by inet.ed.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA08514;

Thu, 1 Jul 1999 12:57:18 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1999 12:57:18 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Michael P. Cohen" <mcohen@inet.ed.gov>

To: "Randall M. Stuefen" <rstuefen@usd.edu>

cc: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Weighting Procedures Question

In-Reply-To: <000001bec3dc5e795fae050601b0ce@brb015.bus.usd.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907011242370.6890-100000@inet.ed.gov>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Thu, 1 Jul 1999, Randall M. Stuefen wrote:

> There are a number of demographic questions common to most general
> population surveys and yet I doubt that all demographics receive the
> same amount of attention when it is time to add the weights. Is the
> under representation of the younger demographic as important as the
> gender representation, income, race or education? One might say that
> it depends on the study and the question but others may question if it
> depends on the sponsor or the analysts personal bias. I think both
> views lend support for seeing the outcomes presented unweighted with
> demographic concerns pointed out along side the weighted findings.
>

Generally age, race/ethnicity, and sex are used, in my experience. Income and education, though they may be relevant, are not as "solid" in their measurement and are less frequently used. In my 20 years experience, I have honestly never run into a situation where the decision was made on other than statistical grounds.

Not weighting (really equal weighting) should not be considered "neutral"

-- it simply locks in what was already there.

Michael P. Cohen phone 202-219-1917
National Center for Education Statistics fax 202-219-1736
555 New Jersey Avenue NW #402 Internet mcohen@inet.ed.gov
Washington DC 20208-5654 USA

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Jul 1 13:17:08 1999

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

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

id NAA14854 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 13:17:07 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000625782@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 01 Jul 1999 16:15:34 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.183]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP

(Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2448.0)

id NMFHGG39; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 16:17:43 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BEC3DB.36651180@mark-bri>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 16:03:09 -0400

Message-Id: <01BEC3DB.36651180@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Internet polling

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1999 16:03:07 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

This item was sent to me-don't know the source, but may be of interest = to

AAPOR:

Harris Black: Net changing polling=20

A major national market research firm said Friday it believes the = Internet will bring a "radical transformation" to the polling industry = during the next Presidential campaign. Jonathan Siegel, director of the = Washington, DC-based Harris Poll Election 2000 said, "Our intent is to = show the Internet is replacement technology for telephone research in = the election arena." Siegel said his firm, Harris Black International, = will conduct online surveys between now and next November, gauging = voters' preferences in the Presidential and major state races and as = many as 100 Congressional contests. "We are going to be able to do those = more often, and for far less money, and with levels of accuracy as good = as anything else out there," he told CBS.MarketWatch.com. Critics contend using the Internet will result in a less representative = sample of the United States than that from telephone surveys. Siegel = disagrees. "Forty-five percent of the population has access to the = Internet. And that 45 percent looks a good deal like the rest of = America," he said. "It's no longer just white males who are well to do." = The director of Harris Poll Election 2000 said, "We're old enough to = remember when people had the same criticism about telephone research vs. = face-to-face. We don't expect to persuade people. We'll just let them = judge for themselves." The results will be posted, beginning next month, =

on a Web site which is under development. In the poll's first survey, conducted in mid-June and including 12,868 = adults 18 and over, Siegel said both Texas Governor George W. Bush and = Elizabeth Dole defeated Vice President Al Gore and former Senator Bill = Bradley. The research study found Bush would beat Gore by 55 percent to = 35 percent and Bradley by 56 percent to 29 percent. Dole holds a = somewhat narrower 49 percent to 36 percent lead over Gore and a 49 = percent to 32 percent lead over Bradley.

Mark Richards

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Jul 1 13:21:34 1999

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

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

id NAA16570 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 13:21:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000625795@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 01 Jul 1999 16:19:58 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.183]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2448.0)

id NMFHGGP3; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 16:22:05 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BEC3DB.D22A6340@mark-bri>; Thu, 1 Jul 1999 16:07:30 -0400

Message-Id: <01BEC3DB.D22A6340@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Relationship between TV and internet

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1999 16:07:29 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

A friend from NBC shared this with me-may be of interest to some in = AAPOR.

From a recent Bob Wright (president NBC) speech in Chicago. (prelims = cut out).=09

...For example, it took the medium of radio 38 years before it reached = 50 million people. Television took 13 years. The personal computer 16 = years. The Internet has reached 50 million people in only four short = years. In fact, in just the last year alone, there were 8 million new = users on-line.

In 1958 we were operating in a three network industry. Today, there are = 6 broadcast networks, nearly 250 cable channels and a meteorically = expanding number of Internet web sites - all of which are vying for = people's attention. =09

Broadcast Television Has Never Been Stronger Than Right Now: Today, = the broadcast networks are being viewed in more homes than 30 years ago. = Even at a time of multiple entertainment choices, 91% of viewers were = tuned into one of the six major broadcast networks during the course of = a recent week. Though rating shares are down, network television is = still reaching as many homes today as it was three or four decades ago - = in the mornings, during primetime and late at night. More people are = watching the "Today" show in 1999 than any other time in its 40-year = history. The highest rated show on network television ("ER") is watched = in 18 million homes - the same number as the highest rated show from 30 = years ago - Rowan and Martin's "Laugh In." Finally, at a time when the = competition in late night couldn't be more fierce, "The Tonight Show = with Jay Leno" is bringing in as many viewers as Johnny Carson did = during his heyday. Maintaining these high ratings is more difficult = than ever with

the expansion in niche, or more audience specific = programming, particularly on cable. Two decades ago, if a show didn't = appeal to a wide audience, it disappeared. Today, these same programs = are becoming stars on cable. Shows like "South Park" on Comedy Central, = the "Sopranos" on HBO, "Sportscenter" on ESPN, and "The Real World" on = MTV have seeped into our popular culture. And, cable will continue to = play a valuable role in providing a myriad of options for the viewing = public - and it's one of the reasons NBC is so strongly invested in the = cable industry. But, even with cable's growth in recent years it still = can't match the reach of broadcast television. For example, the highest = rated entertainment series on cable is "Rugrats," which I'm sure many of = your kids are familiar with. However, "Rugrats" was still watched by 40% = less viewers than the lowest rated regularly scheduled show on the four = major networks - a program on the FOX network called "Brimstone", which = I imagine none of you have ever heard of. A repeat of "Saturday Night = Live" that usually appears at 2 or 3 a.m. on Sunday mornings = out-delivers the primetime ratings of all but three of the 43 cable = channels for which Nielsen provides ratings data. So, while cable's = influence is spreading, we shouldn't exaggerate its ability to reach a = large audience as effectively or efficiently as the major broadcasters.

There Are Some Things That Only Network Television Can Do: Only the = major broadcast networks can provide a shared experience that affects = our collective identity as a nation. Whether it's breaking news stories = such as the shootings in Littleton and the war in Kosovo or major TV = events like the Olympics or the final episode of "Seinfeld," only = network and local affiliates can bring millions of Americans together. = In 1996, NBC's coverage of the Olympics attracted a record 209 million = viewers making it the most-watched television event in history. The last = "Seinfeld" is

estimated to have brought together more than 100 million = people - that's two out of every five Americans. Barbara Walter's recent = interview with Monica Lewinsky on ABC attracted 70 million viewers. And, = FOX's broadcast of the Super Bowl was watched by 127 million people. = Since only network television can deliver the huge national audiences = that advertisers crave, it is no accident that the recent sales figures = for prime-time commercial slots on the upcoming fall season increased by = 13%. And, network television still remains one of the best bargains in = advertising. Network cpms, or the cost of advertising per thousand = persons or homes, are often substantially lower than many other = competing media such as the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, USA = Today, Business Week, Time and Newsweek or even highly-touted web sites = such as slate, Expedia Travel, Quicken and the Economist. In fact, it is = a third cheaper to buy advertising on NBC than in the Chicago Tribune. = Simply put, no other media can reach and influence a mass audience or = extend brand awareness as effectively and efficiently as network = television.=20

Dealing with Vast Changes in the Industry: Of course, for all the = strengths of broadcast television, the industry is rapidly changing and = our business model must change along with it. Television audiences and = market shares are declining at the same time that the cost of producing = top-flight shows is increasing. Our challenge is to ensure that every = element of network television - news, sports and entertainment -- = remains relevant to people's lives. At NBC, we have been number one for = much of the 1990s because we have never been afraid to adapt to changes = in the industry and in society. Back in the late 1980's we spent \$155 = million in start-up costs on CNBC. Today, that amount of money is a = shade below our operating profit for all of 1999. In fact, in the not = too distant future, CNBC will be earning higher profits than the NBC = network itself. MSNBC, our 24-hour news channel is one of the fastest = growing

cable networks in America and is allowing NBC to bolster our already award winning news division. During recent coverage of the shootings in Colorado and the conflict in Kosovo the number of households tuned to MSNBC soared by 80%--more than any other cable news network, including CNN. These networks further extend NBC's reach and continue to make it the best possible gateway for reaching the next generation of television viewers and consumers.

The Internet is Fundamentally Changing the Way We Do Business: Of course, you can't talk about business in the 1990s without discussing the impact of the Internet. In order to remain a prime gateway for reaching consumers, NBC, as well as all broadcasters, must adapt to the evolution of this new technology. And, at NBC, we're not just talking about the Internet; we're doing something about it. The potential for growth on the Internet is mind-boggling, as today only about one in five American households are hooked up to the web. Imagine the commercial opportunities when even half of all Americans are on-line. According to one study, the United States Internet industry is the world's 18th largest economy -- behind Switzerland and ahead of Argentina. As the evolution of the Internet continues, combined with an abundance of new broadcast, cable, and video programming, it will create an entirely new television marketplace that is more fragmented and competitive than ever before. The convergence of television and the Internet could give the viewers of the future more than a thousand different channels from which to choose. It is possible that any web site could one day be transformed into its own television network. Consider, for example, that the portal site Yahoo was recently seen by 100,000 more households than the "X-Files" on FOX. There is a true synergy between Internet companies and broadcast networks because both often have the same goals - attracting ad revenues and pursuing enhanced brand recognition. In fact,

one of the highest barriers to entry on the Internet - the difficulty in reaching a mass audience and establishing brand recognition - is one of network television's greatest strengths. No one can build and deliver a large audience like a broadcast network. For example, since we purchased Snap.com the number of average daily unique users to the web site has increased by more than 480 percent. As the Internet continues to play an even greater role in our everyday lives, it is only natural to expect that the links between broadcast networks and the web will grow.

Transformational Nature of the Internet: As a highly efficient and inexpensive communications system, the Internet will change the entire process by which we watch television, read magazines, use our home computers and go shopping. Certainly, the potential commercial opportunities on the Internet are enormous. From 1996 to 1998 estimated sales on the Internet rose more than sevenfold. And this total doesn't even include business such as brokers fees and airplane tickets. And, by the year 2003, some estimate that Internet commerce could reach \$100 billion and that the four major broadcast network's e-commerce revenues could increase from 50 to 500 million.

These figures may only scratch the surface of what is to come. To be sure, the growth of the Internet is not just about web sites or e-commerce - though they often receive the most attention - it is about changing the way businesses operate. Already some companies are performing a majority of their commercial activities on the web. In fact, today, three-quarters of commerce on the Internet is business to business. And, it is very possible that the next generation of business activity will be conducted almost exclusively on the Internet.

NBC is focused on adapting its business model with a broader and more focused Internet strategy. Seizing the potential of the Internet is

essential to maintaining NBC's strong growth and distribution patterns = and brand name recognition. Currently, NBC is in the process of forming = NBCi, which will combine many of our on-line properties and ensure that = NBC becomes a leading Internet player. Through NBCi's portal service = Snap.com we will have the seventh largest Internet site, combining = search engines, news, chat rooms, e-commerce, music, video and = classifieds. And, the site will reach more than 18 million unique users = per month. As growth on the Internet continues, networks must embrace = the opportunity to connect viewers to the Internet from television. With = our just re-launched CNBC.com, we will be able to do just that -- = directly linking a television network, namely CNBC, to a web site. = Viewers who hear about a stock on CNBC can then connect directly to = CNBC.com and do research, or even receive information about making a = trade.

In the Future, as in the Past - Content is King: This is the future = of media-with greater choices available to more homes and to more = locations within each home. Of course, with these increased = choices-those with the most recognizable brands and strongest content = will continue to stand out. Ultimately, changes in technology can only = take NBC so far. In the broadcasting industry, a network lives or dies = by the quality of its programming. Content is king. The fact is, there = is a diminishing return to increased channel choices that is very = sharply defined. People with 40 channels actually watch only about 14. = People with 60 channels watch about fifteen. People with more than 70 = channels end up watching- just about sixteen. Viewers will continue to = seek out networks with a reliable track record of producing quality = programming. Through 75 years, NBC has never lost touch with its core = mission of developing and producing the most entertaining, thought = provoking and high-quality programming that television has to offer. = It's one of the reasons why NBC remains "Must See TV" for millions of =

Americans. In addition, we will always be looking for new ways to grow = as a broadcaster. We intend on doing this by building strategic = partnerships both on-line and off, strengthening our 13 owned and = operated stations, including Chicago's own WMAQ, acquiring new broadcast = stations, increasing NBC's distribution internationally, and working = with affiliates to change the business model that today defines our = partnership. For all the talk about new technology, none of the = competitors in emerging industries can bring to bear the range and = excellence in local and national programming offered by our nation's = broadcasters. Broadcast television still offers the last universally = shared experience in America. Some broadcasters will become niche = players. Some already are. But in an era of market surplus, = fragmentation, and infinite consumer choice, NBC will continue to = provide the shared national experiences which transcend our cultural and = social divisions-to be the true broad-cast brand of network television. = Thank you. ###

Mark David Richards

>From mkshares@mcs.net Fri Jul 2 06:15:29 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id GAA16903 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 06:15:10 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P38-Chi-Dial-9.pool.mcs.net [205.253.226.38]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id IAA25476 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Fri, 2 Jul 1999 08:13:55 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <377C74AE.12D6E6D3@mcs.net>

Date: Fri, 02 Jul 1999 08:13:40 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <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: FW: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates

References: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B3B156B0@arbmex.arbitron.com>

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----8535954CDA7C544F8F390936"

-----8535954CDA7C544F8F390936

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

My understanding of how this study was conducted was that PC ownership was obtained about the household but that PC usage was obtained for the respondent.

Although 54% of households reported ownership and 29% of respondents reported using that PC at home, this does not mean that the difference represents PCs which are not in use. The study did not ask who in the household uses that PC, an important question before conclusions about usage can be made.

The release headline said "Home Use Stagnates" and the statement "ownership of a home PC does not equal usage" appeared in the release copy. We don't

know that. There may be other users.

(As an aside, although the term "PC" is used in the release, I assume this was not the precise questionnaire wording and that some allowance was made for us Mac users.)

I agree with much of the commentary so far, especially access to better hardware at work and PC fatigue at work. But this does not mean that nearly half of PCs are at home gathering dust or that they are all candidates for the Smithsonian. I can imagine that in many cases the under age 16 segment which was not included in the sample are giving them a lot of use, in some cases, so much use parent usage is precluded.

I also understand that PC usage, again, only asked of the respondent, was open end - something like "please tell me all the places you use a PC?" The respondent had to come up with "work", "library", "home", "school", etc. I think that any conclusions about home usage can only be made if home usage is specifically asked of respondents and again, of other household members.

Questions: Were multiple answers accepted? How many gave multiple responses? How hard did interviewers probe the question with "were else", "anywhere else"?

Most important, given the decline in usage, is whether the usage question was asked exactly the same way and probed exactly the same way with the same effort since 1995.

Those are my thoughts.

"Safir, Adam" wrote:

> My apologies for backing up a couple of threads-

>

> After the lively AAPORNET discussion regarding Arbitron's latest

> Pathfinder Study, I forwarded Jacquelyn Schriber's question concerning

> respondent age over to Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at

> Arbitron NewMedia (along with some of the other insightful hypotheses

> posted by AAPORNETters). Roberta just got back to me after returning

> from vacation, and her reply is attached below:

>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: McConochie, Roberta

>> Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 1999 3:34 PM

>> To: Safir, Adam

>> Subject: RE: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates

>>

>>

>> Hey Adam. Thanks for the feedback. This year, we added a special

>> study

> of children. We > talked w/ 400+ kids 8 - 15 after we interviewed a

> selected adult (16-74). The write up

>> of the kids' data will go out in July. Interesting & informative

>> results

> -- and I believe > of great interest to the AAPOR/academic communities. I

> did a review of recent lit and it > appears to me that there's a dearth

of

> probability-sample research on kids' media uses.

>> FYI, the 3 reasons I see and infer for the drop in PC owners' home
>> use
> are:
>>
>> 1. daytime PC fatigue, given the escalation of PC-dependent office
>> work 2. diminishing PC commitment especially among the newer owners
>> (given
> reduced price, and > lessened specific driving, compelling reasons for
> need/use)
>> 3. rising consumer expectations and diminishing patience -- given
>> the
> plethora of > always-on, easy access devices/services
>>
>> Also, FYI, kids home PC use does not "explain" the lack of increase
>> in the
> adult-home- > user population. That's an independent issue. Feel free
> to share some or all of this > with the AAPOR people. I'd love to
> continue the dialog.
>>
>> r
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Jacquelyn B Schriber [mailto:market.probe.la@juno.com]
>>> Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 9:16 PM
>>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>>> Cc: market.probe.la@juno.com
>>> Subject: Re: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates

>>>

>>>

>>> Hypothesis: The respondents are adults, but in many households,

>>> only the kids use the Internet???

>>>

>>>

>>> Jacquie

>>>

>> =====

>> =

>>> Market Probe, Inc. - PMB #635, 915-C W Foothill Blvd,

>> Claremont, CA

>>> 91711-3356

>>> Phone: 909.626.6172 Fax: 909.626.6072

>>>

>> =====

>> =

>>>

>>> On Mon, 21 Jun 1999 16:13:47 -0700 (PDT) James Beniger

>>> <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> writes:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> AAPORNETters,

>>>>

>>>> Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder

>> Study just

>>>> released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising

>> is that,

>>>> while

>>>38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions

>>>at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S.

>> consumers--report

>>>actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two

>> out of every

>>>three

>>>people who could use the Web at home actually do.

>>>>

>>>>Any ideas about what might account for such results?

>>>> -- Jim

>>>>

>>>>*****

>>>>

>>>>-----

>>>-----

>>>-

>>>> Copyright (c) 1999 Business Wire, Inc.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Business Wire

>>>>-----

>>>-----

>>>-

>>>>

>>>>June 21, 1999, Monday

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> PC Home Ownership Doubles While Home Usage

>>> Stagnates,

>>>>

>>>> Reveals Arbitron New Media Pathfinder Study:

>>>> Increased Home PC Access Does Not Result in Increased Use

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the

>>> last four

>>>>years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually

>> use PCs has

>>>>stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just

>> released from

>>>>Arbitron NewMedia.

>>>>

>>>>According to the study, computers have become as popular

>> as many home

>>>>appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29

>> percent in

>>>>1995

>>>>to 54 percent in 1999. However, the percentage of people

>> with access

>>>>to a

>>>>home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of

>> 90 percent

>>>>in

>>>>1995 to 53 percent today. High income consumers (\$ 75K or

>>> more) report

>>>>the

>>>>highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10

>>>>percent since 1997.

>>>>

>>>>"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've

>> been tracking

>>>>for

>>>>the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of

>>>>research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal

>> with PCs and

>>>>other

>>>>technologies all day at work. By the time they get home,

>>> many of these

>>>>technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time

>> with their

>>>>families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve

>>>>sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have

>>>>to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access

>>>>user

>>>>benefits in

>>>>mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

>>>>

>>>>The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined

>> that the large

>>>>majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet

>>> services at

>>>>home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate

>> in 1995.

>>>>But

>>>>home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While

>>>>nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web

>>> subscriptions at

>>>home
>>>(38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S.
>>>consumers, report actual Web use at home.
>>>
>>>In other words, nearly all of the 29 percent of people who
>> use their
>>>PCs
>>>at home also use the Web. But only two of every three people
>>> who could
>>>use
>>>the Web at home actually do. The lure of the Web is not
>> sufficient to
>>>convert the one-third of home Internet subscribers who do not
>>>currently use their PCs. The increase in home PC ownership is
>>>due,
>> in large, to
>>>first-time PC purchasers.
>>>
>>>Since 1997, the percentage of consumers who have more than
>> one PC at
>>>home
>>>has remained relatively unchanged; there has only been a
>> one-percent
>>>increase. Over the last two years, the largest gains in home PC
>>>purchases has been among low-to middle-income households as well
>>>as
>> households
>>>with
>>>children.

>>>>

>>>>The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey

>>> of consumer

>>>>media

>>>>behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American

>>>>purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results

>>>>were based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys,

>>>>which

>> canvassed a

>>>>total of 5,500 U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey

>> comprises the

>>>>first

>>>>phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

>>>>

>>>>Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and

>> 2000. For

>>>>information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact

>>>>Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046;

>>>>telephone

>>>>(410)

>>>>312-8429.

>>>>

>>>>-----

>>>>-----

>>>>-

>>>> Copyright (c) 1999 Business Wire, Inc.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

Business Wire

>>>-----

>>>-----

>>>-

>>>>

>>>>*****

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

-----8535954CDA7C544F8F390936

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html>

My understanding of how this study was conducted was that PC ownership
was obtained about the <u>household</u> but that PC usage was obtained for
the <u>respondent</u>. <p>Although 54% of households reported ownership and
29% of respondents reported using that PC at home, this does not mean that
the difference represents PCs which are not in use. The study did not ask
who in the household uses that PC, an important question before conclusions
about usage can be made. <p>The release headline said "Home Use Stagnates"
and the statement "ownership of a home PC does not equal usage" appeared in
the release copy. We don't know that. There may be other users. <p>(As an
aside, although the term "PC" is used in the release, I assume this was not
the precise questionnaire wording and that some allowance was made for us
Mac users.) <p>I agree with much of the commentary so far, especially access
to better hardware at work and PC fatigue at work. But this does not mean
that nearly half of PCs are at home gathering dust or that they are all

candidates for the Smithsonian. I can imagine that in many cases the under age 16 segment which was not included in the sample are giving them a lot of use, in some cases, so much use parent usage is precluded. <p>I also understand that PC usage, again, only asked of the respondent, was open end - something like "please tell me all the places you use a PC?" The respondent had to come up with "work", "library", "home", "school", etc. I think that any conclusions about home usage can only be made if home usage is specifically asked of respondents and again, of other household members. <p>Questions: Were multiple answers accepted? How many gave multiple responses? How hard did interviewers probe the question with "were else", "anywhere else"? <p>Most important, given the decline in usage, is whether the usage question was asked exactly the same way and probed exactly the same way with the same effort since 1995. <p>Those are my thoughts.

 <p>"Safir, Adam" wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>My apologies for backing up a couple of threads- <p>After the lively AAPORNET discussion regarding Arbitron's latest Pathfinder
Study, I forwarded Jacquelyn Schriber's question concerning respondent age
over to Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia
(along with some of the other insightful hypotheses posted by AAPORNETters).
Roberta just got back to me after returning from vacation, and her reply is
attached below: <p>> -----Original Message-----
> From: McConochie, Roberta
> Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 1999 3:34 PM
> To: Safir, Adam
> Subject: RE: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates
>
> Hey Adam. Thanks for the feedback. This year, we added a special study
of children. We > talked w/ 400+ kids 8 - 15 after we interviewed a
selected adult (16-74). The write up
> of the kids' data will go out in July. Interesting & informative results
>-- and I believe > of great interest to the AAPOR/academic communities. I
did a review of recent lit and it >

who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90 percent in 1995 to 53 percent today. High income consumers (\$ 75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10 percent since 1997. "This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access user benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage." The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995. But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home. In other words, nearly all of the 29 percent of people who use their PCs at home also use the Web. But only two of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do. The lure of the Web is not sufficient to convert the one-third of home Internet subscribers who do not currently use their PCs. The increase in home PC ownership is due, in large, to

Subject: [Fwd: Question from Russia]

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----F74A4559641121C3FCFE221B"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----F74A4559641121C3FCFE221B

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Colleagues: I received this inquiry. It is a big contract but requires a Canadian center to do the work. I do not know anyone in Canada that does this sort of thing. Any suggestions or ideas to help?

Thanks,

Brian Vargus

Director, Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory

-----F74A4559641121C3FCFE221B

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Return-Path: <temerso_m@col.ru>

Received: from hermes.iupui.edu (hermes.iupui.edu [134.68.220.31])

by ruby.iupui.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA11978

for <igem100@ruby.iupui.edu>; Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:27:40 -0500 (EST)

Received: from hut.comstar.ru (hut.comstar.ru [195.210.128.8])

by hermes.iupui.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1/1.18IUPUIPO) with ESMTP id KAA32134

for <igem100@iupui.edu>; Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:27:37 -0500 (EST)

Received: from [195.210.132.78] (d078.p3.col.ru [195.210.132.78])

by hut.comstar.ru (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id TAA06887

for <igem100@iupui.edu>; Tue, 29 Jun 1999 19:27:14 +0400 (MSD)

Message-ID: <003001bec243\$9d44c600\$0301a8c0@serge>

From: "serg" <temerso_m@col.ru>

To: <igem100@iupui.edu>

Subject: Question from Russia

Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 19:25:24 +0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----_NextPart_000_002C_01BEC265.231B9C10"

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_002C_01BEC265.231B9C10

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----_NextPart_001_002D_01BEC265.231EA950"

-----_NextPart_001_002D_01BEC265.231EA950

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="koi8-r"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Mr. Vargas,

David Fulton tell me about your interest of investigations in Russia. I hope

you will be able to help our group to make a special paper for = one of the Russian political funds. All details are in the attachment. The main question for us: to find respected partners from Canada. It's = the main condition of getting of that oder. I always prefer to make common business through people, whom I knew = before. This is a reason my asking of D.Fulton. If it possible, send me, please, a previos agreement to take a part in = this work, a also the name of institute or firm (may be Gallup or Lew = Harris), which will be presented in this work. Keep in your mind that your side will be able to use all results of this = work in USA and Canada. I'm looking for your answer. Regards, Serge Tokarev.

-----=_NextPart_001_002D_01BEC265.231EA950

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="koi8-r"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Dkoi8-r" http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=3DGENERATOR> <STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Dear Mr.
Vargas,<BR><FONT = face=3DArial>David Fulton=20 tell me about your interest
of investigations in = Russia.</FONT></FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3D"Arial
Cyr" size=3D2>I hope you will be able to help = our group to=20 make a
special paper for one of the Russian political = funds.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3D"Arial Cyr" size=3D2>All details are in the=20
attachment.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3D"Arial Cyr" size=3D2>The main
question for us: to find = respected=20 partners from Canada. It's the main
condition of getting of that=20 oder.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3D"Arial
Cyr" size=3D2><FONT = face=3DArial>I&nbsp;</FONT>always=20
```

prefer to make common business through people, whom I knew before. =
This is=20 a reason my asking of D.Fulton.</DIV> <DIV><FONT
face=3DArial size=3D2>If it possible, send me, please, a = previos=20
agreement to take a part in this work, a also the name of institute or =
firm (may=20 be Gallup or Lew Harris), which will be presented in this =
work.</DIV> <DIV>Keep in your mind
that your side = will be able=20 to use all results of this work in USA and
Canada.</DIV> <DIV>I'm looking for your =
answer.</DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3D"Arial Cyr"
size=3D2>Regards,</DIV> <DIV>Serge
= Tokarev.</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_001_002D_01BEC265.231EA950--

-----=_NextPart_000_002C_01BEC265.231B9C10

Content-Type: application/msword;

name="Letter3.doc"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment;

filename="Letter3.doc"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

OM8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAKQAAAAAAAA
AA

EAAAKwAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAACgAAAD////////////////////////////////////

EAAAKwAAAAEAAAD+////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////s

pcEANyAJBAAA8BK/AAAAAAAAEAAAAAABAAAmgkAAA4AYmpialUWVRYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAJBBYAKRQAADd8AAA3fAAAQUAAAAAAAABYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAA
A

AAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGwAAAAAFYIAAAAAAAVggAAFYI
AAAAAAAVggAAAAAABWCAAAAAAAFYIAAAAAAAVggAABQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGoIAAAAAAAPAo
A

AAAAAA8CgAAAAAADwKAAA4AAAAAoAAAwAAACACgAADAAAAGoIAAAAAAAVhMAAKYBAACYCgA
A

FgAAAK4KAAAOAAAA1goAAAAAADWCgAAAAAANYKAAAAAAA1goAAAAAADWCgAAAAAANYKAA
AA

AAAA1RIAAIAAADXEgAAAAAANcSAAAAAAA1xIAAAAAADXEgAAAAAANcSAAAAAAA1xIAACQA
AAD8FAAAIAIABwXAAA8AQAA+xiAABUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAVggAAAAAADWCgAA
AAD8FAAAIAIABwXAAA8AQAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADWCgAAAAAANYKAAAAAAA1goAAAAAADWCgAAAAAAPsAAAAAA
AA

QgsAAAAAABWCAAAAAAAFYIAAAAAAA1goAAAAAANYKAAAAAAEBMAABYAAAB
C

CwAAAAAAEILAAAAAAQgsAAAAAADWCgAAIlgAAAFYIAAAAAAA1goAAAAAABWCAAAAAAANYK
AAAAAAA1RIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEILAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADWCgAAAAAADVEgAAAAAAEILAAAEwAAQgsAAAAAABGDgA
A

jgAAACkSAABoAAAAVggAAAAAABWCAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADWCgAAAAAAIwKAAAMAAAA0HxSZk
DC

vgFqCAA0gEAADwKAAAAAAA+AOAABYAAACREgAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA1RIAAAAAAmEwAA
vgFqCAA0gEAADwKAAAAAAA+MAAA

AAFAApAAoAAQBpAA
8A

AwAAAAAAAAAAEIAAEDx/wIAQgAMAAYATgBvAHIAbQBhAGwAAAAIAAAAYQDYSQDHABAIpV/T0oC
AFFKAgBfSAEEbUgJBHNICQR0SAkENAABQNEBlgE0AAwACQBIAGUAYQBkAGkAbgBnACAAMQAAA8A
AQADJAAUpNwAQCYAYSQAAAAANAACQNEBlgE0AAwACQBIAGUAYQBkAGkAbgBnACAAMgAAAAAAGAD
JABAJgFhJAAABABDShIAQgADQNEBlgFCAAwACQBIAGUAYQBkAGkAbgBnACAAMwAAABIAAwADJAAU
pNwAMCQBQCYSQADABDShYAT0oCAFFKAgA8AARA0QEiATwADAAJAEgAZQBhAGQAaQBUAGcAIAA0
AAAAEAAEAA+EaAEwJAFJgNehGgBCABAIpV/Q0oSADwABUDRASIBPAAMAakASABIAGEAZABp
AAAAEAAEAA+AG4A

ZwAgADUAAAAQAUAAD4TQAJkAUAmBF6E0AIIAECI+/9DShIAPAAGQNEBlgE8AAwACQBIAGUA
ZwAgADUAAAAQAUAAD4TQAJkAUAmBF6E0AIIAECI+YQBk
AGkAbgBnACAANgAAABAABgAPhDgEMCQBQCYSFXoQ4BAGQlJ7/ONKEgAAAAAAAAA8AEFA8v+hADwA
DAAWAEQAZQBmAGEAdQBsAHQAIABQAGEAcgBhAGcAcgBhAHAAaAAgAEYAbwBuAHQAAAAAAAAAAAA
A
AAAAPgD+TwEBAgE+AAwAEwBJAG4AcwBpAGQAZQAgAEEAZABkAHIAZQBzAHMAIABOAGEAbQBI
AAAAPgD+TwEBAgE+AAAA

BgAPABOk3AAAADYA/k8BAAIBNgAMAA4ASQBUAHMAaQBkAGUAIABBAGQAZABYAGUAcwBzAAAACAAQ
ABJk3AAAAAAPABLQAEUgi8AAwACgBTAGEAbAB1AHQAYQB0AGkAbwBuAAAAFgARAAMkABJk3AAA
ABOk3AAUpNwAYSQAAAAwAEJAAQAIATAADAAJAEIAbwBkAHkAIABUAGUAeAB0AAAADAASABJk3AAA
ABSk3AAAADoAQEABADICOGAMAAkAUwBpAGcAbgBhAHQAdQByAGUAAAABVABMAAYQABIQBEmTcAAA
A

E6RwA2EkAAAAACwAH0ABAEIBLAAMAAYASABIAGEAZABIAHIAAANABQADcYIAALgEMAhAQIAAAAs
ACBAAQBSASwADAAGAEYAbwBvAHQAZQByAAAADQAVAA3GCAAC4BDAlQECAAAPgD+TwEAEgE+AAwA
DgBBAHQAdABIAG4AdABpAG8AbgAgAEwAaQBuAGUAAAQABYAEtTcAAAAE6TcABSk3AAAADwA/k8B
AHIBPAAMAACQwBjACAATABpAHMAAdAAAABsAFwAFJAEPHGGBEYSY/hJk3AAAAF6EaAFghJj+AAAA
MAA/QAEAMgEwAAwABwBDAGwAbwBzAGkAbgBnAAAADwAYAAyKARJk3AAAAABSkPAAAAABgAP5PAQCS
AWAADAAMAEMAbwBtAHAAYQBUAHkAIABOAGEAbQBIAAAQJAZABJkGAEAAABmEfgMahAUPGyZQIyQB
K0Qwhi6EuwAvhLsAMCQBABAAQIjn/ONKIABPSgUAUuOFACoATEABAPIAKgAMAAQARABhAHQAZQAA
AA8AGgASZNwAAAAUpNwAMCQBAAAAMABYQPL/sQEwAAwACABFAG0AcABoAGEAcwBpAHMAAAAQA
ENK

EgBPSgUAUUoFAGtI5AQ2AP5PAQByATYADAAJAEUAbgBjAGwAbwBzAHUAcgBIAAAAEgAcAAUkAQYk
ARJk3AAAABSk3AAAAEgA/k8BACIBSAAMAAwASABIAGEAZABpAG4AZwAgAEIAYQBzAGUAAAAOAB0A
BSQBBiQBEtTcAAAAEABAIpB/S0gUAE9KBQBRsgUASgD+TwEA8gBKAawAFABNAGEAaQBsAGkAbgBn
ACAASQBUAHMAAdABYAHUAYwB0AGkAbwBuAHMAAAAMAB4AEmTcAAAAFKTcAAMAOwiBAEgA/k8BAMI
B
SAAMABIAUgBIAGYAZQByAGUAbgBjAGUAIABJAG4AaQB0AGkAYQBsaHMAAAASAB8ABSQBBiQBEtTc
AAAAE6TcAAAAQAD+TwEA4gFAAAwADgBSAGUAZgBIAHIAZQBUAGMAZQAgAEwAaQBUAGUAAAAS
AAAAE6TcAAAAQAD+ACAA
AyQAEtTcAAAAFKTcAGEkAAAAcAD+TwEAEGJwAAwADgBSAGUAdAB1AHIAbgAgAEAAZABkAHIA
AyQAEtTcAAAAFKTcAGEkAAAAcAD+ZQBz
AHMAAA6ACEAAyQABSQBDcYFAAFwCIASZKAAAAAYhPj/GYTGAXqE4BAbJIajJAERmWDL0S7AC+E
uwAwJAFhJAAIAECIAABDSg4AOgD+TzEB8gE6AAwAEQBtAGkAZwBuAGEAdAB1AHIAZQAgAEMA
uwAwJAFhJAAIAECIAABDSg4AOgD+bwBt
AHAAYQBUAHkAAAAGACIAE6QAAAAAPgD+TzEBIgl+AAwAEwBTAGkAZwBuAGEAdAB1AHIAZQAg
AHAAYQBUAHkAAAAGACIAE6QAAAAAPgD+TzEBIgl+AEoA
bwBiACAavABpAHQAbABIAAAABgAjABOkAAAAACwA/k+iAEELAAmAAyAUwBsAG8AZwBhAG4AAAAQ
AENKEgBPSgUAUUoFAGtI5ARIAP5PAQAIUgADAAMAFMAdQBiAGoAZQBjAHQAIABMAGkAbgBIAAAA
EgAlAAMkABJk3AAAABSk3ABhJAAMAECI9v9PSgUAUUoFACwAL0AhAWICLAAMAAQATABpAHMAdAAA
ABIAJgAphGgBEYSY/l6EaAFghJj+AAyADBAYQJyAjIADQALAEwAaQBzAHQAIABCAHUAbABsAGUA
dAAAAAKJwAKJgALRgMAAAAMgAxQCEBgglyAAwACwBMAGkAcwB0ACAATgB1AG0AYgBIAHIAAAAI
ACgACiYAC0YEAAAAAAAAAACaBQAABgAAFAAAAAD/////AAAAAG4AAADHAAAAEAEAAE0BAACmAQAA
zwEAADQCAAB1AgAAmQIAADUDAACGAAwAAvQMAACIEAACyBAAAYAQAAOgEAAACBQAFAFUADUFAA
BA
BQAAMwUAAJoAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAA
CA
AAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAA
A
gJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgA
BSASMAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgABSASMAEAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgABSASMAIAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAgJgABSAS

MAMAAAAACAAAAAgJgABSASMAQAAAAACAAAAAgJgABSASMAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAAASMA
AA

AAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAAASMAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAAASMAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAAASMAAAAA
A

AACAAAAAgJgAAAAASMAAAAAACAAAAAgJgAAAAASMAAAAAACAAAAAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAVwAAAFcAAABXAAAVwAAAFcAAABaAAAAAQAAJoJAAAHAAAAAQ
A

AJoJAAAIAAAAAQAAJkJAAAJAAAFQUAACQFAAAyBQAAMgUAABNZdP+VjAgAAAAoAAAAKgAA

AJoJAAAIAAAAAQAAJkJAAAJAAAFQUAACQFAAAyBQAAMgUAABNZdP+AC0A

AABGAAAAVAAAFoAAAATIRT/FYATIBT/IYAAAAARgAAAE0AAAABBQAAMAUAAJsFAAAHAAQABwAH

AAIAAAAAEEFAACYBQAAMwUAAAcABwACAAAAAAVBQAANAUAADUFAAA/BQAAQUAAJYFAACYBQA
A

mwUAAAcABQAHAAUABwAFAAcAAgD//woAAAAAdACIEPgQ6BDAEQAQ1BDIEIAAhBDUEQAQzBDUEOQQg

ABoEPgQ9BEEEQgQwBD0EQgQ4BD0EPgQyBDgERwRYAEMAOGbCafCAsQBOAE4AVABcAFAAcgBvAGYA

aQBsAGUAcwBcAGEAZABtAGkAbgBpAHMAAdABYAGEAdABvAHIAXAUBDAEPQQ9BEsENQRcAE0AaQBj

AHIAbwBzAG8AZgB0AFwAVwBvAHIAZABcAEEAdQB0AG8AUgBlAGMAbwB2AGUAcgB5ACAAcwBhAHYA

ZQAgAG8AZgAgAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBIAg4AdAAxAc4AYQBzAGQAHQaiBD4EOgQwBEAENQyBCAAIQQ1

BEAEMwQ1BDkEIAAaBD4EPQRBBEIEMAQ9BEIEOAQ9BD4EMgQ4BEcEIwBDADoAXABBAFAAUgBFAEQA

UwBUAEEAVgBcAEEAUgBDAFwAQwBhAG4AYQBkAGEAXABMAGUAdAB0AGUAcgAxAC4AZABvAGMAHQ
i

BD4EOgQwBEAENQyBCAAIQQ1BEAEMwQ1BDkEIAAaBD4EPQRBBEIEMAQ9BEIEOAQ9BD4EMgQ4BEcE

lwBDADoAXABBAFAAUgBFAEQAUwBUAEEAVgBcAEEAUgBDAFwAQwBhAG4AYQBkAGEAXABMAGUAdAB0

AGUAcgAyAC4AZABvAGMAHQaiBD4EOgQwBEAENQyBCAAIQQ1BEAEMwQ1BDkEIAAaBD4EPQRBBEIE

MAQ9BEIEOAQ9BD4EMgQ4BEcEIwBDADoAXABBAFAAUgBFAEQAUwBUAEEAVgBcAEEAUgBDAFwAQwBh

AG4AYQBkAGEAXABMAGUAdAB0AGUAcgAyAC4AZABvAGMAHQaiBD4EOgQwBEAENQyBCAAIQQ1BEAE

MwQ1BDkEIAAaBD4EPQRBBEIEMAQ9BEIEOAQ9BD4EMgQ4BEcEIwBDADoAXABBAFAAUgBFAEQAUwBU

AEEAVgBcAEEAUgBDAFwAQwBhAG4AYQBkAGEAXABMAGUAdAB0AGUAcgAzAC4AZABvAGMABQCI////

jGOO0P8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w//DwEaif///3p4dLL/D/8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w8BAJ4+jCik

UuI3JwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAkQEUyFnx6C/8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w//DxAA+A8jZjqW

isooAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAEAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAPhGgBEYSY

/hXGBQABaAEGXoRoAWCEmP4CAAAALgABAAAFwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4RoARG
E

mP4VxgUAAWgBBI6EaAFghJj+T0oBAFFKAQBvKAABALfwAQAAABcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

mP4VxgUAAWgBBI6EaAFghJj+AAAA

CxgAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQZehGgBYISY/k9KBABRSgQAbygAAQCn8AEAAAAXEAAAAAAAA

CxgAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAA

AABoAQAAAAAAAAAsYAAAPhNACEYSY/hXGBQAB0AIGXoTQAmCEmP5PSgEAUuOBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAA

F5AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAaAEAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4SgBRGEmP4VxgUAAaAFBI6EoAVghJj+T0oGAFFK

F5AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAaAEAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4SgBRGEmP4VxgUAAaAFBI6EoAVghJj+BgBv

KAABAG8AAQAAABeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgBAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+EcAgRhJj+FcYFAAFwCAZehHAI

KAABAG8AAQAAABeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgBAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+EcAgRhJj+YISY

/k9KBABRSgQAbygAAQCn8AEAAAAXkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABoAQAAAAAAAAAsYAAAPhEALYSY/hXGBQAB

QAsGXoRAC2CEmP5PSgEAUuOBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAAF5AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAaAEAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4QQ

DhGEmP4VxgUAAAOBI6EEA5ghJj+T0oGAFFKBgBvKAABAG8AAQAAABeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgB

DhGEmP4VxgUAAAOBI6EEA5ghJj+AAAA

AAAACxgAAA+E4BARhJj+FcYFAAHgEAZehOAQYISY/k9KBABRSgQAbygAAQCn8AEAAAAXkAAA

AAAACxgAAA+E4BARhJj+AAAA

AAAAABoAQAAAAAAAAAsYAAAPhLATEYSY/hXGBQABsBMGXoSwE2CEmP5PSgEAUuOBAG8oAAEAt/AB

AAAAF5AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAaAEAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4SAFhGEmP4VxgUAAAYAWBI6EgBZghJj+T0oG

AAAAF5AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAaAEAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4SAFhGEmP4VxgUAAAYAWBI6EgBZghJj+AFFK

BgBvKAABAG8AAQAAABeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgBAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+EUBkRhJj+FcYFAAFQGQZe

BgBvKAABAG8AAQAAABeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgBAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+EUBkRhJj+hFAZ

YISY/k9KBABRSgQAbygAAQCn8AEAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhGgBEYSY/hXG

BQABaAEGXoRoAWCEmP4CAAAAKQAFAAAAif///wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIj///8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACe

PowoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+A8jZgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAApARTIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD////////

PowoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+////

//////////BQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAASAAEACQQDAAKEBQAJBAEACQQD

AAKEBQAJBAEACQQDAAKEBQAJBAAA/0ABgAEARgAAAEYAAACEE+cCAQABAEYAAAAAAAAAQgAAAAAA

AAACEAAAAAAAAACaBQAAYAAACABAAAD//wEAAAAAHAFUAbgBrAG4AbwB3AG4A//8BAAgAAAAAAAA

AAAAAP//AQAAAAA//8AAAI//8AAAA//8AAAI//8AAAAABwAAAEcWkAEAAICBgMFBAUCAwSH
egAgAAAAGAgAAAAAAAA/wEAAAAABUJAGkAbQBIAHMAIABOAGUAdwAgAFIAbwBtAGEAbgAADUW
kAECAAUFAQIBBwYCBQcAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAABTAHkAbQBiAG8AbAAAADMmkAEA
AAILBgQCAGICAgSHegAgAAAAGAgAAAAAAAA/wEAAAAABBAHIAaQBhAGwAAAAzFpABAAACAgYD
BQQFAGMEh3oAAAAAIAIAAAAAAAAAAP8AAAAAAAVABJAE0ARQBTA AAAOwaQAQIABQAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAFcAaQBuAGcAZABpAG4AZwBzAAAAPyaQAQAAAgSKBAIB
AgICBIcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACfAAAAAAAAEEAcgBpAGEAbAAgAEIAbABhAGMAawAAD81kAEA
AAIHAWkCAGUCBASHegAgAAAAGAgAAAAAAAA/wEAAAAABDAG8AdQByAGkAZQByACAATgBIAHcA
AAAIQAQ8QjIGADw0AIAAGgBAAAAAMLsNkbC7DZGAAAAAIABAAAAAMIAABVBAAAAQACAAAABAAD
EAKAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAAAOSIA8BAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A
AA
AAA
AA
AAA
AA
AAA
AA
AAA
AAAAigWoAloA9QCBgHIwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABRBQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A
AA
PAQ
AN8DAA//8SAAAAABIAEMAOgBcAFAAcgBvAGcA
cgBhAG0AIABGAGkAbABIAHMAXABNAGkAYwByAG8AcwBvAGYAdAAgAE8AZgBmAGkAYwBIAFwAVABI
AG0AcABsAGEAdABIAHMAXAAxADAAMwAzAFwAUABYAG8AZgBIAHMAcWbPAG8AbgBhAGwAIABMAGU
A
dAB0AGUAcgAuAGQAbwB0AAcARABIAGEAcgAgAE0AcgAAAAAAAAAdACIEPgQ6BDAEQAQ1BDIEIAAh
BDUEQAQzBDUEOQqgABoEPgQ9BEEEQgQwBD0EQgQ4BD0EPgQyBDgERwQdACIEPgQ6BDAEQAQ1BDIE

IAAhBDUEQAQzBDUEOQQgABoEPgQ9BEEEQgQwBD0EQgQ4BD0EPgQyBDgERwQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AAAD+/wAABAACAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAD+AAAB

AAAA4IWf8vIPaBCrkQgAKyetz2TAAACoAQAAEQAAAAEAAACQAAAAAgAAAJgAAAADAAAAqAAAAQA
AAC0AAAABQAAANwAAAAGAAAA6AAAAcAAAD0AAAACAAAABQBAAAJAAAAPAEAABIAABIAQAACgA
A

AGQBAAAMAAAAcAEAAA0AAAAB8AQAADgAAAIgBAAAPAAAAkAEAAABAAAACYAQAAEwAAAKABAAACAAA
A

4wQAAB4AAAAIAAAARGVhciBNcgAeAAAAAQAAAABIYXleAAAAHgAAANLu6uDw5eIg0eXw4+Xp

4wQAAB4AAAAIAAAARGVhciBNcgAeAAAAAQAAAABIYXleAAAAHgAAANLu6uDw5eIg0eXw4+IMru

7fHy4O3y6O3u4uj3AE1pHgAAAAEAAAAA7urgHgAAAAEAAAAA7urgHgAAABgAAABQcm9mZXNzaW9u

YWwgTGV0dGVyLmRvdAAeAAAAHgAAANLu6uDw5eIg0eXw4+XpIMru7fHy4O3y6O3u4uj3AE1p

YWwgTGV0dGVyLmRvdAAeAAAAHgAAANLu6uDw5eIg0eXw4+HgAA

AAIAAAyAOrgHgAAABMAAABNaWNyb3NvZnQgV29yZCA5LjAA8kAAAAAGA2PAAAAEAAAAAZKBW

QMK+AUAAAAAZKBWQMK+AQMAAABAAAAAwAAAMIAAAAADAAAQQAAMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

QMK+AUAAAAAZKBWQMK+AAAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA/v8AAAQAAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAALVzd
Wc

LhsQk5clACss+a4wAAAA/AAAAwAAAABAAAAaAAAA8AAABwAAAABQAAAigAAAAGAAAkAAA
LhsQk5clACss+ABEA

AACYAAAFwAAAKAAAAALAAAqAAAABAAAAcWAAAAEwAAALgAAAwwAAAAwAAAA0AADIAAADAA
AA

ANwAAAACAAAA4wQAAB4AAAAPAAAA0uXs5fDx7i3M7vHq4uAAAAmAAAAJAAAAwAAAAIAAADAAAA
UQUAAAMAAACgCgkACwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAsAAAAAAAAAcwAAAAAAAAeEAAAQAAAAGAAA
BE

AAAaAAAAGwAAABwAAAAdAAAAHgAAAB8AAAD+////IQAAACIAAAAjAAAAJAAAACUAAAAmAAAA

AAAaAAAAGwAAABwAAAAdAAAAHgAAAB8AAAD+JwAA

AP7////9////KgAAP7////+////v////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////UgBvAG8AdAagAEUAbgB0AHIAeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABYABQH////////wMAAAAGCQIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABGAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAsHpvZkDCvgEsAAAAgAAAAAAAAAAxAFQAYQBiAGwAZQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAADgACAP////////wAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAsAAABYGAAAAAAAFcAbwByAGQARABvAG
MA

dQBtAGUAbgB0AAaAIBBQ
AA

AP////////AACKUAAAAAAAA

BQBTAHUAbQBtAGEAcbgB5AEkAbgBmAG8AcbgBtAGEAdABpAG8AbgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAACgAagECAAAABAAAAP////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAYAAAAABAAAAAAAAAFAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBIAG4AdABTAHUAbQBtAGEAcbgB5AEkAbgBmAG8AcbgBt

AGEAdABpAG8AbgAAAAAAAAAAAAOACAf////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAEAAAAAAAEAQwBvAG0AcBPAGIAagAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAASAAIBAQAAAYAAAD////AAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGoAAAAAAATwBiAGoAZQBjAHQUA
Bv

AG8AbAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABYAAQD////
/

////////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALB6b2ZAwr4BsHpvZkDCvgEAAAAAAAAAAAA

AA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAP////////////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAD+////////////////////////////////////

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAD+////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

//////////////////AQD+/wMKAAD/////BgkCAAAAADAAAAAAAAARhgAAABNaWNyb3NvZnQV29y

ZCBEb2N1bWVudAAKAAATVNXb3JkRG9jABAAAABXb3JkLkRvY3VtZW50LjgA9DmycQAAAAAAAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA=

-----F74A4559641121C3FCFE221B--

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fri Jul 2 06:35:33 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id GAA22276 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 06:35:31 -0700

(PDT)

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 JAA11697;

Fri, 2 Jul 1999 09:33:09 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <377CC00E.CB812C22@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Fri, 02 Jul 1999 09:35:10 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: FW: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates

References: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B3B156B0@arbmex.arbitron.com>

<377C74AE.12D6E6D3@mcs.net>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Nick Panagakis wrote:

- >
- >
- > My understanding of how this study was conducted was that PC ownership
- > was obtained about the household but that PC usage was obtained for
- > the respondent.
- >
- > Although 54% of households reported ownership and 29% of respondents
- > reported using that PC at home, this does not mean that the difference
- > represents PCs which are not in use. The study did not ask who in the
- > household uses that PC, an important question before conclusions about
- > usage can be made.
- >
- >

But if this study is compared to a similar earlier study that asked the questions in the same way and used a similar sample, then the conclusion is completely valid. I think the notion that those who got PC's at home first are more likely to use PC's at home is completely rational.

They wanted them earlier; they were willing to pay. Latecomers did not want them as much as the early adopters. They are paying less.

All of the other findings seem completely reasonable to me.

Andy Beveridge

they paid for them.

>From ebeling@ecst.csuchico.edu Fri Jul 2 06:43:53 1999

Received: from mail.csuchico.edu (mail.CSUCHICO.EDU [132.241.82.14])

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

id GAA25524 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 06:43:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ecst.csuchico.edu ([132.241.160.109]) by mail.csuchico.edu
(Netscape Messaging Server 3.6) with ESMTP id AAA743B
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 06:42:05 -0700
Message-ID: <377CBFF4.A37675D8@ecst.csuchico.edu>
Date: Fri, 02 Jul 1999 06:34:45 -0700
From: Jon Ebeling <ebeling@ecst.csuchico.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: In regards to the thread: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use
Stagnates
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Sender: "Jon S. Ebeling" <ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu>

While I admit I have not closely monitored this thread, I do find it odd that there does not appear to be much of breakdown on users of the web at home in terms of sex, age brackets, possibly occupational status and similar characteristics of respondents. Information about the background of the respondent and the background of the user might be helpful. More information of this type might improve the level of understanding about PC, or MAC, use in the home.

While there is some personal background information, it does not seem to be specific enough to produce hypotheses that later might be worth

consideration.

Jon Ebeling

ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu

>From rrand@cfmc.com Fri Jul 2 08:07:17 1999

Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])

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

id IAA14660 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 08:07:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from Rands-W95.cfmc.com (rands-w95.cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])

by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id IAA01088

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 08:07:16 -0700

Message-Id: <4.1.19990702080551.017e28a0@cfmc.com>

X-Sender: rrand@cfmc.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Fri, 02 Jul 1999 08:07:53 -0700

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Rands <rrand@cfmc.com>

Subject: Re: Internet polling

In-Reply-To: <01BEC3DB.36651180@mark-bri>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 04:03 PM 7/1/99 -0400, you wrote:

>This item was sent to me-don't know the source, but may be of interest

>to

>AAPOR:

>

This item was announced at the CASRO Technology conference in New York City last week. They also announced that Harris Black has been completely restructured to emphasize Internet activities and that their name will now be Harris Interactive.

Richard Rands

>Harris Black: Net changing polling

>

>A major national market research firm said Friday it believes the

>Internet

>will bring a "radical transformation" to the polling industry during the

>next Presidential campaign. Jonathan Siegel, director of the Washington,

>From mitchell@earinc.net Fri Jul 2 08:21:47 1999

Received: from smtp5.mindspring.com (smtp5.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

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

id IAA18369 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 08:21:45 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ntwear02 (user-2ivebve.dialup.mindspring.com

[165.247.47.238])

by smtp5.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA29607

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 11:21:45 -0400 (EDT)

Reply-To: <mitchell@earinc.net>

From: "John Mitchell" <mitchell@earinc.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: [Fwd: Question from Russia]

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1999 11:26:25 -0400

Message-ID: <001701bec49f\$3fd43ab0\$0d4992a8@ntwear02>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 1 (Highest)

X-MSMail-Priority: High

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0

X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

In-Reply-To: <377CB82C.5C44D659@iupui.edu>

Smells fishy to me.

John Mitchell

EAR, Inc.

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of

Brian Vargus

Sent: Friday, July 02, 1999 9:02 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: [Fwd: Question from Russia]

Colleagues: I received this inquiry. It is a big contract but requires a Canadian center to do the work. I do not know anyone in Canada that does this sort of thing. Any suggestions or ideas to help?

Thanks,

Brian Vargus

Director, Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory

>From Mark@bisconti.com Fri Jul 2 09:26:38 1999

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

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

id JAA08394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 09:26:37 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000627035@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 02 Jul 1999 12:25:05 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.182]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2448.0)

id 3C5PF0P2; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 12:27:10 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BEC484.2E5C9860@mark-bri>; Fri, 2 Jul 1999 12:12:40 -0400

Message-Id: <01BEC484.2E5C9860@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Computer humor

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1999 12:12:39 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This made me laugh, good tonic for the soul, so I'm posting it as a 4th of July greeting. Happy Revolution Day. mark

>MICROSOFT SHOULD MAKE CARS, GM SHOULD MAKE SOFTWARE

>At a recent computer expo, Bill Gates reportedly compared the computer

>industry with the auto industry and stated: "If GM had kept up with

>technology like the computer industry has, we would all be driving \$25

>cars that got 1000 miles to the gallon". GM responded by issuing a

>press release stating that " if GM had developed technology like

>Microsoft we would be driving cars with the following characteristics.

>1. For no reason whatsoever, your car would crash twice a day.

>2. Every time they repainted the lines on the road you would have to

>buy a new car.

>3. Occasionally, your car would die on the freeway for no reason, and

>you would accept this, restart, and drive on.

>4. Occasionally, executing a maneuver such as a left turn would cause

>your car to shutdown and refuse to restart; in which case you would have

>to reinstall the engine.

>5. Only one person at a time could use the car unless you bought

>'Car95' or 'CarNT'. Then you would have to buy more seats.

>6. Macintosh would make a car that was powered by the sun, was more

>reliable, five times as fast, and twice as easy to drive, but would only

>run on 5 percent of the roads.

>7. The oil, water, temperature and alternator warning lights would be

>replaced by a single 'general car fault' warning light.

>8. New seats would force everyone to have the same butt size.

- >9. The airbag system would ask 'are you sure?' before going off.
- >10. Occasionally, for no reason whatsoever, your car would lock you
>out and refuse to let you in unless you simultaneously lifted the door
>handle, turned the key and grabbed the radio antenna.
- >11. GM would require all car buyers to also purchase a deluxe set of
>Rand road maps (now a GM subsidiary), even though they neither need them
>nor want them. Attempting to delete this option would diminish the cars
>performance by 50 per cent or more.
- >12. Every time GM introduced a new model, car drivers would have to
>learn how to drive all over again because none of the controls would
>operate in the same manner as the old car.
- >13. You'd press the 'start' button to shut off the engine.

Mark Richards

>From Dakbench@aol.com Mon Jul 5 04:13:13 1999

Received: from imo20.mx.aol.com (imo20.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.10])

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

id EAA11424 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 5 Jul 1999 04:13:12 -0700

(PDT)

From: Dakbench@aol.com

Received: from Dakbench@aol.com

by imo20.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5FYOa09216 (4534)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 5 Jul 1999 07:12:32 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <a80214c3.24b1ed20@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 5 Jul 1999 07:12:32 EDT

Subject: Expected Vacancies at the Smithsonian Institution

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 13

The following announcement is posted at the request of Dr. Zahava Doering,
Director, Institutional Studies Office, Smithsonian Institution.

The Institutional Studies Office (ISO) is the Smithsonian Institution's internal resource for basic and applied research on the characteristics, attitudes, opinions and experiences of visitors (and some non-visitors) to the Institution's sixteen museums and research institutes. The small staff, located in Washington, DC, includes professionals with expertise in sociology, research methods, survey statistics, and a variety of quantitative and qualitative analysis and evaluation techniques.

We will have several vacancies by Aug. 1st, with salaries between \$22,000 and \$33,000. Positions may have promotion potential. One vacancy will be for someone who can conduct data collection operations for face-to-face surveys in Smithsonian museums, as well as for a few mail and telephone studies (from questionnaire pretesting to data files). Another vacancy is for someone with skills in qualitative inquiry, including interviewing and analysis.

To apply, please send a complete resume and a writing sample. As vacancies occur, individual announcements will be published and your application will receive early consideration. For further information contact

zdoering@iso.si.edu or call 202-786-2233. [Relocation expenses will not be paid.]

Please send to Z. Doering, Director, Institutional Studies Office, 900 Jefferson Drive, S.W. Washington, DC 20560-0405.

The Smithsonian Institution is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

>From joan.serra@cpis.upf.es Mon Jul 5 12:12:24 1999

Received: from upf.es (newton.upf.es [193.145.54.60])

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

id MAA07883 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 5 Jul 1999 12:12:18 -0700 (PDT)

From: joan.serra@cpis.upf.es

Received: from watt.upf.es (root@watt.upf.es [193.145.56.30])

by upf.es (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id VAA17536

for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 5 Jul 1999 21:11:04 +0200 (MET DST)

Received: from localhost (root@localhost) by watt.upf.es with SMTP (8.8.6 (PHNE_17135)/8.7.3) id VAA00802 for AAPORNET@usc.edu; Mon, 5 Jul 1999 21:11:06 +0200 (METDST)

X-OpenMail-Hops: 1

Date: Mon, 5 Jul 1999 21:11:00 +0200

Message-Id: <H0000cbd016a5a28@MHS>

Subject: PartyID and public opinion

MIME-Version: 1.0

TO: AAPORNET@usc.edu

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

Content-Disposition: inline; filename="PartyID"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Rob Persons showed us nice data on party ID and public opinion. However, I agree that they do not demonstrate that voting for a candidate increases

one's approval ratings of that candidate's political positions. Does anybody know of more conclusive data?

Joan Serra

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Tue Jul 6 17:16:52 1999

Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])

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

id RAA17251 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 6 Jul 1999 17:16:49 -0700

(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2

(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567A7.00013D7F ; Tue, 6 Jul 1999 20:13:32 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567A7.00013D3F.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1999 20:23:32 -0400

Subject: "Don't Know " responses

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

I would be grateful if aaporites shared with me what they do with "don't know" responses in a survey when probes are absent. Do you dump them? Use them? If so, how? I am especially interested in "don't know" responses on an attitude survey (rdd). Please send responses to me and I will summarize for anyone interested. Thanks very much.

Best,

Sid

>From DMMerke@aol.com Thu Jul 8 12:23:59 1999

Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])

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

id MAA24703 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 12:23:39 -0700

(PDT)

From: DMMerke@aol.com

Received: from DMMerke@aol.com

by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5DAJa23678 (7814)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 15:21:43 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <c9d492f0.24b65446@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 8 Jul 1999 15:21:42 EDT

Subject: Job Opening: VNS Dir. of Surveys

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 13

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

VNS - DIRECTOR OF SURVEYS

VOTER NEWS SERVICE, a pool of ABC News, the Associated Press, CBS News, CNN,

FOX News, and NBC News which collects, tabulates and disseminates vote returns, exit poll results and projections of national and state elections and primaries, is currently seeking a DIRECTOR OF SURVEYS.

The Director of Surveys is involved in all aspects of the exit polls and election projections. This includes sampling, design and methodological issues, set-up of the election night databases, testing the election night system, overseeing the telephone polls of absentee voters, and conducting evaluation research. This evaluation research is often published and/or presented at professional conferences. The Director of Surveys also helps respond to media queries about the interpretation of exit poll data and methodology and helps oversee the VNS Survey Committee which develops the exit poll questionnaires.

The Director of Surveys reports to the Editorial Director and manages two full-time employees supplemented with two others each election year. On election night, the Director of Surveys oversees the tabulation of over 70,000 questionnaires and works on the decision team that projects election winners in races for President, Senate, and Governor in all fifty states based on the exit polls, sample precincts and the tabulated vote.

Qualifications: Ph.D. in a survey-related field with at least two years of related work experience or a Master's degree and several years related experience. Strong background in statistics, sampling and survey research methodology. Proficiency with a statistical software package such as SPSS or

SAS. Experience with relational databases such as DB2 and Oracle. Other helpful attributes include writing and editing skills, attention to detail, programming skills, excellent organization skills, the ability to work well under pressure and a knowledge of politics.

Send resume with salary history and references to: Dr. Murray Edelman,
Editorial Director, Voter News Service, 225 West 34th Street, Suite 310, New

York, NY 10122. Fax: (212) 947-7756. E-mail: murray.edelman@vnsusa.org.

>From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Thu Jul 8 12:24:00 1999

Received: from mail.isp.net (psion.isp.net [216.38.129.30])

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

id MAA24736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 12:23:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (mail.socialresearch.com
[208.128.218.194])

by mail.isp.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA69338

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 12:25:54 -0700 (PDT)

Message-Id: <199907081925.MAA69338@mail.isp.net>

Received: by mail.socialresearch.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

id <N1AYRJWD>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 12:12:33 -0700

From: Kathy Cirksena <KathrynC@socialresearch.com>

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

Subject: Screening for targeted subpopulations in RDD samples

Date: Thu, 8 Jul 1999 12:20:39 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="----=_NextPart_000_01BEC975.D4352784"

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

----- =_NextPart_000_01BEC975.D4352784

Content-Type: text/plain

Any resources or research on more and less effective screening techniques to locate desired respondents based on health status variables that AAPORnetters would like to share? I will summarize and post responses, so please reply privately to: kathrync@socialresearch.com Thanks in advance.

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.

Research Services Manager

Communication Sciences Group/

Survey Methods Group

140 Second Street, Suite 400

San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 495-6692 ext. 269

----- =_NextPart_000_01BEC975.D4352784

Content-Type: application/ms-tnef

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

eJ8+IiITAQaQCAAEAAAAAAAAABAAEAAQeQBgAIAAAA5AQAAAAAAAAADoAAEIgAcAGAAAAEIQTS5N

eJ8+aWNy

b3NvZnQgTWFpbC5Ob3RIADEIAQSAAQA1AAAAU2NyZWVuaW5nIGZvciB0YXJnZXRIZCBzdWJwb3B1

bGF0aW9ucyBpbiBSREQgc2FtcGxlcwCjEwEJgAEAIQAAAEMyMDJDREYwMUMzNUQzMTFBOENEMDAX

MDVBQ0U0MkU2ACKHASCAAwAOAAAzwcHAAGADAAMACAABAAhAQEFgAMADgAAAM8HBwAIAAwAF
AAAn

AAQAMAEBDYAEAAIAAAACAAIAAQOQBgBMBwAALQAAAAsAAgABAAAQA5AKCwWPZ2yb4BHgBwAAEA
AAA1AAAAU2NyZWVuaW5nIGZvciB0YXJnZXRIZCBzdWJwb3B1bGF0aW9ucyBpbiBSREQgc2FtcGxl
cwAAAAACAXEAAQAAABYAAAABvsI29rfwzQLFNrW06jNABBazkLmAAACAQkQAQAAAE0CAABJAgAA
xwIAAExaRnXrt0c5AwAKAHJjcGcxMjUWUWgD4C2BuDhAwMzOdAfcgAqQD4wIAY2gKwDBzZXQwB7IE
IEdv7HRoDeAF0FQCgwBQA1SVENIHCSbhBGBuZAKAMn0KgXVjAFALA3VsCm4CIGULpiBBnnqIAlw
cwhhYweRBbEWgX5lCsAQ8BcQA6AEYAlwIPEAcGQgbAeQBCABEQWQeHRpdhhABPEJ4QuAZ9QgdAWQ
aAMAcQpQBCBEdG8YkG9jYRowIG8BAACQCXEWcnAUMQnwdLkEIGJhETAYgBfhaBeATmwR8BmAAZB0
dQQgdj8KwAcwAmAashEABUBBQXhQT1IVkAJABJAEIHdICGBsGIFpaxhAGuFzwREBZT8gIEk4AMQ
sQMgc3VtAMAFEHoYRM8cMB3AG/URMHMsGYAa8L8LUBeAETAWcQtQFmBwBRCPHjAaMCRxGuA6lGsb
QEBocnluY0AWoGNrBzEXVi4FoG0KogqAVLkRAG5rBCALgBhQZB4w+SXgZS4nNCi4CzAAoBKi
QEBocnluY0AWoGNrBzEXVi4FoG0KogqAVLkRAG5rBCALgBhQZB4w+kQvw

NCBLJZQgQxuwqyQCfBhI4BQJuBEKKW2UhdmBmF2DeAHkU0AcLxhZwSQJzQIUChgdQMArSxaRfh
UyYwCfAW4kfra2B1cC8nNFMlcbIgdRZgTRFAaARwL4UnNDGeNBfgBmAFoBhxU3QJ0fZ0I4AwYGkb
UTIQUAUAwFH0DkUYUACXgBAAFoCOAQ1BBIDk0D0A1JzQoCTVQNSkzgdK1LTYINjkyGOB4dC4gfjI2
oCkbAtELxSdDFIEAATlgAAAAAwD9P1IDAAADAN4/r28AAAsAAYAIAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAA

AAOFAAAAAAAAwACgAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAAAEYAAAAEIUAAAAAADAAOACCAGAAAAADAAAA
A

AAAARgAAAABShQAA8BMAAB4ABIAIAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAAFSFAAABAAAABAAAADguNQAD
AAWACCAGAAAAADAAAAAARgAAAAABhQAAAAAAsABoAIIAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAA6
F

AAAAAAAwAHgAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAAAEYAAAAEIUAAAAAADAAiACCAGAAAAADAAAAAA
A

RgAAAAAYhQAAAAAAB4ACYAIAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAADaFAAABAAAAAQAAAAAAAEAAqA
CCAGAAAAADAAAAAARgAAAAA3hQAAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAHgALgAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAAAEY
A

AAAAOIUAAAEAAAAABAAAAAAsADIALIAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAACIAAAAAACwANgAsg
BgAAAAAwAAAAAAAEYAAAAABYgAAAAAALAA6ACCAGAAAAADAAAAAARgAAAAAGhQAAAA
A

AAMAJgAAAAAAAwA2AAAAAAAEADFAAQAAAAcAAABLQVRIWUMAAAMAGkAAAAAAHgAwQAEAAAAHA
AAA
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AAAAAMAERAAAAAAHgAIEAEEAABIAAAAQU5ZUkVTT1VSQOVTT1JSRVNFQVJDSE9OTU9SRUFOREx
U1NFRkZfQ1RJVkVtQ1JFRU5JTkduRUUNITkIRVUVtVE9MT0NBVEEVERVNJUKVEUKVTUE9OREVOVFNC
QVNFRE9OSEVBTA AAAADSIA==

----- =_NextPart_000_01BEC975.D4352784--

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Thu Jul 8 12:56:25 1999

Received: from imo24.mx.aol.com (imo24.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.68])

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

id MAA03820 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 12:56:19 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo24.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5OPSa21644 (4421)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 15:53:53 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <d6efee81.24b65bd1@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 8 Jul 1999 15:53:53 EDT

Subject: Re: Internet Polling

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 10

On July 2, Richard Rands reported to AAPORNET members the announcement by Harris Black that the firm "has been completely restructured to emphasize Internet activities and that their name will now be Harris Interactive."

Not

surprisingly, as prologue to that announcement, the same national market research firm, expressed its belief that "the Internet will bring a 'radical

transformation' to the polling industry during the next Presidential campaign."

A close reading of the first quote suggested the possibility that the frames

from which respondents would be chosen in Harris' future research would be limited to the population of Internet users, however that's to be defined.

It would, in any case, not be households/individuals in total. But the second quote pretty much puts that (too optimistic) interpretation to rest

if

what's being contemplated is election polling via Internet. The phrase "radical transformation" is an apt one, so long as we accept that transformations can cut both ways: as distortions of as well as positive break-throughs from whatever it is that's being transformed.

I wonder how many in AAPOR remember the late and unlamented Warner-Amex and its Columbus, Ohio test of an early (maybe 1981 or 1982) interactive

mechanism called Qube. Whatever year it was, at least one major session at AAPOR'S annual conference was devoted to what was then correctly perceived as

a threat, not only to the validity of political polling, but to the democratic process itself. Qube's supporters, whose enthusiasm for the technology would on occasion lead them to issue statements just this side of

outright lunacy, were talking-up its capacity to transmit to Washington of the collective position of a Congressperson's constituency, in accord with which he or she was expected to vote.

All of which, if I understand the nature of this radical transformation Harris Black plans to introduce to Presidential election polling, only reinforces the old saw about there being nothing really new under the sun. That, and the question: if Presidential election polling today, what about candidates for other public office tomorrow? And preferences for different brands of margarine the day after? It boggles the mind, but maybe you had to

be at the CASRO conference where this was announced. Still, it wouldn't hurt

to dust off the Proceedings issue for that year's AAPOR conference; at first

blush, there's going to be some overlap between what we (AAPOR) had to say back then -- it seems to me there was even a demonstration of the Qube mechanism itself -- and what we'll be obliged to say this time around.

And, for anyone in a betting mood, five will get you ten if the results of polling entirely by Internet fail to show the Republican candidate for federal office consistently coming out on top "if the election were held

today."

Philip Harding

>From ebeling@ecst.csuchico.edu Thu Jul 8 17:33:25 1999

Received: from mail.csuchico.edu (mail.CSUChico.EDU [132.241.82.14])

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

id RAA16603 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 17:33:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ecst.csuchico.edu ([132.241.160.109]) by mail.csuchico.edu

(Netscape Messaging Server 3.6) with ESMTP id AAA3C08

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Jul 1999 17:33:06 -0700

Message-ID: <378540F1.79AE5EC0@ecst.csuchico.edu>

Date: Thu, 08 Jul 1999 17:23:13 -0700

From: Jon Ebeling <ebeling@ecst.csuchico.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Screening for targeted subpopulations in RDD samples

References: <199907081925.MAA69338@mail.isp.net>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sender: "Jon S. Ebeling" <ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu>

Dr. Cirksena:

I've done a brief review of the issue as you have noted it here. It seems a bit unclear to me since you have not specified the model too well. But here is a resource you might want to look at:

Judith T. Lessler and Willam D. Kalsbeek

Non Sampling Errors in Surveys.

Of particular interest I would think is the article entitled: "Non response: Background and Terminology" while this might seem a bit fundamental to a person of your experience I feel it has some relevant material since all of the cases are based on doing health surveys. If you will note pages 127 and 128 you will see Table 6.4. Note how the non response rate seems to drop considerably as the type of survey moves across the columns. One possibility is to track down the surveys mentioned here and then see how their screening and sampling methods were carried out. The reason I raise the issue of non response in this context is because screening, as you know, will cause higher potential unwillingness to participate. Hence the entire survey has a high likelihood of non response than merely one of the questions. It seems to me that you have integrate the rationale for the survey data with the screening questions to enable higher levels of participation at the front end. My experience with screens is not real positive. I hope this might lead you to some further solutions to your problem.

Jon Ebeling, Ph.D.

ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu

Kathy Cirksena wrote:

- > Any resources or research on more and less effective screening
- > techniques to locate desired respondents based on health status
- > variables that AAPORnetters would like to share? I will summarize and

> post responses, so please reply privately to:
> kathrync@socialresearch.com Thanks in advance.

>

> Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.

> Research Services Manager

> Communication Sciences Group/

> Survey Methods Group

> 140 Second Street, Suite 400

> San Francisco, CA 94105

> (415) 495-6692 ext. 269

>

>

> -----

> --

>

> Part 1.2 Type: application/ms-tnef

> Encoding: base64

>From Goldenberg_K@bls.gov Fri Jul 9 06:40:53 1999

Received: from dcgate.bls.gov (dcgate.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])

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

id GAA05148 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 06:40:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from psbmail1.psb.bls.gov (psbmail1.psb.bls.gov [146.142.42.18])

by dcgate.bls.gov (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id JAA11880

for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 09:40:49 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by PSBMAIL1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <NSJWNGR6>; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 09:40:11 -0400

Message-ID: <705AF639142AD211BCE500104B6A398961E929@PSBMAIL4>

From: Goldenberg_K <Goldenberg_K@bls.gov>

To: aapornet <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>

Subject: More selling under the guise...

Date: Fri, 9 Jul 1999 09:40:08 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain

This time it's the Washington Times. The envelope says "Your opinion is requested." The form contains a number of "simple" yes/no questions, e.g., "Is there a values deficit in America," "Do you support stronger U.S. ties with China?" as well as questions about internet access, email use, and interest in chat rooms and access to Times archives on the Web. The rest, of course, is a subscription pitch.

I hope they don't publish the results of this effort as a legitimate poll!!
Come to think of it, how do most of the FRUGers and SUGers use the data they collect?

Karen Goldenberg
goldenberg_k@bls.gov

>From bthompson@directionrsch.com Fri Jul 9 06:44:42 1999

Received: from proxy.directionrsch.com (root@dri74.directionrsch.com [206.112.196.74])

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

id GAA06178 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 06:44:40 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com (drione.directionsrsch.com [100.0.0.4])

by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id JAA23179
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 09:59:19 -0400

Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2
10-16-1998)) id 852567A9.004B6906 ; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 09:43:40 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI

From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567A9.004B687E.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>

Date: Fri, 9 Jul 1999 09:43:38 -0400

Subject: Re: More selling under the guise...

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

One would assume (if they use them at all) its either for their own internal marketing/planning purposes or for external PR since many of the answers to these questions are obvious.

>From jballou@rci.rutgers.edu Fri Jul 9 11:03:43 1999

Received: from gehenna1.rutgers.edu (gehenna1.rutgers.edu [165.230.116.154])

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

id LAA16787 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Jul 1999 11:03:41 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (qmail 10419 invoked by alias); 9 Jul 1999 18:03:39 -0000

Received: (qmail 10410 invoked from network); 9 Jul 1999 18:03:38 -0000

Received: from the-network-asy-41.rutgers.edu (HELO rci.rutgers.edu)
(128.6.248.41)

by gehenna1.rutgers.edu with SMTP; 9 Jul 1999 18:03:38 -0000

Message-ID: <37863833.5621F496@rci.rutgers.edu>

Date: Fri, 09 Jul 1999 13:58:11 -0400

From: Janice Ballou <jballou@rci.rutgers.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en] (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: [Fwd: Job Openings]

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----E6757218C0476C4379F33AEB"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----E6757218C0476C4379F33AEB

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

-----E6757218C0476C4379F33AEB

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Message-ID: <378628D6.934BB2F1@rci.rutgers.edu>

Date: Fri, 09 Jul 1999 12:52:38 -0400

From: Janice Ballou <jballou@rci.rutgers.edu>

Organization: Center for Public Interest Polling

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en] (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: appornet@usc.edu

Subject: Job Openings

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There are two Project Manager job openings at the Center for Public Interest Polling, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers the State University of New Jersey. Both projects are program evaluations. One is to evaluate HIV prevention programs and the other is for substance abuse prevention programs. The Center is located in New Brunswick, NJ which is centrally located between New York City and Philadelphia. The following is a general description of the responsibilities for both of these positions. For more information or to express interest in the position, please contact Janice Ballou (jballou@rci.rutgers.edu; Phone: 732-828-2210 x-240; Fax: 732-732-1551).

Assists in the management of data collection and analysis for program evaluation. Supervises and plans project coordination. Interviews, trains, and supervises the interviewing staff in the collection of behavioral data. Regularly interfaces with personnel at community-based sites. Coordinates the data collection of a complex project. Responsible for progress reports to clients. Provides preliminary analysis to clients.

Requires a bachelor's degree in public health, social work, behavioral science, social science, or related field, and a minimum of one year experience in research setting, preferably in project management. Masters degree preferred. Must have computer experience, including SPSS.

Must be skilled in working with diverse populations. Spanish speaking is preferred.

-----E6757218C0476C4379F33AEB--

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Sun Jul 11 16:31:33 1999

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

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

id QAA06928 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 16:31:32 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo27.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5KLIa19491 (4422)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:30:40 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <fb0fd9e7.24ba8320@aol.com>

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:30:40 EDT

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

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 10

Sid:

When probes are absent from attitude (or other open-end) questions, my position has always been that you can't really interpret a DK response. Is there really no affect on the respondent's part toward the issue or brand or

candidate you're asking about, or is he or she someone who really could give a response but it's got to be teased out. Which, of course, is one function of probes.

So a DK category, in mixing the two together, becomes essentially meaningless because you can't make the assumption that an attitude that has to be dragged out of a respondent is somehow less strongly held than one expressed very readily loquaciously and clearly not in need of probing.

My own preference, especially when the DKs weren't especially prevalent, is just to drop them from the tabulation for just that reason. That seems to me

the most sensible approach to responses whose collective meaning is that unclear. But sometime you find yourself dealing with circumstances in which

the DKs must be at least included, if not shown separately, in the final table. In that situation -- and especially absent probes -- my position is that the consequent uncertainty of the DK percentage should be distributed among the responses that were expressed and in accordance with the relative frequency of those responses.

Lacking the power to read respondents' minds and unable to persuade people to

let the DKs just twist slowly, slowly in the wind, I don't know how else to

handle the problem in any rational way.

Best regards,

Phil Harding

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Sun Jul 11 16:48:54 1999

Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])

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

id QAA09034 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 16:48:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login0.isis.unc.edu (login0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.130])

by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA19870

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:46:11 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <63539-37218>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:46:06 -0400

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:45:55 -0400 (EDT)

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

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

X-Sender: pmeyer@login0.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

In-Reply-To: <fb0fd9e7.24ba8320@aol.com>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990711193908.79918E-100000@login0.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I was taught, very early in my career, that "Don't-know is data." In my newspaper writing, I would sometimes drop it from the percentage base and alert the reader by saying, "Among those who expressed an opinion ..."

But most of the time, it's potentially important information because the analyst wants to know which questions have higher levels of DK. And one especially wants to know the DK trend over time. As a choice becomes salient, DK should drop. Pre-election polls are the obvious example.

=====
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, 11 Jul 1999 PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote:

> Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:30:40 EDT
> From: PAHARDING7@aol.com
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses
>
> Sid:
>
> When probes are absent from attitude (or other open-end) questions, my
> position has always been that you can't really interpret a DK response.
Is
> there really no affect on the respondent's part toward the issue or brand
or

> candidate you're asking about, or is he or she someone who really could
give
> a response but it's got to be teased out. Which, of course, is one
function
> of probes.
>
> So a DK category, in mixing the two together, becomes essentially
> meaningless
> because you can't make the assumption that an attitude that has to be
dragged
> out of a respondent is somehow less strongly held than one expressed very
> readily loquaciously and clearly not in need of probing.
>
> My own preference, especially when the DKs weren't especially
> prevalent, is
> just to drop them from the tabulation for just that reason. That seems to
me
> the most sensible approach to responses whose collective meaning is that
> unclear. But sometime you find yourself dealing with circumstances in
which
> the DKs must be at least included, if not shown separately, in the final
> table. In that situation -- and especially absent probes -- my position
is
> that the consequent uncertainty of the DK percentage should be distributed

> among the responses that were expressed and in accordance with the
relative
> frequency of those responses.
>

> Lacking the power to read respondents' minds and unable to persuade
> people to
> let the DKs just twist slowly, slowly in the wind, I don't know how else
to
> handle the problem in any rational way.

>

> Best regards,

>

> Phil Harding

>

>From vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu Mon Jul 12 06:34:16 1999

Received: from POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU (POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU [130.91.52.35])

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

id GAA06669 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 06:34:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from student75 (130.91.52.32) by POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU with SMTP

(Eudora Internet Mail Server 1.2); Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:39:50 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.1.16.19990712093950.1f376f10@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

X-Sender: vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (16)

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:39:50

To: AAPORNET@usc.edu

From: Vincent Price <vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Subject: POQ Now in JSTOR

Cc: Public Opinion Quarterly <poq@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now available in JSTOR.

All issues of POQ from Volume 1 (1937) to Volume 57 (1993) can be searched easily in JSTOR by issue, author, or title. Complete page images of the articles are provided. The full text of articles and abstracts can also be searched. At this point, access is available only through JSTOR institutional subscriptions (e.g., libraries).

For those unfamiliar with JSTOR, it is a not-for-profit organization, established with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and dedicated to helping the scholarly community take advantage of new information technologies. Its major aim is to assemble a reliable and comprehensive electronic archive of important scholarly journals.

Archiving in JSTOR is just one of the ways POQ will become more widely available through electronic means. As announced at this year's AAPOR meeting, the University of Chicago Press plans to begin Web-based, electronic publication of the journal beginning in the Spring of 2000. All POQ subscribers will receive access to the electronic publication as well as their usual, printed issues. In the future, in partnership with JSTOR, the University of Chicago Press will also provide POQ subscribers with access to all back issues of the journal, as well as links from current individual articles to cited articles in previous volumes.

With our move to on-line publication, we are interested in manuscripts contributing to the field of public opinion research that also make inventive use of new electronic formats -- for example, incorporating supplemental audio or video material, interview schedules, or interactive

data presentations.

-- Vince Price

Editor

Public Opinion Quarterly Telephone: (215) 573-1966
The Annenberg Public Policy Center Facsimile: (215) 573-1962
of the University of Pennsylvania
3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 POQ@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

On the World-Wide Web: www.journals.uchicago.edu/POQ

>From rusciano@rider.edu Mon Jul 12 06:35:39 1999

Received: from GENIUS.rider.edu (genius.rider.edu [192.107.45.5])

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

id GAA07249 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 06:35:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)

id <01JDH0HY4L8G8Y6OP5@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:33:17 EDT

Received: from rider.edu (fs90.rider.edu)

by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)

with ESMTP id <01JDH0HOGKB28Y6PFW@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:33:10 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:35:18 -0400

From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <3789EF16.CB72836F@rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en]C-NECCK (Win95; I)

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

References: <852567A7.00013D3F.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

I have found in certain cases that "don't know" responses can be very useful if cross-tabulated with other data. For instance, in an article I wrote about patterns of voting among German women between 1947 and 1987, I discovered that there were a higher percentage of "don't know" and "no answer" questions among the female respondents when they were more likely to vote for the Conservatives than men, prior to the 1969 election. However, this difference dropped significantly when the female and male patterns converged in that election and subsequent ones, suggesting that the "don't know" or "no answer" responses among women were actually an expression of their detachment from politics during the early postwar era, which was consistent with their votes for the Conservative party. In essence, a "don't know" response did not mean that they did not have political opinions, but rather that they tended to embrace a Conservative philosophy which somewhat (at that time) circumscribed their political roles.

The bottom line, I guess, would be to check "don't know" and "no answer" responses to test whether they correlate with other opinions or characteristics in your sample population. That information could yield extremely valuable insights into the nature of the groups you are studying.

Frank Rusciano, Professor and Chair

Department of Political Science

Rider University
2083 Lawrenceville Road
Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648-3099
email at rusciano@rider.edu

s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu wrote:

> I would be grateful if aaporites shared with me what they do with
> "don't know" responses in a survey when probes are absent. Do you
> dump them? Use them? If so, how? I am especially interested in
> "don't know" responses on an attitude survey (rdd). Please send responses
to me and I will summerize
> for anyone interested. Thanks very much.
>
> Best,
>
> Sid

>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Mon Jul 12 06:44:01 1999

Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (firewall-user@www.tapmedia.com
[208.232.40.10])

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

id GAA08889 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 06:44:00 -0700
(PDT)

Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id JAA01406; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:44:22
-0400

Received: from nodnsquery(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via smap (V5.0)
id xma001393; Mon, 12 Jul 99 09:44:13 -0400

Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <MV02M5FM>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:37:20 -0400

Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B30141994E@arbmidx.arbitron.com>

From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>

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

Subject: RE: POQ Now in JSTOR

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:37:14 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain

Fabulous!

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Vincent Price [SMTP:vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu]

> Sent: Monday, July 12, 1999 5:40 AM

> To: AAPORNET@usc.edu

> Cc: Public Opinion Quarterly

> Subject: POQ Now in JSTOR

>

> I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now

> available in JSTOR.

>

> All issues of POQ from Volume 1 (1937) to Volume 57 (1993) can be

> searched easily in JSTOR by issue, author, or title. Complete page

> images of the articles are provided. The full text of articles and

> abstracts can also be searched. At this point, access is available

> only through JSTOR institutional subscriptions (e.g., libraries).

>

> For those unfamiliar with JSTOR, it is a not-for-profit organization,

> established with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and
> dedicated to helping the scholarly community take advantage of new
> information technologies. Its major aim is to assemble a reliable and
> comprehensive electronic archive of important scholarly journals.
>
> Archiving in JSTOR is just one of the ways POQ will become more widely
> available through electronic means. As announced at this year's AAPOR
> meeting, the University of Chicago Press plans to begin Web-based,
> electronic publication of the journal beginning in the Spring of 2000.
> All POQ subscribers will receive access to the electronic publication
> as well as their usual, printed issues. In the future, in partnership
> with JSTOR, the University of Chicago Press will also provide POQ
> subscribers with access to all back issues of the journal, as well as
> links from current individual articles to cited articles in previous
> volumes.
>
> With our move to on-line publication, we are interested in manuscripts
> contributing to the field of public opinion research that also make
> inventive use of new electronic formats -- for example, incorporating
> supplemental audio or video material, interview schedules, or
> interactive data presentations.

>

> -- Vince Price
> Editor

>

> -----

> Public Opinion Quarterly Telephone: (215) 573-1966
> The Annenberg Public Policy Center Facsimile: (215) 573-1962
> of the University of Pennsylvania

> 3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:
> Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 POQ@pobox.asc.upenn.edu
>
> On the World-Wide Web: www.journals.uchicago.edu/POQ
>From hschuman@umich.edu Mon Jul 12 08:36:26 1999
Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.17])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id IAA29755 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 08:36:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.81])
 by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
LAA06215
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 11:36:24 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
 by breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id LAA03335
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 11:36:23 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 11:36:23 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses
In-Reply-To: <3789EF16.CB72836F@rider.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.4.10.9907121120180.20105-100000@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The various inquiries and replies about don't know responses seem to ignore a fairly substantial literature on the subject. There is classic work by Daniel Lerner (1963) and Philip Converse (1970). My own book with Presser has two chapters reporting experiments with DK responses. There are relevant articles by Bishop & his colleagues, by Tom Smith, by Jean Converse, by Coombs & Coombs, etc., and there are articles in more recent issues of POQ. I am no doubt leaving out other relevant work. We don't have all the answers at present, but we also do not need to reinvent the wheel in each new survey.

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Jul 12 09:55:55 1999

Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])

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

id JAA22349 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:55:53 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 1DTLa17700 (4225);

Mon, 12 Jul 1999 12:55:12 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <38c2523.24bb77f0@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 12:55:12 EDT

Subject: Responses to Your AAPORNET Question

To: Kraus@csu-a.csuohio.edu

CC: 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 10

Sid:

What follows is the failure response of AOL's mailer after I'd sent off my reply yesterday to your aapornet question re Don't Knows:

Hi. This is the qmail-send program at is1.net.ohio-state.edu.

I'm afraid I wasn't able to deliver your message to the following addresses.

This is a permanent error; I've given up. Sorry it didn't work out.

<ts7072@ohstmvs.uts.ohio-state.edu>: <----- MAYBE THIS?

E-Mail no longer supported on the Mainframe

If it happened to me, I have to assume it did so to others, with the result that everyone received comments about the question raised except the person who raised it. If so, and if the pony express made it through on this run,

could you let me know and I'll re-submit what I had to say. Perhaps, since they were all sent to aapornet@usc.edu, the others can be retrieved as well.

Having read what's come to me so far, I think it would be well worth the effort.

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Mon Jul 12 10:17:27 1999

Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])

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

id KAA28411 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 10:17:26 -0700

(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2

(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567AC.005EB5DD ; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:14:29 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567AC.005EB4D0.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:24:40 -0400

Subject: Re: Responses to Your AAPORNET Question

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

I have your response. Thanks.

Best,

Sid

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jul 12 13:19:33 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id NAA27861 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:19:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id NAA27344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:19:33 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:19:32 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: All AAPORNET Postings Since Friday

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907121305030.20233-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

AAPORNETters,

Because some of you feel that your mail systems might have fumbled messages from AAPORNET in recent days, below you will find every last keystroke successfully posted to our list since late Friday night, July 9.

If you don't have the feeling that you've missed something, simply delete this message--what follows isn't that much better in the retelling.

-- Jim

-----E6757218C0476C4379F33AEB--

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Sun Jul 11 16:31:33 1999

Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.71])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA06928 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 16:31:32 -0700
(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com
by imo27.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5KLIa19491 (4422)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:30:40 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <fb0fd9e7.24ba8320@aol.com>

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:30:40 EDT

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

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 10

Sid:

When probes are absent from attitude (or other open-end) questions, my position has always been that you can't really interpret a DK response. Is there really no affect on the respondent's part toward the issue or brand or candidate you're asking about, or is he or she someone who really could give a response but it's got to be teased out. Which, of course, is one function of probes.

So a DK category, in mixing the two together, becomes essentially meaningless because you can't make the assumption that an attitude that has to be dragged out of a respondent is somehow less strongly held than one expressed very readily loquaciously and clearly not in need of probing.

My own preference, especially when the DKs weren't especially prevalent, is just to drop them from the tabulation for just that reason. That seems to me the most sensible approach to responses whose collective meaning is that unclear. But sometime you find yourself dealing with circumstances in which

the DKs must be at least included, if not shown separately, in the final table. In that situation -- and especially absent probes -- my position is that the consequent uncertainty of the DK percentage should be distributed among the responses that were expressed and in accordance with the relative frequency of those responses.

Lacking the power to read respondents' minds and unable to persuade people to let the DKs just twist slowly, slowly in the wind, I don't know how else to handle the problem in any rational way.

Best regards,

Phil Harding

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Sun Jul 11 16:48:54 1999

Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA09034 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 16:48:51 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from login0.isis.unc.edu (login0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.130])
by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA19870
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:46:11 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <63539-37218>; Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:46:06 -0400

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:45:55 -0400 (EDT)

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

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

X-Sender: pmeyer@login0.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

In-Reply-To: <fb0fd9e7.24ba8320@aol.com>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990711193908.79918E-100000@login0.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I was taught, very early in my career, that "Don't-know is data." In my newspaper writing, I would sometimes drop it from the percentage base and alert the reader by saying, "Among those who expressed an opinion ..."

But most of the time, it's potentially important information because the analyst wants to know which questions have higher levels of DK. And one especially wants to know the DK trend over time. As a choice becomes salient, DK should drop. Pre-election polls are the obvious example.

=====
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, 11 Jul 1999 PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote:

> Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1999 19:30:40 EDT

> From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

>

> Sid:

>

> When probes are absent from attitude (or other open-end) questions, my

> position has always been that you can't really interpret a DK response.

Is

> there really no affect on the respondent's part toward the issue or brand

or

> candidate you're asking about, or is he or she someone who really could

give

> a response but it's got to be teased out. Which, of course, is one

function

> of probes.

>

> So a DK category, in mixing the two together, becomes essentially
> meaningless
> because you can't make the assumption that an attitude that has to be
dragged
> out of a respondent is somehow less strongly held than one expressed very
> readily loquaciously and clearly not in need of probing.
>
> My own preference, especially when the DKs weren't especially
> prevalent, is
> just to drop them from the tabulation for just that reason. That seems to
me
> the most sensible approach to responses whose collective meaning is that
> unclear. But sometime you find yourself dealing with circumstances in
which
> the DKs must be at least included, if not shown separately, in the final
> table. In that situation -- and especially absent probes -- my position
is
> that the consequent uncertainty of the DK percentage should be distributed

> among the responses that were expressed and in accordance with the
relative
> frequency of those responses.
>
> Lacking the power to read respondents' minds and unable to persuade
> people to
> let the DKs just twist slowly, slowly in the wind, I don't know how else
to
> handle the problem in any rational way.
>

> Best regards,
>
> Phil Harding
>

>From vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu Mon Jul 12 06:34:16 1999

Received: from POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU (POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU [130.91.52.35])

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

id GAA06669 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 06:34:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from student75 (130.91.52.32) by POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU with SMTP

(Eudora Internet Mail Server 1.2); Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:39:50 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.1.16.19990712093950.1f376f10@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

X-Sender: vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (16)

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:39:50

To: AAPORNET@usc.edu

From: Vincent Price <vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Subject: POQ Now in JSTOR

Cc: Public Opinion Quarterly <poq@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now available in JSTOR.

All issues of POQ from Volume 1 (1937) to Volume 57 (1993) can be searched easily in JSTOR by issue, author, or title. Complete page images of the articles are provided. The full text of articles and abstracts can also be

searched. At this point, access is available only through JSTOR institutional subscriptions (e.g., libraries).

For those unfamiliar with JSTOR, it is a not-for-profit organization, established with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and dedicated to helping the scholarly community take advantage of new information technologies. Its major aim is to assemble a reliable and comprehensive electronic archive of important scholarly journals.

Archiving in JSTOR is just one of the ways POQ will become more widely available through electronic means. As announced at this year's AAPOR meeting, the University of Chicago Press plans to begin Web-based, electronic publication of the journal beginning in the Spring of 2000. All POQ subscribers will receive access to the electronic publication as well as their usual, printed issues. In the future, in partnership with JSTOR, the University of Chicago Press will also provide POQ subscribers with access to all back issues of the journal, as well as links from current individual articles to cited articles in previous volumes.

With our move to on-line publication, we are interested in manuscripts contributing to the field of public opinion research that also make inventive use of new electronic formats -- for example, incorporating supplemental audio or video material, interview schedules, or interactive data presentations.

-- Vince Price

Editor

Public Opinion Quarterly Telephone: (215) 573-1966
The Annenberg Public Policy Center Facsimile: (215) 573-1962
of the University of Pennsylvania
3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 POQ@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

On the World-Wide Web: www.journals.uchicago.edu/POQ

>From rusciano@rider.edu Mon Jul 12 06:35:39 1999

Received: from GENIUS.rider.edu (genius.rider.edu [192.107.45.5])

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

id GAA07249 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 06:35:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)

id <01JDH0HY4L8G8Y6OP5@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 12 Jul
1999 09:33:17 EDT

Received: from rider.edu (fs90.rider.edu)

by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)

with ESMTP id <01JDH0HOGKB28Y6PFW@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;

Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:33:10 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:35:18 -0400

From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <3789EF16.CB72836F@rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en]C-NECCK (Win95; I)

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

References: <852567A7.00013D3F.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

I have found in certain cases that "don't know" responses can be very useful if cross-tabulated with other data. For instance, in an article I wrote about patterns of voting among German women between 1947 and 1987, I discovered that there were a higher percentage of "don't know" and "no answer" questions among the female respondents when they were more likely to vote for the Conservatives than men, prior to the 1969 election. However, this difference dropped significantly when the female and male patterns converged in that election and subsequent ones, suggesting that the "don't know" or "no answer" responses among women were actually an expression of their detachment from politics during the early postwar era, which was consistent with their votes for the Conservative party. In essence, a "don't know" response did not mean that they did not have political opinions, but rather that they tended to embrace a Conservative philosophy which somewhat (at that time) circumscribed their political roles.

The bottom line, I guess, would be to check "don't know" and "no answer" responses to test whether they correlate with other opinions or characteristics in your sample population. That information could yield extremely valuable insights into the nature of the groups you are studying.

Frank Rusciano, Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
Rider University
2083 Lawrenceville Road
Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648-3099
email at rusciano@rider.edu

s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu wrote:

> I would be grateful if aaporites shared with me what they do with
> "don't know" responses in a survey when probes are absent. Do you
> dump them? Use them? If so, how? I am especially interested in
> "don't know" responses on an attitude survey (rdd). Please send responses
to me and I will summerize
> for anyone interested. Thanks very much.
>
> Best,
>
> Sid

>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Mon Jul 12 06:44:01 1999

Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (firewall-user@www.tapmedia.com
[208.232.40.10])

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

id GAA08889 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 06:44:00 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id JAA01406; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:44:22

-0400

Received: from nodnsquery(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via smap (V5.0)

id xma001393; Mon, 12 Jul 99 09:44:13 -0400

Received: by arbmex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <MV02M5FM>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:37:20 -0400

Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B30141994E@arbmex.arbitron.com>

From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>

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

Subject: RE: POQ Now in JSTOR

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:37:14 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain

Fabulous!

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Vincent Price [SMTP:vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu]

> Sent: Monday, July 12, 1999 5:40 AM

> To: AAPORNET@usc.edu

> Cc: Public Opinion Quarterly

> Subject: POQ Now in JSTOR

>

> I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now

> available in JSTOR.

>

> All issues of POQ from Volume 1 (1937) to Volume 57 (1993) can be

> searched easily in JSTOR by issue, author, or title. Complete page

> images of the articles are provided. The full text of articles and

> abstracts can also be searched. At this point, access is available

> only through JSTOR institutional subscriptions (e.g., libraries).

>

> For those unfamiliar with JSTOR, it is a not-for-profit organization,

> established with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and

> dedicated to helping the scholarly community take advantage of new

> information technologies. Its major aim is to assemble a reliable and

> comprehensive electronic archive of important scholarly journals.

>

> Archiving in JSTOR is just one of the ways POQ will become more widely

> available through electronic means. As announced at this year's AAPOR
> meeting, the University of Chicago Press plans to begin Web-based,
> electronic publication of the journal beginning in the Spring of 2000.
> All POQ subscribers will receive access to the electronic publication
> as well as their usual, printed issues. In the future, in partnership
> with JSTOR, the University of Chicago Press will also provide POQ
> subscribers with access to all back issues of the journal, as well as
> links from current individual articles to cited articles in previous
> volumes.

>
> With our move to on-line publication, we are interested in manuscripts
> contributing to the field of public opinion research that also make
> inventive use of new electronic formats -- for example, incorporating
> supplemental audio or video material, interview schedules, or
> interactive data presentations.

>
> -- Vince Price
> Editor

>
> -----
> Public Opinion Quarterly Telephone: (215) 573-1966
> The Annenberg Public Policy Center Facsimile: (215) 573-1962
> of the University of Pennsylvania
> 3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:
> Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 POQ@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

>
> On the World-Wide Web: www.journals.uchicago.edu/POQ
> From hschuman@umich.edu Mon Jul 12 08:36:26 1999

Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu)

[141.211.63.17])

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

id IAA29755 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 08:36:25 -0700

(PDT)

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

[141.211.63.81])

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

LAA06215

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 11:36:24 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)

by breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id LAA03335

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 11:36:23 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 11:36:23 -0400 (EDT)

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Don't Know " responses

In-Reply-To: <3789EF16.CB72836F@rider.edu>

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.9907121120180.20105-100000@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

The various inquiries and replies about don't know responses seem to ignore a fairly substantial literature on the subject. There is classic work by Daniel Lerner (1963) and Philip Converse (1970). My own book with Presser has two chapters reporting experiments with DK responses. There are relevant articles by Bishop & his colleagues, by Tom Smith, by Jean Converse, by

Coombs & Coombs, etc., and there are articles in more recent issues of POQ. I am no doubt leaving out other relevant work. We don't have all the answers at present, but we also do not need to reinvent the wheel in each new survey.

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Jul 12 09:55:55 1999

Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])

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

id JAA22349 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 09:55:53 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 1DTLa17700 (4225);

Mon, 12 Jul 1999 12:55:12 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <38c2523.24bb77f0@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 12:55:12 EDT

Subject: Responses to Your AAPORNET Question

To: Kraus@csu-a.csuohio.edu

CC: 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 10

Sid:

What follows is the failure response of AOL's mailer after I'd sent off my

reply yesterday to your aapornet question re Don't Knows:

Hi. This is the gmail-send program at is1.net.ohio-state.edu.

I'm afraid I wasn't able to deliver your message to the following addresses.

This is a permanent error; I've given up. Sorry it didn't work out.

<ts7072@ohstmvs.uts.ohio-state.edu>: <----- MAYBE THIS?

E-Mail no longer supported on the Mainframe

If it happened to me, I have to assume it did so to others, with the result that everyone received comments about the question raised except the person who raised it. If so, and if the pony express made it through on this run,

could you let me know and I'll re-submit what I had to say. Perhaps, since they were all sent to aapornet@usc.edu, the others can be retrieved as well.

Having read what's come to me so far, I think it would be well worth the effort.

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Mon Jul 12 10:17:27 1999

Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])

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

id KAA28411 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 10:17:26 -0700

(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2

(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567AC.005EB5DD ; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:14:29 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567AC.005EB4D0.00@smtmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 13:24:40 -0400

Subject: Re: Responses to Your AAPORNET Question

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

I have your response. Thanks.

Best,

Sid

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

>From lee.giesbrecht@bts.gov Mon Jul 12 14:34:27 1999

Received: from proto.bts.gov (proto.bts.gov [204.152.44.10])

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

id OAA01273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 14:34:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from inet.bts.gov (inet.bts.gov [204.152.44.12])

by proto.bts.gov (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA04018

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 17:33:55 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from BTS-Message_Server by inet.bts.gov

with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 17:30:39 -0400

Message-Id: <s78a263f.083@inet.bts.gov>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 17:32:02 -0400

From: "Lee giesbrecht" <lee.giesbrecht@bts.gov>

To: <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>, <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Job Openings at the Bureau of Transportation Statistics

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I am posting this message for a colleague. Please forgive the cross =
posting.

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) of the U.S. Department of =
Transportation is forming a team to pioneer a discipline of transportation =
statistics. We are seeking statisticians and transportation professionals =
with quantitative training.

BTS provides critical transportation information for public policy and =
private decision making at all levels. Areas of our work include safety, =
environment, international trade, travel, shipment, productivity, =
geographic information systems, performance measures, and research on =
survey and other statistical methods. See our home page (www.bts.gov) for =
more information.

We have a number of positions open now at the GS-13 and GS-14 levels, and =
we plan to develop more junior and senior positions in the future. =

Training and experience is sought in statistics (including statistical computing, risk analysis, stochastic modeling, simulation, data mining, spatial statistics, visualization, biostatistics, epidemiology, experimental design, statistical analysis and inference, quality improvement, and survey design and research) or in transportation related fields, in particular transportation safety, with training and experience in quantitative methods. Other attributes sought are the ability to interact productively with colleagues in a team environment, demonstrated skills in effective written and oral communication, and skills in organization, analysis, and research. Senior positions also require project management skills.

For inquiries about current and future positions, please contact David Banks at the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Room 3430, Washington, DC 20590, or e-mail david.banks@bts.gov. We welcome resumes or SF-171s on an informal basis, if available. To inquire about specific vacancy announcements or to receive official information about how to apply for these positions, candidates should contact TASC Human Resource Services at 202 366-4075. Announcements are posted on the OPM web site (www.usajobs.opm.gov). The Bureau is located at the L'Enfant Plaza Metro station. DOT is an equal opportunity employer.

>From abider@earthlink.net Mon Jul 12 19:12:17 1999

Received: from falcon.prod.itd.earthlink.net (falcon.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.74])

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

id TAA03662 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 19:12:16 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from earthlink.net (1Cust241.tnt4.tco2.da.uu.net [153.35.88.241])
by falcon.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id TAA22684
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Jul 1999 19:12:11 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <378A9D32.BA628DC1@earthlink.net>

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 21:58:11 -0400

From: Albert Biderman <abider@earthlink.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: POQ Now in JSTOR

References: <3.0.1.16.19990712093950.1f376f10@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I hope an implication is that I can discard without guilt the cases of back
issues I've hoarded?

Vincent Price wrote:

> I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now
> available in JSTOR.
>
> All issues of POQ from Volume 1 (1937) to Volume 57 (1993) can be
> searched easily in JSTOR by issue, author, or title. Complete page
> images of the articles are provided. The full text of articles and
> abstracts can also be searched. At this point, access is available
> only through JSTOR institutional subscriptions (e.g., libraries).
>

> For those unfamiliar with JSTOR, it is a not-for-profit organization,
> established with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and
> dedicated to helping the scholarly community take advantage of new
> information technologies. Its major aim is to assemble a reliable and
> comprehensive electronic archive of important scholarly journals.
>
> Archiving in JSTOR is just one of the ways POQ will become more widely
> available through electronic means. As announced at this year's AAPOR
> meeting, the University of Chicago Press plans to begin Web-based,
> electronic publication of the journal beginning in the Spring of 2000.
> All POQ subscribers will receive access to the electronic publication
> as well as their usual, printed issues. In the future, in partnership
> with JSTOR, the University of Chicago Press will also provide POQ
> subscribers with access to all back issues of the journal, as well as
> links from current individual articles to cited articles in previous
> volumes.
>
> With our move to on-line publication, we are interested in manuscripts
> contributing to the field of public opinion research that also make
> inventive use of new electronic formats -- for example, incorporating
> supplemental audio or video material, interview schedules, or
> interactive data presentations.

>

> -- Vince Price

> Editor

>

> -----

> Public Opinion Quarterly Telephone: (215) 573-1966

> The Annenberg Public Policy Center Facsimile: (215) 573-1962

> of the University of Pennsylvania
> 3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:
> Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 POQ@pobox.asc.upenn.edu
>
> On the World-Wide Web: www.journals.uchicago.edu/POQ

>From hochschi@wws.princeton.edu Tue Jul 13 06:47:10 1999
Received: from Princeton.EDU (outbound2.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id GAA07878 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 06:47:09 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from mail.Princeton.EDU (mail.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.14])
 by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA03271
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 09:47:08 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from wws.princeton.edu (wws.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.240])
 by mail.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA08342
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 09:47:07 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from WWS/SpoolDir by wws.princeton.edu (Mercury 1.44);
 13 Jul 99 09:48:34 EDT

Received: from SpoolDir by WWS (Mercury 1.44); 13 Jul 99 09:48:33 EDT

From: "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@wws.princeton.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 09:48:26 EDT

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: POQ Now in JSTOR

X-pmrqc: 1

In-reply-to: <378A9D32.BA628DC1@earthlink.net>

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.53/R1)

Message-ID: <6D6C6CD2993@www.princeton.edu>

I just went through all my back issues last night, saved some articles with sentimental or substantive value to me (I won't report which ones...), and took a load of journals to the recycling center this morning

-- lots of bookshelf space for new books!! JDate: Mon, 12 Jul 1999

21:58:11 -0400 Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu From: Albert

Biderman

<abider@earthlink.net> To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re:

POQ

Now in JSTOR

I hope an implication is that I can discard without guilt the cases of back issues I've hoarded?

Vincent Price wrote:

> I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now

> available in JSTOR.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Jennifer Hochschild

Politics Dept/Woodrow Wilson School

Princeton University

Princeton NJ 08544

o: 609-258-5634

fax: 609-258-2809

hochschi@wws.princeton.edu

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

>From JAM@moviefone.com Tue Jul 13 07:22:20 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id HAA14795 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 07:22:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 10:19:05 -0400

Message-Id: <s78b1299.013@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 10:18:23 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

There's an Op. Ed. piece in the NY Times today from a proud poll non-respon=
dent defending her refusal to answer surveys. The piece is called "Call =
Me Unresponsive." I hope that Council is considering crafting a response =
to this piece. Some of her concerns are legitimate complaints about =
practices that AAPOR has long condemned (e.g., SUGGing and push polls). =
Others are the standard complaints of refusers ("Polls take up my time," =
"Some questions are too personal"). I think it's important that we =

articulate our side of the story.

Jay Mattlin

New York

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Tue Jul 13 07:33:49 1999

Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id HAA17568 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 07:33:47 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <MFVCWCJC>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 10:31:50 -0400

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA919D825@AS_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 10:31:49 -0400

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

The non-respondent opens her opinion piece with the following statement "Blame me, if you wish, for the poor showing of conservatives in opinion polls. I refuse to respond to telephone polls."

So I think it is even more important that someone crafts a response - this folk-science belief in

the under-reporting of conservative opinion is very strong and damages the credibility of all political polling.

For those who would like to access the article via the Internet it is available at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/13dick.html>

--

Leo G. Simonetta <http://www.artsci.com>

Art & Science Group, Inc.

simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jay Mattlin [<mailto:JAM@moviefone.com>]

> Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 1999 10:18 AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

>

>

> There's an Op. Ed. piece in the NY Times today from a proud
> poll non-respondent defending her refusal to answer surveys.
> The piece is called "Call Me Unresponsive." I hope that
> Council is considering crafting a response to this piece.
> Some of her concerns are legitimate complaints about
> practices that AAPOR has long condemned (e.g., SUGGing and
> push polls). Others are the standard complaints of refusers
> ("Polls take up my time," "Some questions are too personal").
> I think it's important that we articulate our side of the story.

>

> Jay Mattlin

> New York

>

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Tue Jul 13 08:38:24 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id IAA03260 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 08:38:23 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp3x37.chesco.com [209.195.202.216])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA25661

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 11:38:20 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <001a01becd45\$611d4be0\$d8cac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 11:35:46 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

For a non-technical, respondent-oriented web site that addresses some of the issues contained in the NYT piece, see www.mail-survey.com. Specifically: why we ask "personal" questions; how respondents are selected; what is and

is not done with the data; statement regarding sugging; etc.

More efforts like this are needed to maintain the viability of our industry.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Jay Mattlin <JAM@moviefone.com>

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

Date: Tuesday, July 13, 1999 10:22 AM

Subject: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

>There's an Op. Ed. piece in the NY Times today from a proud poll
>non-respondent defending her refusal to answer surveys. The piece is called
>"Call Me Unresponsive." I hope that Council is considering crafting a
>response to this piece. Some of her concerns are legitimate complaints
>about practices that AAPOR has long condemned (e.g., SUGGing and push
>polls). Others are the standard complaints of refusers ("Polls take up my
>time," "Some questions are too personal"). I think it's important that we
>articulate our side of the story.

>

> Jay Mattlin

> New York

>

>

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Tue Jul 13 08:53:34 1999

Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])

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

id IAA07713 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 08:53:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 11:48:53 -0400

Message-Id: <s78b27a5.059@srbi.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 11:50:22 -0400

From: "MARK SCHULMAN " <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: POQ Now in JSTOR

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Before we POQers descend upon the recycling centers, my understanding is =
that JSTOR right now is available ONLY through institutional/university =
subscribers, not yet to individual POQ subscribers. Individual subscribers=
without university affiliations might want to hold on to their beloved =
gray, blue and green-covered POQ's a little while longer.

>>> "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@wvs.princeton.edu> 07/13/99 09:48AM

>>> =

>>>

I just went through all my back issues last night, saved some articles=20

with sentimental or substantive value to me (I won't report which=20
ones...), and took a load of journals to the recycling center this =
morning=20

-- lots of bookshelf space for new books!! JDate: Mon, 12 Jul =
1999=20

21:58:11 -0400 Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu From: Albert =
Biderman=20

<abider@earthlink.net> To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: =
POQ=20

Now in JSTOR

I hope an implication is that I can discard without guilt the cases of =
back issues I've hoarded?

Vincent Price wrote:

> I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now
> available =
in
> JSTOR.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Jennifer Hochschild
Politics Dept/Woodrow Wilson School
Princeton University
Princeton NJ 08544
o: 609-258-5634
fax: 609-258-2809

hochschi@wws.princeton.edu=20

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

>From kosicki.1@osu.edu Tue Jul 13 09:36:07 1999

Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.31])

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

id JAA19923 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 09:36:06 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from gkosicki (NEW93118173.columbus.rr.com [24.93.118.173])

by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id MAA24205

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 12:36:04 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990713123930.007601f8@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: gkosicki@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 12:39:30 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Gerald Kosicki <kosicki.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: POQ Now in JSTOR

In-Reply-To: <s78b27a5.059@srbi.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

It appears that even those of us affiliated with institutions that are subscribers will encounter certain difficulties and restrictions in using this -- at least some of the time. For example, I have accessed JSTOR from my university office for a long time, but when working at home and connecting via Roadrunner, I cannot gain access.

At 11:50 AM 7/13/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Before we POQers descend upon the recycling centers, my understanding

>is

that JSTOR right now is available ONLY through institutional/university subscribers, not yet to individual POQ subscribers. Individual subscribers without university affiliations might want to hold on to their beloved gray, blue and green-covered POQ's a little while longer.

Gerald Kosicki

School of Journalism and Communication

The Ohio State University

3036 Derby Hall

154 North Oval Mall

Columbus, OH 43210-1339

Office Tel.: 614-292-9237

Home Tel.: 614-873-3718

kosicki.1@osu.edu

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Jul 13 11:14:50 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id LAA20380 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 11:14:48 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp9.vgernet.net [205.219.186.109])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA20457

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 15:03:57 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <378B8229.DE963DE4@jwdp.com>

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 14:15:05 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today
References: <s78b1299.013@smtp1.moviefone.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

And just what, pray tell, is "our side of the story?"

No-one is obliged to respond to polls, any more than they are obliged to vote or brush their teeth. There may be good reasons to, but the truth is that telephone polling is intrusive and getting ever more so.

The sad fact is that most of what Ms. Dickerson says is all too true. I can cite even worse experiences of my own. Does that mean that polling is evil in itself? Certainly not! But even aside from the obvious abusers, such as FRUGers and SUGers, far too many in our profession seem to believe that their right to ask questions overrides a respondent's right not to answer them.

For my part, I generally will not answer polls either, and if it makes you feel better, my liberalism probably cancels out Ms. Dickerson's conservatism, thereby reducing the overall bias.

Jan Werner

jwerner@jwdp.com

Jay Mattlin wrote:

>

> There's an Op. Ed. piece in the NY Times today from a proud poll
> non-respondent defending her refusal to answer surveys. The piece is
> called "Call Me Unresponsive." I hope that Council is considering
> crafting a response to this piece. Some of her concerns are
> legitimate complaints about practices that AAPOR has long condemned
> (e.g., SUGGing and push polls). Others are the standard complaints of
> refusers ("Polls take up my time," "Some questions are too personal").
> I think it's important that we articulate our side of the story.

>

> Jay Mattlin
> New York From
>JAM@moviefone.com Tue Jul 13 11:26:30 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id LAA24796 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 11:26:26 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 14:22:38 -0400

Message-Id: <s78b4bae.014@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 14:22:33 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

By "our side of the story," I mean the benefits of survey data, the = reasons that we ask the questions we ask, and the fact that many of her = complaints represent abuses of our profession, not approved by most = practitioners in the industry. I agree that many of her complaints are = legitimate, and that she has every right to refuse to participate in = surveys. But without a counter-point to her perspective, I fear that we = would be tacitly signalling that suggesting and push polling are acceptable, = that we waste people's time for our own gain alone, and that we are = unnecessarily nosy.

Her political views are, I think, the least relevant point in the article.

Jay Mattlin

jam@moviefone.com=20

>>> Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com> 07/13/99 02:15PM >>>

And just what, pray tell, is "our side of the story?"

No-one is obliged to respond to polls, any more than they are obliged to vote or brush their teeth. There may be good reasons to, but the truth is that telephone polling is intrusive and getting ever more so.

The sad fact is that most of what Ms. Dickerson says is all too true. I can cite even worse experiences of my own. Does that mean that polling is evil

in itself? Certainly not! But even aside from the obvious abusers, such as FRUGers and SUGers, far too many in our profession seem to believe that their right to ask questions overrides a respondent's right not to answer them.

For my part, I generally will not answer polls either, and if it makes you feel better, my liberalism probably cancels out Ms. Dickerson's conservatism, thereby reducing the overall bias.

Jan Werner

jwerner@jwdp.com

Jay Mattlin wrote:

>=20

> There's an Op. Ed. piece in the NY Times today from a proud poll = non-respondent defending her refusal to answer surveys. The piece is = called "Call Me Unresponsive." I hope that Council is considering = crafting a response to this piece. Some of her concerns are legitimate = complaints about practices that AAPOR has long condemned (e.g., SUGGing = and push polls). Others are the standard complaints of refusers ("Polls = take up my time," "Some questions are too personal"). I think it's = important that we articulate our side of the story.

>=20

> Jay Mattlin

> New York

>From JAM@moviefone.com Tue Jul 13 14:53:22 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id OAA07258 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 14:53:21 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:50:18 -0400

Message-Id: <s78b7c5a.000@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:49:54 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Fwd: Jay Mattlin

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=_EABC5B8A.D0B1DED8"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--=_EABC5B8A.D0B1DED8

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I agree with you re: the NYT column. It must be responded to -- quickly. I'd do it myself, but a letter from Toronto probably has less chance to making it into print than a US reply.=20 No other industry would let its methods be attacked and not counter-attack. It's discouraging to employees in the business. I recall the Ariana Huffington symposium on AAPORNET just weeks ago. Thanks to polls Americans know the cost of living, the jobless rate,

and apparently soon their census. - Marc Zwelling/Vector Research +
Development Inc., Toronto

--=_EABC5B8A.D0B1DED8

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Received: from smtp11.bellglobal.com

by smtp1.moviefone.com; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:38:11 -0400

Received: from m-zwelling (ppp8412.on.bellglobal.com [207.236.124.76])

by smtp11.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA09132

for <jam@moviefone.com>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:44:21 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <378BB01E.7F95@sympatico.ca>

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:31:10 -0400

From: Marc Zwelling <vector@sympatico.ca>

Reply-To: vector@sympatico.ca

Organization: Vector Research + Development Inc.

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-SYMPA (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: jam@moviefone.com

Subject: Jay Mattlin

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with you re: the NYT column. It must be responded to -- quickly. I'd
do it myself, but a letter from Toronto probably has less chance to making
it into print than a US reply.

No other industry would let its methods be attacked and not counter-attack.

It's discouraging to employees in the business. I recall the Ariana

Huffington symposium on AAPORNET just weeks ago. Thanks to polls Americans

know the cost of living, the jobless rate, and apparently soon their census.

- Marc Zwelling/Vector Research + Development Inc., Toronto

--=_EABC5B8A.D0B1DED8--

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Tue Jul 13 17:02:29 1999

Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])

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

id RAA19595 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:02:27 -0700

(PDT)

From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com

Received: from exchng2.gallup.com (exchng2.gallup.com [198.175.140.80])

by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id TAA29552

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 19:01:45 -0500 (CDT)

Received: by exchng2.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <3K3FCMHR>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 19:01:46 -0500

Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90918427@EXCHNG3>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: POQ Now in JSTOR

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 19:01:44 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

...or offer them (for sale or free) to others. I've heard of several people over the years looking to buy POQ issues which are missing from their collection, or wanting to add old volumes. If there is some list-serve etiquette against using aapornet to offer POQ issues for sale or free, I'd be happy to print announcements in the AAPOR newsletter (and/or possibly on

www.aapor.org). The next issue will be going to print at the end of this month. Please send any offers or requests for POQ volumes to me directly at the email below.

~~~~~

Lydia K. Saad  
1999 AAPOR Publications and Information Chair  
Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll  
ph: 609-279-2219  
fax: 609-924-1857  
lydia\_saad@gallup.com

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

From: MARK SCHULMAN [mailto:M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 1999 10:50 AM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: POQ Now in JSTOR

Before we POQers descend upon the recycling centers, my understanding is that JSTOR right now is available ONLY through institutional/university subscribers, not yet to individual POQ subscribers. Individual subscribers without university affiliations might want to hold on to their beloved gray, blue and green-covered POQ's a little while longer.

>>> "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@wss.princeton.edu> 07/13/99 09:48AM

>>> >>>

I just went through all my back issues last night, saved some articles with sentimental or substantive value to me (I won't report which

ones...), and took a load of journals to the recycling center this morning

-- lots of bookshelf space for new books!! JDate: Mon, 12 Jul 1999

21:58:11 -0400 Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu From: Albert

Biderman

<abider@earthlink.net> To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re:

POQ

Now in JSTOR

I hope an implication is that I can discard without guilt the cases of back issues I've hoarded?

Vincent Price wrote:

> I am pleased to announce that Public Opinion Quarterly is now

> available in JSTOR.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Jennifer Hochschild

Politics Dept/Woodrow Wilson School

Princeton University

Princeton NJ 08544

o: 609-258-5634

fax: 609-258-2809

hochschi@wws.princeton.edu

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

>From Irv Crespi@aol.com Tue Jul 13 17:30:16 1999

Received: from imo22.mx.aol.com (imo22.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.66])

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

id RAA27530 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 17:30:15 -0700

(PDT)

From: Irv Crespi <IrvCrespi@aol.com>

Received: from IrvCrespi@aol.com

by imo22.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5QUNa18551 (4222)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 20:28:11 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <5afe6e0c.24bd339a@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 20:28:10 EDT

Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

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 13

I agree that AApor should reply to the op-ed attack on all polling, but I think we should do more than issue a statement. I think two alternatives should be considered - one a letter and the other an op-ed piece of our own.

This must be done fast! If the Executive Committee cannot move fast, I suggest past presidents write a letter. I would be glad to sign such a letter.

Irving Crespi

>From mtrau@umich.edu Tue Jul 13 19:02:21 1999

Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu

[141.211.83.11])

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

id TAA29622 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 19:02:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from umich.edu (pm467-46.dialip.mich.net [207.75.177.200])

by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id VAA16621

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1999 21:58:45 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <378BF0B6.2E7C45D0@umich.edu>

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 22:06:46 -0400

From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

References: <5afe6e0c.24bd339a@aol.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

.I sent a letter of response to The New York Times this afternoon, as well as an offer to write a rebuttal piece if they have the space. I agree with the comments on AAPORNET today about gratuitous nature of some of the comments Ms. Dickerson made, as well as the fact that we do rely upon the good graces of respondents for their attitudes and opinions. But it is also important to point out the differences between good/acceptable practice and unethical treatment of respondents. I will keep you all informed of the response that I receive.

>From arobbin@mail.fsu.edu Wed Jul 14 03:25:49 1999

Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])

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

id DAA27734 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 03:25:46 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)  
by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id GAA22141  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 06:25:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 06:25:45 -0400 (EDT)  
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: POQ Now in JSTOR  
In-Reply-To: <s78b27a5.059@srbi.com>  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9907140618110.21595-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Before any people throw out old issues of POQ...

- 1) Not every institution subscribes to JSTOR.
- 2) If your institution does subscribe, please don't discard just yet.  
Please consider that libraries may be missing single issues and might want your personal copy to "fill in" their paper version. Please contact your university library to ascertain this.
- 3) There are many libraries around your city or elsewhere that would greatly appreciate an opportunity to have your collection. Of course, it might take a few telephone calls, but you would probably find some grateful institution.

Alice Robbin/FSU

On Tue, 13 Jul 1999, MARK SCHULMAN wrote:

> Before we POQers descend upon the recycling centers, my understanding is that JSTOR right now is available ONLY through institutional/university



subscribers, not yet to individual POQ subscribers.

...

>

> >>> "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@www.princeton.edu> 07/13/99

> >>> 09:48AM >>>

> I just went through all my back issues last night, saved some articles

> with sentimental or substantive value to me (I won't report which

> ones...), and took a load of journals to the recycling center this morning

...

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Alice Robbin \*  
\* School of Information Studies \*  
\* Florida State University \*  
\* 240 Louis Shores Building \*  
\* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 \*  
\* Office: 850-644-8116 Fax: 850-644-6253 \*  
\* email: arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu \*

\*\*\*\*\*

>From link@rti.org Wed Jul 14 05:59:08 1999

Received: from rtints26.rti.org (rtints26.rti.org [152.5.128.111])

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

id FAA15869 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 05:59:07 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by rtints26.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <N5AA82JK>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 08:58:36 -0400

Message-ID: <89FDB122A0E0D2118D2E0090273FA8C5851F35@rtints26.rti.org>

From: "Link, Michael" <link@rti.org>

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

Subject: Incentives to interviewers

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 08:58:36 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

I know this topic has come up on AAPORnet a couple of times over the past several years, but ...

I would be interested in hearing from anyone who has implemented successful incentive plans to motivate interviewers on difficult or long-term projects.

I'm particularly interested in "creative" incentives and those that incorporate a "team" approach.

For instance, one incentive technique we have used involves our refusal conversion "team" members. On a weekly basis a pool of bonus money is generated for certain projects based on the number of initial refusals converted during the week X whatever the going rate is for refusal conversions for that study (say \$6). So if the team converted 20 refusals, the pool of available money is \$120. That pool is split among the team members based not on the number of RF conversions per interviewer, but rather on the amount of time each individual spent working refusals (with some adjustments made to emphasize weekend and weeknight hours). So if team members spent a total of 40 hours working refusals for the week and "John" worked 10 of those 40 hours (or 25%), "John's" bonus payment for the week would be 25% of the \$120 = \$30.

This approach attempts to motivate via both individual and team efforts, and has been fairly successful. I'd appreciate hearing from anyone else who has attempted any other types of in-house incentive plans, particularly in CATI shops. Thanks!

Michael

Michael W. Link, Ph.D.                      Office: (919)  
485-7785

Survey Research Division                      Fax: (919)  
485-7700

Research Triangle Institute                      E-mail:  
Link@rti.org

PO Box 12194                      Internet:  
www.rti.org

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

>From JAM@moviefone.com Wed Jul 14 07:20:21 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id HAA28861 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 07:20:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 10:17:19 -0400

Message-Id: <s78c63af.075@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 10:17:05 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>  
To: <mtrau@umich.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

Thank you so much, Mike. I appreciate your leadership on this. Obviously, it would be preferable if the Times gave you as much space as it gave Dickerson. Please note that Irv Crespi, in an earlier e-mail, would be willing to add his signature to such a letter.

Jay Mattlin

>>> Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu> 07/13/99 10:06PM >>>

.I sent a letter of response to The New York Times this afternoon, as well as an offer to write a rebuttal piece if they have the space. I agree with the comments on AAPORNET today about gratuitous nature of some of the comments Ms. Dickerson made, as well as the fact that we do rely upon the good graces of respondents for their attitudes and opinions. But it is also important to point out the differences between good/acceptable practice and unethical treatment of respondents. I will keep you all informed of the response that I receive.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jul 14 09:00:59 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id JAA21986 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 09:00:47 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id JAA27624 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 09:00:47 -0700  
(PDT)

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 09:00:47 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: What to do with paper POQs?

In-Reply-To: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90918427@EXCHNG3>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907140722340.4011-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Lydia, as might be expected, has several good ideas here (see far below).

There's no netiquette against attempting to buy-and-sell in this advanced consumer capitalist society of ours, just as long as the commodities in question are particular to the collective interests of those on a given list. For AAPORNET, I think not only back issues of POQ and other similar journals would be appropriate, but also, say, collections of methods and statistics texts still useful. But nothing like old National Geographics or glassware, please. And all messages between potential buyers and sellers ought to be kept off-list; I don't think we wish to become an auction site.

I also like Alice Robbin's suggestion that those with stacks of unneeded POQs consider taking an hour or two to attempt to place them in local libraries, university schools or departments (those without JSTOR, I suppose), or high schools (or perhaps with civics or advanced math teachers in schools without central libraries or reading centers).

As scientific survey research increasingly suffers the slings and arrows of outrageous columnists, journalists, and dishonest or misguided "pollsters" (who are, of course, beneath the term), I think we--all of us in AAPOR, certainly--can only gain by spreading the contents of POQ to anyone willing to look at them, especially in our own communities, and even if we have to fall back on dried-black-ink-on-dried-white-pressed-wood-and-cotton-pulp to do so.

Maybe it's just me, but I can't bear to destroy any book or journal, even the gawdawful ones that publishers keep sending me free of charge (it's even sad for me to put stacks of that elegant New York Times prose out for the trash, yesterday's op-ed page notwithstanding). I usually donate all my unwanted books and journals to my local public library, which catalogs a few and offers the others at monthly Saturday sales, where most are snatched up by neighbors at least interested enough to part with a few coins for each. These funds, in turn, are used to purchase new books outside the annual library budget--including an occasional book on statistics, survey research, public opinion, political behavior, or mass media studies.

If your local library doesn't have such used books and journals sales, I encourage you to lobby to begin one. If those of us on AAPORNET do not work to enlighten the general public about our subjects of study, why we choose to study them, and what we consider the best ways to conduct such studies,

who else is likely to do this?

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

On Tue, 13 Jul 1999 Lydia\_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

> ...or offer them (for sale or free) to others. I've heard of several  
> people over the years looking to buy POQ issues which are missing from  
> their collection, or wanting to add old volumes. If there is some  
> list-serve etiquette against using aapornet to offer POQ issues for  
> sale or free, I'd be happy to print announcements in the AAPOR  
> newsletter (and/or possibly on www.aapor.org). The next issue will be  
> going to print at the end of this month. Please send any offers or  
> requests for POQ volumes to me directly at the email below.

>

> ~~~~~

> Lydia K. Saad  
> 1999 AAPOR Publications and Information Chair  
> Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll  
> ph: 609-279-2219  
> fax: 609-924-1857  
> lydia\_saad@gallup.com

\*\*\*\*\*

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Wed Jul 14 09:23:53 1999

Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])

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

id JAA00499 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 09:23:51 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from login5.isis.unc.edu (root@login5.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.135])  
by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA12202  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 12:23:49 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by email.unc.edu id <1040-211388>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 12:23:46 -0400  
Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 12:23:38 -0400 (EDT)  
Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-Sender: pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: What to do with paper POQs?  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907140722340.4011-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990714121607.270768B-100000@login5.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Endorsing Jim's wisdom, I'll add a tip: smaller schools can be warmly grateful for journal collections. I am purging my office in preparation for a move to a new building, and my POQs and JQs are on their way to Salem College even as we speak.

=====  
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 Wed, 14 Jul 1999, James Beniger wrote:

> Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 09:00:47 -0700 (PDT)

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

> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: What to do with paper POQs?

>

>

>

>

> Lydia, as might be expected, has several good ideas here (see far  
> below).

>

> There's no netiquette against attempting to buy-and-sell in this  
> advanced consumer capitalist society of ours, just as long as the  
> commodities in question are particular to the collective interests of  
> those on a given list. For AAPORNET, I think not only back issues of  
> POQ and other similar journals would be appropriate, but also, say,  
> collections of methods and statistics texts still useful. But nothing  
> like old National Geographics or glassware, please. And all messages  
> between potential buyers and sellers ought to be kept off-list; I  
> don't think we wish to become an auction site.

>

> I also like Alice Robbin's suggestion that those with stacks of  
> unneeded POQs consider taking an hour or two to attempt to place them  
> in local libraries, university schools or departments (those without  
> JSTOR, I suppose), or high schools (or perhaps with civics or advanced

> math teachers in schools without central libraries or reading  
> centers).

>

> As scientific survey research increasingly suffers the slings and  
> arrows of outrageous columnists, journalists, and dishonest or misguided  
> "pollsters" (who are, of course, beneath the term), I think we--all of us  
> in AAPOR, certainly--can only gain by spreading the contents of POQ to  
> anyone willing to look at them, especially in our own communities, and  
> even if we have to fall back on dried-black-ink-on-dried-white-pressed-  
> wood-and-cotton-pulp to do so.

>

> Maybe it's just me, but I can't bear to destroy any book or journal,  
> even the gawdawful ones that publishers keep sending me free of charge  
> (it's even sad for me to put stacks of that elegant New York Times  
> prose out for the trash, yesterday's op-ed page notwithstanding). I  
> usually donate all my unwanted books and journals to my local public  
> library, which catalogs a few and offers the others at monthly  
> Saturday sales, where most are snatched up by neighbors at least  
> interested enough to part with a few coins for each. These funds, in  
> turn, are used to purchase new books outside the annual library  
> budget--including an occasional book on statistics, survey research,  
> public opinion, political behavior, or mass media studies.

>

> If your local library doesn't have such used books and journals sales,  
> I encourage you to lobby to begin one. If those of us on AAPORNET do  
> not work to enlighten the general public about our subjects of study,  
> why we choose to study them, and what we consider the best ways to  
> conduct such studies, who else is likely to do this?

>

> -- Jim

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

> On Tue, 13 Jul 1999 Lydia\_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>

>> ...or offer them (for sale or free) to others. I've heard of  
>> several people over the years looking to buy POQ issues which are  
>> missing from their collection, or wanting to add old volumes. If  
>> there is some list-serve etiquette against using aapornet to offer  
>> POQ issues for sale or free, I'd be happy to print announcements in  
>> the AAPOR newsletter (and/or possibly on www.aapor.org). The next  
>> issue will be going to print at the end of this month. Please send  
>> any offers or requests for POQ volumes to me directly at the email  
>> below.

>>

>> ~~~~~

>> Lydia K. Saad

>> 1999 AAPOR Publications and Information Chair

>> Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll

>> ph: 609-279-2219

>> fax: 609-924-1857

>> lydia\_saad@gallup.com

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>From vish+@osu.edu Wed Jul 14 19:44:33 1999

Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.31])

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

id TAA15774 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 19:44:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [24.31.189.73] (dhcp31189073.columbus.rr.com [24.31.189.73])

by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with ESMTP id WAA15914

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Jul 1999 22:44:30 -0400 (EDT)

X-Sender: viswanath.2@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

Message-Id: <v03130305b3b2fad4d7c9@[24.31.189.73]>

In-Reply-To:

<Pine.A41.3.95L.990714121607.270768B-100000@login5.isis.unc.edu>

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907140722340.4011-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 22:47:12 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "K. Viswanath" <vish+@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: What to do with paper POQs?

I hope you can bear one more thought on the JSTOR. We should be appropriately mindful of all the caveats that have been mentioned here in regard to JSTOR --subscription, access, ease of availability etc.

If you are indeed assured of access and availability, and you DO want to "dispose" of old POQs, several useful ideas have emerged on the listserve. Yet another group to consider is graduate students--current and former, not all of whom may have access. While many of them may have access, there may be those who may not for various reasons. Just another thought.

Vish

Endorsing Jim's wisdom, I'll add a tip: smaller schools can be  
>warmly grateful for journal collections. I am purging my office in  
>preparation for a move to a new building, and my POQs and JQs are on  
>their way to Salem College even as we speak.

>

>=====

>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 Wed, 14 Jul 1999, James Beniger wrote:

>

>> Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1999 09:00:47 -0700 (PDT)

>> From: James Beniger <[beniger@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:beniger@almaak.usc.edu)>

>> Reply-To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

>> To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

>> Subject: What to do with paper POQs?

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Lydia, as might be expected, has several good ideas here (see far

>> below).

>>

>> There's no netiquette against attempting to buy-and-sell in this  
>> advanced consumer capitalist society of ours, just as long as the  
>> commodities in question are particular to the collective interests of  
>> those on a given list. For AAPORNET, I think not only back issues of  
>> POQ and other similar journals would be appropriate, but also, say,  
>> collections of methods and statistics texts still useful. But  
>> nothing like old National Geographics or glassware, please. And all  
>> messages between potential buyers and sellers ought to be kept  
>> off-list; I don't think we wish to become an auction site.

>>

>> I also like Alice Robbin's suggestion that those with stacks of  
>> unneeded POQs consider taking an hour or two to attempt to place them  
>> in local libraries, university schools or departments (those without  
>> JSTOR, I suppose), or high schools (or perhaps with civics or  
>> advanced math teachers in schools without central libraries or  
>> reading centers).

>>

>> As scientific survey research increasingly suffers the slings and  
>> arrows of outrageous columnists, journalists, and dishonest or  
>> misguided "pollsters" (who are, of course, beneath the term), I think  
>> we--all of us in AAPOR, certainly--can only gain by spreading the  
>> contents of POQ to anyone willing to look at them, especially in our  
>> own communities, and even if we have to fall back on  
>> dried-black-ink-on-dried-white-pressed-  
>> wood-and-cotton-pulp to do so.

>>

>> Maybe it's just me, but I can't bear to destroy any book or journal,

>> even the gawdawful ones that publishers keep sending me free of  
>> charge (it's even sad for me to put stacks of that elegant New York  
>> Times prose out for the trash, yesterday's op-ed page  
>> notwithstanding). I usually donate all my unwanted books and  
>> journals to my local public library, which catalogs a few and offers  
>> the others at monthly Saturday sales, where most are snatched up by  
>> neighbors at least interested enough to part with a few coins for  
>> each. These funds, in turn, are used to purchase new books outside  
>> the annual library budget--including an occasional book on  
>> statistics, survey research, public opinion, political behavior, or  
>> mass media studies.

>>

>> If your local library doesn't have such used books and journals  
>> sales, I encourage you to lobby to begin one. If those of us on  
>> AAPORNET do not work to enlighten the general public about our  
>> subjects of study, why we choose to study them, and what we consider  
>> the best ways to conduct such studies, who else is likely to do this?

>>

>> -- Jim

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>> On Tue, 13 Jul 1999 Lydia\_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>>

>> > ...or offer them (for sale or free) to others. I've heard of

>> > several

>> people

>> > over the years looking to buy POQ issues which are missing from

>> > their collection, or wanting to add old volumes. If there is some

>> > list-serve etiquette against using aapornet to offer POQ issues for

>> > sale or free, I'd be happy to print announcements in the AAPOR  
>> > newsletter (and/or  
>> possibly on  
>> > www.aapor.org). The next issue will be going to print at the end  
>> > of this month. Please send any offers or requests for POQ volumes  
>> > to me  
>> directly at  
>> > the email below.

>> >

>> > ~~~~~

>> > Lydia K. Saad  
>> > 1999 AAPOR Publications and Information Chair  
>> > Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll  
>> > ph: 609-279-2219  
>> > fax: 609-924-1857  
>> > lydia\_saad@gallup.com

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>

K. Viswanath  
Associate Professor of Journalism & Communication  
Associate Professor of Public Health

School of Journalism & Communication  
The Ohio State University  
3026 Derby Hall



154 North Oval Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210

Tel: voice: (614) 292-1319, FAX: (614) 292-2055

E-mail: vish+@osu.edu

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Thu Jul 15 10:34:19 1999

Received: from cicero.src.uchicago.edu (cicero.src.uchicago.edu  
[128.135.232.3])

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

id KAA19078 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 10:34:18 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])

by cicero.src.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA29780

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 12:34:17 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from localhost (abcgss1@localhost)

by nittany.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA22579

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 12:34:17 -0500 (CDT)

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 12:34:16 -0500 (CDT)

From: "Tom\_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: POQs

Message-ID: <Pine.HPP.3.93.990715122911.22551A-100000@nittany.uchicago.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

This is a message from a NORC employee and an AAPOR member who has had

problems sending messages on AAPORNET.

Tom Smith

Over the last half year or so I have been looking to purchase POQs dating back at least to the 1960's. I am both a graduate student and will soon be moving to Brazil where technical journals are hard to come by. For those of you that are discarding your POQs, I would be interested in possibly purchasing them.

You can either contact me at [young-cliff@norcmail.uchicago.edu](mailto:young-cliff@norcmail.uchicago.edu) or at 773-256-6285.

Cliff Young

>From [abider@earthlink.net](mailto:abider@earthlink.net) Thu Jul 15 11:25:01 1999

Received: from [avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net](mailto:avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net) ([avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net](mailto:avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net) [207.217.121.50])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id LAA04730 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 11:25:01 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from [earthlink.net](mailto:earthlink.net) (1Cust45.tnt8.tco2.da.uu.net [153.35.93.45])

by [avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net](mailto:avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net) (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA04983

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 11:24:59 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <378E27CA.E8358D3B@earthlink.net>

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:26:18 -0400

From: Albert Biderman <[abider@earthlink.net](mailto:abider@earthlink.net)>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: What to do with paper POQ's

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My dropping a hint that I might be disposing of old journals set spouse Su to doing a joyful jig. She'll have to cool it for a bit because my post drew a host of responses including a few kind offers to take the old POQs off my hands but more which would send me back on that guilt trip if I did not explore the noblest use for them. (Quarterlies are the less burdensome of a half century's hoarding of journals.)

Perhaps

I can move with the intellectual times to accepting the proposition that best dollar offer equals optimum use, but this gratuitous interchange belies it. So, with apologies for not answering individually, let me thank everyone for their suggestions and offers while I continue my past strategy, perhaps the most irresponsible of all: stalling perhaps long enough for it to become an executor's problem.

Albert D. Biderman

abider@american.edu

>From amccutch@unlinfo.unl.edu Thu Jul 15 12:22:10 1999

Received: from unlinfo3.unl.edu (unlinfo3.unl.edu [129.93.1.18])

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

id MAA22777 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 12:22:09 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from unlinfo.unl.edu (unlinfo.unl.edu [129.93.1.11])

by unlinf3.unl.edu (8.9.2/8.8.7) with ESMTP id OAA13709

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:05:30 -0500 (CDT)

Received: (from amccutch@localhost)

by unlinf0.unl.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) id OAA05068;

Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:27:27 -0500 (CDT)

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:27:26 -0500 (CDT)

From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <amccutch@unlinf0.unl.edu>

Subject: Re: What to do with paper POQ's

To: aapornet@usc.edu

In-Reply-To: <378E27CA.E8358D3B@earthlink.net>

Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9907151439.A4119-0100000@unlinf0.unl.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

If any you are intending to unburden yourself of old issues of POQ, let me request that you consider giving them to the Survey Research and Methodology (SRAM) graduate program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. We would be happy to pay for the shipping charges.

With 20+ graduate students, we can assure the donor that his/her POQ's will be greatly appreciated and used repeatedly. We are building our library of survey research, statistics and methodology source books, and previous editions of POQ would be a great addition to our program collection.

Please email or call (402/458-2035) if you have any questions--thanks!

Allan McCutcheon, Chair

Graduate Program in Survey Research and Methodology

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

>From LYNDA.CARLSON@hq.doe.gov Thu Jul 15 13:20:51 1999

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

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

id NAA08955 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 13:20:50 -0700

(PDT)

From: LYNDA.CARLSON@hq.doe.gov

Received: from 146.138.1.131 by hqwss.hr.doe.gov with ESMTP (Dept. of  
Energy SMTP Relay(WSS) v3.2 SR1); Thu, 15 Jul 99 16:20:19 -0400

X-Server-Uuid: 0bf4d294-faec-11d1-a39a-0008c7246279

Received: (from x400@localhost) by hqrtmta1.doe.gov (8.8.6 (PHNE\_17135)  
/8.7.1) id QAA08137 for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:23:37 -0400

(EDT)

Received: by ATTMAIL; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:10:00 -0400

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:10:00 -0400

Subject: FW: Funding opportunity in survey research methodology

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Message-ID:

<M2000754884.035.xhw05.1.990715202138Z.CC-MAIL\*/O=HQ/PRMD=USDOE/ADMD=ATTMAIL  
/C=US/@MHS>

X-Mailer: Worldtalk (NetJunction 4.6-p2)/MIME

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-WSS-ID: 1B909D0960937-01-01

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Subject: Funding opportunity in survey research methodology

> From: Monroe Sirken

>  
> This is an announcement of a short meeting at the Joint  
> Statistical Meetings in Baltimore next month. We will describe and  
> discuss continuation during 2000 of the Funding Opportunity In Survey  
> Research Methodology that was established last year by the National  
> Science Foundation and the Interagency Committee On Statistical  
> Policy. The Funding Opportunity invites research proposals that  
> further the development of innovative approaches to surveys.  
> Information about last year's program is available in last year's  
announcement of the Funding  
> Opportunity on display at NSF's website (   
> <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf9935.htm>).

>  
> We will meet on Tuesday, August 10 , 12:30 - 1:30, Room 327 in  
> the Convention Center. This is an open meeting, and all interested  
> parties are encouraged to attend.

>  
>

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Thu Jul 15 13:44:59 1999  
Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id NAA16465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 13:44:58 -0700  
(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu  
Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2  
(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567AF.0071B19D ; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:41:50 -0400  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU  
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567AF.0071B0A4.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:52:07 -0400

Subject: POQ issues

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

In the next week or two I too will trek down to the basement and sort POQs and several other journals dating back to the early '60s. In the meantime, I will review all the suggestions of what to do with them. My wife thanks you, Al; I don't know how I feel about the task!

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Thu Jul 15 14:11:03 1999

Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id OAA26522 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:11:03 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from michael.tdl.com (tdl-dyn222.tdl.com [205.162.12.222])

by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA08507;

Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:11:01 -0700

Message-Id: <199907152111.OAA08507@web2.tdl.com>

From: "Mike Sullivan" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:24:06 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: POQ issues

Reply-to: sullivan@fsc-research.com

X-pmrqc: 1

In-reply-to: <852567AF.0071B0A4.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Enough already about the old POQ issues.

Date sent: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:52:07 -0400

Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: POQ issues

>

>

> In the next week or two I too will trek down to the basement and sort

> POQs and several other journals dating back to the early '60s. In the

meantime,

> I will review all the suggestions of what to do with them. My wife

> thanks you, Al; I don't know how I feel about the task!

>

>

>



>From DMMerke@aol.com Thu Jul 15 14:27:04 1999

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

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

id OAA01220 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:27:03 -0700

(PDT)

From: DMMerke@aol.com

Received: from DMMerke@aol.com

by imo14.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5GQYa18547 (7805)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 17:18:22 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <7503c5e3.24bfaa1c@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 17:18:20 EDT

Subject: Help with Job Posting

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 13

I am interested in suggestions on additional places to post a job announcement for a position we are looking to fill. We would like to target those with a Ph.D. or MA with a strong background in sampling theory and survey methodology. So far we have posted the job on AAPORNET, JobTrack, in the NY Times and with the American Statistical Association.

Thanks.

Daniel Merkle

>From mkshares@mcs.net Thu Jul 15 14:55:41 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id OAA11660 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:55:40 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P42-Chi-Dial-3.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.170]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id QAA28383 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:55:35 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <378E1276.ABB7495D@mcs.net>

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 16:55:19 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <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: Help with Job Posting

References: <7503c5e3.24bfaa1c@aol.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Polling Report has job listings at their website.

<http://www.pollingreport.com/>

DMMerkle@aol.com wrote:

- > I am interested in suggestions on additional places to post a job
- > announcement for a position we are looking to fill. We would like to
- > target those with a Ph.D. or MA with a strong background in sampling
- > theory and survey methodology. So far we have posted the job on

> AAPORNET, JobTrack, in the NY Times and with the American Statistical  
> Association.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Daniel Merkle

>From mitchell@earinc.net Thu Jul 15 15:21:43 1999

Received: from smtp1.mindspring.com (smtp1.mindspring.com [207.69.200.31])

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

id PAA00395 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 15:21:42 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ntwear02 (user-2ivea63.dialup.mindspring.com

[165.247.40.195])

by smtp1.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA13005

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:21:41 -0400 (EDT)

Reply-To: <mitchell@earinc.net>

From: "John Mitchell" <mitchell@earinc.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Help with Job Posting

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:26:43 -0400

Message-ID: <005501becf11\$1e55b680\$0d4992a8@ntwear02>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 1 (Highest)

X-MSMail-Priority: High

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0

In-Reply-To: <7503c5e3.24bfaa1c@aol.com>

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

I've had excellent candidates from WorldOpinion.com, a site run by SSI.

John Mitchell

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
DMMerkle@aol.com

Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 5:18 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Help with Job Posting

I am interested in suggestions on additional places to post a job announcement for a position we are looking to fill. We would like to target those with a Ph.D. or MA with a strong background in sampling theory and survey methodology. So far we have posted the job on AAPORNET, JobTrack, in the NY Times and with the American Statistical Association.

Thanks.

Daniel Merkle

>From barry@arches.uga.edu Thu Jul 15 15:55:46 1999

Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])

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

id PAA15224 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 15:55:45 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from archa8.cc.uga.edu (arch8.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu

(LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.00F29828@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;

Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:53:25 -0400

Received: from archa15.cc.uga.edu (arch15.cc.uga.edu [128.192.95.115])

by archa8.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA09632

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:55:42 -0400

Received: from localhost (barry@localhost)

by archa15.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA123104

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:55:41 -0400

X-Authentication-Warning: archa15.cc.uga.edu: barry owned process doing -bs

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:55:41 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>

X-Sender: barry@archa15.cc.uga.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: POQ issues

In-Reply-To: <199907152111.OAA08507@web2.tdl.com>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.10.9907151851440.25874-100000@archa15.cc.uga.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Thu, 15 Jul 1999, Mike Sullivan wrote:

> Enough already about the old POQ issues.

>

Oh c'mon. And I was just about to continue the thread with  
an issue-by-issue description of my going through my POQs.

I was going to serialize the journey from volume to volume,

right here on the list, as articles brought forth memories  
of research past.

And so on and so on. People would laugh, they would cry,  
it would become a part of them.

Um...in other words, enough about the old POQs.

---

Barry A. Hollander      College of Journalism  
Associate Professor      and Mass Communication  
barry@arches.uga.edu      The University of Georgia  
phone: 706.542.5027      Athens, GA 30602

web: <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

>From market.probe.la@juno.com Thu Jul 15 19:04:00 1999

Received: from m4.boston.juno.com (m4.boston.juno.com [205.231.101.198])

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

id TAA05623 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 19:03:59 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (from market.probe.la@juno.com)

by m4.boston.juno.com (queuemail) id EFL5XKDM; Thu, 15 Jul 1999 22:03:35

EDT

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Cc: market.probe.la@juno.com, tr@marketprobe.com

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 18:28:47 -0700

Subject: Job opening

Message-ID: <19990715.190255.-198109.0.Market.Probe.LA@juno.com>

X-Mailer: Juno 2.0.11

X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-1,10-11,19-20,22-23,26-32

X-Juno-Att: 0

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

From: Jacquelyn B Schriber <market.probe.la@juno.com>

International marketing research firm is seeking a Database Specialist to create computer programs for the purposes of preparing client customer data for survey mailings, and for submission to a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system. These programs may involve: 1) Reading/writing data in multiple formats, 2) Selecting random or representative samples, 3) Validating telephone numbers and/or street addresses, 5) Removing duplicate records, 6) Suppressing records used in previous studies, 7) Verifying key variables, 8) Stratifying samples, or 9) Other customized programming.

The following skills are required: 1) Possession of a fundamental understanding of database concepts, 2) 1-3 years of database or statistical programming experience (SAS experience a plus), 3) Strong analytic skills, 4) A strong positive orientation to details, 5) The ability to work independently, 6) A basic proficiency in mathematics or statistics, and 7) The ability to communicate effectively with both internal and external clients. A Bachelor's Degree in Information Systems is preferred, but not required.

Market Probe is headquartered in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, but work from a remote site will be considered for the right candidate.

Interested principals, please send resumes to T.R. Rao, Ph.D., Market Probe, Inc., 2655 North Mayfair Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226 or forward to TR@marketprobe.com.

>

>

>

>From bthompson@directionrsch.com Fri Jul 16 06:09:14 1999

Received: from proxy.directionrsch.com (root@dri74.directionrsch.com [206.112.196.74])

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

id GAA03269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 06:09:13 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from drione.directionrsch.com (drione.directionrsch.com [100.0.0.4])

by proxy.directionrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id JAA02975

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 09:25:05 -0400

Received: by drione.directionrsch.com (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2 10-16-1998)) id 852567B0.00481E8C ; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 09:07:44 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI

From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionrsch.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567B0.00481D3B.00@drione.directionrsch.com>



Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 09:07:40 -0400

Subject: Re: Help with Job Posting

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

I wonder where your job opening is located? You mentioned the NY Times, so is it in NY?

I would also recommend the Washington Post, which lists a lot of market research/survey research jobs. There should be lots of the types of candidate you're looking for in that market.

If the job is in the DC area or you would be interested in candidates from there, I would also look into a publication called "Opportunities in Public Affairs" as well as one called "The Jobs Book". They both come out twice a month and are sold at some news stands, but are mostly by subscription, so serious job seekers use them. The former is (or at least was) published by the Brubach Corporation in DC. The latter has a web site which I think is called "jobsbook.com."

The Cincinnati area has a many market research firms, so the Cincinnati Enquirer is another option for newspapers.

I believe the Marketing Research Association posts jobs on their site at "mra-net.org."

Discovery Research Group in Utah sponsors a job posting site as well as discussion roundtable at "drgutah.com."

Can you tell I've done this before???

Hope this helps.

DMMerke@aol.com on 07/15/99 05:18:20 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Help with Job Posting

I am interested in suggestions on additional places to post a job announcement for a position we are looking to fill. We would like to target those with a Ph.D. or MA with a strong background in sampling theory and survey methodology. So far we have posted the job on AAPORNET, JobTrack, in the NY Times and with the American Statistical Association.

Thanks.

Daniel Merkle

>From Irv Crespi@aol.com Fri Jul 16 07:13:30 1999

Received: from imo11.mx.aol.com (imo11.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.1])

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

id HAA13775 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 07:13:29 -0700

(PDT)

From: Irv Crespi@aol.com

Received: from Irv Crespi@aol.com

by imo11.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5FJWa21802 (4454)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 10:11:09 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <34fed2c9.24c0975b@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 10:10:35 EDT

Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

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 13

Congratulations to Mike Traugott for his rapid response to the New York

Times

op-ed attack on polling. It is a well-thought letter and he should take pride that he demonstrated that AAPOR can act fast. Irving Crespi

>From JAM@moviefone.com Fri Jul 16 07:28:50 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id HAA17033 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 07:28:41 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 10:25:30 -0400

Message-Id: <s78f089a.081@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 10:24:58 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Op Ed Piece in the Times Today

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I second Irv Crespi's congratulatory note. Thank you very much, Mike, =  
for your timely and very congenent response. It's a great letter, addressing=  
Dickerson's key points and striking a positive professional tone. I can =  
sleep a little easier now.

Jay Mattlin=20

>>> <Irvcrespi@aol.com> 07/16/99 10:10AM >>>

Congratulations to Mike Traugott for his rapid response to the New York =

Times=20 op-ed attack on polling. It is a well-thought letter and he should  
= take=20

pride that he demonstrated that AAPOR can act fast. Irving Crespi

>From mark@bisconti.com Fri Jul 16 08:27:18 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id IAA26411 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 08:27:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip159.washington11.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.47.159])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service  
Version 5.5.2232.9)

id 37Y6N0L6; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 11:27:18 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: NYT Letters to Editor

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 11:12:53 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEECEAKCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html>

July 16, 1999

Do Polls Answer a Political Need?

---

----

Related Articles

Call Me Unresponsive (July 13)

Letters Index

---

----

To the Editor:

Genie Dickerson's complaints about public-opinion polls (Op-Ed, July 13) translate into a serious problem for pollsters: the increase in nonrespondents.

The intrusiveness of some questions and the lack of information in the media about the way polls are constructed and conducted lead skeptics to shun participation.

As the public grows less willing to respond, politicians grow more eager to commission polls and treat their results as representative of public opinion.

If the political attitudes of nonrespondents differ systematically from the opinions of those who respond (an idea social scientists debate, but something we can never really know), then the credibility of polls and pollsters declines precipitously.

KATHLEEN GRAMMATICO

Middlebury, Conn., July 14, 1999

To the Editor:

Re "Call Me Unresponsive," Genie Dickerson's July 13 Op-Ed article on polls:  
What is the purpose of having any public polls at all? Why must we know how the public feels on any issue? Are we incapable of making up our own minds? Must we know what the masses are doing before we make any decisions?

Obviously, candidates (or corporations, for that matter) need their own private polls to see what to offer and how. But must we know how most Americans plan to vote before we cast ballots?

NATHAN LAMM

Flushing, Queens, July 14, 1999

To the Editor:

Genie Dickerson (Op-Ed, July 13) refuses to respond to phone surveys and urges others to do the same. Many of the practices she rails against reflect unethical behavior from unscrupulous telemarketers or political consultants. Groups like the American Association for Public Opinion Research and the National Council of Public Polls have guidelines that respect confidentiality and call for disclosure of polling methods.

While legitimate surveys do contain questions about personal characteristics, they are not intended to learn information about specific individuals.

This information is gathered so that information from groups of people with similar characteristics can be analyzed in relation to others with different characteristics.

Polls are not biased by underrepresentation of conservative views.

If they were, they would not have underestimated the Democratic surge in last fall's elections.

And participating is not like charity.

Responding gives voice to concerns that can inform policy decisions, and the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the views of political elites and interest groups.

MICHAEL W. TRAUOGOTT

Pres., American Assn. for Public Opinion Research

Ann Arbor, Mich., July 13, 1999

To the Editor:

Re "Call Me Unresponsive" (Op-Ed, July 13): Genie Dickerson's complaints about polls are correct, but there is one she misses.



Questions are often so badly constructed that to answer "agree" or "disagree" is impossible. When I make that point, poll takers usually list my answer as "no opinion." After one of these sessions, I invariably think that whoever commissioned the poll is wasting the public's time and his or her money -- even, or especially, when the intent is to plant poison about a competi-tor.

JUDY SEIGEL

New York, July 14, 1999

sent from:

Mark-David RICHARDS

mark@bisconti.com

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Jul 16 09:11:51 1999

Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id JAA06897 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 09:11:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from michael.tdl.com (tdl-dyn216.tdl.com [205.162.12.216])

by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA24590

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 09:11:45 -0700

Message-Id: <199907161611.JAA24590@web2.tdl.com>

From: "Mike Sullivan" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 09:24:58 -0800

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Job Openings

Reply-to: sullivan@fsc-research.com

CC: COFFEY@web2.tdl.com

X-pmrqc: 1

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Survey Project Manager - Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

Date Posted: July 16, 1999

Location: San Francisco, California USA

Freeman, Sullivan & Co. has openings for experienced survey project managers. Qualified parties will have advanced degrees (MA or higher) in the social sciences with 5-10 years experience carrying out survey projects in a commercial or university survey laboratory environment.

Successful applicants will be responsible for day-to-day management of survey projects. This work includes: staffing, vendor management, survey team management, development of survey instruments and measurement protocols, sample management, analysis and report writing.

Excellent writing and analytical skills are required. Candidates should be fluent in MS Word or Wordperfect and MS Excel; and they should be able to analyze data using SAS or SPSS without assistance. Familiarity with dbase, MS Access and other data base management software is a plus.

Salary depends on qualifications and prior experience.

To inquire about these openings send a resume to Michael Sullivan at:

e-mail: [sullivan@fsc-research.com](mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com)

fax: (415) 777-2420

mail: Michael Sullivan

Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

131 Steuart St. Suite 500

San Francisco, Ca 94105

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Jul 16 14:50:15 1999

Received: from smtp1.mindspring.com (smtp1.mindspring.com [207.69.200.31])

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

id OAA15842 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 14:50:14 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mindspring.com (user-38lcad9.dialup.mindspring.com

[209.86.41.169])

by smtp1.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id RAA06576;

Fri, 16 Jul 1999 17:50:11 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <378FA903.C1A22117@mindspring.com>

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 17:49:55 -0400

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Do Polls Answer a Political Need?

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----91135FE55BCC4EC072568CB7"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----91135FE55BCC4EC072568CB7

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Letters from NY Times re Dickerson's letter of complaint.

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html>

-----91135FE55BCC4EC072568CB7

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

name="llamm.html"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline;

filename="llamm.html"

Content-Base: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html"

Content-Location: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html"

<html>

<head>

<!-- ELEMENT META-->

<META NAME="Filingmethod" CONTENT="Atex">

<META NAME="UnixSlug" CONTENT="../backfield/savekeep/LLAMM.W01">

<META NAME="Date" CONTENT="99/07/16">

<META NAME="Type" CONTENT="story">

<META NAME="AtexNotes" CONTENT="friltr/grammatico(5)/unsk lc/nbk /th ">

<META NAME="AtexSlug" CONTENT="llamm ">

<META NAME="AtexHJ" CONTENT="y012.80/0096">

<META NAME="AtexFrom" CONTENT="done-edt ;07/15,19:14">

<META NAME="AtexOp" CONTENT="madroh;07/15,19:09">

<META NAME="AtexBy" CONTENT="licohn;07/14,12:49">

<META NAME="section" CONTENT="">

<META NAME="subsection" CONTENT="">

<META NAME="End of header" CONTENT="">

<!--ELEMENT TITLE -->

<TITLE>Do Polls Answer a Political Need?

</TITLE>

</head>

<NYT\_HEADER version="1.0" type="main">

<body bgcolor="#ffffff" vlink=#444464 link=#000066

background=http://graphics.nytimes.com/images/back.c.gif>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<tr><td align=left width=600 valign=top>



<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=left valign=top width=480>

<NYT\_BANNER version="1.0" type="main">



</NYT\_BANNER>

```
<br clear=all>
<NYT_TOOLBARMAP version="1.0" type="main">
<map name="maintoolbar2">
<area shape="rect" coords="0,0,75,16" href="/yr/mo/day/"
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to go to the Home Page';return true">
<area shape="rect" coords="76,0,154,16" href="/info/contents/siteindex.html"
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to see site contents';return true"> <area
shape="rect" coords="155,0,233,16" href="/search/daily/"
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the current site';return true">
<area shape="rect" coords="234,0,312,16" href="/comment/"
onMouseOver="window.status='Click for discussion in the Forums';return
true"> <area shape="rect" coords="313,0,391,16" href="/archives/"
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the archives';return true">
<area shape="rect" coords="392,0,468,16" href="/marketplace/"
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to visit the Marketplace';return true">
</map>
```

```
</NYT_TOOLBARMAP>
```

```
<NYT_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">
<a href="/images/maintoolbar2.map">
</a>
```

```
</NYT_TOOLBAR>
```

```
<br><NYT_AD version="1.0" location="top">
```

```
<A
```

```
href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Top/OPED0001/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"
```

target="\_top"><IMG  
SRC="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.co  
m/yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Top/OPED0001/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"  
border=0 ALT="" ></A>

</NYT\_AD>

</td></table>

</NYT\_HEADER>

<BLOCKQUOTE><BLOCKQUOTE>

<NYT\_DATE version="1.0" type=" ">

<!--ELEMENT DATE-->

<H5>July 16, 1999</H5><br>

</NYT\_DATE>

<NYT\_HEADLINE version="1.0" type=" ">

<!--ELEMENT HEADLINE-->

<H2>Do Polls Answer a Political Need?

</H2>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_LINKS\_ONSITE version="1.0" type="main">

<hr size=1>

<b>Related Articles</b>

<li><a href="/yr/mo/day/early/07139913dick.html">Call Me Unresponsive </a>

(July 13) <li><a href="/yr/mo/day/letters/index.html">Letters Index</a>

<HR SIZE=1>

</NYT\_LINKS\_ONSITE>

To the Editor:

<p> Genie Dickerson's complaints about public-opinion polls (Op-Ed, July 13) translate into a serious problem for pollsters: the increase in nonrespondents.

<p>The intrusiveness of some questions and the lack of information in the media about the way polls are constructed and conducted lead skeptics to shun participation.

<p> As the public grows less willing to respond, politicians grow more eager to commission polls and treat their results as representative of public opinion.

<p>If the political attitudes of nonrespondents differ systematically from the opinions of those who respond (an idea social scientists debate, but something we can never really know), then the credibility of polls and pollsters declines precipitously. <P><I>KATHLEEN GRAMMATICO</I><BR>

Middlebury, Conn., July 14, 1999

<P>



<center><UL><LI></UL></CENTER>

<P>

To the Editor:

<p> Re "Call Me Unresponsive," Genie Dickerson's July 13 Op-Ed article on polls: What is the purpose of having any public polls at all? Why must we know how the public feels on any issue? Are we incapable of making up our own minds? Must we know what the masses are doing before we make any decisions?

<p> Obviously, candidates (or corporations, for that matter) need their own private polls to see what to offer and how. But must we know how most Americans plan to vote before we cast ballots?<P><I>NATHAN LAMM</I><BR>

Flushing, Queens, July 14, 1999

<P>

<center><UL><LI></UL></CENTER>

<P>

To the Editor:

<p> Genie Dickerson (Op-Ed, July 13)

refuses to respond to phone surveys

and urges others to do the same. Many

of the practices she rails against reflect unethical behavior from

unscrupulous telemarketers or political consultants. Groups like the

American

Association for Public Opinion Research and the National Council of

Public Polls have guidelines that respect confidentiality and call for

disclosure of polling methods.

<p> While legitimate surveys do contain questions about personal

characteristics, they are not intended to

learn information about specific individuals.

<p>This information is gathered

so that information from groups of

people with similar characteristics

can be analyzed in relation to others

with different characteristics.

<p> Polls are not biased by underrepresentation of conservative views.

<p>If

they were, they would not have underestimated the Democratic surge in

last fall's elections.

<p>And participating

is not like charity.

<p>Responding gives

voice to concerns that can inform

policy decisions, and the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the views of political elites and interest groups.

MICHAEL  
W. TRUGOTT

Pres., American Assn. for  
Public Opinion Research  
Ann Arbor, Mich., July 13, 1999

To the Editor:

Re "Call Me Unresponsive" (Op-Ed, July 13):

Genie Dickerson's complaints about polls are correct, but there is one she misses.

Questions are often so badly constructed that to answer "agree" or "disagree" is impossible.

When I make that point, poll takers usually list my answer as "no opinion." After one of these sessions, I invariably think that whoever commissioned the poll is wasting the public's time and his or her money --

even, or especially, when the intent is to plant poison about a competitor.

JUDY SEIGEL

New York, July 14, 1999

<NYT\_FOOTER version="1.0">

</BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE>

<br>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=center valign=top width=468>

<NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="bottom">

<A

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/  
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Bottom/OPED0001/empty.gif/616e6e616c69766961"  
target="\_top"><IMG

src="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.co  
m/yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Bottom/OPED0001/empty.gif/616e6e616c6976696  
1" border=0 alt="" ></A>

</NYT\_AD>

<hr size=1>

<P>

<font size=-1>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">

<A href="/"><b>Home</b></A> |

<A href="/info/contents/siteindex.html"><b>Site Index</b></A> |

<A href="/search/daily/"><b>Site Search</b></A> |

<A href="/comment/"><b>Forums</b></A> |

<A href="/archives/"><b>Archives</b></A> |

<A href="/marketplace/"><b>Marketplace</b></A>

<P>

[Quick News](/yr/mo/day/late/) |  
[Page One Plus](/yr/mo/day/front/) |  
[International](/yr/mo/day/world/) |  
[National/N.Y.](/yr/mo/day/national/) |  
[Business](/yr/mo/day/business/) |  
[Technology](/yr/mo/day/tech/) |  
[Science](/yr/mo/day/science/) |  
[Sports](/yr/mo/day/sports/) |  
[Weather](/weather/) |  
[Editorial](/yr/mo/day/editorial/) |  
[Op-Ed](/yr/mo/day/oped/) |  
[Arts](/yr/mo/day/artleisure/) |  
[Automobiles](/yr/mo/day/auto/) |  
[Books](/books/yr/mo/day/home/) |  
[Diversions](/diversions/) |  
[Job Market](/yr/mo/day/jobmarket/) |  
[Real Estate](/yr/mo/day/realestate/) |  
[Travel](/yr/mo/day/travel/)

<P>

[Help/Feedback](/subscribe/help/) |  
[Classifieds](/classified/) |  
[Services](/info/contents/services.html) |  
[New York Today](http://www.nytoday.com)

</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<NYT\_COPYRIGHT version="1.0" type="main">

<P>

[<B>Copyright 1999 The New York](/subscribe/help/copyright.html)

Times Company</B></A> <P>

</NYT\_COPYRIGHT>

</font>

</td></table>

</td>

<td align=left width=14 valign=top>

</td> <td align=center width=140 valign=top> 

<table cool width="264" height="1799" border="0" cellpadding="0"

cellspacing="0" gridx="16" showgridx usegridx gridy="16" showgridy usegridy>

<tr height="1" cntrlrow>

<td width="1" height="1"></td>

<td width="261" height="1"><spacer type="block" width="261"

height="1"></td>

</tr>

<tr height="1796">

<td width="1" height="1796"><spacer type="block" width="1" height="1796"></td>

<td width="261" height="1796" colspan="1" rowspan="1" valign="top" align="left" xpos="0">

<table border="0" cellpadding="0" cellspacing="6" width="140" height="632" bgcolor="#df1100">

```
<tr>
  <td>
<center>
  <table border="0" cellpadding="0" cellspacing="6" width="138">
    <tr>
      <td>
<center>
  </center>
```

```
<tr>
  <td>
    <div align="center">
      <a
href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Right3/audible_side/aul1-rtsd.html/616e6e616c
69766961?_RM_REDIR_=www.audible.com/bestsellers/6.html">
<font color="#ffffcc" face="Arial,Helvetica,Geneva,Swiss,SunSans-Regular"
size="1"><b>Business @ the Speed of Thought </b></font></a><font
color="#ffffcc" face="Arial,Helvetica,Geneva,Swiss,SunSans-Regular"
size="1"> by Bill Gates<br>
      <br>
      <a
href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Right3/audible_side/aul1-rtsd.html/616e6e616c
69766961?_RM_REDIR_=www.audible.com/bestsellers/6.html">
        <br>
```

<br>

</a><a

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/  
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Right3/audible\_side/aul1-rtsd.html/616e6e616c  
69766961?\_RM\_REDIR\_=www.audible.com/bestsellers/6.html"><b>The  
Testament</b></a> by John Grisham<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<a

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/  
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Right3/audible\_side/aul1-rtsd.html/616e6e616c  
69766961?\_RM\_REDIR\_=www.audible.com/bestsellers/6.html"><b>The Girl Who  
Loved Tom Gordon </b></a> by Stephen King<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<a

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/  
yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Right3/audible\_side/aul1-rtsd.html/616e6e616c  
69766961?\_RM\_REDIR\_=www.audible.com/bestsellers/6.html"><b>All Too  
Human</b></a><br> by George Stephanopoulos<br>



<br>

<br>

<br>

<a

href="http://images2.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/

yr/mo/day/letters/llamm.html/0/Right3/audible\_side/aul1-rtsd.html/616e6e616c

69766961?\_RM\_REDIR\_=www.audible.com/bestsellers/6.html"><b>Under the Tuscan

Sun</b></a><br> by Frances Mayes<br>

<br>

</font></div>

</td>

</tr>

<tr>

<td></td>

</tr>

</table>

</center>

</td>  
</tr>  
</table>  
</td>  
</tr>  
</table>

</td></tr></table>

</NYT\_FOOTER>

</body>

</html>

-----91135FE55BCC4EC072568CB7--

>From SavellJM@aol.com Fri Jul 16 19:01:12 1999

Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69])

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

id TAA10930 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 19:01:02 -0700

(PDT)

From: SavellJM@aol.com

Received: from SavellJM@aol.com

by imo25.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5ZPDa17404 (14464)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 21:59:07 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <7b0ae0c1.24c13d6b@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 21:59:07 EDT

Subject: (no subject)

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 13

I would like to donate my set of POQ to some appropriate institution, hopefully taking a tax write-off . With respect to this latter point, I don't believe anyone has mentioned tax write-offs in any of the postings, and I'm wondering whether there is a problem here. (If not, I would appreciate any suggestions.)

My set goes back to winter 1962-63 and includes most if not all the individual issues, though I haven't confirmed this latter point.

I would appreciate hearing from interested persons.

Joel Savell

SavellJM@AOL.Com

6605 Millwood Road

Bethesda, MD 20817

(301) 229-1806

>From SavellJM@aol.com Fri Jul 16 20:49:52 1999

Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.71])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id UAA10498 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 20:49:51 -0700  
(PDT)

From: SavellJM@aol.com

Received: from SavellJM@aol.com  
by imo27.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5CWZa06608 (4539)  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 23:47:36 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <bdfd3093.24c156d7@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 23:47:35 EDT

Subject: (no subject)

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 13

My e-mail message about an hour ago had an error in it. The back issues of

POQ that I am offering to donate go back to winter 1952-53. (My previous  
message showed a date ten years later.)

Joel Savell

>From SavellJM@aol.com Fri Jul 16 21:03:30 1999

Received: from imo29.mx.aol.com (imo29.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.73])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id VAA12798 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Jul 1999 21:03:29 -0700  
(PDT)

From: SavellJM@aol.com

Received: from SavellJM@aol.com

by imo29.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.25) id 5Va0005584 (4539)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 00:01:28 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <131f185d.24c15a18@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 00:01:28 EDT

Subject: Re: failure notice

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 13

Let me try again. I sent the message below about an hour ago. Then, when I

discovered an error in what I had typed, I corrected it and sent it.

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Sat Jul 17 08:34:40 1999

Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])

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

id IAA09931 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 08:34:38 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login0.isis.unc.edu (login0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.130])

by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA14310

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 11:34:36 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <63496-71876>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 11:34:21 -0400

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 11:34:19 -0400 (EDT)

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

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

X-Sender: pmeyer@login0.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: (no subject)

In-Reply-To: <7b0ae0c1.24c13d6b@aol.com>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990717113228.32504B-100000@login0.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I looked into that years ago and was reminded that I had deducted the costs when I acquired the journals and so another deduction for giving them away would not be allowed. Who knows what the law is today? Perhaps you could make a case that they had gained in value with age.

=====

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 Fri, 16 Jul 1999 SavellJM@aol.com wrote:

> Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 21:59:07 EDT

> From: SavellJM@aol.com

> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: (no subject)

>

> I would like to donate my set of POQ to some appropriate institution,

> hopefully taking a tax write-off . With respect to this latter point, I  
> don't believe anyone has mentioned tax write-offs in any of the postings,  
and  
> I'm wondering whether there is a problem here. (If not, I would appreciate  
  
> any suggestions.)  
>  
> My set goes back to winter 1962-63 and includes most if not all the  
> individual issues, though I haven't confirmed this latter point.  
>  
> I would appreciate hearing from interested persons.  
>  
> Joel Savell  
> SavellJM@AOL.Com  
> 6605 Millwood Road  
> Bethesda, MD 20817  
> (301) 229-1806  
>  
>

>From SavellJM@aol.com Sat Jul 17 08:43:31 1999

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

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

id IAA11367 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 08:43:25 -0700

(PDT)

From: SavellJM@aol.com

Received: from SavellJM@aol.com

by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.25) id 5HJZa23915 (4069)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 11:42:51 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <de0e30a9.24c1fe7b@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 11:42:51 EDT

Subject: Re: (no subject)

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 13

Thanks. I hadn't thought of that.

Joel

>From RFunk787@aol.com Sat Jul 17 09:49:55 1999

Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])

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

id JAA19048 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 09:49:54 -0700

(PDT)

From: RFunk787@aol.com

Received: from RFunk787@aol.com

by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5UIKa02036 (3700)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 12:48:28 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <634cf038.24c20dd6@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 12:48:22 EDT

Subject: Deducting Donated POQs

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 24



I think it is permissible to deduct the current fair market value of donated

POQs less any originally deducted cost; e.g., the amount Phil Meyer originally deducted as a "professional publication". Apparently old POQs do

appreciate with age, because the last time I looked up the price of back issues, as listed in POQ, it was enough more than their original cost (remember, the subscription is only a fraction of AAPOR dues) to make doing the math worthwhile (though maybe not enough to justify hiring a tax accountant). And that is for old POQs that currently are still available.

For those no longer available, let your conscience be your guide.

Ray Funkhouser

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Sat Jul 17 09:52:13 1999

Received: from smtp0.mindspring.com (smtp0.mindspring.com [207.69.200.30])

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

id JAA19937 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 09:52:12 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38ld6ok.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.155.20])

by smtp0.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA16549

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 12:52:10 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.56.19990717123406.009c23c0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.56 (Beta)

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 12:45:04 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Why Polling?

In-Reply-To: <34fed2c9.24c0975b@aol.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="===== \_72477432==\_ .ALT"

----- \_72477432==\_ .ALT

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

Irv Crespi is right on the mark: Mike Traugott is to be congratulated for his timely and meaningful response to the op-ed piece in the NY Times on polling.

Particularly relevant was Mike's comment: "

>Responding gives voice to concerns that can inform policy decisions,

>and

>the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the views of political

>elites and interest groups."

>

>In a world without polls we would be at the mercy of various political

>interests who would each claim to know what the public thinks and who

>could support their contentions with vast amounts of advertising and PR

>funds. In today's complicated world how could any politician or interest

>group really know what the public thinks, their wants and needs, without

>some sort of polling? The unanticipated consequences of no polling would

>not be pleasant.

>

>Dick Halpern

>

>

>

>

>

>

>-----

>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

>Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

>Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

>3837 Courtyard Drive

>Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

>rshalpern@mindspring.com

>phone/fax 770 434 4121

>

>-----

--===== \_72477432== \_ .ALT

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

<html>

<font size=3>Irv Crespi is right on the mark: Mike Traugott is to be congratulated for his timely and meaningful response to the op-ed piece in the NY Times on polling.<br> <br> Particularly relevant was Mike's comment: &quot;</font><blockquote>Responding gives voice to concerns that can inform policy decisions, and the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the views of political elites and interest groups.&quot;<br> <br> In a world without polls we would be at the mercy of various political interests who would each claim to know what the public thinks and who could support their contentions with vast amounts of advertising and PR funds. In today's complicated world how could any politician or interest group really know

what the public thinks, their wants and needs, without some sort of polling?&nbsp; The unanticipated consequences of no polling would not be pleasant.<br> <br> Dick Halpern<br> <br> <br> <br> <br>

<hr>

<font size=1 color="#0000FF">Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. <br> Consultant,  
Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research <br> Adjunct Professor, Georgia  
Institute of Technology <br> 3837 Courtyard Drive <br> Atlanta, GA  
30339-4248 <br> rshalpern@mindspring.com <br> phone/fax 770 434 4121 <br>  
<hr> </font></html>

--===== \_72477432== \_ .ALT--

>From SavellJM@aol.com Sat Jul 17 13:20:03 1999

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

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

id NAA18006 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 13:20:02 -0700

(PDT)

From: SavellJM@aol.com

Received: from SavellJM@aol.com

by imo14.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.21) id 5PDUa19159 (3948)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Jul 1999 16:19:15 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <fe237766.24c23f43@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 1999 16:19:15 EDT

Subject: Re: Deducting Donated POQs

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 13

Thanks

Joel

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sun Jul 18 04:40:19 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id EAA01031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 04:40:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-4.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.213])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id HAA13357;

Sun, 18 Jul 1999 07:40:16 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <3791BD1F.73AF1592@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 07:40:15 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Hard Copy of POQ's

References: <fe237766.24c23f43@aol.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear All:

I have found the discussion of POQ's (the hard copy) very entertaining. Our

college library, for one, now makes a regular practice of throwing away journals that are more than 10 years old. Everything that they buy they replace with microfiche. Now with the advent of computerized data bases one is better off in many ways with the electronic version. For example, you can search them.

If POQ goes on JSTOR, and JSTOR is relatively easy to get access to, what is the point of institutions preserving or even accepting hard copies?

This may make all of your contemplated tax deductions less lucrative.

Better give them away fast before the IRS catches on!

Andy Beveridge

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Sun Jul 18 07:52:36 1999

Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])

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

id HAA12777 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 07:52:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login5.isis.unc.edu (root@login5.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.135])

by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA12546

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 10:52:32 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <1038-323868>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 10:52:25 -0400

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 10:52:14 -0400 (EDT)

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

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

X-Sender: pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

In-Reply-To: <3791BD1F.73AF1592@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990718104822.358080A-100000@login5.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Andy may be right, in which case the surviving hard copies will eventually be prized by antiquarians, not to mention the monks who will piece together the remnants of our civilization. I wish now I had kept mine and stored them in a Kansas salt mine.

=====

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, 18 Jul 1999, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:

> Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 07:40:15 -0400

> From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Hard Copy of POQ's

>

> Dear All:

>

> I have found the discussion of POQ's (the hard copy) very

> entertaining. Our college library, for one, now makes a regular  
> practice of throwing away journals that are more than 10 years old.  
> Everything that they buy they replace with microfiche. Now with the  
> advent of computerized data bases one is better off in many ways with  
> the electronic version. For example, you can search them.  
>  
> If POQ goes on JSTOR, and JSTOR is relatively easy to get access to,  
> what is the point of institutions preserving or even accepting hard  
> copies?  
>  
> This may make all of your contemplated tax deductions less lucrative.  
>  
> Better give them away fast before the IRS catches on!  
>  
> Andy Beveridge  
>

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sun Jul 18 08:48:25 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id IAA18994 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 08:48:23 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-6.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.215])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id LAA19370;

Sun, 18 Jul 1999 11:48:22 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <3791F748.BB10A006@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 11:48:24 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>



X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

References: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990718104822.358080A-100000@login5.isis.unc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Philip Meyer wrote:

> . . . the surviving hard copies will  
> eventually be prized by antiquarians, not to mention the monks who  
> will piece together the remnants of our civilization. I wish now I had  
> kept mine and stored then in a Kansas salt mine.

But Phil the monks will just load up the new replacement of the DVD, which  
by that time will store a few terrabytes, and they will punch a few buttons  
and suddenly, all of POQ is accessible.

Andy

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Sun Jul 18 11:23:56 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id LAA05176 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 11:23:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp4x42.chesco.com [209.195.207.106])  
by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA09690  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 14:23:49 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <007c01bed14a\$539dfb00\$6acfc3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 14:21:15 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

"Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the  
announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to the  
editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting Ms.  
Dickerson, and two opposed.

Postings on what to do with old copies of a journal have outnumbered those  
on the Dickerson piece by (according to a hasty tabulation) 22:13. At least  
half of the 13 had no substantive content .

As a new member of this organization I find this baffling.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

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

Date: Sunday, July 18, 1999 11:48 AM

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

>

>

>Philip Meyer wrote:

>

>

>> . . . the surviving hard copies will

>> eventually be prized by antiquarians, not to mention the monks who

>> will piece together the remnants of our civilization. I wish now I

>> had kept mine and stored them in a Kansas salt mine.

>

>But Phil the monks will just load up the new replacement of the DVD,

>which by that time will store a few terrabytes, and they will punch a

>few buttons and suddenly, all of POQ is accessible.

>

>Andy

>

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sun Jul 18 11:35:18 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id LAA07308 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Jul 1999 11:35:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-6.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.215])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id OAA24047;

Sun, 18 Jul 1999 14:35:16 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37921E49.614DFC84@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 14:34:49 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win95; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

References: <007c01bed14a\$539dfb00\$6acfc3d1@default>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>

> "Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the

> announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to the

> editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting Ms.

> Dickerson, and two opposed.

Since Pollsters have been bashed for many years and most recently by Arianna

Huffington, but POQ has just become part of a computerized data base, I for one think the latter is of more real "news" value.

Haven't non-responses been going up for quite a while?

Andy

>From JAM@moviefone.com Mon Jul 19 06:02:31 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id GAA29913 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 06:02:30 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 08:59:25 -0400

Message-Id: <s792e8ed.076@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 08:59:01 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I don't know you, but I was having the same exact thoughts. It seemed as if the organization preferred to dwell on the glories of the past than to focus on the challenges of the present.

Jay Mattlin

>>> "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com> 07/18/99 02:21PM >>>

"Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to the editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting Ms. Dickerson, and two opposed.

Postings on what to do with old copies of a journal have outnumbered those on the Dickerson piece by (according to a hasty tabulation) 22:13. At least half of the 13 had no substantive content.

As a new member of this organization I find this baffling.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com=20

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

From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

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

Date: Sunday, July 18, 1999 11:48 AM

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

>

>

>Philip Meyer wrote:

>

>

>> . . . the surviving hard copies will  
>> eventually be prized by antiquarians, not to mention the monks who  
>> will piece together the remnants of our civilization. I wish now I  
>> had kept mine and stored then in a Kansas salt mine.  
>  
>But Phil the monks will just load up the new replacement of the DVD,  
>which by that time will store a few terrabytes, and they will punch a  
>few buttons and suddenly, all of POQ is accessible.  
>  
>Andy  
>

>From JAM@moviefone.com Mon Jul 19 06:08:08 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id GAA01519 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 06:08:07 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:05:02 -0400

Message-Id: <s792ea3e.086@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:04:54 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Andy -

Non-responses are not news, but a clarion call in the Times to defend the =  
practice of not responding and to dismiss poll results "with a grain of =  
salt" is news. =20

Jay

>>> "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> 07/18/99 02:34PM >>>

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>=20

> "Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the  
> announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to the  
> editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting Ms.  
> Dickerson, and two opposed.

Since Pollsters have been bashed for many years and most recently by Arianna  
Huffington, but POQ has just become part of a computerized data base, I for  
one think the latter is of more real "news" value.

Haven't non-responses been going up for quite a while?

Andy

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Jul 19 06:17:46 1999



Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id GAA03513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 06:17:45 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-9.tuckahoe.bestweb.net  
[209.94.107.218])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id JAA28471;  
Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:17:43 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <379325F0.5EBBF8D4@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:19:44 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (WinNT; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

References: <s792ea3e.086@smtp1.moviefone.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

No! It is just opinon. Pollsters should not confuse opinon with news.

Sometimes opinion is big news, but only in cases where public opinion goes  
against what accepted thinks that opinion should be, or in other noteworthy  
cases.

Andy

Jay Mattlin wrote:

>

> Andy -

>

> Non-responses are not news, but a clarion call in the Times to defend

> the practice of not responding and to dismiss poll results "with a

> grain of salt" is news.

>

> Jay

>

>>> "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> 07/18/99 02:34PM >>>

>

> "James P. Murphy" wrote:

>>

>> "Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the

>> announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to

>> the editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting

>> Ms. Dickerson, and two opposed.

>

> Since Pollsters have been bashed for many years and most recently by

> Arianna Huffington, but POQ has just become part of a computerized

> data base, I for one think the latter is of more real "news" value.

>

> Haven't non-responses been going up for quite a while?

>

> Andy

>From JAM@moviefone.com Mon Jul 19 06:27:05 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id GAA05068 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 06:27:04 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:23:57 -0400

Message-Id: <s792eead.012@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:23:44 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

True, the piece was an expression of an individual's opinion, but by =  
virtue of its dissemination in a publication with wide and influential =  
readership, it had the force (or the potential force) of a news item in =  
that publication. It was "news" in the sense that it was an item which, I =  
believe, was of great interest to our membership. If an ad of that size =  
attacking the polling industry had appeared in the Times, it would have =  
been news to our membership, something that merited the group's attention.=  
=20

You are right, though, that the piece is not news to the general public. =  
I should have used another term.

Jay

>>> "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> 07/19/99 09:19AM >>>

No! It is just opinon. Pollsters should not confuse opinon with news.

Sometimes opinion is big news, but only in cases where public opinion goes against what accepted thinks that opinion should be, or in other noteworthy cases.

Andy

Jay Mattlin wrote:

>=20

> Andy -

>=20

> Non-responses are not news, but a clarion call in the Times to defend

>=

the practice of not responding and to dismiss poll results "with a grain = of salt" is news.

>=20

> Jay

>=20

> >>> "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> 07/18/99 02:34PM >>>

>=20

> "James P. Murphy" wrote:

> >

> > "Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the

> > announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to

> > the editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting

> > Ms. Dickerson, and two opposed.

>=20

> Since Pollsters have been bashed for many years and most recently by  
> Arianna Huffington, but POQ has just become part of a computerized  
> data base, I for one think the latter is of more real "news" value.  
>=20 Haven't non-responses been going up for quite a while?  
>=20  
> Andy

> From rusciano@rider.edu Mon Jul 19 07:12:45 1999

Received: from GENIUS.rider.edu (genius.rider.edu [192.107.45.5])

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

id HAA11530 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 07:12:44 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)

id <01JDQTTYIVUO8Y73CG@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 19 Jul

1999 10:10:46 EDT

Received: from rider.edu (fs90.rider.edu)

by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)

with ESMTP id <01JDQTTV33UC8Y72LD@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;

Mon, 19 Jul 1999 10:10:41 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 10:13:13 -0400

From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>

Subject: Re: One more note on old POQs

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <37933278.779B4B04@rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en]C-NECCK (Win95; I)

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

References: <01be9320\$7a02e840\$6b04dec2@worc.demon.co.uk>

One possibility for getting rid of old POQs is to send them overseas to countries that do not have the resources to access the online information, nor the money to buy foreign journals. I recall a request from some of the former Eastern bloc nations on this for their universities. Maybe try through WAPOR?

Frank Rusciano

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Mon Jul 19 07:49:35 1999

Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])

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

id HAA17796 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 07:49:32 -0700

(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2

(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567B3.00512A33 ; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 10:46:32 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567B3.0051286C.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 10:56:54 -0400

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Merely because one might respond to the POQ inquiries and not to the NYT piece does not necessarily mean that one is more concerned about the former than the latter. I contributed to the POQ discussion because I had something to say that I believed hadn't been said. I didn't respond to the NYT because my position was being well represented by others. Perhaps this suggests caution in how we handle "aapornet" E-mail "data" and how we generalize from it.

"James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com> on 07/18/99 02:21:15 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc: (bcc: Sidney Kraus/COMMUNICTN/Faculty/CSU)

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

"Call Me Unresponsive" appeared in the NYT within one day of the announcement concerning JSTOR and POQ. Since then, six letters to the editor have been published (two more today) -- four supporting Ms. Dickerson, and two opposed.

Postings on what to do with old copies of a journal have outnumbered those on the Dickerson piece by (according to a hasty tabulation) 22:13. At least half of the 13 had no substantive content .

As a new member of this organization I find this baffling.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

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

Date: Sunday, July 18, 1999 11:48 AM

Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

>

>

>Philip Meyer wrote:

>

>

>> . . . the surviving hard copies will

>> eventually be prized by antiquarians, not to mention the monks who

>> will piece together the remnants of our civilization. I wish now I

>> had kept mine and stored them in a Kansas salt mine.

>

>But Phil the monks will just load up the new replacement of the DVD,

>which by that time will store a few terrabytes, and they will punch a



>few buttons and suddenly, all of POQ is accessible.

>

>Andy

>

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Mon Jul 19 07:55:18 1999

Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])

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

id HAA19216 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 07:55:17 -0700

(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2

(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567B3.0051AE75 ; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 10:52:10 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567B3.0051ACC1.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:02:33 -0400

Subject: POQ responses vs. NYT responses

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Merely because one might respond to the POQ inquiries and not to the NYT piece does not necessarily mean that one is more concerned about the former than the latter. I contributed to the POQ discussion because I had something to say that I believed hadn't been said. I didn't respond to the NYT because my position was being well represented by others. Perhaps this suggests one way to respond to Murphy's surprise.

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Mon Jul 19 08:06:15 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id IAA21664 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 08:06:13 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <MFVCWDDS>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:03:45 -0400

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA919D848@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: Hard Copy of POQ's

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:03:44 -0400

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

There are a number of reason why there are likely to be more posts on POQ issues than on the N.Y. Time op-ed piece.

First the N.Y. Times is likely to be somewhat more selective in what responses it publishes than is AAPORnet.

I also think that we are more likely to differ on what is a good way to dispose of printed copies of POQ than we are on what we think of polling, pollsters, non-response and conservative opinion under-representation (all of which have been discussed in some depth on AAPORnet as well as at conferences and in the POQ).

--

Leo "preaching to the choir" Simonetta  
<http://www.artsci.com>  
Art & Science Group, Inc.  
[simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:simonetta@artsci.com)

> -----Original Message-----

> From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

> [mailto:s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu]

> Sent: Monday, July 19, 1999 10:57 AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Hard Copy of POQ's

>

>

> Merely because one might respond to the POQ inquiries and not

> to the NYT  
> piece does not necessarily mean that one is more concerned about the  
> former than the latter. I contributed to the POQ discussion  
> because I had  
> something to say that I believed hadn't been said. I didn't  
> respond to  
> the NYT because my position was being well represented by  
> others. Perhaps  
> this suggests caution in how we handle "aapornet" E-mail  
> "data" and how we  
> generalize from it.  
>

>From hschuman@umich.edu Mon Jul 19 08:28:35 1999

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.19])

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

id IAA26645 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 08:28:34 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu (frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.85])

by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8+Sun/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id  
LAA25541

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:28:33 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)

by frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8+Sun/5.1-client) with ESMTP id  
LAA02305

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:28:33 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:28:32 -0400 (EDT)

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>

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

To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Hypothesis

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.9907191117100.29602-100000@frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Hypothesis: Consternation over the Dickerson op-ed piece and similar attacks on surveys tends to be negatively related to the ages of AAPOR members (excepting a few who feel an official or nostalgic obligation to respond).

Those old enough to have experienced many such attacks over the years know that not only have they gone on for a very long time, but more important, during those years surveys have grown enormously in use by just about everyone. Case in point: the same newspaper that published the Dickerson piece now often features poll results on its front page.

Decreasing response rates, where they have implications for validity and are not due to the limitations of investigators, can become a serious problem, but the cause is not the occasional attack in writing. One factor is the flip side of success: the enormous increase in polls, many of them poorly done or having little point, with the proliferation increased of course by the low cost in moving, first, from field to telephone, and now from telephone to internet. AAPOR is unlikely to do much about this, since the more polling groups there are, the more it benefits in membership, as do most organizations. The other factor is pseudo-polls and the vast deluge of commercial calls generally, against which AAPOR is like Xerxes whipping the waters of the Hellespont for failing to behave.

AAPOR seems to me most useful as an organization concerned primarily with understanding both the survey method and the nature of public opinion more generally.

>From Irv Crespi@AOL.COM Mon Jul 19 08:42:41 1999  
Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAB00261 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 08:42:40 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: Irv Crespi@AOL.COM  
Received: from Irv Crespi@AOL.COM  
by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.25) id 5AVHa26635 (390)  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:40:37 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <471d1974.24c4a0f5@aol.com>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:40:37 EDT  
Subject: Re: Hypothesis  
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 13

My immediate sponse as a member of the older generation to Schumann's age hypothesis is that AAPOR should conduct a public education campaign to acquaint people with the benefits of legitimate polls, how to identify them,

and what to do when one is called by an illegitimate one. We should make a

continuing effort and budget for this.

Irv crespi

>From JAM@moviefone.com Mon Jul 19 08:47:57 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id IAA01815 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 08:47:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:44:49 -0400

Message-Id: <s7930fb1.094@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:44:23 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Hypothesis

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Thank you. Once again, I agree with you.=20

Jay Mattlin

>>> <Irvcrespi@aol.com> 07/19/99 11:40AM >>>

My immediate sponse as a member of theolder generation to Schumann's =

age=20 hypothesis is that AAPOR should conduuct a public education campaign

to=20 acquaint people with the benefits of legitimate polls, how to identify  
= them,=20 and what to do when one is called by an illegitimate one. We  
should make = a=20 continuing effort and budget for this.

Irv crespi

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jul 19 09:40:40 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id JAA17256 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:40:39 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id JAA03063; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:40:38 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:40:38 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

cc: "James R. Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

Subject: Calling Your Collective Bluff

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907190834460.28076-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Okay, if some folks want more discussion of Genie Dickerson's piece, "Call  
Me Unresponsive," on the op-ed page of the July 13 New York Times, and of  
the six letters it generated, as also published in the Times (four on July  
16, including one from AAPOR President Mike Traugott, and two more



yesterday), how about a discussion of an extreme form of the many and varied issues this exchange has generated? Suppose we put the question like this:

DO PUBLIC OPINION POLLS--AND THE MASS DISSEMINATION OF THEIR RESULTS--HELP

OR HARM DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION AND ITS ROLE IN PUBLIC POLICY DECISIONS?

This question, it seems to me, runs through the opinions expressed in the Times by all seven of the participants. For example:

On the "Pro" side, Mike Traugott writes, in part, in his letter published in the Friday, July 16, New York Times:

Polls are not biased by underrepresentation of conservative views. If they were, they would not have underestimated the Democratic surge in last fall's elections. And participating is not like charity. Responding gives voice to concerns that can inform policy decisions, and the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the views of political elites and interest groups.

On the "Con" side, Ron Cohen, of Cambridge, Mass., writes in his letter

published in yesterday's New York Times (Sunday, July 18, Week in Review Section):

As the Founders knew, public opinion is best formed in the cauldron of public debate. That is why the Constitution protects freedom of speech, assembly and the press. Telephone polls, on the other hand, are conducted in private, away from the din of politics (Op-Ed, July 13). There is no opportunity for the respondent to hear pros and cons, much less to answer the call of an inspired leader.

Polling claims to be scientific, and on that rests its authority. In the act of describing, however, it robs the public forum of vitality, and so distorts the very behavior it claims to describe. The result is a political culture of timidity. Increasingly political leaders describe what the public wants, rather than prescribe through the lens of their values and experience what they believe is best.

\*\*\*\*\*

I find both of these writers intelligent and well-informed, and both of their positions tenable--which is why I think the larger question and resulting set of issues well worth discussing as a whole.

Because most of us on AAPORNET will undoubtedly favor--if not embrace--the "pro" position suggested in Mike Traugott's letter, I think it would be good for each of us to present all of the better "con" arguments we can make. Our case in support of public opinion polling can only grow stronger as a result of our respectfully considering arguments against it, I do believe. For this reason, I would hope to be able to take issue with all points made on either side.

Several of you have already called for a discussion such as this--anyone else wish to play?

If we do so play, this might lead to, say, a session at our Annual Conference, or maybe even an edited volume, perhaps after a call for papers (in which case, don't anyone hesitate to volunteer to organize any of the above--to the AAPOR Council, of course). Countless books and articles have already been published on various of the issues raised here, as we all know, but it might now be useful to visit these once again.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

>From mark@bisconti.com Mon Jul 19 09:44:33 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id JAA18748 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 09:44:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip83.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.214.83])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service  
Version 5.5.2232.9)

id 37Y6N097; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 12:44:31 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Hard Copy of POQ's

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 12:29:35 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKJFKIDCKOFNAEEMECDCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA919D848@AS\_SERVER>

James P. Murphy, Ph.D. wrote: ... "As a new member of this organization I  
find this baffling..."

the only thing I'm pretty certain AAPORites (?!) have in common is their professional interest in survey research; their public forum (AAPORNET) allows them to speak about whatever they want related to the practice, keeping in mind social pressures that might act as a restraint... the range of conversations is fairly broad, and the delete button is handy for those times one is bored...

the POQ conversation seems to have been a friendly in-group exercise, a bit chatty, but... it struck a chord and the choir sang... hey, i'm keeping my POQs on the shelf because my sense tells me that once I discard them, I'll spend hours trying to answer some simple question I know I could have found in the POQs in 5 minutes after I posted the question in this forum and one of you told me where to look... if only those POQs were still on my shelf...

as for letters to the editor and public/media/legislative relations... all are important and if it is the youngest generation that gets their feathers ruffled by the ongoing mostly uninformed attacks, AAPOR's efforts to attract more youngsters is a good thing (this is also true here in DC on local home rule issues... a new generation always picks up the ball and keeps it moving).

Mike Traugott's letter was important, glad he gave AAPOR voice; you will find in this group a wealth of knowledge unsurpassed in the field... even those with the highest status are readily accessible, and this forum is a good way to prompt (or provoke) discussion.

Welcome to AAPOR! mark

Mark Richards

Bisconti Research, Inc.

mark@bisconti.com

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

>From mark@bisconti.com Mon Jul 19 11:39:54 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id LAA28488 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 11:39:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip83.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.214.83])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service

Version 5.5.2232.9)

id 37Y63ABF; Mon, 19 Jul 1999 14:39:49 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Calling Your Collective Bluff

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 14:24:52 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEEOECHCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907190834460.28076-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Beniger asks: DO PUBLIC OPINION POLLS--AND THE MASS DISSEMINATION OF THEIR  
RESULTS--HELP OR HARM DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION AND ITS ROLE IN PUBLIC POLICY

## DECISIONS?

I vote for "more help than harm."

Studies have shown that people look at polls because they provide a sort of perspective by which people compare their own opinion to others.

I wouldn't want to start making public policy by polls, but think they contribute to the discussion. I find that political elites and journalists find it all too easy to say what they think public opinion is, after a few conversations they've had in their networks and by watching the op-ed page. When I hear assertions, I often wonder why they don't just ask people (i.e., poll).

Political leaders usually do what they or their constituents want... not what the US public wants as a whole. They have priorities, and they trade votes to get their priority issues passed at the expense of less important issues. If there is political "timidity," it is because there are real interests with real power exerting pressure, not because politicians are looking at the polls and seeing a wall. At best, they're probably looking at the polls to see how to rewrite their arguments so they are more persuasive.

Polls seem to set a "boundary" for elites, who moderate and control public policy. They also show the boundaries of possible action.

Sometimes they provide "ground cover" for actions (as do advertising programs, public relations programs, etc... Congressional members will tell you directly: "you should be out there doing something about the issue you care about... I can't carry the ball alone...")

Everyone with an "interest" and enough \$ to poll polls... if they find public support for what they like, they're more likely to share the polls. Sometimes it seems there are "conflicting" polls... mainly because each "interest" usually only shows part of the picture. I like to think of each

question as a brush stroke in an impressionist painting, or a point in pointillism. No one question will clarify what people are thinking, but the combination of findings brings things into focus a bit. So the polls frequently reflect the complex range of opinions on any given issue, even if they're not coming from the same source.

The American polyarchy is about allowing competing interests to speak, in hopes that compromises can be reached. Not all interests are equally endowed with resources. Polling is one more way average people, who are usually cut out of the debate, can be heard (regardless of the motives of those doing the data collection...). It can provide a populist perspective. Usually, those who argue that polling undermines public discussion fail to propose ways to enlarge the public discussion... other than to say people should vote for someone of high integrity to make the important decisions. And people vote alone, and there's usually not much group deliberation beforehand. Except when local, these decisions are usually formed based on impressions, not participation in a debate. Blaming polling for a lack of public involvement or political leadership is ridiculous.

COPA's study ("Expecting More Say..." at [www.policyattitudes.org](http://www.policyattitudes.org)) showed a high level of public support for the use of polling by political elites... that says something.

Sorry, someone will have to sort the pro versus con arguments from this missive--they're tangled!

cheers, mark richards

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of

James Beniger

Sent: Monday, July 19, 1999 12:41 PM

To: AAPORNET



Cc: James R. Beniger

Subject: Calling Your Collective Bluff

Okay, if some folks want more discussion of Genie Dickerson's piece, "Call Me Unresponsive," on the op-ed page of the July 13 New York Times, and of the six letters it generated, as also published in the Times (four on July 16, including one from AAPOR President Mike Traugott, and two more yesterday), how about a discussion of an extreme form of the many and varied issues this exchange has generated? Suppose we put the question like this:

DO PUBLIC OPINION POLLS--AND THE MASS DISSEMINATION OF THEIR RESULTS--HELP

OR HARM DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION AND ITS ROLE IN PUBLIC POLICY DECISIONS?

This question, it seems to me, runs through the opinions expressed in the Times by all seven of the participants. For example:

On the "Pro" side, Mike Traugott writes, in part, in his letter published in the Friday, July 16, New York Times:

Polls are not biased by underrepresentation of conservative views. If they were, they would not have underestimated the Democratic surge in last fall's elections. And participating is not like charity. Responding gives

voice to concerns that can inform policy decisions, and the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the views of political elites and interest groups.

On the "Con" side, Ron Cohen, of Cambridge, Mass., writes in his letter published in yesterday's New York Times (Sunday, July 18, Week in Review Section):

As the Founders knew, public opinion is best formed in the cauldron of public debate. That is why the Constitution protects freedom of speech, assembly and the press.

Telephone polls, on the other hand, are conducted in private, away from the din of politics (Op-Ed, July 13).

There is no opportunity for the respondent to hear pros and cons, much less to answer the call of an inspired leader.

Polling claims to be scientific, and on that rests its authority. In the act of describing, however, it robs the public forum of vitality, and so distorts the very behavior it claims to describe. The result is a political

culture of timidity. Increasingly political leaders describe what the public wants, rather than prescribe through the lens of their values and experience what they believe is best.

\*\*\*\*\*

I find both of these writers intelligent and well-informed, and both of their positions tenable--which is why I think the larger question and resulting set of issues well worth discussing as a whole.

Because most of us on AAPORNET will undoubtedly favor--if not embrace--the "pro" position suggested in Mike Traugott's letter, I think it would be good for each of us to present all of the better "con" arguments we can make. Our case in support of public opinion polling can only grow stronger as a result of our respectfully considering arguments against it, I do believe. For this reason, I would hope to be able to take issue with all points made on either side.

Several of you have already called for a discussion such as this--anyone else wish to play?

If we do so play, this might lead to, say, a session at our Annual Conference, or maybe even an edited volume, perhaps after a call for papers (in which case, don't anyone hesitate to volunteer to organize any of the above--to the AAPOR Council, of course). Countless books and articles have already been published on various of the issues raised here, as we all know,

but it might now be useful to visit these once again.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

>From Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik@zuma-mannheim.de Tue Jul 20 05:37:09 1999

Received: from mail.zuma-mannheim.de (mail.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.12])

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

id FAA17718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 05:37:06 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from zuma-mannheim.de (pc-hoffmeyer-zlotnik.zuma-mannheim.de

[193.196.10.40])

by mail.zuma-mannheim.de (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id OAA14423

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 14:35:16 +0200

Message-ID: <37946CA9.F91DC990@zuma-mannheim.de>

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 14:33:45 +0200

From: Juergen Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik <Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik@zuma-mannheim.de>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: de

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Textanalysis software review

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The readers of this list may be interested a review of  
15 qualitative and quantitative software for textanalysis  
published as a book by the Center for Survey Research and  
Methodology (ZUMA) in Mannheim, Germany.

It costs 25.- DM and is available from ZUMA:

<http://www.zuma-mannheim.de/publications/periodicals/zuma-nachrichten/zuma-na-spezial.htm#zn-5>

To order send an e-mail to [cta@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:cta@zuma-mannheim.de).

-----  
ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial Band 5

A review of software for text analysis

Alexa Melina & Cornelia Zuell

Mannheim: ZUMA 1999, 176 pages, 25 DM, ISBN 3-924220-16-6

The book reviews a selection of software for  
computer-assisted text analysis. The primary aim  
is to provide a detailed account of the spectrum of  
available text analysis software and catalogue the kinds  
of support the selected software offers to the user.  
A related goal is to record the tendencies  
both in functionality and technology and identify the  
areas where more development is needed. For this reason  
the presented selection of software comprises not only fully developed  
commercial and research programs, but also prototypes and beta versions. An

additional aspect with regards to the kinds of software reviewed is that both qualitative and quantitative-oriented types of research are included.

The following fifteen programs are reviewed: AQUAD, ATLAS.ti, CoAN, Code-A-Text, DICTION, DIMAP-MCCA, HyperRESEARCH, KEDS, NUD\*IST, QED, TATOE, TEXTPACK, TextSmart, WinMAXpro, and WordStat and the criteria and methodology used for selecting them are delineated. The last part of the book contains an extensive discussion about text analysis programs and the concrete issues raised from the review.

---

Dr. Juergen H.P. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik

Zentrum fuer Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen ZUMA

Postfach 12 21 55, D-68072 Mannheim, Germany

Tel: +49 621-1246-175

email: hoffmeyer-zlotnik@zuma-mannheim.de

>From dkb@casro.org Tue Jul 20 06:03:54 1999

Received: from mail.saturn5.net (mail.saturn5.net [207.122.105.6])

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

id GAA21612 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 06:03:54 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from diane ([207.122.105.202]) by mail.saturn5.net

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-59533U600L2S100V35)

with SMTP id net for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Tue, 20 Jul 1999 09:00:24 -0400

Message-ID: <000a01bed2b0\$ef44e7a0\$ca697acf@diane>

From: dkb@casro.org ((CASRO) Diane Bowers)

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Hypothesis

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 09:08:15 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

In response to Irv Crespi's Hypothesis that AAPOR should conduct a public education campaign on what research is and its value: that is what CMOR (the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) is empowered to do by the industry (we hope that AAPOR will become very involved in this effort). Of course, a PR campaign costs millions, so we are going about it in a methodical way (understanding what pieces can be addressed first--internal and external challenges--what the costs are, finding supporters and media vehicles, etc.). Please visit CMOR's website [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org) to learn more about our initiatives on behalf of the industry in government affairs and respondent cooperation. Diane Bowers -----Original Message-----

From: Irv Crespi <IrvCrespi@aol.com>

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

Date: Monday, July 19, 1999 11:41 AM

Subject: Re: Hypothesis

>My immediate sponse as a member of the older generation to Schumann's

>age hypothesis is that AAPOR should conduct a public education  
>campaign to acquaint people with the benefits of legitimate polls, how  
>to identify  
them,  
>and what to do when one is called by an illegitimate one. We should  
>make  
a  
>continuing effort and budget for this.  
>Irv      cresp

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Tue Jul 20 08:41:39 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id IAA11506 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 08:41:38 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <MFVCWD2Q>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 09:50:21 -0400

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA919D855@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: Hypothesis

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 09:50:21 -0400

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain

While it may cost millions to conduct a public relations campaign many of us  
can do our own part in educating the media (and the public).



An occasion of apparent push polling occurred while I was in New Hampshire. When this happened I made sure that I pointed out to the media contacts that I had made the this was a practice that AAPOR condemned. I also explained the differences between a push poll and a true public opinion survey and sent them to the AAPOR website (or sent hard copies to the less web connected).

I even developed a short explanation of random sampling and what the sampling margin of error meant. While I am sure that not all the reporters to whom I sent these pieces read them and that not all of those who read them remembered them past their next deadline I know that some did read, learn and remember.

--

Leo G. Simonetta     <http://www.artsci.com>  
Art & Science Group, Inc.  
[simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:simonetta@artsci.com)

> -----Original Message-----

> From: [dkb@casro.org](mailto:dkb@casro.org) [mailto:[dkb@casro.org](mailto:dkb@casro.org)]

> Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 1999 9:08 AM

> To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

> Subject: Re: Hypothesis

>

>

> In response to Irv Crespi's Hypothesis that AAPOR should  
> conduct a public  
> education campaign on what research is and its value: that  
> is what CMOR  
> (the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) is empowered  
> to do by the  
> industry (we hope that AAPOR will become very involved in  
> this effort). Of  
> course, a PR campaign costs millions, so we are going about it in a  
> methodical way (understanding what pieces can be addressed  
> first--internal  
> and external challenges--what the costs are, finding  
> supporters and media  
> vehicles, etc.). Please visit CMOR's website [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org)  
> to learn more  
> about our initiatives on behalf of the industry in government  
> affairs and  
> respondent cooperation. Diane Bowers  
>From [lavrakas.1@osu.edu](mailto:lavrakas.1@osu.edu) Tue Jul 20 08:52:34 1999

Received: from [mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu) ([mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu)  
[128.146.214.32])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA14083 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 08:52:30 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from [pjl1](mailto:pjl1) ([128.146.93.67])

by [mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu) (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id LAA17454

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 11:52:30 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19990720154805.00c1e890@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: [lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu](mailto:lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu)

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 11:48:05 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

In light of the recent exchange of messages on AAPORnet on this topic, Mike Traugott and I agreed that some members might find it of interest to get an early exposure to our new book that is due out in a few months. The long section below is the first half of the introductory chapter.

\*\*\*\*\*

Lavrakas & Traugott (eds.), *Election Polling, the News Media and Democracy*,  
Chatham House, 1999 forthcoming

## Chapter 1

Why Election Polls are Important to a Democracy: An American Perspective

Paul J. Lavrakas and Michael W. Traugott

Polling has been a part of American elections and election news coverage since the early 1800s. Early straw polls, with unscientific

"samples" of whomever happened to attend a political rally or was present in a public place, represented journalists' earliest interests in directly measuring and reporting public opinion about candidate preferences (cf. Frankovic, 1998; Herbst, 1995; Mann and Orren, 1992). Journalists recognized that it was newsworthy to report which candidate had greater support among which segments of the public, even if they did not well understand the unreliable nature, and thus the severe limitations, of these early polls.

Why, within the democratic society of the United States - with its First Amendment protections for freedom of speech - should polling information be popular among and deemed newsworthy by the members of the "free press?" Is it at all surprising that election polling as a formal mechanism to measure public opinion developed and began to take hold in a relatively new democracy that, at least in theory, placed so much value on the equality of voting rights of the "common man?" Straw polls in the early 1800s served a vox populi function even if early journalists did not explicitly recognize this or conduct them primarily for this reason. In retrospect, as Herbst (1995) notes, these early "people's" polls "were a means of citizen expression during [election] campaigns, and a starting point for discourse among voters" (p. 28). Although this may be an overly romanticized view of how news about straw polls actually was "used" by the 19th century American citizenry, it seems more certain that poll-based election news was highly valued by 19th century American journalists for several reasons.

First, polls gave journalists a means of writing about the popular will and sentiment by providing information that was gathered directly and in the aggregate from relatively large groups of citizens. As James Bryce

noted at the time, the 19th century American press clearly served "as an index and mirror of public opinion" (1891, p. 265). This polling information had at least the aura, if not the reality, of being representative of the public. Second, as the United States grew in size and population, and the 20th century unfolded, polling techniques became formalized and systematic. Pollsters, such as George Gallup, Archibald Crossley, and Elmo Roper were able to provide their media sponsors with more information about larger geographic segments of the public, on a more timely basis (cf. Cantril, 1991). Furthermore, the technological advances of the last twenty-five years made it possible to gather this information even more rapidly, thus allowing the media to report it ever more quickly (cf. Frankovic, 1994). For these reasons alone, it is not surprising that at the end of the 20th century election polls are a central feature in election news coverage and, thus, of the American democratic milieu.

But the motivation for America's free press to use election polls was not simply the relatively ease with which the data could be collected and analyzed. A third reason journalists were attracted to this information was because it allowed them a quasi-objective, proactive role in the news-making process. We recognize that the news media have always "made" news not merely reported it, despite what some critics of the media and their use of election polls appear to believe (e.g., Von Hoffman, 1980; Salmon & Glasser, 199\_). To us, this conclusion seems unassailable, because of the simple fact that the media are constantly awash in much more information than they can ever report. As such, they constantly are "making news" by actively exercising their own news judgments about which stories to cover, with what amount of prominence and which stories to ignore. When the media gather and report poll-based election information, they are making news that should in theory, and we believe often does in practice,

contribute to the democracy within which the media operate. By conducting polls and reporting on poll-based information to represent the public's opinions, preferences, and intentions, journalists are behaving in a quintessential "Fourth Estate" manner. This is information that comes from a qualitatively unique source that is independent of the media's other political sources such as elected officials and other politicians, their campaign staffers and supporters, lobbyists, other special interest groups, and the like - And, this is another reason polling information appeals to journalists.

When the media report on methodologically-sound election polls, they make perhaps their single greatest contribution to democracy. In doing this, they send the symbolic message that it is the will and preferences of the entire population of individual citizens that the polity exists to serve, symbolized nowhere better than by a good-quality survey's representative sample of the public. Reporting on majority and minority public preferences is important because the continuous presentation of the opinions and intentions of representative segments of the public through election polls and other political surveys reinforces the purpose of the democracy and the reality that elected leaders ultimately need majority public support for their policies and practices. As long as public polls about citizens' political preferences and intentions are conducted and reported freely, there is little possibility that elected politicians could completely flaunt the will of the public for any length of time.

Another important contribution that media-sponsored election polls can make to a democracy is that they provide the news media with an independent way to know, and thus be able to report, the thoughts and intentions of the citizenry. . These polls provide information that is

intended to be widely disseminated; thus, they empower the media to speak for the people. No one else has more power and legitimacy to act in this manner than a respected news organization when it reports the results of a high quality opinion poll of the citizenry. Such polls allow reporters to know about majority and minority opinion preferences, even if these opinions may appear unwise from a more "knowledgeable," elite perspective (cf. Yankelovich, 1991).

Take for example, the role of the public polls of 1998 and early 1999 that showed consistent and strong majority support for keeping President Clinton in office. This news about the will of the majority of Americans reduced the strength of the Congressional Republicans and bolstered the Congressional Democrats in the House impeachment and Senate trial processes (cf. Morin, 1999; Schneider, 1999). Had this information about the public's preferences been unavailable to Congress and to the American people, there is no doubt there would have been a much higher probability that Congress would have removed the President from office or that he would have resigned before being required to leave office. This is one of the important ways the news media fulfill their "watchdog" function to determine if elected officials are out of sync with the larger public they purport to serve. It also gives the public a direct voice in the nation's political discourse. Despite a lack of evidence that many in the public recognize or appreciate that the media can and do serve these functions for them in a democracy, we believe that these roles of the media are highly consistent with the real workings of a successfully functioning democratic system. That is, in accord with Aristotelian thinkers about American democracy such as James Bryce and John Dewey, we strongly believe that our nation functions better when journalists and the organizations for which they work help the public serve as an active "check and balance" on

the workings of the formal government (cf. Glynn, Herbst, O'Keefe and Shapiro, 1999). For example, when elected officials and candidates for office are made aware of public sentiment towards a policy issue and find this information being widely disseminated via the news media, they are "put on notice" that their own policy stances can and will be scrutinized. In this way, the media actively and powerfully affect the direction and tenor of the public discourse that evolves around various political issues.

Other critical thinkers about democracy, from Plato through Walter Lippman, have lamented the fact that the majority of the citizenry is generally ill-informed on many policy issues and thereby appear ill-equipped to play any meaningful, positive role in political discourse. However, we side more with the view most recently articulated by Yankelovich (1991) that the mass public in a democracy, even with its lack of detailed knowledge of many issues, nevertheless can be "wise" on many matters - and in ways that often are not immediately apparent because, in part, their policy attitudes are very difficult to ascertain and understand with traditional, purely rational theories and methods. If one values the equality of all citizens - including their right to hold and articulate their own opinions and beliefs and to act in any legal manner they choose - then it is difficult to dismiss the importance of using quality polls to measure and report the public's preferences regardless of whether or not certain elites may agree with the "wisdom" manifest in those mass preferences. With this said, it is also necessary to emphasize the special responsibility the media have both to gather accurate poll data and to report the results accurately; (a topic that receives greater attention in Chapter 14). Because this type of information has the power to affect democratic processes, it is paramount that the media (1) be confident they are releasing information that accurately reflects the public's opinions and intentions, (2) have analyzed



their data to find the most newsworthy results, and (3) have reported on these accurately (cf. Lavrakas and Traugott, 1995; Traugott & Lavrakas, 1999; Traugott and Means, 1995).

We also believe that the information election polls produce serves other democracy-enhancing functions. First, the information from election polls that enters the public sphere immediately becomes a very important form of "political capital." Because this happens to some extent regardless of whether the information is accurate, it increases the need for accurate public polls! When the media report "horserace findings" showing which candidate is leading before a primary or general election or when they report other poll findings about the public's awareness levels and evaluations of candidates and their policy positions, they are providing an important measure of a candidate's viability. We can think of few better ways that public accountability for candidates and their policy stances can be achieved than by the routine reporting of election polls. Some have lamented the decline in the relative importance of political parties in the candidate selection and support processes during the past few decades. However, anyone who values the "wisdom of the public" - what Yankelovich (1991) calls "public judgment" - should be pleased that "closed-door deals" alone no longer can determine which candidates will win their party's nominations for prominent political offices.

Another important way that election polls enhance American democracy takes place immediately after major national elections. Mostly unrecognized by both the public and many elites, current Election Day exit polls give the news media the power to frame or interpret the meaning of an election. Unlike prior campaigns when no timely source of reliable information was available to explain "why" the electorate voted as it did, the exit polls

conducted by the Voter News Service, for example, empower journalists to explain the underlying motivations of the citizenry that led to an election's outcomes. In this way, the media serve American democracy by thwarting the efforts of political "spin doctors" to put their own self-serving interpretations on an election's "mandate." At the national level, for example, one needs only to wait a day or two after a November presidential election to learn in detail from the New York Times what the national exit polls showed was the "whys and wherefores" of the public's vote. The significance of this role further reinforces the need for exit polls to be accurate and for the media to report accurately on their findings.

Another valuable role that election polls play in a democracy is the heightened interest they can create among citizens about an upcoming election during the months and weeks preceding Election Day (cf. Meyer, 199\_). The sports metaphors that are routinely used to report horserace poll findings in election news stories resonate with many news consumers. In fact, it may well be that the public interest generated by horserace coverage helps to draw some members of the public into more complex election news coverage, including issue-related news. This, however, can be a double-edged sword: Whereas the public may find pre-primary and pre-election poll predictions interesting news up to a point, they quickly complain if the amount of this type of news grows too large, especially close to Election Day. Exactly when this point is reached and what constitutes "too much" horserace attention across different election contexts remains to be understood. But this potential problem notwithstanding, election polling news that focuses on who is ahead and behind has become an anticipated part of the election news stream among most of the citizenry. Imagine the public hue and cry if news organizations stopped reporting such information.

One failing that the media have yet to address adequately is the negative effect pre-election polls have on some registered voters and thus, in theory, on democracy. This problem concerns the tendency for some proportion of the American public to abstain from voting simply because they have concluded that their own vote will not matter in an election whose outcome is a foregone conclusion according to the pre-election polls. Lavrakas, Holley, and Miller (1991), in studying the effects of pre-election polling on the 1988 presidential election, concluded that at least 10%, and possibly as many as 20%, of people who were registered but did not vote (between 2.5 and 5.0 million Americans) opted out primarily because they expected a Bush victory over Dukakis as had been predicted by all the pre-election polls in the month preceding the election. =20

Of equal interest, this research also indicated that had this subset of registered nonvoters actually voted in 1988, the outcome of the presidential election would have been nearly identical to what actually occurred. When the media report pre-election poll results in an unrestricted fashion, as is their right in the United States, we believe they also should shoulder some responsibility for the unintended but potentially negative consequences of this news. For example, recognizing that pre-election poll predictions can dampen the likelihood of some to vote when a major contest is in fact lopsided, the media bear a special responsibility to encourage the public to vote. =09

For those who believe that more information is better than less, then both private and public election polls provide valuable strategic information to candidates and the public (cf. Hickman, 1991; Meyer, 199\_). In deciding how best to plan their campaigns, public and private polls help candidates make informed decisions about the various strategies they will use. We think that to some extent, these polls, especially the public ones,

help to place "boundaries" on what will be acceptable policy stances for those who aspire to elected office. To the extent that election polls, including ones that focus on the horserace, speak to a candidate's viability, then these polls provide the voting public, journalists, and potential campaign supporters with strategic information useful for their own behaviors. For partisan voters in a primary season, poll standing may be one the few accessible pieces of information that plays an important role in helping them decide which of their party's candidates to support. For journalists, poll-based information helps in deciding how to allocate among the candidates such limited resources as reporters' time, travel budgets, and space and airtime. Finally, campaign support from partisans can take many forms, including making financial contributions. Election polls, especially during the primary season, help potential supporters make more informed judgments about the wisdom of voluntarily supporting a particular candidate with a contribution or helping with a "get out the vote" drive (cf. Mutz, 1995; Perloff, 1998; Traugott, 1992).

Of course there are many scholars and others who would disagree with our view about the potential for polls and the media's use of them to enhance contemporary democracy in the United States. These criticisms can be summarized under four general headings. First, there are those who question the construct validity of the data gathered by polls as not truly representing "public opinion" or the individual attitudes that often are measured in polls. Second, there are questions about the external validity (generalizability) of opinion polls due to allegedly flawed methods used to draw samples and gather data. Third, there are arguments that the opinion polling enterprise actually harms democratic processes by replacing public deliberation with the dissemination of private opinions, thereby alienating citizens further from a sense that their voices are being heard. And

finally, some argue that the quality of the news reported by journalists has suffered because some have become "lazy" and rely too much on poll results to cover political news.

Blumer (1948) articulated a position that has served as a rallying point for many recent critics of opinion polls and the media's use of them (e.g., Herbst, 199\_ ; Salmon & Glasser, 1995). However, we find fault with these "anti-poll" views at a very basic level. Blumer criticized the polling enterprise of the first half of the 20th century because, in part, it generated "data" that purported to represent public opinion without offering any evidence that such data actually represented anything that approximated what "public opinion" actually is. Strange though it may seem, Blumer did not venture a clear definition of what he thought "public opinion" was in his essay, other than arguing that it was not the information that opinion polls generate. Many who use Blumer's 1948 essay to support their own critiques of opinion polling have not appeared to be bothered by this missing part of Blumer's argument nor to offer their own definition of what "public opinion" is either.

The thrust of Blumer's argument is that public opinion in a society is not an aggregation of individual-level expressions of "private opinion," although this is what he believes opinion polls do. In making this argument, we believe Blumer took much too narrow a view of how opinions are communicated within a free society, possibly because he could not have anticipated the effects of the telecommunications revolution of the last part of the 20th century. Much like the "'invisible' dark matter" that astronomers now believe accounts for much of the mass in the universe, we believe that most manifestations of what public opinion actually is are "invisible" to most attempts to measure them. That is, citizens qua

individuals express their opinions in many direct and indirect ways. As such, the effects of these expressions on the public and private deliberations that occur in a democracy, from the level of elected officials down to small informal groups of friends and neighbors, are hopelessly complicated and impractical to measure in any comprehensive manner. However, we also believe that the best way to capture this complexity is to ask individual citizens about their opinions and behaviors in good quality opinion polls. We are not arguing that opinion polls are the end-all and be-all of representing "public opinion", that is we do not believe they are a sufficient condition. But good quality polls of the citizenry are necessary to understand what public opinion is under the simple, yet broad, conceptualization to which we subscribe: the expression of individual- and group-level opinions by all citizens within a society, regardless of their position or roles within that society. =09

We also believe that many critics of election polling and polls more generally miss the mark on two other important counts. First, they appear locked in to an overly romanticized (i.e., theoretical) view of how democracy ideally should work rather than accepting how it does work. Since much of this anti-polling rhetoric uses a utopian standard for how citizens should behave in a well-functioning democracy, it is not surprising that the critics find many shortcomings in how democracy is practiced. With this predisposition serving as the lens through which their view of opinion polling is filtered, it is also not surprising that they find much to fault in the opinion polling enterprise. Second, critics of opinion polls have misdirected their criticism to the polls themselves rather to those agents and organizations that may imperfectly use these manifestations of public opinion. More criticism should be targeted at those reporters and editors who misuse the information that polls provide rather than at the polls themselves. Although we believe that polls are a valuable but limited

indicator of public opinion, we also want the media to improve their treatment of these polls in news making, and that is one of our explicit motivations in compiling this volume. =09

In sum, we believe strongly that election polls can and do aid democratic processes, especially in a society with unrestricted freedom of speech such as the United States. They do this by:

=B7 sending a continuous symbolic message that the opinions of "everyone" matter, not simply those of elites and other special interests,

=B7 empowering the media to serve as an independent watchdog on politicians and resisting other would-be spokespersons for the public or for so-called "election mandates,"

=B7 empowering the media to speak on behalf of the public and thereby helping to fulfill their responsibilities as the Fourth Estate,

=B7 empowering politicians and their supporters, interest groups, journalists and the public alike with information about candidate viability so that each group can make more informed judgments about how this knowledge might affect their respective future behaviors, and

=B7 raising the public's interest in political campaigns, although this has a potential downside if too much horserace reporting occurs.

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Tue Jul 20 14:12:53 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id OAA29761 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 14:12:52 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <MFVCWDMJ>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 17:09:47 -0400

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA919D85D@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: Online households watch less TV -- AOL/Nielsen study

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 17:09:45 -0400

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

What AOL and Nielsen state below contradicts some of the finding that were reported in the session (People and the Internet) for which I was the discussant at St. Pete's Beach .

They also report that about 33% of households "had on-line or Internet access"

--

Leo G. Simonetta     <http://www.artsci.com>

Art & Science Group, Inc.

[simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:simonetta@artsci.com)

Online households watch less TV -- AOL/Nielsen study



July 19, 1999 7:53 PM EDT

DULLES, Va. (Reuters) - It may come as little surprise to those who spend hours surfing the Net instead of watching ``the tube," but people in households that are online watch less television than those without Internet access, according to a study released Monday.

The study, conducted by Nielsen Media Research for America Online Inc., found that households with Internet access watch on average 13 percent less television than those households that are not online. That works out to an estimated 32 fewer hours of television viewing monthly per household.

The data also indicated that television consumption in households new to the Internet is also lower. Households with Internet access for a period of six months or less watch about 10 percent less television -- (Monday through Sunday, around-the-clock) - than non-online households, it said.

AOL and Nielsen said the findings are statistically consistent to those they released in January 1997 and August 1998, even though Internet use has penetrated deeper into the mass market. Since the August, 1998 study, the number of U.S. households with Internet access has increased roughly 60 percent -- from 22 million households in 1997 to 35 million households this year, according to Jupiter Communications research.

``As the percentage of mass market consumers coming online steadily increases, we're seeing that television consumption among wired households continues to remain consistent -- at one hour less per day," said Paul Lindstrom, vice president of Nielsen Media Research. ``Even more significant

is the relationship between television viewing and Internet usage among households new to the online medium. This new research indicates that, even among those people who are new to online, television viewing is lower than among those who are not online."

AOL, one of the world's largest Internet companies and a leading beneficiary of advertisers' move to the online market, said the research supported the view that television "is no longer a sufficient, inclusive form of advertising ..."

The study also found that Internet households watch less television across key parts of the viewing day than those households without access:

-- During late afternoon, or Monday through Friday between 4:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., television usage is 17 percent lower among online households;

-- During early fringe, or Monday through Friday between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m., television usage is 14 percent lower among online households;

-- During prime time, or Monday through Friday between 8:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m., television usage is 6 percent lower among online households;

-- During late fringe, Monday through Friday between 11:00 p.m. and 1:00 a.m., television usage is 7 percent lower among the online households.

For the study, Nielsen metered television and Internet usage in January of 5,000 members of its People Meter sample, the broadcasting and advertising industry's standard. The sample consisted of a panel of 4,484 households, of

which 1,489 had online or Internet access at the time of the study. Of those, 686 households were ``new" to online access in January 1999 but did not have access in June 1998 or January 1998.

A total of 2,988 households did not have online access at the time of the study.

The online and offline numbers do not total 4,484 because results for several of the households could not be clearly classified for the purpose of the study.

Reuters/Variety

>From hschuman@umich.edu Tue Jul 20 14:57:53 1999

Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.17])

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

id OAA17024 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 14:57:52 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from qix.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@qix.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.87])

by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id RAA13658

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 17:57:51 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)

by qix.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id RAA14982

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 17:57:50 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 17:57:50 -0400 (EDT)

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff"

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907190834460.28076-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9907201744060.1913-100000@qix.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Jim, that seems to me a fair summary, at least as a starting point, and the idea of a volume bringing together the various arguments on both sides is a good idea. If that's the goal, since there is always the possibility of AAPOR sounding like a trade organization defending the interests of its own members (including mine), perhaps such a book calls for a more detached sponsor, say, a foundation like Russell Sage. It might also be good to encourage some research--by whatever method--on key points, so that the volume contains a little more than restatements of the pro's and con's. -Howard (p.s., this is not a covert way of volunteering)

On Mon, 19 Jul 1999, James Beniger wrote:

>

>

>

> Okay, if some folks want more discussion of Genie Dickerson's piece,

> "Call Me Unresponsive," on the op-ed page of the July 13 New York

> Times, and of the six letters it generated, as also published in the

> Times (four on July 16, including one from AAPOR President Mike

> Traugott, and two more yesterday), how about a discussion of an  
> extreme form of the many and varied issues this exchange has  
> generated? Suppose we put the question like this:  
>  
>  
> DO PUBLIC OPINION POLLS--AND THE MASS DISSEMINATION OF THEIR  
> RESULTS--HELP  
>  
> OR HARM DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION AND ITS ROLE IN PUBLIC POLICY  
> DECISIONS?  
>  
>  
> This question, it seems to me, runs through the opinions expressed in  
> the Times by all seven of the participants. For example:  
>  
>  
> On the "Pro" side, Mike Traugott writes, in part, in his letter  
> published in the Friday, July 16, New York Times:  
>  
>       Polls are not biased by underrepre-  
>       sentation of conservative views. If  
>       they were, they would not have under-  
>       estimated the Democratic surge in  
>       last fall's elections. And participating  
>       is not like charity. Responding gives  
>       voice to concerns that can inform  
>       policy decisions, and the data often  
>       provide a popular counterpoint to the  
>       views of political elites and interest

> groups.

>

> On the "Con" side, Ron Cohen, of Cambridge, Mass., writes in his

> letter published in yesterday's New York Times (Sunday, July 18, Week

> in Review

> Section):

>

> As the Founders knew, public  
> opinion is best formed in the caul-  
> dron of public debate. That is why  
> the Constitution protects freedom of  
> speech, assembly and the press.

> Telephone polls, on the other hand,  
> are conducted in private, away from  
> the din of politics (Op-Ed, July 13).

> There is no opportunity for the re-  
> spondent to hear pros and cons,  
> much less to answer the call of an  
> inspired leader.

>

> Polling claims to be scientific, and  
> on that rests its authority. In the act  
> of describing, however, it robs the  
> public forum of vitality, and so dis-  
> torts the very behavior it claims to  
> describe. The result is a political  
> culture of timidity. Increasingly  
> political leaders describe what the  
> public wants, rather than prescribe

> through the lens of their values  
> and experience what they believe is  
> best.

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

> I find both of these writers intelligent and well-informed, and both  
> of their positions tenable--which is why I think the larger question  
> and resulting set of issues well worth discussing as a whole.

>

> Because most of us on AAPORNET will undoubtedly favor--if not  
> embrace--the "pro" position suggested in Mike Traugott's letter, I  
> think it would be good for each of us to present all of the better  
> "con" arguments we can make. Our case in support of public opinion  
> polling can only grow stronger as a result of our respectfully  
> considering arguments against it, I do believe. For this reason, I  
> would hope to be able to take issue with all points made on either  
> side.

>

> Several of you have already called for a discussion such as  
> this--anyone else wish to play?

>

> If we do so play, this might lead to, say, a session at our Annual  
> Conference, or maybe even an edited volume, perhaps after a call for  
> papers (in which case, don't anyone hesitate to volunteer to organize  
> any of the above--to the AAPOR Council, of course). Countless books  
> and articles have already been published on various of the issues  
> raised here, as we all know, but it might now be useful to visit these  
> once again.

>

>

>

-- Jim

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>

>

>From pbeatty@umich.edu Tue Jul 20 15:36:54 1999

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.19])

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

id PAA28909 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 15:36:44 -0700

(PDT)

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

[141.211.63.89])

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

SAA19714

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:36:42 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (pbeatty@localhost)

by gorf.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id SAA08208

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:36:41 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:36:41 -0400 (EDT)

From: Paul Beatty <pbeatty@umich.edu>

X-Sender: pbeatty@gorf.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>



Subject: Funding opportunity in survey research methodology (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9907201831540.7097-100000@gorf.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Forwarded on behalf of Monroe Sirken from the National Center for Health Statistics.

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

> "Sirken, Monroe G." wrote:

>

> This is an announcement of a short meeting at the Joint Statistical  
> Meetings in Baltimore next month. We will describe and discuss  
> continuation during 2000 of the Funding Opportunity In Survey Research  
> Methodology that  
> was established last year by the National Science Foundation and the  
> Interagency Committee On Statistical Policy. The Funding Opportunity  
> invites research proposals that further the development of innovative  
> approaches to surveys. Information about last year's program is  
> available  
> in last year's announcement of the Funding Opportunity on display at  
> NSF's  
> website  
> <http://www.nsf.gov:80/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf9935>

>

> We will meet on Tuesday, August 10 , 12:30 - 1:30, Room 327 in the  
> Convention Center. This is an open meeting, and all interested  
> parties are encouraged to attend.

>

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Tue Jul 20 15:36:54 1999

Received: from smtp0.mindspring.com (smtp0.mindspring.com [207.69.200.30])

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

id PAA28902 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 15:36:44 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-2ive0a1.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.1.65])

by smtp0.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA00012

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:36:30 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.1.19990720182458.00c68c00@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:40:26 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff"

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9907201744060.1913-100000@qix.rs.itd.umich.edu>

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907190834460.28076-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I would like to join Howard and Jim's call for an airing of the topic. I also liked Mike Traugott and Paul Lavrakas essay on why we do election polls. I think it would be useful to focus more in this discussion on WHY we conduct opinion polls and what contribution they make to the public welfare. I prefer to leave the details of HOW to conduct them to some other forum. I like Howard's idea of separate publication. Instead of a book, perhaps a special edition of POQ would be a suitable place for this discussion. Also,

I would like to see the discussion broadened to include the reasons executives in news give for sponsoring and publishing or broadcasting public opinion research. The news media obviously see a public good to reporting public opinion research. I believe the views of executives from news would be a useful addition.

warren mitofsky (ps - Howard, are you sure you did not volunteer?)

At 05:57 PM 7/20/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Jim, that seems to me a fair summary, at least as a starting point, and  
>the idea of a volume bringing together the various arguments on both  
>sides is a good idea. If that's the goal, since there is always the  
>possibility of AAPOR sounding like a trade organization defending the  
>interests of its own members (including mine), perhaps such a book  
>calls for a more detached sponsor, say, a foundation like Russell Sage.  
>It might also be good to encourage some research--by whatever  
>method--on key points, so that the volume contains a little more than  
restatements of the pro's and  
>con's. -Howard (p.s., this is not a covert way of volunteering)

>

>

>On Mon, 19 Jul 1999, James Beniger wrote:

>

>>

>>

>>

>> Okay, if some folks want more discussion of Genie Dickerson's piece,

>> "Call Me Unresponsive," on the op-ed page of the July 13 New York

>> Times, and of the six letters it generated, as also published in the

>> Times (four on July 16, including one from AAPOR President Mike Traugott, and two more yesterday), how about a discussion of an extreme form of the many and varied issues this exchange has generated? Suppose we put the question like this:

>>

>>

>> DO PUBLIC OPINION POLLS--AND THE MASS DISSEMINATION OF THEIR RESULTS--HELP

>>

>> OR HARM DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION AND ITS ROLE IN PUBLIC POLICY DECISIONS?

>>

>>

>> This question, it seems to me, runs through the opinions expressed in the Times by all seven of the participants. For example:

>>

>>

>> On the "Pro" side, Mike Traugott writes, in part, in his letter published in the Friday, July 16, New York Times:

>>

>> Polls are not biased by underrepresentation of conservative views. If they were, they would not have underestimated the Democratic surge in last fall's elections. And participating is not like charity. Responding gives voice to concerns that can inform policy decisions, and the data often provide a popular counterpoint to the

>> views of political elites and interest

>> groups.

>>

>> On the "Con" side, Ron Cohen, of Cambridge, Mass., writes in his

>> letter published in yesterday's New York Times (Sunday, July 18, Week

>> in Review

>> Section):

>>

>> As the Founders knew, public

>> opinion is best formed in the caul-

>> dron of public debate. That is why

>> the Constitution protects freedom of

>> speech, assembly and the press.

>> Telephone polls, on the other hand,

>> are conducted in private, away from

>> the din of politics (Op-Ed, July 13).

>> There is no opportunity for the re-

>> spondent to hear pros and cons,

>> much less to answer the call of an

>> inspired leader.

>>

>> Polling claims to be scientific, and

>> on that rests its authority. In the act

>> of describing, however, it robs the

>> public forum of vitality, and so dis-

>> torts the very behavior it claims to

>> describe. The result is a political

>> culture of timidity. Increasingly

>> political leaders describe what the

>> public wants, rather than prescribe  
>> through the lens of their values  
>> and experience what they believe is  
>> best.

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>> I find both of these writers intelligent and well-informed, and both  
>> of their positions tenable--which is why I think the larger question  
>> and resulting set of issues well worth discussing as a whole.

>>

>> Because most of us on AAPORNET will undoubtedly favor--if not  
>> embrace--the "pro" position suggested in Mike Traugott's letter, I  
>> think it would be good for each of us to present all of the better  
>> "con" arguments we can make. Our case in support of public opinion  
>> polling can only grow stronger as a result of our respectfully  
>> considering arguments against it, I do believe. For this reason, I  
>> would hope to be able to take issue with all points made on either  
>> side.

>>

>> Several of you have already called for a discussion such as  
>> this--anyone else wish to play?

>>

>> If we do so play, this might lead to, say, a session at our Annual  
>> Conference, or maybe even an edited volume, perhaps after a call for  
>> papers (in which case, don't anyone hesitate to volunteer to organize  
>> any of the above--to the AAPOR Council, of course). Countless books  
>> and articles have already been published on various of the issues  
>> raised here, as we all know, but it might now be useful to visit

>> these once again.

>>

>>

>> -- Jim

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>

>>

>>

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From ande271@ibm.net Tue Jul 20 18:01:00 1999

Received: from out1.ibm.net (out1.ibm.net [165.87.194.252])

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

id SAA18981 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:00:58 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (slip-32-100-112-224.ny.us.ibm.net [32.100.112.224])

by out1.ibm.net (8.8.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id BAA19890 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Wed, 21 Jul 1999 01:00:56 GMT

Message-ID: <379546E7.47EE@ibm.net>

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 21:04:55 -0700

From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>

Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Beniger and Schuman

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A book on the topic Jim suggests is a wonderful idea. Howard is right, however, that it should not appear to be a defense of the industry. I cannot imagine a worthwhile treatment of the topic without the input of public policy makers. That, of course, opens a can of worms. How about research among legislators and/or other "policymakers" on their ideas on the topic? Would a foundation fund such a study?

One can imagine in-depth interviews with public persons resulting in several dimensions of less than standard opinion surveys and perhaps also of high quality surveys (or dissemination of same) that respondents find fault with. This could be followed up with analysis of the pressures on public opinion researchers/media that mold opinion surveys into communications that can be found fault with. And, if opinion researchers are up to it, a discussion of whether there are methods for dealing with those pressures or whether something must be done to insulate the research from the sources of pressure.

There ought to be some non-researchers out there who think about the democratic process seriously whose support could be sought.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Jul 20 19:13:49 1999



Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id TAA27208 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 19:13:48 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp52.vgernet.net [205.219.186.152])  
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id XAA02947  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Jul 1999 23:12:53 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37952D11.825C7908@jwdp.com>

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 22:14:41 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff"

References: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9907201744060.1913-100000@qix.rs.itd.umich.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>From the introduction to the paperback edition of "Tainted Truth" by  
Cynthia Crossen:

An angry group of pollers attacked me one night in the spring of  
1995, and for a few minutes I pictured a noose going up and me in it.

Naively, I had agreed to appear on a panel at a meeting of the New  
York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research,  
the pollers' national trade association. The panel quickly

deteriorated into a hectoring free-for-all, in which I was accused of many journalistic and ethical lapses. "Garbage," complained one red-faced poller about Tainted Truth. "I'm sure it's already on the remainder tables."

I guess I had really got to them.

This came from the pen of the individual who covered polls for the Wall Street Journal at the time, and who spoke at the 1992 conference in St. Petersburg, so you can imagine what the REAL opponents of polls will say about any such defense of "our" interests.

There are several worthy organizations defending the proper use of polls, including CMOR and NCPP, and excellent books by Asher, Cantril and Gawiser, among others, to explain to laymen what polling is all about.

But AAPOR is, in the words of Sheatsley and Mitofsky, "A Meeting Place," that is, a forum in which we can speak to each other, share knowledge and seek to advance the ethical and scientific aims of our profession.

It cannot remain that if it becomes a lobbying organization.

Jan Werner

---

Howard Schuman wrote:

>

> Jim, that seems to me a fair summary, at least as a starting point,

> and the idea of a volume bringing together the various arguments on

> both sides is a good idea. If that's the goal, since there is always

> the possibility of AAPOR sounding like a trade organization defending  
> the interests of its own members (including mine), perhaps such a book  
> calls for a more detached sponsor, say, a foundation like Russell  
> Sage. It might also be good to encourage some research--by whatever  
> method--on key points, so that the volume contains a little more than  
restatements of the pro's and  
> con's. -Howard (p.s., this is not a covert way of volunteering)  
>

>From ratledge@UDel.Edu Wed Jul 21 08:23:56 1999

Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92])

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

id IAA11359 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 08:23:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from murphy2.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.18])

by copland.udel.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA15421

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:24:27 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by murphy2.udel.edu with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet  
Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63)

id <01BED36B.6D73A750@murphy2.udel.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:23:16

-0400

Message-ID: <c=US%a=\_%p=CUAPP%l=MURPHY2-990721152314Z-342@murphy2.udel.edu>

From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDel.Edu>

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

Subject: RE: Online households watch less TV -- AOL/Nielsen study

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:23:14 -0400

X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version  
4.0.994.63

In two surveys that came out of the field this week, at least here in

Delaware about 60-65% of households have a PC in the home and about 70% of those have access to the internet. So that suggests that around 44% overall have access to the internet in this state.

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Leo Simonetta [SMTP:Simonetta@artsci.com]

>Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 1999 5:10 PM

>To: 'aapornet'

>Subject: Online households watch less TV -- AOL/Nielsen study

>

>What AOL and Nielsen state below contradicts some

>of the finding that were reported in the session

>(People and the Internet) for which I was the

>discussant at St. Pete's Beach .

>

>They also report that about 33% of households

>"had on-line or Internet access"

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta <http://www.artsci.com>

>Art & Science Group, Inc.

>simonetta@artsci.com

>

>

>Online households watch less TV -- AOL/Nielsen study

>July 19, 1999 7:53 PM EDT

>

>

>DULLES, Va. (Reuters) - It may come as little surprise to those who

>spend hours surfing the Net instead of watching ``the tube," but  
>people in households that are online watch less television than those  
>without Internet access, according to a study released Monday.

>

>The study, conducted by Nielsen Media Research for America Online Inc.,  
>found that households with Internet access watch on average 13 percent  
>less television than those households that are not online. That works  
>out to an estimated 32 fewer hours of television viewing monthly per  
>household.

>

>The data also indicated that television consumption in households new  
>to the Internet is also lower. Households with Internet access for a  
>period of six months or less watch about 10 percent less television --  
>(Monday through Sunday, around-the-clock) - than non-online households,  
>it said.

>

>AOL and Nielsen said the findings are statistically consistent to those  
>they released in January 1997 and August 1998, even though Internet use  
>has penetrated deeper into the mass market. Since the August, 1998  
>study, the number of U.S. households with Internet access has increased  
>roughly 60 percent -- from 22 million households in 1997 to 35 million  
>households this year, according to Jupiter Communications research.

>

>``As the percentage of mass market consumers coming online steadily  
>increases, we're seeing that television consumption among wired  
>households continues to remain consistent -- at one hour less per  
>day," said Paul Lindstrom, vice president of Nielsen Media Research.

>``Even more significant is the relationship between television viewing  
>and Internet usage among households new to the online medium. This new

>research indicates that, even among those people who are new to online,  
>television viewing is lower than among those who are not online."

>

>AOL, one of the world's largest Internet companies and a leading  
>beneficiary of advertisers' move to the online market, said the  
>research supported the view that television ``is no longer a  
>sufficient, inclusive form of advertising ... ``

>

>The study also found that Internet households watch less television  
>across key parts of the viewing day than those households without  
>access:

>

>-- During late afternoon, or Monday through Friday between 4:30 p.m.  
>and 6:00 p.m., television usage is 17 percent lower among online  
>households;

>

>-- During early fringe, or Monday through Friday between 6:00 p.m. and  
>8:00 p.m., television usage is 14 percent lower among online  
>households;

>

>-- During prime time, or Monday through Friday between 8:00 p.m. and  
>11:00 p.m., television usage is 6 percent lower among online  
>households;

>

>-- During late fringe, Monday through Friday between 11:00 p.m. and  
>1:00 a.m., television usage is 7 percent lower among the online  
>households.

>

>For the study, Nielsen metered television and Internet usage in January

>of 5,000 members of its People Meter sample, the broadcasting and  
>advertising industry's standard. The sample consisted of a panel of  
>4,484 households, of which 1,489 had online or Internet access at the  
>time of the study. Of those, 686 households were ``new" to online  
>access in January 1999 but did not have access in June 1998 or January  
>1998.

>

>A total of 2,988 households did not have online access at the time of  
>the study.

>

>The online and offline numbers do not total 4,484 because results for  
>several of the households could not be clearly classified for the  
>purpose of the study.

>

>Reuters/Variety

>

>From RFunk787@aol.com Wed Jul 21 08:38:10 1999

Received: from imo23.mx.aol.com (imo23.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.67])

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

id IAA17378 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 08:38:09 -0700

(PDT)

From: RFunk787@aol.com

Received: from RFunk787@aol.com

by imo23.mx.aol.com (IMOV20.25) id 5VWDa10245 (4196)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:36:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <77cdcab.24c742f5@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:36:21 EDT

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff"

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 24

Thinking back to my early days in the field -- late 1960s and 1970s -- I don't recall that public opinion polling during that period was as under-attack/on-the-defensive as it seems to be now. But of course, I had "younger eyes" back then, and it was all relatively new to me. Two thoughts:

1. Perhaps some of our Old Hands could comment on this. Sure, we took some flack over the Dewey-Truman squeaker, but did there used to be as much general negativism about polling? (For that matter, is there really that much now?)

2. If indeed it's different now, what's changed in the public/media/politics/polling relationships since then? One thing that strikes me is, there sure are a lot more polls out there now . Is it an instance of "too much of a good thing"? Or perhaps a problem of too much media space to fill and not enough issues for columnists to fulminate over?

Or have some folks come to have legitimate gripes?

Ray Funkhouser

>From SEYMOURS@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Jul 21 09:00:08 1999

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

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

id JAA23141 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 09:00:07 -0700



(PDT)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id KAA14184

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 10:58:10 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 10:53:30 -0500

Message-Id: <s795a6a9.050@SRL.UIC.EDU>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 10:53:54 -0500

From: SEYMOUR SUDMAN <SEYMOURS@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: RFunk787@aol.com, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff" -Reply

I would suggest that AAPORites might well want to look at George Gallup's defense of the polls in his 1940 book with Rae, The Pulse of Democracy. Then, as now, there were doubters. Here is a quote from p.6 of that book:

"What the mass of people thinks puts governments in and out of office, starts and stops wars, sets the tone of morality, makes and breaks heroes.

We know that democrats think public opinion is important because continuous efforts have been made throughout the history of popular government to improve and clarify its expression. We know too that autocrats think public opinion is important because they devote vast sums and careful attention to curbing and controlling it.

Throughout the history of politics, this central problem has remained: shall the common people be free to express their basic needs and purposes, or shall they be dominated by a small ruling clique. Shall the goal be the free expression of public opinion, or shall efforts be made to ensure its repression? In the democratic community, the attitudes of the mass of the

people determine policy. "With public opinion on its side," said Abraham Lincoln in the course of his famous contest with Douglas, "everything succeeds. With public opinion against it, nothing succeeds." I have always found this quote inspiring. Seymour Sudman

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jul 21 09:45:41 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id JAA07042 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 09:45:41 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id JAA14939 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 09:45:41 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 09:45:41 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Sudman on Gallup

In-Reply-To: <s795a6a9.050@SRL.UIC.EDU>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907210920380.4092-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I think Gallup via Sudman, or vice versa, or the two in cahoots, suggests a good defensive of the proliferation of polls in recent years, following Ray Funkhouser's suggestion that this might be a major source of public irritation with telephone polling:

The only thing worse for a democracy than no polls at all would be to have only one organization conducting all of the polls.

If you love democracy, for a country as large as the United States, then you must necessarily welcome just as many people polling as the market will bear--or else whom would you have decide who may poll and who may not?

If only one organization conducted all polls, or if only a few large organizations conducted only a few polls, would you trust polls more or less than you trust polls today?

Works for me.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

On Wed, 21 Jul 1999, SEYMOUR SUDMAN wrote:

- > I would suggest that AAPORites might well want to look at George
- > Gallup's defense of the polls in his 1940 book with Rae, The Pulse of
- > Democracy. Then, as now, there were doubters. Here is a quote from
- > p.6 of that book:
- > "What the mass of people thinks puts governments in and out of office,

> starts and stops wars, sets the tone of morality, makes and breaks  
> heroes. We know that democrats think public opinion is important  
> because continuous efforts have been made throughout the history of  
> popular government to improve and clarify its expression. We know too  
> that autocrats think public opinion is important because they devote  
> vast sums and careful attention to curbing and controlling it.  
> Throughout the history of politics, this central problem has  
> remained: shall the common people be free to express their basic needs  
> and purposes, or shall they be dominated by a small ruling clique.  
> Shall the goal be the free expression of public opinion, or shall  
> efforts be made to ensure its repression? In the democratic  
> community, the attitudes of the mass of the people determine policy.  
> "With public opinion on its side," said Abraham Lincoln in the course  
> of his famous contest with Douglas, "everything succeeds. With public  
> opinion against it, nothing succeeds." I have always found this quote  
> inspiring. Seymour Sudman

>From JAM@moviefone.com Wed Jul 21 09:49:12 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id JAA08736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 09:49:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 12:46:08 -0400

Message-Id: <s795c110.044@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 12:45:33 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Sudman on Gallup

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Thank you for passing that along. It really goes to the heart of Ms. =  
Dickerson's complaint.

Jay M.

>>> James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 07/21/99 12:45PM >>>

I think Gallup via Sudman, or vice versa, or the two in cahoots, suggests a  
good defensive of the proliferation of polls in recent years, following Ray  
Funkhouser's suggestion that this might be a major source of public  
irritation with telephone polling:

The only thing worse for a democracy than no polls at all  
would be to have only one organization conducting all of the  
polls. =20

If you love democracy, for a country as large as the United  
States, then you must necessarily welcome just as many people  
polling as the market will bear--or else whom would you have  
decide who may poll and who may not?

If only one organization conducted all polls, or if only a few large organizations conducted only a few polls, would you trust polls more or less than you trust polls today?

Works for me.

-- Jim=09

\*\*\*\*\*

On Wed, 21 Jul 1999, SEYMOUR SUDMAN wrote:

- > I would suggest that AAPORites might well want to look at George
- > Gallup's defense of the polls in his 1940 book with Rae, *The Pulse of*
- > *Democracy*. Then, as now, there were doubters. Here is a quote from
- > p.6 of that book:
- > "What the mass of people thinks puts governments in and out of office,
- > starts and stops wars, sets the tone of morality, makes and breaks
- > heroes. We know that democrats think public opinion is important
- > because continuous efforts have been made throughout the history of
- > popular government to improve and clarify its expression. We know too
- > that autocrats think public opinion is important because they devote =
- vast
- > sums and careful attention to curbing and controlling it.
- > Throughout the history of politics, this central problem has =
- remained:
- > shall the common people be free to express their basic needs and
- > purposes, or shall they be dominated by a small ruling clique. Shall

> =

the

> goal be the free expression of public opinion, or shall efforts be

> made =

to

> ensure its repression? In the democratic community, the attitudes of

> =

the

> mass of the people determine policy. "With public opinion on its

> side," said Abraham Lincoln in the course of his famous contest with

> Douglas, "everything succeeds. With public opinion against it,

> nothing succeeds."=

> I have always found this quote inspiring.

> Seymour Sudman=20

>From eisinger@lclark.edu Wed Jul 21 10:04:31 1999

Received: from sun.lclark.edu (sun.lclark.edu [149.175.1.1])

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

id KAA17344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 10:04:25 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (eisinger@localhost) by sun.lclark.edu

(8.8.3/8.6.11) with ESMTP id KAA22219; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 10:05:06 -0700 (PDT)

X-Authentication-Warning: sun.lclark.edu: eisinger owned process doing -bs

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 10:05:06 -0700 (PDT)

From: Robert Eisinger <eisinger@lclark.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc: RFunk787@aol.com

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff" -Reply

In-Reply-To: <s795a6a9.050@SRL.UIC.EDU>

Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.4.10.9907211002180.22151-100000@sun.lclark.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet

From: Robert Eisinger

As Seymour Sudman has cited Gallup and Rae, here are sections of a passage from Archibald Crossley, in what I believe was the first issue of POQ....

"If the polls are legislated out of existence, it will be chiefly because an open revelation of public opinion is not desired. The New York Times fears that legislators will be swayed by polls because they desire to be reelected. "The American form of Government is not really built to function successfully on this pattern. It is properly assumed that our representative will think for themselves." In other words, it might be dangerous if our lawmakers know the desires of their constituents. . .The desire for reelection being what it is, the argument may have some weight. But the choice is not between vox populi and silence. The real choice is between reliable information and unreliable information supplied by pressure groups.

Best,

Robert Eisinger



>From JAM@moviefone.com Wed Jul 21 11:49:01 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id LAA22820 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:49:00 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 21 Jul 1999 14:45:57 -0400

Message-Id: <s795dd25.051@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 14:45:34 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Beniger's "Calling Your Collective Bluff" -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

So, the "old POQ" and "Op-Ed piece" discussions converge! Suddenly, =  
everything seems to be falling into place . . .

Jay Mattlin

>>> Robert Eisinger <eisinger@lclark.edu> 07/21/99 01:05PM >>>

To: aapornet

From: Robert Eisinger

As Seymour Sudman has cited Gallup and Rae, here are sections of a passage  
from Archibald Crossley, in what I believe was the first issue of POQ....

"If the polls are legislated out of existence, it will be chiefly because an open revelation of public opinion is not desired. The New York Times fears that legislators will be swayed by polls because they desire to be reelected. "The American form of Government is not really built to function successfully on this pattern. It is properly assumed that our representative will think for themselves." In other words, it might be dangerous if our lawmakers know the desires of their constituents. . .The desire for reelection being what it is, the argument may have some weight. But the choice is not between vox populi and silence. The real choice is between reliable information and unreliable information supplied by pressure groups.

Best,  
Robert Eisinger

>From mohler@zuma-mannheim.de Thu Jul 22 03:21:35 1999

Received: from mail.zuma-mannheim.de (mail.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.12])

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

id DAA07815 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 03:21:30 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from zuma-mannheim.de (pc-mohler.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.35])

by mail.zuma-mannheim.de (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id MAA31089

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 12:19:32 +0200

Message-ID: <3796EFDD.F30634EC@zuma-mannheim.de>

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 12:18:06 +0200

From: "Peter Ph. Mohler" <mohler@zuma-mannheim.de>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: quality criteria in survey research german memorandum

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----E254091882E61DC30B90B22E"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----E254091882E61DC30B90B22E

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

to: aapornet

from: Peter Mohler ZUMA

The German National Science Foundation (DFG) published a memorandum on Quality Criteria for Survey Research. It is published in German and English simultaneously. The memorandum is an official publication of the DFG.

The group of scientists who were in charge of the memorandum used to quite some extent AAPOR standards and best practices (both were translated into German and published together with the groups memorandum) - many thanks to AAPOR for providing this material.

The memorandum is published as:

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Max Kaase (ed): Quality Criteria for Survey Research (Qualitaetskriterien der Umfrageforschung). Berlin: Akademie

Verlag, 1999. ISBN 3-05-003455-6 Price DM 64.00

P. Mohler

-----E254091882E61DC30B90B22E

Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;

name="mohler.vcf"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: Card for Peter Ph. Mohler

Content-Disposition: attachment;

filename="mohler.vcf"

begin:vcard

n:Mohler;Peter Ph.

x-mozilla-html:TRUE

org:ZUMA ;Director

adr;;;P.O. Box 122155;Mannheim;;68072;Germany

version:2.1

email;internet:director@zuma-mannheim de

title:Prof. Peter Ph. Mohler

x-mozilla-cpt;;0

fn:Peter Ph. Mohler

end:vcard

-----E254091882E61DC30B90B22E--

>From janisrussell@yahoo.com Thu Jul 22 08:27:16 1999

Received: from web801.mail.yahoo.com (web801.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.61])

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

id IAA24685 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 08:27:16 -0700

(PDT)

Message-ID: <19990722153130.17497.rocketmail@web801.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [208.233.17.171] by web801.mail.yahoo.com; Thu, 22 Jul 1999

11:31:30 EDT

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 11:31:30 -0400 (EDT)

From: Janis Russell <janisrussell@yahoo.com>

Subject: Job Opening - Market Research

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

PERT Survey Research

522 Cottage Grove Rd

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Phone: (860) 242-2005

Fax: (860) 242-2708 (send ATTN: Janis Russell)

## MARKETING RESEARCH CAREER OPPORTUNITY

### Project Analyst

We invite you to join us at a full-service, custom marketing research supplier located in the Hartford area. Over the past 20 years, PERT Survey Research has established partnerships with well-known national companies in the areas of Consumer Package Goods, Service and Health Care.

The Project Analyst works with the project team to design the survey, review the data, analyze and interpret the results, prepare the data, and write the report or presentation, including recommendations to our clients.

#### Required:

&#61623; A four year degree minimum and experience writing research reports.

&#61623; Excellent oral and written communication and analytical skills

&#61623; Word and Powerpoint skills

Exposure to writing multivariate techniques is helpful.

Must be able to work with project team including Account Representative, Project Director, Graphics person, and Statistician to understand study objectives and assist in study design. Also must be able to work independently to analyze the data and prepare a marketing-oriented report. Able to work under deadlines and manage multiple projects.

Career growth potential into account management. Excellent company paid benefits. Team environment and casual dress policy.

Please send resume to:

Janis Russell

Director of Project Services

ext. 168

or

Scott Lefcheck,

Presentation/Analysis Manager

ext. 155

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jul 22 09:07:46 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id JAA04269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 09:07:45 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id JAA20929; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 09:07:45 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 09:07:45 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

cc: Elxtn2000@aol.com

Subject: Request/Guidance (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907220903080.18090-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

If any of you can help, please reply to Brent McGoldrick directly, at  
Elxtn2000@aol.com , and NOT to AAPORNET unless, of course, what you have to  
say you think might be of interest to us all. -- Jim

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

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 11:28:32 EDT

From: Elxtn2000@aol.com

To: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Subject: Request/Guidance

I obtained your e-mail address from the AAPOR website, and I'm wondering if  
you can help us.



We're working with Third Millennium, an organization that works on public policy issues facing young people, and are trying to track down the major surveys that have been conducted among voters roughly 18-34 over the past few years.

Do you know of any of these surveys and can you point in me in the right direction as to how we might obtain copies of them?

I would appreciate any help you might be able to offer.

Thank you,

Brent McGoldrick

\*\*\*\*\*

eIXtion 2000  
2020 North Quinn St.  
Suite 1  
Arlington, VA 22209  
P: 703/ 582-8269

>From lisap@opinion.isi.uconn.edu Thu Jul 22 09:52:38 1999

Received: from opinion (opinion.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.21])

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

id JAA17278 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 09:52:36 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from Lisa.isi.uconn.edu (d117h184.public.uconn.edu

[137.99.117.184]) by opinion (SMI-8.6/8.6.9) with SMTP id MAA06253 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 12:48:39 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990722125258.00d33410@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

X-Sender: lisap@opinion.isi.uconn.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 12:52:58 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Lisa Parmelee <lisap@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

Subject: Re: Request/Guidance (fwd)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Jim and other AAPORites --

The best place for Mr. McGoldrick or any interested user of polls to go for existing survey data is the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. Our collection is extensive, we're fast and friendly, and our bill probably won't bring on a cardiac event.

Please contact me directly at [lisap@opinion.isi.uconn.edu](mailto:lisap@opinion.isi.uconn.edu), or call me or one of our other researchers at the number below, and we'll be more than happy to help you.

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee  
Senior Research Analyst  
The Roper Center  
(860)486-4440

At 09:07 AM 7/22/99 -0700, you wrote:

>

>

>If any of you can help, please reply to Brent McGoldrick directly, at  
>Elxtn2000@aol.com , and NOT to AAPORNET unless, of course, what you  
>have to say you think might be of interest to us all. -- Jim

>

>

>From Jill.Richardson@latimes.com Thu Jul 22 17:12:17 1999

Received: from mail03-lax.pilot.net (mail-lax-3.pilot.net [205.139.40.17])

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

id RAA21298 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 17:12:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com

[204.48.23.147] (may be forged)) by mail03-lax.pilot.net with ESMTP id

RAA12288 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 17:25:52 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from pegasus.latimes.com (unknown-45-201.latimes.com

[144.142.45.201])

by mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA09603

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 17:12:14 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from vireo.latimes.com (vireo.adv.latimes.com [144.142.39.121])

by pegasus.latimes.com (Pro-8.9.3/Pro-8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA00844

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 17:11:23 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by vireo.adv.latimes.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <PNG64VJN>; Thu, 22 Jul 1999 17:11:57 -0700

Message-ID: <5520FFE1207ED211AC8300805FEA2FF60126DA16@dove.adv.latimes.com>

From: "Richardson, Jill" <Jill.Richardson@latimes.com>

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

Subject: Job Opening

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 17:12:13 -0700

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

CATI Manager

The Los Angeles Times Poll is looking for someone with extensive experience in coding CfMC (Computers for Marketing Corporation) DOS or UNIX CATI questionnaires. In addition to coding, the CATI Manager will provide support to the Poll's field staff during surveys and will also be responsible for creating custom reports and managing survey files on the Times Poll's IBM SP2 minicomputer system.

This is a consultant position and the hours are not set. The CATI Manager would be on-site during the week leading up to a survey while the questionnaire is being written and coded, then would be required to be on-site or on-call for the duration of each survey to provide support to the field operation.

The Los Angeles Times Poll is a leading public opinion polling unit which conducts approximately one survey a month for publication in the newspaper. Surveys are conducted afternoons, evenings and weekends, and are sometimes planned in advance, but also may be conducted under tight time constraints in response to news events.

The CATI manager must work well under deadline pressures, and be willing and able to put in the hours to meet those deadlines when necessary. Familiarity with public opinion polling and the UNIX operating system is a plus, but will train.

Please respond to Jill Darling Richardson, Assistant Director, Times Poll.

By mail: Times Mirror Square; Los Angeles Times; Los Angeles, CA 91208

or fax : (213) 237-2505

or email: [jill.richardson@latimes.com](mailto:jill.richardson@latimes.com)

No telephone calls, please.

>From [tsilver@CapAccess.org](mailto:tsilver@CapAccess.org) Fri Jul 23 09:01:37 1999

Received: from [cap1.CapAccess.org](mailto:cap1.CapAccess.org) ([tsilver@cap1.CapAccess.org](mailto:tsilver@cap1.CapAccess.org)  
[151.200.199.10])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id JAA24937 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Fri, 23 Jul 1999 09:01:33 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: (from [tsilver@localhost](mailto:tsilver@localhost)) by [cap1.CapAccess.org](mailto:cap1.CapAccess.org) (8.6.12/8.6.10) id  
MAA01490; Fri, 23 Jul 1999 12:04:30 -0400

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1999 12:04:29 -0400 (EDT)

From: Tom Silver <[tsilver@CapAccess.org](mailto:tsilver@CapAccess.org)>

To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

Subject: Reporter's query

Message-ID: <[Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.990723114803.28082B-100000@cap1.capaccess.org](mailto:Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.990723114803.28082B-100000@cap1.capaccess.org)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I'm posting the query below on behalf of Meredith O'Brien. Please respond  
to her at: [obrweis@gis.net](mailto:obrweis@gis.net)

Tom Silver

[editor@PollingReport.com](mailto:editor@PollingReport.com)

-----  
I am a freelance reporter working on a story for Quill Magazine, a publication of the Society of Professional Journalists, about polling.

Specifically, I'm examining whether new technologies -- such as caller ID and answering machines coupled with the boom in telemarketing calls -- have resulted in larger numbers of Americans failing to participate in polls. Are millions of people selecting themselves out of polls and thereby affecting the results? Considering that politicians base their public policies on polling results and news outlets report polls on a daily basis, is there cause for concern here?

I understand that there is a tremendous reluctance on the part of many pollsters to report the refusal rates, the numbers of people who refuse to participate, don't return messages left on their answering machines, or simply don't pick up. I have read that upwards of 70 percent of those contacted by pollsters on average, do not participate. Do you have any industry-wide facts or figures on this?

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Meredith O'Brien

obriweis@gis.net

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Fri Jul 23 19:42:31 1999

Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id TAA04531 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Jul 1999 19:42:30 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])  
by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id WAA24853  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Jul 1999 22:44:01 -0400

Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44);  
23 Jul 99 22:42:08 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 23 Jul 99 22:41:43 -0500

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (128.227.163.109) by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44)  
with ESMTP;  
23 Jul 99 22:41:33 -0500

Message-ID: <37992A5E.2D979189@hp.ufl.edu>

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1999 22:52:16 -0400

From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Calling Your Collective Bluff

References: <NCBBKJCKJFKIDCKOFNAEEOECHCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mark Richards wrote:

> [...]Studies have shown that people look at polls because they provide

- > a sort of perspective by which people compare their own opinion to others.
- > I wouldn't want to start making public policy by polls, but
- > think they contribute to the discussion. I find that political elites
- > and journalists find it all too easy to say what they think public
- > opinion is, after a few conversations they've had in their networks
- > and by watching the op-ed page.

I should admit my bias that in addition to being a survey researcher, I write a somewhat-monthly column for my local op-ed page....

- > When I hear assertions, I often wonder why they don't just ask people
- > (i.e., poll).

Another question is why "they" (political elites) don't listen to polls that \*are\* conducted.

Clear example of this last fall, when exit polls showed that most voters were not sending a message against impeachment.

Several major media organizations pooled resources to commission an exit poll of 10,017 voters as they left 250 precincts around the country. A Nov. 5 article in the Los Angeles Times put it this way: "Most Americans said that their decision in Tuesday's stunning election was not a vote for or against President Clinton."

About 60 percent of voters said their ballot expressed neither support nor opposition to the president. To be fair, some voters were indeed sending a message in support



of President Clinton. But only about 18 percent--not quite the "loud and clear" message touted by the media.

Those results were not some freak accident of the weather on election day, either--they were right in line with a USA Today poll published the previous week. Among likely voters, 52 percent had reported they were "not sending a message" with their vote.

Yet the media wrote over and over and over and over again that the electorate was "sending a message against impeachment." John Conyers coined the phrase, and it was replayed over and over again, all over the country.

> [...] Polling is one more way average people, who are  
> usually cut out of the debate, can be heard (regardless of the motives  
> of those doing the data collection...).

Except that they aren't, not always. I would have felt ripped off if I had taken the time from a busy work day to answer an exit poll, weighed in with the majority who were not sending a message, and still got told time and again that I *\*was\** sending a message. I certainly wouldn't have felt "heard." And maybe that's part of the disgruntlement with polls nowadays.

I guess political elites can avoid that scenario by asking only questions to which they are willing to hear any answer. Which makes for a vanilla-flavored world.

Or they can just carefully word the question to elicit the response they want.

Colleen K. Porter

cporter@hp.ufl.edu

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jul 23 21:50:57 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id VAA26976 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Jul 1999 21:50:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id VAA21885 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Jul 1999 21:50:55 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1999 21:50:55 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Computer Void Among Working Poor

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907232147190.20407-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

This Washington Post coverage of new survey research findings speaks for itself. Ironically, internet surveys might well have served as an additional example in the first paragraph.

-- Jim

---

(C) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

---

## Computer Void Limits Working Poor, Study Finds

By Kirstin Downey Grimsley

Washington Post Staff Writer

Thursday, July 22, 1999; Page E01

At a time when many companies are posting job opportunities on the Internet and are requesting that job applicants submit their resumes via e-mail, a new study finds that less than half of the working poor have access to the Internet or a computer at work or at home.

Only 39 percent of the working poor and unemployed people surveyed by Rutgers University had access to the Internet, compared with 76 percent of other employees.

"It's another example of what's been called the 'digital divide' in America," said Carl E. Van Horn, a professor of public policy at Rutgers and director of the school's John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development. "People without access to the Internet are cut off from many opportunities in today's economy."

Van Horn said that companies having trouble finding workers amid a labor shortage are "short-sighted" if they rely exclusively on electronic communications to post openings, because the survey indicated there are many workers interested in finding new positions that pay more money.

He said that many available workers live in less affluent neighborhoods and can be best reached through church or community groups.

"We need to look to expand the labor pool," Van Horn said. "Many employers only see a puddle because they're not looking in the right places."

The two-year-old Heldrich Center focuses on America's work-force needs and seeks to identify strategies to improve worker training. The study, which was conducted last month in collaboration with the University of Connecticut, surveyed 500 workers defined as among the working poor -- or those who earn 200 percent or less of the federally defined poverty levels. That benchmark would include, for example, a family of three with an annual income of less than \$32,800. The interviews were conducted by telephone.

The survey found that the average working-poor individual is a middle-aged single white woman who holds a full-time job but earns less than \$25,000 a year. Most have dependent children. About 48 percent have no paid vacation, and an additional 18 percent have less than one week of paid vacation each year.

Only about half reported they were satisfied with their health and medical coverage, compared with about three-quarters of the other workers previously surveyed by the center.

The survey found that more than four-fifths of the working poor surveyed said that they were interested in furthering their educations and obtaining specialized training that would allow them to move to more skilled positions that could lead to higher salaries.

"The rising tide hasn't lifted all boats," Van Horn said. "These people aren't officially poor, but they are living very difficult lives."

---

(C) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jul 24 08:43:50 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id IAA21841 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 08:43:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id IAA00545; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 08:43:50 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 08:43:49 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

cc: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@aol.com>

Subject: Re: Take Our Laser Vision Survey!

In-Reply-To: <uJGrVdeE2Fd9k.gYibY2uRVvXGxhzP@mail.>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907240814330.26962-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

FORMAL STANDARDS COMPLAINT:

I have just received, perhaps 10 minutes before the time and date of this message, the following spam, with the subject header "Take Our Laser Vision Survey!". Simply clicking on the hot link provided in the body of the message put me on the Web at the "survey instrument" (no, not a laser surgical tool).

It's easy to envision a future, two or three years from today, in which one might routinely receive a half dozen such unsolicited attempts--each day--to be "surveyed" via Internet spam bearing hot links to Web sites. Some reputable scientific survey research firms might well wish to use parts of these technologies for legitimate studies. If the survey research community does not act quickly to stop abuses like this one, however, the global consumer public will become even more suspicious, rejecting and hostile to all survey efforts--including legitimate telephone polling--I think it is reasonable to worry.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

On Mon, 26 Jul 1999, vision586@usa.net wrote:

>

> NetSurvey invites you to take our Laser Vision Survey. All

> participants

> will receive more information about laser vision correction upon request!

>

> Our SURVEY takes less than two minutes to complete and provides our

> sponsors with valuable information on how to improve their web site

> and services offered.

>

> To participate, please visit:

>

> <http://208.169.249.102>

> [by clicking here](http://208.169.249.102)

>

> \* Please note: You must be age 18+ to participate!

>

---

> NetSurvey respects your Internet Privacy and on-line time. Your

> address will be deleted from our files. Thank you!

>

---

\*\*\*\*\*

By clicking on "[here](#)" above, I arrived at the "survey" below. -- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

<http://208.169.249.102/>

[IMAGE]

[IMAGE]

[IMAGE]

[IMAGE]

Please see our online privacy statement

(Please answer all questions)

[FORM]

1.) Are you a contact lens or eyeglass wearer?

Contact lens Eyeglass

2.) Your age group: Please Select 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+

3.) Your Gender: Please Select Male Female

4.) Would freedom from having to wear eyeglasses or contact lenses  
benefit you?

Yes No

5.) Would a corrective eye procedure where you can return to work the  
next day be of value to you?

Yes No

6.) Is knowing the procedure is comfortable important to you?

Yes No

7.) Would you like to receive a:



a.) FREE Vision Correction Video

b.) FREE Literature

c.) Screening

d.) Seminar

e.) Exam

8.) Would you like to know more about these procedures online?

Yes No

9.) When was your last eye exam?

Please Select Less than one year 1 to 2 Years 2 to 3 Years 3 to 4 Years

Over 4 Years

....Information Request Form

First Name:

Last Name:

Email Address:

Street Address:

City:

State:

Zip/Postal Code:

Home Telephone:

Work Telephone:

\*\*\*\*\*

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sat Jul 24 09:25:29 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id JAA03169 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 09:25:28 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp55.vgernet.net [205.219.186.155])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id NAA15859

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 13:29:06 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <3799E929.24702AEC@jwdp.com>

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 12:26:17 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Calling Your Collective Bluff

References: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEEOECHCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

<37992A5E.2D979189@hp.ufl.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

While one can certainly complain about "interpretation" of poll results by

politicians and the press, this example does not make that case.

If even a small fraction of that minority who admitted being influenced by impeachment had actually changed their vote from one candidate to another because of it, this would be considered a huge factor by politicians for whom a small group of swing voters is the critical target.

In any event, I would hardly expect many voters to admit that they cast their ballots as they did "to send a message" on any subject, particularly one as controversial as Clinton's impeachment, even if they were in fact conscious of that event having modified their behavior.

If anything, this is a good illustration of why it is a mistake to treat poll results as if they were the results of properly designed experiments, which can use double blinds or placebos to eliminate the bias stemming from the respondents' conscious reaction to the survey conditions or questions.

Jan Werner

[jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

---

"Colleen K. Porter" wrote:

>

> Mark Richards wrote:

>

>> [...]Studies have shown that people look at polls because they

>> provide a sort of perspective by which people compare their own opinion to others.

>> I wouldn't want to start making public policy by polls, but

>> think they contribute to the discussion. I find that political  
>> elites and journalists find it all too easy to say what they think  
>> public opinion is, after a few conversations they've had in their  
>> networks and by watching the op-ed page.  
>  
> I should admit my bias that in addition to being a survey researcher,  
> I write a somewhat-monthly column for my local op-ed page....  
>  
>> When I hear assertions, I often wonder why they don't just ask  
>> people (i.e., poll).  
>  
> Another question is why "they" (political elites) don't listen to  
> polls that *are* conducted.  
>  
> Clear example of this last fall, when exit polls showed that most  
> voters were not sending a message against impeachment.  
>  
> Several major media organizations pooled resources to commission an  
> exit poll of 10,017 voters as they left 250 precincts around the  
> country. A Nov. 5 article in the Los Angeles Times put it this way:  
> "Most Americans said that their decision in Tuesday's stunning  
> election was not a vote for or against President Clinton."  
>  
> About 60 percent of voters said their ballot expressed neither support nor  
opposition  
> to the president. To be fair, some voters were indeed sending a message  
in support  
> of President Clinton. But only about 18 percent--not quite the "loud  
> and clear" message touted by the media.

>

> Those results were not some freak accident of the weather on election  
> day, either--they were right in line with a USA Today poll published  
> the previous week. Among likely voters, 52 percent had reported they  
> were "not sending a message" with their vote.

>

> Yet the media wrote over and over and over and over again that the  
> electorate was "sending a message against impeachment." John Conyers  
> coined the phrase, and it was replayed over and over again, all over  
> the country.

>

>> [...] Polling is one more way average people, who are  
>> usually cut out of the debate, can be heard (regardless of the  
>> motives of those doing the data collection...).

>

> Except that they aren't, not always. I would have felt ripped off if  
> I had taken the time from a busy work day to answer an exit poll,  
> weighed in with the majority who were not sending a message, and still  
> got told time and again that I \*was\* sending a message. I certainly  
> wouldn't have felt "heard." And maybe that's part of the  
> disgruntlement with polls nowadays.

>

> I guess political elites can avoid that scenario by asking only  
> questions to which they are willing to hear any answer. Which makes  
> for a vanilla-flavored world.

>

> Or they can just carefully word the question to elicit the response  
> they want.

>

> Colleen K. Porter

> cporter@hp.ufl.edu

> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>From mkshares@mcs.net Sat Jul 24 11:01:48 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id LAA19914 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 11:01:47 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P55-Chi-Dial-9.pool.mcs.net [205.253.226.55]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id NAA00311 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Sat, 24 Jul 1999 13:01:45 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <3799B928.42839BA3@mcs.net>

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 13:01:34 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <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: Calling Your Collective Bluff

References: <NCBBKJCKJFIDCKOFNAEEOECHCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

<37992A5E.2D979189@hp.ufl.edu> <3799E929.24702AEC@jwdp.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree completely.

MOST voters did not need to say they were sending a message last Fall for this sentiment to have been a factor in those elections.

As further evidence, I would also point to pre-election polls across the nation showing movement to Democratic candidates during October after the House vote to initiate the inquiry. This movement was reported in poll stories. Two examples come to mind - LA Times and Chicago Tribune - and I am sure there were others.

Jan Werner wrote:

- > While one can certainly complain about "interpretation" of poll
- > results by politicians and the press, this example does not make that
- > case.
- >
- > If even a small fraction of that minority who admitted being
- > influenced by impeachment had actually changed their vote from one
- > candidate to another because of it, this would be considered a huge
- > factor by politicians for whom a small group of swing voters is the
- > critical target.
- >
- > In any event, I would hardly expect many voters to admit that they
- > cast their ballots as they did "to send a message" on any subject,
- > particularly one as controversial as Clinton's impeachment, even if
- > they were in fact conscious of that event having modified their
- > behavior.
- >
- > If anything, this is a good illustration of why it is a mistake to
- > treat poll results as if they were the results of properly designed
- > experiments, which can use double blinds or placebos to eliminate the

> bias stemming from the respondents' conscious reaction to the survey  
> conditions or questions.

>

> Jan Werner

> jwerner@jwdp.com

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

> "Colleen K. Porter" wrote:

>>

>> Mark Richards wrote:

>>

>>> [...]Studies have shown that people look at polls because they  
>>> provide a sort of perspective by which people compare their own  
opinion to others.

>>> I wouldn't want to start making public policy by polls,  
>>> but think they contribute to the discussion. I find that  
>>> political elites and journalists find it all too easy to say what  
>>> they think public opinion is, after a few conversations they've  
>>> had in their networks and by watching the op-ed page.

>>

>> I should admit my bias that in addition to being a survey  
>> researcher, I write a somewhat-monthly column for my local op-ed  
>> page....

>>

>>> When I hear assertions, I often wonder why they don't just ask  
>>> people (i.e., poll).

>>

>> Another question is why "they" (political elites) don't listen to  
>> polls that *are* conducted.



>>

>> Clear example of this last fall, when exit polls showed that most  
>> voters were not sending a message against impeachment.

>>

>> Several major media organizations pooled resources to commission an  
>> exit poll of 10,017 voters as they left 250 precincts around the  
>> country. A Nov. 5 article in the Los Angeles Times put it this way:  
>> "Most Americans said that their decision in Tuesday's stunning  
>> election was not a vote for or against President Clinton."

>>

>> About 60 percent of voters said their ballot expressed neither support  
nor opposition

>> to the president. To be fair, some voters were indeed sending a  
message in support

>> of President Clinton. But only about 18 percent--not quite the  
>> "loud and clear" message touted by the media.

>>

>> Those results were not some freak accident of the weather on  
>> election day, either--they were right in line with a USA Today poll  
>> published the previous week. Among likely voters, 52 percent had  
>> reported they were "not sending a message" with their vote.

>>

>> Yet the media wrote over and over and over and over again that the  
>> electorate was "sending a message against impeachment." John  
>> Conyers coined the phrase, and it was replayed over and over again,  
>> all over the country.

>>

>>> [...] Polling is one more way average people, who are

>>> usually cut out of the debate, can be heard (regardless of the

>>> motives of those doing the data collection...).

>>

>> Except that they aren't, not always. I would have felt ripped off

>> if I had taken the time from a busy work day to answer an exit poll,

>> weighed in with the majority who were not sending a message, and

>> still got told time and again that I *\*was\** sending a message. I

>> certainly wouldn't have felt "heard." And maybe that's part of the

>> disgruntlement with polls nowadays.

>>

>> I guess political elites can avoid that scenario by asking only

>> questions to which they are willing to hear any answer. Which makes

>> for a vanilla-flavored world.

>>

>> Or they can just carefully word the question to elicit the response

>> they want.

>>

>> Colleen K. Porter

>> cporter@hp.ufl.edu

>> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>From mtrau@umich.edu Sat Jul 24 13:02:44 1999

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

[141.211.63.17])

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

id NAA07646 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 13:02:43 -0700

(PDT)

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

[141.211.63.90])

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

QAA10501

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 16:02:42 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (mtrau@localhost)

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

QAA18947

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 16:02:41 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 16:02:41 -0400 (EDT)

From: Michael W Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

X-Sender: mtrau@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Calling Your Collective Bluff

In-Reply-To: <3799B928.42839BA3@mcs.net>

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.9907241557320.18442-100000@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

One problem with off-year congressional elections for House seats is the strong influence of incumbency effects. These derive from the way the districts were drawn in the beginning (the party division in the constituency), long-term service to constituents, and a tremendous fund raising advantage, among many factors. As a result, few people think of themselves as "sending a message" about the president because they are voting for someone who solves problems for and brings projects to their local area.

So it is not surprising from that perspective that most people in the exit poll did not think they were sending a message. But political elites interpret (sometimes in advance) the meaning of expressions of opinion like

polls and elections. Their strategic interests are often not the same as citizens'.

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Sat Jul 24 15:28:57 1999

Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])

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

id PAA26419 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 15:28:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])

by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA02456

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 24 Jul 1999 18:31:06 -0400

Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44);

24 Jul 99 18:29:01 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 24 Jul 99 18:28:59 -0500

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (128.227.163.151) by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44)

with ESMTP;

24 Jul 99 18:28:48 -0500

Message-ID: <379A40A2.A23A1CBC@hp.ufl.edu>

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 18:39:41 -0400

From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Calling Your Collective Bluff

References: <NCBBKJCKJFKIDCKOFNAEEOECHCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

<37992A5E.2D979189@hp.ufl.edu> <3799E929.24702AEC@jwdp.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jan Werner wrote:

> [...]

> If even a small fraction of that minority who admitted being  
> influenced by impeachment had actually changed their vote from one  
> candidate to another because of it, this would be considered a huge  
> factor by politicians for whom a small group of swing voters is the  
> critical target.

Absolutely. And 18% is a substantial percentage, no question. Especially in some of those close Congressional races last year. If political pundits wanted to claim that impeachment was a factor in the elections, I'd have no quarrel.

But a "significant factor" is not the same as a "mandate" or "clear message."

It's those latter hyperbolic statements that bothered me. I guess it's partly a problem of semantics. Before declaring something a "clear message," I guess I'd like to see more than 18% agreeing.

(Maybe we could compile a chart, with the actual percentage cutoff points for "significant minority", "clear message," "vast majority" and those other terms that journalists throw around, sometimes with wild abandon. Bet there's a huge variation in how each of us interprets those terms...but I digress.)

> In any event, I would hardly expect many voters to admit that they  
> cast their ballots as they did "to send a message" on any subject,  
> particularly one as controversial as Clinton's impeachment, even if  
> they were in fact conscious of that event having modified their  
> behavior.

I can see that point, but then why ask the question, if there is no way to  
get a valid answer?

And how can we justify ignoring the answers we do get once we do ask it?

Look at it from the respondents' point of view (which is how this discussion  
all  
started...) They may feel that whatever they say, it can be dismissed by  
charges of "respondent bias." So why should they bother to take the time to  
answer the questions?

Of course we could all think of dozens of better ways to approach this same  
issue--rank orderings and such that could help quantify \*any\* effect of  
impeachment, even if it was less important than the qualifications of a  
particular candidate. We could do that, if the client wanted to have a  
better picture of what was happening.

But the fact is, that simple question was asked, and the responses largely  
dismissed.

And if we declare our respondents incompetent, and try to second guess why  
they answered a certain way, how can they feel they are "being heard"--why

should they keep talking to us?

Colleen K. Porter

cporter@hp.ufl.edu

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>From mkshares@mcs.net Sun Jul 25 09:40:13 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id JAA18764 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 25 Jul 1999 09:40:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P40-Chi-Dial-7.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.168]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id LAA13904 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Sun, 25 Jul 1999 11:40:10 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <379AF789.2E904739@mcs.net>

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1999 11:40:00 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <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: Calling Your Collective Bluff

References: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEEOECHCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

<37992A5E.2D979189@hp.ufl.edu> <3799E929.24702AEC@jwdp.com>

<379A40A2.A23A1CBC@hp.ufl.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In our Wisconsin exit poll, we asked the question differently.

On the questionnaire, one of ten listed reasons for voting for the candidate of their choice for Senate was: "How he might vote on impeachment of Clinton". In Wisconsin, a significant minority also selected this as one of their reasons. (I don't have the exact figure handy.)

Was this minority important to the outcome? Certainly. More incumbent Democrat Russ Feingold voters selected this reason than did GOP challenger Mark Neumann voters and Feingold won reelection by only two points!

Use of a simple majority threshold when analyzing data is sometimes too simple when characterizing an event or outcome. Obviously, a majority (or plurality) threshold is usually significant only when analyzing response to dichotomous questions; e.g., for or against, approve or disapprove, vote for Smith or Jones, favor or oppose, agree or disagree, etc.

Re: Traugott's comment. Certainly, there were other deciding factors influencing voter choices including local issues. But they were not limited to House races. Two-thirds of the states had U.S. Senate contests on the ballot and two-thirds had races for Governor and other state offices.

"Colleen K. Porter" wrote:

> Jan Werner wrote:

>

>> [...]

>> If even a small fraction of that minority who admitted being



>> influenced by impeachment had actually changed their vote from one  
>> candidate to another because of it, this would be considered a huge  
>> factor by politicians for whom a small group of swing voters is the  
>> critical target.

>

> Absolutely. And 18% is a substantial percentage, no question.  
> Especially in some of those close Congressional races last year. If  
> political pundits wanted to claim that impeachment was a factor in the  
> elections, I'd have no quarrel.

>

> But a "significant factor" is not the same as a "mandate" or "clear  
> message."

>

> It's those latter hyperbolic statements that bothered me. I guess  
> it's partly a problem of semantics. Before declaring something a  
> "clear message," I guess I'd like to see more than 18% agreeing.

>

> (Maybe we could compile a chart, with the actual percentage cutoff  
> points for "significant minority", "clear message," "vast majority"  
> and those other terms that journalists throw around, sometimes with  
> wild abandon. Bet there's a huge variation in how each of us  
> interprets those terms...but I digress.)

>

>> In any event, I would hardly expect many voters to admit that they  
>> cast their ballots as they did "to send a message" on any subject,  
>> particularly one as controversial as Clinton's impeachment, even if  
>> they were in fact conscious of that event having modified their  
>> behavior.

>

> I can see that point, but then why ask the question, if there is no  
> way to get a valid answer?  
>  
> And how can we justify ignoring the answers we do get once we do ask  
> it?  
>  
> Look at it from the respondents' point of view (which is how this  
> discussion all  
> started...) They may feel that whatever they say, it can be dismissed by  
charges of  
> "respondent bias." So why should they bother to take the time to answer  
the questions?  
>  
> Of course we could all think of dozens of better ways to approach this  
> same issue--rank orderings and such that could help quantify \*any\*  
> effect of impeachment, even if it was less important than the  
> qualifications of a particular candidate. We could do that, if the  
> client wanted to have a better picture of what was happening.  
>  
> But the fact is, that simple question was asked, and the responses  
> largely dismissed.  
>  
> And if we declare our respondents incompetent, and try to second guess  
> why they answered a certain way, how can they feel they are "being  
> heard"--why should they keep talking to us?  
>  
> Colleen K. Porter  
> cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>From Andrew.Smith@unh.edu Mon Jul 26 06:59:22 1999

Received: from alberti.unh.edu (alberti.unh.edu [132.177.137.21])

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

id GAA10736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Jul 1999 06:59:21 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from andy-smith.unh.edu (staff1-cis246.unh.edu [132.177.209.246])

by alberti.unh.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA10668

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Jul 1999 09:56:38 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.19990726095142.007e3e10@cisunix.unh.edu>

X-Sender: aes4@cisunix.unh.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 09:51:42 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Andrew E. Smith" <Andrew.Smith@unh.edu>

Subject: Re: Take Our Laser Vision Survey!

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907240814330.26962-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

References: <uJGrVdeE2Fd9k.gYibY2uRVvXGxhzP@mail.>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I have to disagree that this merits a formal standards complaint. In my reading, the researcher is more open and provides more information to the potential respondent than many telephone surveys:

1. The "researcher" indicates why the the survey is being conducted (...provides our sponsors with valuable information on how to improve their web site and services offered),

2. who the sponsor is (Laser Vision),

3. how long the survey takes (Our SURVEY takes less than two minutes to complete),

4. that participation voluntary (To participate, please visit:) ... the respondent has to click on the URL to go the web site, they won't be taken their automatically,

5. and the respondent will receive additional information (or spam, if you will) only on request (All participants will receive more information about laser vision correction upon request!).

I have received requests to complete similar surveys and find this "spam" much less intrusive than a telephone call at dinner.

While this survey will probably not provide any information that most of us would find interesting, it may provide the sponsor with useful market information to help them sell their product. And marketing research IS a legitimate business, one in which many AAPOR members are active.

The use of e-mail and Internet surveys will likely become more and more common among both by "real" researchers and others. It also has the potential to be abused (as are telephone and mail methodologies) and therefore should be watched by AAPOR. However, this particular survey does not seem to violate AAPOR standards.

Andy Smith

UNH Survey Center

At 08:43 AM 7/24/1999 -0700, you wrote:

>

>

>

>FORMAL STANDARDS COMPLAINT:

>

>I have just received, perhaps 10 minutes before the time and date of  
>this message, the following spam, with the subject header "Take Our  
>Laser Vision Survey!". Simply clicking on the hot link provided in the  
>body of the message put me on the Web at the "survey instrument" (no,  
>not a laser surgical tool).

>

>It's easy to envision a future, two or three years from today, in which  
>one might routinely receive a half dozen such unsolicited  
>attempts--each day--to be "surveyed" via Internet spam bearing hot  
>links to Web sites. Some reputable scientific survey research firms  
>might well wish to use parts of these technologies for legitimate  
>studies. If the survey research community does not act quickly to stop  
>abuses like this one, however, the global consumer public will become  
>even more suspicious, rejecting and hostile to all survey  
>efforts--including legitimate telephone polling--I think it is  
>reasonable to worry.

>

>

-- Jim

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>On Mon, 26 Jul 1999, vision586@usa.net wrote:

>

>>

>> NetSurvey invites you to take our Laser Vision Survey. All

>> participants

>> will receive more information about laser vision correction upon request!

>>

>> Our SURVEY takes less than two minutes to complete and provides our

>> sponsors with valuable information on how to improve their web site

>> and services offered.

>>

>> To participate, please visit:

>>

>> <http://208.169.249.102>

>> <A HREF="http://208.169.249.102">by clicking here</A>

>>

>> \* Please note: You must be age 18+ to participate!

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>> NetSurvey respects your Internet Privacy and on-line time. Your

>> address will be deleted from our files. Thank you!

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>By clicking on "here<A>" above, I arrived at the "survey" below. --

>Jim

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

><http://208.169.249.102/>

>

> [IMAGE]

>

> [IMAGE]

>

> [IMAGE]

>

> [IMAGE]

>

> Please see our online privacy statement

>

> (Please answer all questions)

>

> [FORM]

>

> 1.) Are you a contact lens or eyeglass wearer?

> Contact lens Eyeglass

>

> 2.) Your age group: Please Select 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64

> 65+

>

> 3.) Your Gender: Please Select Male Female

>

> 4.) Would freedom from having to wear eyeglasses or contact lenses  
benefit you?

> Yes No

>

> 5.) Would a corrective eye procedure where you can return to work the  
next day be of value to you?

> Yes No

>

> 6.) Is knowing the procedure is comfortable important to you?

> Yes No

>

> 7.) Would you like to receive a:

> a.) FREE Vision Correction Video

> b.) FREE Literature

> c.) Screening

> d.) Seminar

> e.) Exam

>

> 8.) Would you like to know more about these procedures online?

> Yes No

>

> 9.) When was your last eye exam?

> Please Select Less than one year 1 to 2 Years 2 to 3 Years 3 to 4 Years

> Over 4 Years

>

> ....Information Request Form

>

> First Name:

>

> Last Name:

>

> Email Address:

>

> Street Address:

>



> City:  
>  
> State:  
>  
> Zip/Postal Code:  
>  
> Home Telephone:  
>  
> Work Telephone:  
>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jul 26 08:47:05 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id IAA02004 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Jul 1999 08:47:05 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id IAA25461; Mon, 26 Jul 1999 08:47:04 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 08:47:04 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

cc: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Take Our Laser Vision Survey!

In-Reply-To: <3.0.6.32.19990726095142.007e3e10@cisunix.unh.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907260733200.8922-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Andy and others,

I apologize if I did not make the nature of my standards complaint clear:

Selling under the guise of a survey.

Key evidence is found at the Web site, but only as an image, and therefore not transmissible via AAPORNET. All you saw here, at the top of the Laser Vision Web site, was:

[IMAGE]

[IMAGE]

[IMAGE]

[IMAGE]

Please see our online privacy statement

This is why I included the URL: <http://208.169.249.102/>

Here's what's in the four images above:

[ ONE LARGE EYEBALL ]

laser vision survey

[ THREE SMALLER EYEBALLS IN A ROW ]

Participate in our laser vision survey  
and receive more information about  
laser vision correction.

The first three images might be seen to be advertising for the company,  
tastefully done though it is; the final image clearly states that to  
participate in the survey is to be sent additional information--anyone wish  
to bet that that doesn't contain advertising for the company?

Even worse is the "online privacy statement":

-----

-----

#### Online Privacy Statement

We value your business and respect your privacy and therefore will never  
send you any information which you have not requested. We will never make  
the information which you provide to us available to any company without  
your expressed permission. We collect the e-mail addresses of those who  
communicate with us via e-mail, aggregate information on what pages visitors  
access or review and information volunteered by visitors, such as survey  
information and/or site registrations. The information we  
collect is used to service your request to the Laser Vision Survey.

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

This statement tells me that, if I reply to the survey, Laser Vision will feel free to attach my name and all personal information given in the survey to information on "what pages [I] access or review" (Laser Vision here has but one page, so it can't mean its own), "and/or [my] site registrations" (Laser Vision has no registration here, so it can't be referring to its own site).

In short, this "privacy statement" declares an intention to violate my privacy in ways that no survey research firm could have even dreamed about before the advent of the World Wide Web--by linking my survey responses to data on my personal interests and habits on the Web which I never intended to be monitored by--nor known to--anyone.

Although the first sentence of the privacy statement promises never to send me any information which I have not requested, the first sentence atop the survey instrument tells me that merely to respond to the survey is to request "additional information" from Laser Vision, amounts and duration of that communication left unspecified.

And so I make my I think modest standards complaint: Selling under the guise of a survey. The much more serious violations here will probably require the drafting of new standards for Internet (E-mail and Web) surveys, but that's up to the AAPOR Council to decide.

If we don't resist "surveys" like this right now, considering the current dissatisfaction with especially telephone surveys, what respect will anyone have--five years from now--for any kind of survey or polling effort?

Again, sorry all this wasn't entirely clear in my first message.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

On Mon, 26 Jul 1999, Andrew E. Smith wrote:

> I have to disagree that this merits a formal standards complaint. In  
> my reading, the researcher is more open and provides more information  
> to the potential respondent than many telephone surveys:  
>  
> 1. The "researcher" indicates why the the survey is being conducted  
> (...provides our sponsors with valuable information on how to improve  
> their web site and services offered),  
>  
> 2. who the sponsor is (Laser Vision),  
>  
> 3. how long the survey takes (Our SURVEY takes less than two minutes  
> to complete),  
>  
> 4. that participation voluntary (To participate, please visit:) ...  
> the respondent has to click on the URL to go the web site, they won't  
> be taken their automatically,  
>  
> 5. and the respondent will receive additional information (or spam, if  
> you

> will) only on request (All participants will receive more information  
> about laser vision correction upon request!).

>

> I have received requests to complete similar surveys and find this  
> "spam" much less intrusive than a telephone call at dinner.

>

> While this survey will probably not provide any information that most  
> of us would find interesting, it may provide the sponsor with useful  
> market information to help them sell their product. And marketing  
> research IS a legitimate business, one in which many AAPOR members are  
> active.

>

> The use of e-mail and Internet surveys will likely become more and  
> more common among both by "real" researchers and others. It also has  
> the potential to be abused (as are telephone and mail methodologies)  
> and therefore should be watched by AAPOR. However, this particular  
> survey does not seem to violate AAPOR standards.

>

> Andy Smith  
> UNH Survey Center

>

> At 08:43 AM 7/24/1999 -0700, you wrote:

>>

>> FORMAL STANDARDS COMPLAINT:

>>

>> I have just received, perhaps 10 minutes before the time and date of  
>> this message, the following spam, with the subject header "Take Our  
>> Laser Vision Survey!". Simply clicking on the hot link provided in  
>> the body of the message put me on the Web at the "survey instrument"

>>(no, not a laser surgical tool).

>>

>>It's easy to envision a future, two or three years from today, in  
>>which one might routinely receive a half dozen such unsolicited  
>>attempts--each day--to be "surveyed" via Internet spam bearing hot  
>>links to Web sites. Some reputable scientific survey research firms  
>>might well wish to use parts of these technologies for legitimate  
>>studies. If the survey research community does not act quickly to  
>>stop abuses like this one, however, the global consumer public will  
>>become even more suspicious, rejecting and hostile to all survey  
>>efforts--including legitimate telephone polling--I think it is  
>>reasonable to worry.

>>

>> -- Jim

>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>On Mon, 26 Jul 1999, vision586@usa.net wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> NetSurvey invites you to take our Laser Vision Survey. All

>>> participants

>>> will receive more information about laser vision correction upon  
request!

>>>

>>> Our SURVEY takes less than two minutes to complete and provides our

>>> sponsors with valuable information on how to improve their web site

>>> and services offered.

>>>

>>> To participate, please visit:

>>>

>>> <http://208.169.249.102>

>>> <A HREF="http://208.169.249.102">by clicking here</A>

>>>

>>> \* Please note: You must be age 18+ to participate!

>>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>> NetSurvey respects your Internet Privacy and on-line time. Your

>>> address will be deleted from our files. Thank you!

>>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>By clicking on "here<A>" above, I arrived at the "survey" below. --

>>Jim

>>

>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>

>><http://208.169.249.102/>

>>

>> [IMAGE]

>>

>> [IMAGE]

>>

>> [IMAGE]

>>

>> [IMAGE]

>>

>> Please see our online privacy statement

>>



>> (Please answer all questions)

>>

>> [FORM]

>>

>> 1.) Are you a contact lens or eyeglass wearer?

>> Contact lens Eyeglass

>>

>> 2.) Your age group: Please Select 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64

>> 65+

>>

>> 3.) Your Gender: Please Select Male Female

>>

>> 4.) Would freedom from having to wear eyeglasses or contact lenses

>> benefit you?

>> Yes No

>>

>> 5.) Would a corrective eye procedure where you can return to work

the

>> next day be of value to you?

>> Yes No

>>

>> 6.) Is knowing the procedure is comfortable important to you?

>> Yes No

>>

>> 7.) Would you like to receive a:

>> a.) FREE Vision Correction Video

>> b.) FREE Literature

>> c.) Screening

>> d.) Seminar

>> e.) Exam

>>

>> 8.) Would you like to know more about these procedures online?

>> Yes No

>>

>> 9.) When was your last eye exam?

>> Please Select Less than one year 1 to 2 Years 2 to 3 Years 3 to 4

Years

>> Over 4 Years

>>

>> ....Information Request Form

>>

>> First Name:

>>

>> Last Name:

>>

>> Email Address:

>>

>> Street Address:

>>

>> City:

>>

>> State:

>>

>> Zip/Postal Code:

>>

>> Home Telephone:

>>

>> Work Telephone:

>>

>>\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jul 27 07:35:46 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id HAA05606 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 07:35:45 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id HAA08228; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 07:35:44 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 07:35:44 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com

Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907270726520.2711-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

AAPORNETters,

If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see below), please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET, where I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to his query.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

Dear Prof. Beniger,

I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately seeking an estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

Thanks a lot,

Greg Winter

(407) 420-6941

\*\*\*\*\*

>From mark@bisconti.com Tue Jul 27 07:53:10 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id HAA09560 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 07:53:09 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip207.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net

[38.30.214.207]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange

Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)

id 37Y63DH5; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 10:53:06 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: From the National Journal

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 10:38:15 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCJKFIDCKOFNAEEMEIIICHA.mark@bisconti.com>

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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Verbatim:

> "NATIONAL JOURNAL'S ONLINE ADVERTISING UPDATE  
> A monthly newsletter for public affairs and advertising professionals  
> about the Internet and online advertising  
> ++++++  
> Gathering Public Opinion Online  
> In addition to communicating online, public affairs professionals are  
> increasingly using the Internet to gather public opinion. The Harris  
> Poll plans to "canvas cyberspace to predict the outcomes of the  
> primaries and elections in 2000." The bipartisan Battleground poll,  
> conducted by The Tarrance Group and Lake, Snell, Perry & Associates,  
> is now simultaneously fielding an internet component. However, such  
> practices are not without controversy. Pew Research Center Director

> Andrew Kohut has been quoted as saying "political polling on the  
> internet has absolutely no validity."  
> [http://199.97.97.16/contWriter/cnd7/1999/06/30/cndin/4418-0261-pat\\_nytimes](http://199.97.97.16/contWriter/cnd7/1999/06/30/cndin/4418-0261-pat_nytimes)  
> .html"  
>

Mark Richards

>From vector@sympatico.ca Tue Jul 27 08:09:24 1999

Received: from smtp13.bellglobal.com (smtp13.bellglobal.com  
[204.101.251.52])

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

id IAA13235 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 08:09:23 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from m-zwelling (ppp8410.on.bellglobal.com [207.236.124.74])

by smtp13.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA12945;

Tue, 27 Jul 1999 11:09:44 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <379DCB68.27A@sympatico.ca>

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 11:08:24 -0400

From: Marc Zwelling <vector@sympatico.ca>

Reply-To: vector@sympatico.ca

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-SYMPA (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: Greg.Winter@wsj.com

CC: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Greg Winter/WSJ

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dun & Bradstreet would be your fastest and most reliable source since they

segment firms by SIC and sales. Probably 20% of US polling firms (Harris, Gallup, Yankelovich) do 80% of the business. - Marc Zwelling/Vector Research + Development Inc./

>From rday@mcs.net Tue Jul 27 08:38:41 1999

Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])

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

id IAA20213 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 08:38:40 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from gopher (P51-Chi-Dial-1.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.51]) by

Mailbox.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.8.2) with SMTP id KAA89192 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Tue, 27 Jul 1999 10:38:33 -0500 (CDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990727103444.00726724@popmail.mcs.net>

X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 10:34:44 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907270726520.2711-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

contact CASRO the Council of American Survey Research Organizations  
516 928 6954 since they represent they for-profit survey companies they  
have a fairly accurate number for that part of the industry At 07:35 AM  
7/27/99 -0700, you wrote:

>

>

>AAPORNETters,

>

>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see  
>below), please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET,  
>where I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to  
>his query.

>

> -- Jim

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>

>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>

>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately seeking  
>an estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing  
>research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how about  
>polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>

>Thanks a lot,

>Greg Winter

>(407) 420-6941

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>



>

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Tue Jul 27 08:42:50 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id IAA22960 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 08:42:49 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp1x43.chesco.com [209.195.202.62])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA03732

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 11:41:59 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <001d01bed846\$3796e9a0\$3ecac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 11:39:28 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates it to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research industry and other sponsors, including commercial studies done by companies whose names are strongly associated with polling. That is not a simple exercise.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>

>

>AAPORNETters,

>

>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see

>below), please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET,

>where I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to

>his query.

>

> -- Jim

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>

>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>

>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately seeking

>an estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing

>research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how about

>polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>

>Thanks a lot,

>Greg Winter

>(407) 420-6941

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>From mkshares@mcs.net Tue Jul 27 11:48:19 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id LAA27088 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 11:48:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P9-Chi-Dial-4.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.201]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id NAA19231; Tue, 27 Jul 1999

13:48:13 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <379DB88A.F6E94CCB@mcs.net>

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 13:47:58 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu, Greg.Winter@wsj.com

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907270726520.2711-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

That \$5 billion figure sounds like the Jack Honomichl estimate from the June 7 Marketing News issue.

This estimate is for U.S. revenues of research companies in 1998. The estimate is based on the revenue of top 50 research companies from data he gathers - plus revenue reported by members of CASRO not among the top 50.

Unfortunately, included in the \$5 billion are the "polling industry" revenues you are seeking. This is because the top 50 companies also include top "polling" companies who have both polling and marketing research revenue. Check his list of companies.

Also included in the \$5 billion estimate is \$2 billion in revenue for Nielsen and IRI - not primarily survey research companies - which may matter to you depending on the subject of your story

Excluded from the \$5 billion marketing (and polling) revenue are companies which do not belong to CASRO. Revenue also excluded would be expenditures of companies (e.g., packaged goods) who conduct their own marketing research using internal or external non-CASRO member resources and field service companies who gain revenue from business entities not belonging to CASRO.

Hope this helps.

James Beniger wrote:

> AAPORNETters,

>

> If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see

> below), please do so, and also please post your reply here on

> AAPORNET, where I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed

> answer to his query.

>

> -- Jim

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

> From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>

> Dear Prof. Beniger,

>

> I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

> seeking an estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that

> marketing research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But

> how about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>

> Thanks a lot,

> Greg Winter

> (407) 420-6941

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

>From gulicke@slhn.org Tue Jul 27 13:16:11 1999

Received: from ntserver.slhn.org (ntserver.slhn.org [205.147.244.5])

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

id NAA26035 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 13:16:09 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by ntserver with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <386S9YLV>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 16:15:32 -0400

Message-ID: <7138ECDD5A46D11192AC00805F1930FFBA517E@ntserver>

From: "Gulick, Elizabeth" <gulicke@slhn.org>

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

Subject: Trauma Patient Satisfaction

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 16:15:32 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BED86C.C7668A6A"

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

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BED86C.C7668A6A

Content-Type: text/plain

I'm looking for help with constructing a tool to measure patient satisfaction with our trauma patients. We are a new Level II trauma center located in the Lehigh Valley. I can't seem to find anything that has been

published and would appreciate any help that is offered. Thanks in advance!

Elizabeth P. Gulick

Quality Coordinator

Quality Resources Department

St. Luke's Hospital

Bethlehem, PA

610-954-4129

gulicke@slhn.org

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BED86C.C7668A6A

Content-Type: text/html

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =

charset=3Dus-ascii"> <META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server

version = 5.5.2448.0"> <TITLE>Trauma Patient Satisfaction</TITLE> </HEAD>

<BODY>

<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">I'm looking for help with constructing = a

tool to measure patient satisfaction with our trauma patients.&nbsp;= We

are a new Level II trauma center located in the Lehigh Valley.&nbsp;= I

can't seem to find anything that has been published and would = appreciate

any help that is offered.&nbsp;Thanks in = advance!</FONT></P>

<P><B><I><FONT SIZE=3D4 FACE=3D"Century Schoolbook">Elizabeth P. =  
Gulick</FONT></I></B> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Century Schoolbook">Quality  
= Coordinator</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Century Schoolbook">Quality  
Resources = Department</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Century  
Schoolbook">St. Luke's = Hospital</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Century  
Schoolbook">Bethlehem, PA</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Century  
Schoolbook">610-954-4129</FONT> <BR><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF" SIZE=3D2  
FACE=3D"Century = Schoolbook">gulicke@slhn.org</FONT>  
</P>

</BODY>

</HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BED86C.C7668A6A--

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Tue Jul 27 13:28:06 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id NAA00843 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 13:28:03 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp2x34.chesco.com [209.195.202.162])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA25671

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jul 1999 16:28:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <004101bed86e\$2c5c4800\$a2cac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Trauma Patient Satisfaction

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 16:25:29 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_003E\_01BED84C.A44741C0"



X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_003E\_01BED84C.A44741C0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Try the Picker Institute in Boston (Cambridge?). [www.picker.org](http://www.picker.org).

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)

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

From: Gulick, Elizabeth <[gulicke@slhn.org](mailto:gulicke@slhn.org)>

To: 'AAPOR' <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>

Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 4:18 PM

Subject: Trauma Patient Satisfaction

=20

=20

I'm looking for help with constructing a tool to measure patient =  
satisfaction with our trauma patients. We are a new Level II trauma =  
center located in the Lehigh Valley. I can't seem to find anything that =  
has been published and would appreciate any help that is offered. = Thanks

in advance!

Elizabeth P. Gulick=20  
Quality Coordinator=20  
Quality Resources Department=20  
St. Luke's Hospital=20  
Bethlehem, PA=20  
610-954-4129=20  
gulicke@slhn.org=20

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_003E\_01BED84C.A44741C0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =

http-equiv=3DContent-Type><TITLE>Trauma Patient =

Satisfaction</TITLE><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN"> <META

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

bgColor=3D#ffffff> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Try the Picker

Institute in Boston=20 (Cambridge?).&nbsp; <A=20

href=3D"http://www.picker.org">www.picker.org</A></FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV> <DIV><FONT

color=3D#000000 size=3D2>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.<BR>Voice = (610)=20

408-8800<BR>Fax (610) 408-8802<BR><A=20

href=3D"mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com">jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com</A></FONT></D=

IV>

<BLOCKQUOTE=20

style=3D"BORDER-LEFT: #000000 solid 2px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: =

5px">

<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><B>-----Original =

Message-----</B><BR><B>From:=20

</B>Gulick, Elizabeth &lt;<A=20

href=3D"mailto:gulicke@slhn.org">gulicke@slhn.org</A>&gt;<BR><B>To:=20

</B>'AAPOR' &lt;<A=20

=

href=3D"mailto:aapornet@usc.edu">aapornet@usc.edu</A>&gt;<BR><B>Date:=20

</B>Tuesday, July 27, 1999 4:18 PM<BR><B>Subject: </B>Trauma Patient =

Satisfaction<BR><BR></DIV></FONT>

<P><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>I'm looking for help with = constructing  
a tool to=20

measure patient satisfaction with our trauma patients.&nbsp; We are = a  
new=20

Level II trauma center located in the Lehigh Valley.&nbsp; I can't =  
seem to=20

find anything that has been published and would appreciate any help =  
that is=20

offered.&nbsp; Thanks in advance!</FONT></P>

<P><B><I><FONT face=3D"Century Schoolbook" size=3D4>Elizabeth P.=20  
Gulick</FONT></I></B> <BR><FONT face=3D"Century Schoolbook" =  
size=3D2>Quality=20

Coordinator</FONT> <BR><FONT face=3D"Century Schoolbook" =

size=3D2>Quality=20

Resources Department</FONT> <BR><FONT face=3D"Century Schoolbook" =  
size=3D2>St.=20

Luke's Hospital</FONT> <BR><FONT face=3D"Century Schoolbook" =  
size=3D2>Bethlehem,=20

PA</FONT> <BR><FONT face=3D"Century Schoolbook" =  
size=3D2>610-954-4129</FONT>=20

<BR><FONT color=3D#0000ff face=3D"Century Schoolbook"=20

size=3D2>gulicke@slhn.org</FONT> </P></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_003E\_01BED84C.A44741C0--

>From bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com Wed Jul 28 04:53:34 1999

Received: from mail.haglerbailly.com (mail.haglerbailly.com  
[208.138.215.14])

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

id EAA27617 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 04:53:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by arlmsg002.HaglerBailly.com with Internet Mail Service  
(5.5.2448.0)

id <P4MMV5B7>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 07:41:30 -0400

Message-ID:

<713ED6F94609D211B5F200805F9FE8EE2006AE@madfps001.HaglerBailly.com>

From: "Baumgartner, Bob" <bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com>

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

Cc: "McNulty, Shawn E." <SMCNULTY@HaglerBailly.com>

Subject: RE: Internet Penetration

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 07:49:16 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

A colleague is interested in estimating the current percentage of households and Businesses with access to the internet. Does anyone have a source with current information?

Please reply to: [smcnulty@haglerbailly.com](mailto:smcnulty@haglerbailly.com)

> -----Original Message-----

> From: McNulty, Shawn E.

> Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:27 AM

> To: Madison Office Staff

> Subject: Internet Penetration

>

> Does anyone know of a source for the current penetration of Internet

>access among both residential and business customers in the US?

>Thanks. From [bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com](mailto:bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com) Wed Jul 28 05:15:28 1999

Received: from mail.haglerbailly.com (mail.haglerbailly.com

[208.138.215.14])

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

id FAA00928 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 05:15:21 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by arlmsg002.HaglerBailly.com with Internet Mail Service

(5.5.2448.0)

id <P4MMV514>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:03:18 -0400

Message-ID:

<713ED6F94609D211B5F200805F9FE8EE2006AF@madfps001.HaglerBailly.com>

From: "Baumgartner, Bob" <bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com>

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

Cc: "Ryan, Barb" <BRYAN@HaglerBailly.com>

Subject: Surveys addressing Smart Growth and Sprawl Issues

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:10:14 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

I am conducting a review of survey data on Smart Growth and Sprawl issues for a client. The client has identified a set of 10-12 surveys (with reports and documentation) as a starting point, however, we are not sure if this is a comprehensive set of surveys. I am interested in identifying other survey reports that may be relevant to the review. Can anyone point me to relatively recent (1997 or later) reports that describe methodology and results of surveys on issues, such as:

the type of community, neighborhood, or housing people prefer to live in preferences for characteristics of different types of neighborhoods prioritizing the development of new neighborhoods versus revitalizing existing neighborhoods building design, density, and the mix of building types in neighborhoods transportation choices -- being able to walk or bike to nearby locations/commuting time issues advantages of urban areas versus suburban or outlying areas (lot size, proximity to neighbors, services, etc.)

Please reply to me. I will be happy to share the results with others who are interested.

Bob Baumgartner

bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Jul 28 05:15:48 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.74])

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

id FAA01015 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 05:15:36 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from warrenmi (user-2ive4ht.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.18.61])

by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id IAA14660

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:15:37 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.1.19990728081246.01c46840@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:15:30 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

In-Reply-To: <001d01bed846\$3796e9a0\$3ecac3d1@default>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The definition of a poll is very easy. A poll is something done by or for

the media. A survey is something done by academics and government. A poll can become a survey if it is archived at a respectable academic archive. Otherwise, there are no differences.

At 11:39 AM 7/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates it  
>to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research  
>industry and other sponsors, including commercial studies done by  
>companies whose names are strongly associated with polling. That is  
>not a simple exercise.

>

>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>Voice (610) 408-8800

>Fax (610) 408-8802

>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>-----Original Message-----

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

>To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

>Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

>Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

>Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>

>

>>

>>

>>AAPORNETters,

>>

>>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see

>>below), please do so, and also please post your reply here on



>>AAPORNET, where I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed

>>answer to his query.

>>

>> -- Jim

>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>----- Forwarded message -----

>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>>

>>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>>

>>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

>>seeking an estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that

>>marketing research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But

>>how about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>>

>>Thanks a lot,

>>Greg Winter

>>(407) 420-6941

>>

>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>

>>

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL=20

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor=20

New York, NY 10022=20

212 980-3031=A0=A0=A0=A0=20

212 980-3107 fax

e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com =20

>From langley@pop.uky.edu Wed Jul 28 05:56:58 1999

Received: from smtp.uky.edu (smtp.uky.edu [128.163.2.17])

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

id FAA08465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 05:56:57 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from pop.uky.edu (pop.uky.edu [128.163.2.16])

by smtp.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA50762

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:56:56 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from nc.gws.uky.edu (rgs51.gws.uky.edu [128.163.30.142])

by pop.uky.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id IAA02552

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:56:56 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990728085654.006c6aa0@pop.uky.edu>

X-Sender: langley@pop.uky.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:56:54 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@pop.uky.edu>

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

If one accepts Mr. Mitofsky's distinction between polls and surveys by looking at who is conducting them, then I respectfully suggest that the statement that there are no other distinctions is incorrect. There may be a great many differences between surveys and polls (so defined) with respect to their methodology. Many conducting polls do not schedule callbacks, do not use very many (if any) additional attempts to reach a phone number after an unsuccessful first attempt, and do not attempt refusal conversion. Most, if not all, surveys conducted by and for government and academic institutions use these methods.

Also, where do legitimate marketing research surveys (polls?) fit into this scheme?

At 08:15 AM 7/28/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>The definition of a poll is very easy. A poll is something done by or  
>for the media. A survey is something done by academics and government.  
>A poll can become a survey if it is archived at a respectable academic  
>archive. Otherwise, there are no differences.

>

>At 11:39 AM 7/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>>You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates  
>>it to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research  
>>industry=  
and  
>>other sponsors, including commercial studies done by companies whose  
>>names are strongly associated with polling. That is not a simple  
>>exercise.

>>

>>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>>Voice (610) 408-8800

>>Fax (610) 408-8802

>>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>-----Original Message-----

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

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

>>Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

>>Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

>>Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>>

>>

>>>

>>>

>>>AAPORNETters,

>>>

>>>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see=  
below),

>>>please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET, where

>>>I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to his

>>>query.

>>>

>>> -- Jim

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>----- Forwarded message -----

>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>>>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>>>

>>>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>>>

>>>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

>>>seeking=

an

>>>estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing

>>>research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how

>>>about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>>>

>>>Thanks a lot,

>>>Greg Winter

>>>(407) 420-6941

>>>

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>

>

>

>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL=20

>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor=20

>New York, NY 10022=20

>

>212 980-3031=A0=A0=A0=A0=20

>212 980-3107 fax

>

>e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com =20

>

>

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D.

Phone: (606)257-4684=09

Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (606) 323-1972

University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771

403 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu

Lexington, KY 40506-0056

=09

<http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srhome.htm>

>From ajsupple@students.wisc.edu Wed Jul 28 06:32:17 1999

Received: from mail5.doit.wisc.edu (mail5.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.104.215])

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

id GAA14294 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 06:32:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [144.92.147.65] by mail5.doit.wisc.edu

id IAA11538 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:32:15 -0500

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19990728083929.007b8600@students.wisc.edu>

X-Sender: ajsupple@students.wisc.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 08:39:29 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: andy supple <ajsupple@students.wisc.edu>

Subject: audio-CASI and voice effects

In-Reply-To: <713ED6F94609D211B5F200805F9FE8EE2006AF@madfps001.HaglerBai

lly.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

AAPORITES:

I am working on an evaluation of an educational software curriculum for junior high health classes. As part of the evaluation we will be using

audio-CASI to collect data on substance abuse. We are in the process of making decisions regarding programming the A-CASI and were wondering if characteristics of the voice doing read-overs has any effect on response tendencies.

For example, since we have a heterogeneous group of early adolescents, the programmer suggested that we use a variety of voice overs representing different racial or ethnic categories. Some of us were wondering if there is any research on how these different voices may influence responses, or if there is a similarity to race-of-interviewer effects.

Is anyone aware of any research on these possible effects? If so, please contact me privately.

Thank you, Andy Supple

[ajsupple@students.wisc.edu](mailto:ajsupple@students.wisc.edu)

>From [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com) Wed Jul 28 07:07:02 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id HAA21177 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 07:06:59 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp1x1.chesco.com [209.195.202.20])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA05114

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:06:57 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <001b01bed902\$1b7d21a0\$14cac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)>

To: <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:04:26 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I hope these definitions are offered tongue in cheek. Otherwise . . .

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

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

Date: Wednesday, July 28, 1999 8:20 AM

Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

>The definition of a poll is very easy. A poll is something done by or  
>for the media. A survey is something done by academics and government.  
>A poll can become a survey if it is archived at a respectable academic  
>archive. Otherwise, there are no differences.  
>

>At 11:39 AM 7/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>>You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates



>>it to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research  
>>industry  
and  
>>other sponsors, including commercial studies done by companies whose  
>>names are strongly associated with polling. That is not a simple  
>>exercise.

>>

>>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>>Voice (610) 408-8800

>>Fax (610) 408-8802

>>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>-----Original Message-----

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

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

>>Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

>>Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

>>Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>>

>>

>>>

>>>

>>>AAPORNETters,

>>>

>>>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see  
below),

>>>please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET, where

>>>I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to his

>>>query.

>>>

>>> -- Jim

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>----- Forwarded message -----

>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>>>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>>>

>>>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>>>

>>>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

>>>seeking

an

>>>estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing

>>>research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how

>>>about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>>>

>>>Thanks a lot,

>>>Greg Winter

>>>(407) 420-6941

>>>

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>

>

>

>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

>New York, NY 10022

>

>212 980-3031

>212 980-3107 fax

>

>e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com

>

>

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Wed Jul 28 10:03:47 1999

Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5])

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

id KAA08534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:03:45 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo15.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id cGDGa07446 (7812);

Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:13 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <7746d3a3.24d091cf@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:11 EDT

Subject: Internet Penetration Among Households and Businesses

To: smcnulty@haglerbailly.com

CC: 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 22

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites, number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

>From KKrotki@dc.air.org Wed Jul 28 10:05:32 1999

Received: from firewall.air-dc.org (firewall-user@[208.246.68.129])

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

id KAA09663 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:05:30 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by firewall.air-dc.org; id MAA08310; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 12:53:06  
-0400 (EDT)

Received: from unknown(10.4.0.4) by firewall.air-dc.org via smap (V4.2)  
id xma008211; Wed, 28 Jul 99 12:52:20 -0400

Received: by DC1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
id <N950ALPP>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:44 -0400

Message-ID: <1D09884C7BCAD211A82F00902730151B4E6CC1@DC2>

From: "Krotki, Karol" <KKrotki@dc.air.org>

To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: ICES II

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:01 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Call for Abstracts for Contributed Papers

Deadline for Abstracts: December 1, 1999

The Conference: A second International Conference on Establishment Surveys (ICES-II) will be held June 17 - 21, 2000 in Buffalo, New York at the Adam's Mark Hotel. Since the first ICES was held in 1993, many new techniques have been implemented by practitioners around the globe. With the new millennium upon us, it is time for a forward look at methods for surveying businesses, farms, and institutions. ICES-II will contain invited and contributed paper sessions, short courses, and software demonstrations. The preliminary program can now be seen on our website. A hardcover, unedited volume of the invited papers--as well as CD-ROMs of the invited and contributed

papers--will be produced after the conference.

Contributed Paper Sessions: At this time, we are soliciting abstracts for contributed papers. The focus of all papers must be on surveys of businesses, farms, or institutions--or issues related to their products. Special contributed paper sessions are also encouraged. These sessions are arranged in advance by an organizer, and include four speakers and a discussant. Potential topics include (among others) the following:

Registers and frames --- classification, issues with multiple frames, updating for births and deaths Survey Design, Sampling, or Estimation --- survey coordination, small-area methods, outliers, pps sampling Data Collection or Processing --- electronic reporting, use of administrative records, respondent burden Dissemination --- web publishing, metadata, disclosure avoidance, public-use files, data warehousing Analysis of Economic Data --- effects of survey errors on indicators, seasonal adjustment, benchmarking Specific Sectors or Industries --- surveys of retail businesses, schools, farms, plants, hospitals, and jails  
Cross-Cutting Issues --- meta analysis, international comparisons, measurement errors and evaluation

How to Submit Abstracts and Register: An abstract of 200 words should be submitted, accompanied by a completed registration form and registration fee of \$350 U.S. Registration forms and more detailed information can be obtained on our website at [www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html). There you can also find the call for software demonstrations. General questions about the conference can be addressed to John G. Kovar at [kovar@statcan.ca](mailto:kovar@statcan.ca), or by calling (613) 951-8615. Questions about the contributed paper sessions should be addressed to Pat Cantwell at [patrick.j.cantwell@ccmail.census.gov](mailto:patrick.j.cantwell@ccmail.census.gov)

or by calling (301) 457-8105.

Visit our webpage at [www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html)

>From KKrotki@dc.air.org Wed Jul 28 10:09:13 1999

Received: from firewall.air-dc.org (firewall-user@[208.246.68.129])

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

id KAA11400 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:09:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by firewall.air-dc.org; id MAA08588; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 12:55:06

-0400 (EDT)

Received: from unknown(10.4.0.4) by firewall.air-dc.org via smap (V4.2)

id xma008542; Wed, 28 Jul 99 12:54:45 -0400

Received: by DC1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <N950ALP7>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:06:09 -0400

Message-ID: <1D09884C7BCAD211A82F00902730151B4E6CC2@DC2>

From: "Krotki, Karol" <KKrotki@dc.air.org>

To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: ICES II - Call for Software Demo

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:05:26 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Call for Software Demonstration

Deadline for Nominations: December 1, 1999

The Conference: A second International Conference on Establishment =

Surveys

(ICES-II) will be held June 17 - 21, 2000 in Buffalo, New York at the Adam's Mark Hotel. The Demonstrations: Since the first ICES was held in 1993, many new processing systems have been developed by statistical agencies or software organisations around the globe. The organising committee will set aside a room for demonstrating software used in establishment surveys. Demonstrations should target live processing of data with possible customisations for the interest of specific audiences, rather than inflexible slide shows or presentations. Proposed software packages should already be in use for one or more establishment surveys and should be designed to automate establishment survey processes, such as

- =B7 Sample design and selection
- =B7 Data collection, capture and coding
- =B7 Record linkage and matching
- =B7 Editing and imputation
- =B7 Weighting, estimation, and tabulation
- =B7 Times series adjustment
- =B7 Disclosure analysis
- =B7 Survey data analysis
- =B7 Publication and data presentation

Schedule and Equipment: The demonstrations will take place during the regular conference sessions, on June 19-20. They will be split in four different groups, with a dedicated half day for each group. The organizing committee will provide the participants with telephone lines, tables and chairs. The participants will bring their laptops or desktop computers with their own software already set up. How to send your proposal: A 200 word abstract must be submitted by December 1, 1999. A completed registration form and registration fee of \$350 U.S. will be required later. The abstract will help evaluate the proposed software demonstration. It should include a description of the software package,



potential applications in other survey organisations, and = special  
equipment required for the demonstration. Registration forms, as well = as  
detailed information can be obtained on our web site. Nominations and  
questions on the software demonstrations should be sent to Claude = Poirier  
at poircla@statcan.ca or by calling (613) 951-1491. Visit our web site at  
www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Wed Jul 28 10:43:32 1999

Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])

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

id KAA24238 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:43:30 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo19.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5TCUa06252 (7812)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:42:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <63848928.24d09ae6@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:41:58 EDT

Subject: Fwd: failure notice re reply to McNulty Question (Internet  
Penetration)

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1\_63848928.24d09ae6\_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 22

--part1\_63848928.24d09ae6\_boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It appears that only you possess the key to Ohio State's e-mail system. I had exactly this problem when I wrote to Sid Kraus about some question he raised via AAPORNET.

Then I had his personal e-mail address; here I don't, so I wonder if you'd do me the kindness of sending either the cc to aapornet@usc.edu of my letter to

Shawn or a forward of this.

Thanks much.

paharding7@aol.com (Phil Harding)

--part1\_63848928.24d09ae6\_boundary

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Disposition: inline

Return-Path: <>

Received: from aol.com (rly-zc01.mail.aol.com [172.31.33.1]) by air-zc04.mail.aol.com (v60.18) with ESMTP; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:04:22 -0400

Received: from is1.net.ohio-state.edu (is1.net.ohio-state.edu [128.146.48.8]) by rly-zc01.mx.aol.com (v60.18) with ESMTP; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:04:09 -0400

Received: (qmail 21885 invoked for bounce); 28 Jul 1999 17:04:08 -0000

Date: 28 Jul 1999 17:04:08 -0000

From: MAILER-DAEMON@is1.net.ohio-state.edu

To: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Subject: failure notice

Hi. This is the qmail-send program at is1.net.ohio-state.edu. I'm afraid I wasn't able to deliver your message to the following addresses. This is a permanent error; I've given up. Sorry it didn't work out.

<fabrig@ohstmvs.uts.ohio-state.edu>:

E-Mail no longer supported on the Mainframe

--- Below this line is a copy of the message.

Return-Path: <PAHARDING7@aol.com>

Received: (qmail 21881 invoked from network); 28 Jul 1999 17:04:08 -0000

Received: from orb2.osu.edu (128.146.225.192)

by is1.net.ohio-state.edu with SMTP; 28 Jul 1999 17:04:08 -0000

Received: (qmail 1047 invoked by alias); 28 Jul 1999 13:04:08 -0400

Received: (qmail 981 invoked by uid 0); 28 Jul 1999 13:04:06 -0400

Received: from usc.edu (128.125.253.136)

by orb2.osu.edu with SMTP; 28 Jul 1999 13:04:06 -0400

Received: from usc.edu (localhost [127.0.0.1])

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

id KAA08816; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:04:01 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5])

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

id KAA08534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 10:03:45 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo15.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id cGDGa07446 (7812);

Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:13 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <7746d3a3.24d091cf@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:11 EDT

Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

Precedence: bulk

X-PH: V4.4@orb2

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

To: smcnulty@haglerbailly.com

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Internet Penetration Among Households and Businesses

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 22

X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites,

number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

--part1\_63848928.24d09ae6\_boundary--

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Jul 28 11:34:27 1999

Received: from smtp2.mindspring.com (smtp2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.32])

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

id LAA16494 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 11:34:25 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-2ive0ce.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.1.142])

by smtp2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA12711

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 14:34:20 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.1.19990728143135.009dc960@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 14:38:21 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.19990728085654.006c6aa0@pop.uky.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

The key word below is "most." All academic, government as well as media surveys do not incorporate call-backs, refusal conversion, probability selection, pre-testing, and much more. Furthermore, the design features referred to are no more the province of surveys than they are of polls. There is good and bad work where ever one looks.

At 08:56 AM 7/28/99 -0400, you wrote:

>If one accepts Mr. Mitofsky's distinction between polls and surveys by  
>looking at who is conducting them, then I respectfully suggest that the  
>statement that there are no other distinctions is incorrect. There may  
>be a great many differences between surveys and polls (so defined) with  
>respect to their methodology. Many conducting polls do not schedule  
>callbacks, do not use very many (if any) additional attempts to reach a  
>phone number after an unsuccessful first attempt, and do not attempt  
>refusal conversion. Most, if not all, surveys conducted by and for  
>government and academic institutions use these methods.

>

>Also, where do legitmate marketing research surveys (polls?) fit into  
>this scheme?

>

>At 08:15 AM 7/28/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>>The definition of a poll is very easy. A poll is something done by or  
>>for the media. A survey is something done by academics and government.

>>A poll can become a survey if it is archived at a respectable academic  
>>archive. Otherwise, there are no differences.

>>

>>At 11:39 AM 7/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>>>You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates  
>>>it to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research  
>>>industry and other sponsors, including commercial studies done by  
>>>companies whose names are strongly associated with polling. That is  
>>>not a simple exercise.

>>>

>>>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>>>Voice (610) 408-8800

>>>Fax (610) 408-8802

>>>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>>-----Original Message-----

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

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

>>>Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

>>>Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

>>>Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>>>

>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>AAPORNETters,

>>>>

>>>>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see

>>>>below), please do so, and also please post your reply here on

>>>>AAPORNET, where I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed

>>>>answer to his query.

>>>>

>>>> -- Jim

>>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>>

>>>>----- Forwarded message -----

>>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>>>>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>>>>

>>>>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>>>>

>>>>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

>>>>seeking an estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know

>>>>that marketing research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each

>>>>year. But how about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>>>>

>>>>Thanks a lot,

>>>>Greg Winter

>>>>(407) 420-6941

>>>>

>>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>>

>>>>

>>

>>

>>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

>>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

>>New York, NY 10022



>>

>>212 980-3031

>>212 980-3107 fax

>>

>>e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com

>>

>>

>Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (606)257-4684

>Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (606) 323-1972

>University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771

>403 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu

>Lexington, KY 40506-0056

>

> <http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srhome.htm>

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From HOneill536@aol.com Wed Jul 28 16:04:23 1999

Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.3])

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

id QAA29138 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 16:04:21 -0700

(PDT)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

by imo13.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5KRPa13743 (4467)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jul 1999 19:03:21 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <16d1e38.24d0e639@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 19:03:21 EDT

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

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 21

there's no difference between a poll and a survey except in the minds of those with nothing better to do than examine their navels.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Jul 29 04:39:36 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id EAA20697 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 04:39:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp5.vgernet.net [205.219.186.105])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id HAA08771

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 07:41:18 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37A03DA5.27E9F890@jwdp.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 07:40:21 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

References: <16d1e38.24d0e639@aol.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A poll is an evaluation of opinion in a population derived from a sample or subset.

A survey is an evaluation of something which may or may not be accomplished by sampling a subset and may or may not be related to opinions (e.g., "A Survey of American Literature" or "U.S. Geological Survey").

Thus polls are a specific type of survey, however not all surveys are polls.

It is only in the context of polling that the two can be considered in any way synonymous.

Jan Werner

---

HOneill536@aol.com wrote:

>

> there's no difference between a poll and a survey except in the minds  
> of those with nothing better to do than examine their navels. From

>hschuman@umich.edu Thu Jul 29 05:32:28 1999

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.19])

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

id FAA26588 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 05:32:27 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.94])

by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id  
IAA00046

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:32:26 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)

by qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id IAA16325

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:32:25 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:32:25 -0400 (EDT)

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

In-Reply-To: <16d1e38.24d0e639@aol.com>

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.9907290819290.10181-100000@qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

For those seriously interested (and those not so seriously interested) in the distinction between polls and surveys, the following is an excerpt from an article that appeared in the Roper Center's "The Public Perspective" (April/May 1997, v.8, no.3, pp. 6-7). Apologies for the length of the excerpt, but a deep sociolinguistic investigation cannot be done on a shoestring:

"...the distinction [between polls and surveys is] largely a question of the origin of words and their current use in appealing to different parts of the population.

Our English vocabulary is generally recognized as having two major sources: its original Old English or Anglo-Saxon base, dating from the first millennium after Christ, and the infusion of new words that followed the Norman Conquest in 1066. The earlier period connects English to Germanic roots; the latter derives from Latin, at first indirectly through French and then more directly as scholars and scientists went purposefully to the classical languages in search of new terms.

The two lexical sources often lead to duplication in a literal sense, but with differences in connotation and usage that we all recognize, whether consciously or not. Thus our food comes from cows, pigs, and sheep, words of Anglo-Saxon origin; but once prepared it is transformed into the French beef, pork, and mutton (boeuf, porc, mouton). The barnyard character of the first three words reflects the fact that the conquered Anglo-Saxons tended the farms, while the culinary suggestion of the latter comes from the tables of the conquering Normans. Similarly, we have a set of everyday Anglo-Saxon words for parts of the body--mouth, eye, ear, and the like--and parallel but fancier terms from Latin, such as oral cavity. Perhaps the most divergent connotations of all appear when one considers the four-letter words that make up our store of vulgar expressions. Many of these are Old English words, whereas their polite equivalents are generally and obviously Latinate in character.

As these last examples suggest, words of Anglo-Saxon descent tend to be shorter, often blunter, and seem more ordinary in the sense of mass usage. Words coming from French or Latin convey greater refinement and have

more appeal to the educated ear.

My hypothesis about the distinction between polls and surveys should now be apparent. "Poll" is a four letter word, generally thought to be from an ancient Germanic term referring to "head," as in counting heads. The two-syllable word "survey," on the other hand, comes from the French *survee*, which in turn derives from Latin *super* (over) and *vide-re* (to look). The first is therefore an expression with appeal to a wider public, the intended consumers of results from Gallup, Harris, and other polls. The second fits the needs of academicians in university institutes who wish to emphasize the scientific or scholarly character of their work. Moreover, since the academic investigators perceive themselves to be regarded with some suspicion by their colleagues in the traditional sciences and humanities, it is especially important for them to differentiate their work from the transient poll reports that appear in the mass media. As in many other social contexts, a distinction in names is called upon to help maintain the difference.

Of course, there may be other factors involved as well....The present hypothesis is simply that divergent social meanings play a strong role in maintaining the poll-survey distinction even when all other differences vanish. Moreover, a test of this hypothesis may be close at hand, for recently some commercial organizations have begun to refer to their products as surveys, rather than as polls--an effort at social mobility through renaming, much as occurs in other areas of life. This may make academic researchers somewhat uncomfortable, however, and it will be interesting to see if social necessity leads to new words--or, to translate into Latinate English--additional refinements in terminology."

>From vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu Thu Jul 29 05:51:54 1999

Received: from POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU (POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU [130.91.52.35])

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

id FAA29894 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 05:51:53 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from student75 (130.91.52.32) by POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU with SMTP

(Eudora Internet Mail Server 1.2); Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:57:43 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.1.16.19990729085737.1b0f76f2@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

X-Sender: vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (16)

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:57:37

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Vincent Price <vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

In-Reply-To: <4.1.19990728081246.01c46840@pop.mindspring.com>

References: <001d01bed846\$3796e9a0\$3ecac3d1@default>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

My shot, for what it may be worth:

The word "poll" comes from the Middle English word meaning head. It refers to a "head count," most often associated with elections and voting, the casting of ballots. We refer to the site for election voting as a "polling place" for this reason. In any event, the aim of a poll is generally to register a head count of preferences on matters of community or state= concern.

The word "survey" derives from the Middle English word meaning to "look over" or "view." It is most closely associated with its engineering usage, referring to the act of finding and representing the contours and measures of a given space or region. This is what a civil engineer attempts in making a survey. In social surveys, on the other hand, the "space or region" is some defined population (usually but not exclusively human). The "contours" of common interest are conditions (e.g., age, family size, living conditions, etc.), orientations (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, opinions), or actions (e.g., political behavior, consumer behavior, sexual behavior, etc.) and their interrelationships. Surveys may be based upon a census of the population, but we now generally conflate the term survey with a sample survey. Sample surveys may be either probability-based (generally called ("scientific surveys") or not.

Surveys are thus more general in function than polls. All polls are surveys of a kind, but not all (not even most) surveys are intended as polls. Many "polling organizations" (called so because of their popular connection to election polling and/or relationship to the media, which has long favored the publication of polls on many topics), conduct surveys on many topics as well as polls.

Cheers,

-- Vince=20

At 08:15 AM 7/28/99 -0400, you wrote:

- >The definition of a poll is very easy. A poll is something done by or
- >for the media. A survey is something done by academics and government.
- >A poll can become a survey if it is archived at a respectable academic
- >archive. Otherwise, there are no differences.



>

>At 11:39 AM 7/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>>You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates

>>it to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research

>>industry=

and

>>other sponsors, including commercial studies done by companies whose

>>names are strongly associated with polling. That is not a simple

>>exercise.

>>

>>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>>Voice (610) 408-8800

>>Fax (610) 408-8802

>>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>-----Original Message-----

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

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

>>Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

>>Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

>>Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>>

>>

>>>

>>>

>>>AAPORNETters,

>>>

>>>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see=  
below),

>>>please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET, where

>>>I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to his

>>>query.

>>>

>>> -- Jim

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>----- Forwarded message -----

>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>>>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>>>

>>>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>>>

>>>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

>>>seeking=

an

>>>estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing

>>>research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how

>>>about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>>>

>>>Thanks a lot,

>>>Greg Winter

>>>(407) 420-6941

>>>

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>

>

>

>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL=20

>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor=20

>New York, NY 10022=20

>

>212 980-3031=A0=A0=A0=A0=20

>212 980-3107 fax

>

>e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com =20

>

>

-----

Vincent Price Telephone: (215) 573-1963

Annenberg School for Communication Facsimile: (215) 898-5906

University of Pennsylvania=09

3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

>From vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu Thu Jul 29 06:02:15 1999

Received: from POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU (POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU [130.91.52.35])

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

id GAA02394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 06:02:13 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from student75 (130.91.52.32) by POBOX.ASC.UPENN.EDU with SMTP

(Eudora Internet Mail Server 1.2); Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:08:04 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.1.16.19990729090758.1bd794fc@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

X-Sender: vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (16)

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:07:58

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Vincent Price <vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9907290819290.10181-100000@qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu>

References: <16d1e38.24d0e639@aol.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Just got Howard's message. The one I posted only moments ago is of course similar in spirit, though clearly less thorough in terms of a sociolinguistic analysis. I might have well have waited.

Thanks, Howard, for the reference to the "Public Perspective" article, which certainly I ought to consult.

At 08:32 AM 7/29/99 -0400, you wrote:

>For those seriously interested (and those not so seriously interested)  
>in the distinction between polls and surveys, the following is an  
>excerpt from an article that appeared in the Roper Center's "The Public  
>Perspective" (April/May 1997, v.8, no.3, pp. 6-7). Apologies for the  
>length of the excerpt, but a deep sociolinguistic investigation cannot  
>be done on a shoestring:  
>  
>  
>"...the distinction [between polls and surveys is] largely a question  
>of the origin of words and their current use in appealing to different  
>parts of the population.  
> Our English vocabulary is generally recognized as having two major

>sources: its original Old English or Anglo-Saxon base, dating from the  
>first millennium after Christ, and the infusion of new words that  
>followed the Norman Conquest in 1066. The earlier period connects  
>English to Germanic roots; the latter derives from Latin, at first  
>indirectly through French and then more directly as scholars and  
>scientists went purposefully to the classical languages in search of new  
terms.

> The two lexical sources often lead to duplication in a literal sense,  
>but with differences in connotation and usage that we all recognize,  
>whether consciously or not. Thus our food comes from cows, pigs, and  
>sheep, words of Anglo-Saxon origin; but once prepared it is transformed  
>into the French beef, pork, and mutton (boeuf, porc, mouton). The  
>barnyard character of the first three words reflects the fact that the  
>conquered Anglo-Saxons tended the farms, while the culinary suggestion  
>of the latter comes from the tables of the conquering Normans.  
>Similarly, we have a set of everyday Anglo-Saxon words for parts of the  
>body--mouth, eye, ear, and the like--and parallel but fancier terms  
>from Latin, such as oral cavity. Perhaps the most divergent  
>connotations of all appear when one considers the four-letter words  
>that make up our store of vulgar expressions. Many of these are Old  
>English words, whereas their polite equivalents are generally and obviously  
Linate in character.

> As these last examples suggest, words of Anglo-Saxon descent tend to  
>be shorter, often blunter, and seem more ordinary in the sense of mass  
>usage. Words coming from French or Latin convey greater refinement and  
>have more appeal to the educated ear.

> My hypothesis about the distinction between polls and surveys should  
>now be apparent. "Poll" is a four letter word, generally thought to be  
>from an ancient Germanic term referring to "head," as in counting

>heads. The two-syllable word "survey," on the other hand, comes from  
>the French *survee*, which in turn derives from Latin *super* (over) and  
>*vide-re* (to look). The first is therefore an expression with appeal to  
>a wider public, the intended consumers of results from Gallup, Harris,  
>and other polls. The second fits the needs of academicians in  
>university institutes who wish to emphasize the scientific or scholarly  
>character of their work. Moreover, since the academic investigators  
>perceive themselves to be regarded with some suspicion by their  
>colleagues in the traditional sciences and humanities, it especially  
>important for them to differentiate their work from the transient poll  
>reports that appear in the mass media. As in many other social  
>contexts, a distinction in names is called upon to help maintain the  
difference.

> Of course, there may be other factors involved as well....The present  
>hypothesis is simply that divergent social meanings play a strong role  
>in maintaining the poll-survey distinction even when all other  
>differences vanish. Moreover, a test of this hypothesis may be close  
>at hand, for recently some commercial organizations have begun to refer  
>to their products as surveys, rather than as polls--an effort at social  
>mobility through renaming, much as occurs in other areas of life. This  
>may make academic researchers somewhat uncomfortable, however, and it  
>will be interesting to see if social necessity leads to new words--or,  
>to translate into Latinate English--additional refinements in  
>terminology."

>

>

>

>

-----

Vincent Price Telephone: (215) 573-1963  
Annenberg School for Communication Facsimile: (215) 898-5906  
University of Pennsylvania  
3620 Walnut Street E-mail address:  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6220 vprice@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

>From bthompson@directionrsch.com Thu Jul 29 06:06:15 1999  
Received: from proxy.directionrsch.com (root@dri74.directionrsch.com  
[206.112.196.74])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id GAA03576 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 06:06:14 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from drione.directionrsch.com (drione.directionrsch.com  
[100.0.0.4])  
by proxy.directionrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id JAA26087  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:07:34 -0400  
Received: by drione.directionrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2  
10-16-1998)) id 852567BD.0047D92A ; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:04:46 -0400  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI  
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionrsch.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-ID: <852567BD.0047D788.00@drione.directionrsch.com>  
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:04:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Disposition: inline

Leave it to Harry to once again come up with the bottom line.

Thanks, Harry!

HOneill536@aol.com on 07/28/99 07:03:21 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

there's no difference between a poll and a survey except in the minds of those with nothing better to do than examine their navels.



>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jul 29 06:59:08 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id GAA13633 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 06:59:07 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id GAA10311 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 06:59:07 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 06:59:07 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: NIGHTLINE ON HMO ADVERTISING

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907290647050.8256-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

AAPORNETheads,

The following message comes, via a personal contact, from Nightline, the ABC television news program. If you think yourself qualified to be interviewed and wish to be, feel free to contact ABC and ask to speak to the producer for their piece on advertising and HMO reform. I'm afraid that I am not at liberty to give more specific information about whom to contact, for which I apologize.

-- Jim

-----  
Nightline is planning a program soon on the advertising campaigns over HMO reform. They are particularly interested in anyone who has done research on the previous campaigns (i.e. Harry and Louise) , or looked at the impact of advertising on HMO political debates. They are also interested in your views about the current advertising campaign that has been going aimed at the congressional debate over HMO reform.  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu Jul 29 07:24:16 1999

Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])

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

id HAA19584 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 07:24:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login0.isis.unc.edu (login0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.130])

by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA18751

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:24:14 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <63558-74042>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:24:07 -0400

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:24:00 -0400 (EDT)

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

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

X-Sender: pmeyer@login0.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

In-Reply-To: <3.0.1.16.19990729090758.1bd794fc@pobox.asc.upenn.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990729102317.138296C-100000@login0.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Now I see the difference! I'm a survey researcher and you're a pollster.

=====  
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>  
=====

>From daves@startribune.com Thu Jul 29 07:41:34 1999

Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com  
[132.148.80.211])

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

id HAA23011 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 07:41:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id JAA10345; Thu, 29 Jul 1999

09:48:57 -0500

Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by

firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V4.2)

id xma010088; Thu, 29 Jul 99 09:48:42 -0500

Received: from STAR-Message\_Server by mail.startribune.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:39:53 -0600

Message-Id: <s7a02169.078@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:39:20 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Only a survey researcher, Phil? Those of us with our snoots slightly =  
higher in the air prefer public opinion research pratitioner over the =  
other two. It has more words, most of which come to us from the Latin or =  
French, so it must be better. The moniker clearly carries more clout: =  
"I'm a public opinion research pratitioner, but my competitor, alas, is a =  
pollster."

Cheers.

Rob Daves

-----

Rob Daves

Director of Polling & News Research

Star Tribune v: 612-673-7278

425 Portland Av. S. f: 612-673-4359

Minneapolis MN 55488 e: daves@startribune.com

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Thu Jul 29 08:37:36 1999

Received: from imo29.mx.aol.com (imo29.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.73])

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

id IAA07929 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:37:34 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo29.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 2SNGa06267 (3994);

Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:36:04 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <664cfa3c.24d1cee4@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:36:04 EDT

Subject: Fwd: Internet Penetration Among Households and Businesses

To: s.kraus@notesmail2.csuohio.edu

CC: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1\_664cfa3c.24d1cee4\_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 22

--part1\_664cfa3c.24d1cee4\_boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sid:

The attached has taken a very circuitous route since it was first sent to Shawn McNulty in reply to his AAPORNET query. When neither I nor the folks at aapornet@usc.edu were able to transmit it to him via Ohio State's mechanism for handling e-mail, I remembered being able to get past that when I replied to your question about Don't Know responses.

If you would do me the kindness either of forwarding to Shawn what I'm now sending to you or simply e-mailing me Shawn's e-mail address, I'd be most grateful.

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

--part1\_664cfa3c.24d1cee4\_boundary

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Disposition: inline

Return-path: PAHARDING7@aol.com

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Full-name: PAHARDING7

Message-ID: <7746d3a3.24d091cf@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 13:03:11 EDT

Subject: Internet Penetration Among Households and Businesses

To: smcnulty@haglerbailly.com

CC: 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 22

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a

web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites, number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

--part1\_664cfa3c.24d1cee4\_boundary--

>From mark@bisconti.com Thu Jul 29 08:49:54 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id IAA12312 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:49:53 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip28.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.214.28])  
by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service  
Version 5.5.2232.9)

id 37Y631KZ; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:49:43 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:34:13 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEECEKCHAA.mark@bisconti.com>

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 IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <s7a02169.078@mail.startribune.com>

I'm definitely glad to know the difference between polling and surveying;  
this has been an item of real concern for the past decade while I was  
thoroughly examining my navel. As you'll recall, George Washington  
"surveyed" the area now known as "Washington," so we have a proud lineage,  
directly tied to Revolution. Some days I like to be a "public consultation  
or participation practitioner" (depending on how much decision-making power  
the client wants to or must share with "their" public); as such, I can build  
opinion research (public or otherwise) into the range of things I can do...  
polling, surveying, focusing... never a boring moment. You survey research



practitioners (SRPs) are funny, it's been a long week, i need that. PS--how does "sondages" (the French word) fit into all this?

Mark Richards

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Rob

Daves

Sent: Thursday, July 29, 1999 11:39 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Only a survey researcher, Phil? Those of us with our snoots slightly higher in the air prefer public opinion research pratitioner over the other two. It has more words, most of which come to us from the Latin or French, so it must be better. The moniker clearly carries more clout: "I'm a public opinion research pratitioner, but my competitor, alas, is a pollster."

Cheers.

Rob Daves

-----

Rob Daves

Director of Polling & News Research

Star Tribune v: 612-673-7278

425 Portland Av. S. f: 612-673-4359

Minneapolis MN 55488 e: daves@startribune.com

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Thu Jul 29 08:52:01 1999

Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69])

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

id IAA13635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:51:59 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo25.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 2TCTa16296 (3994);

Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:51:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <25beabc0.24d1d27b@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:51:23 EDT

Subject: Re: your (Phil Harding's) problem

To: s.kraus@notesmail2.csuohio.edu

CC: 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 22

Sid:

The requested clarification is contained in a mailing sent off literally minutes ago and before I'd gotten to your note. I'd have done better to wait, but I really didn't know that aapornet@usc.edu and I had been on the same page as to how best to try to reach Shawn.

Thanks much

Phil

>From dkb@casro.org Thu Jul 29 08:52:21 1999

Received: from mail.saturn5.net (mail.saturn5.net [207.122.105.6])

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

id IAA13729 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:52:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from diane ([207.122.105.205]) by mail.saturn5.net

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-59533U600L2S100V35)

with SMTP id net for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:48:08 -0400

Message-ID: <000901bed9da\$d84a52c0\$cd697acf@diane>

From: dkb@casro.org ((CASRO) Diane Bowers)

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:55:55 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Let me see, using Harry's position, if I'm a pollster that means I'm counting the number of navels, and if I'm a survey researcher, I'm determining the number of innsies and outsies among them. So, that also means that contemplation of navels falls in the qualitative region?

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

From: Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>

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

Date: Thursday, July 29, 1999 10:40 AM

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Only a survey researcher, Phil? Those of us with our snoots slightly higher in the air prefer public opinion research practitioner over the other two. It has more words, most of which come to us from the Latin or French, so it must be better. The moniker clearly carries more clout: "I'm a public opinion research practitioner, but my competitor, alas, is a pollster."

Cheers.

Rob Daves

-----

Rob Daves

Director of Polling & News Research

Star Tribune                   v: 612-673-7278

425 Portland Av. S.       f: 612-673-4359

Minneapolis MN 55488   e: daves@startribune.com

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Thu Jul 29 09:34:05 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id JAA00143 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:34:04 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp2x29.chesco.com [209.195.202.157])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id MAA10250

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 12:33:58 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <004701bed9df\$cf83ac40\$9dcac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 12:31:27 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I feel that the distinction described by Vincent Price is very useful --  
even worthy of "archiving"!

My take is that a poll is a process of enumeration, with or without  
sampling, of "pro or con" (or similar measures) on a specific issue ("Are  
you for or against \_\_\_\_\_?"), the results of which are considered  
authoritative or normative -- as when they reflect or predict a legislative  
or electoral outcome, or a statement of public opinion. Polls generally do  
not attempt to identify or measure the underlying dynamics (causes,  
whatever) accounting for the results measured.

Surveys, in our world, usually do involve sampling, are usually descriptive or exploratory (e.g. start with a topic rather than an issue), and are often undertaken to obtain knowledge about the incidence, correlates and consequences of a particular phenomenon.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: (CASRO) Diane Bowers <dkb@casro.org>

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

Date: Thursday, July 29, 1999 11:53 AM

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

>Let me see, using Harry's position, if I'm a pollster that means I'm  
>counting the number of navels, and if I'm a survey researcher, I'm  
>determining the number of innsies and outsies among them. So, that  
>also means that contemplation of navels falls in the qualitative  
>region? -----Original Message-----

>From: Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>

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

>Date: Thursday, July 29, 1999 10:40 AM

>Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

>

>

>Only a survey researcher, Phil? Those of us with our snoots slightly

higher

>in the air prefer public opinion research practitioner over the other

>two.

It

>has more words, most of which come to us from the Latin or French, so it

>must be better. The moniker clearly carries more clout: "I'm a public

>opinion research practitioner, but my competitor, alas, is a pollster."

>

>Cheers.

>

>Rob Daves

>-----

>

>Rob Daves

>Director of Polling & News Research

>Star Tribune v: 612-673-7278

>425 Portland Av. S. f: 612-673-4359

>Minneapolis MN 55488 e: daves@startribune.com

>

>

>

>

>From worc@mori.com Thu Jul 29 09:57:34 1999

Received: from finch-post-10.mail.demon.net (finch-post-10.mail.demon.net

[194.217.242.38])

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

id JAA10651 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 09:57:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from worc.demon.co.uk ([194.222.4.107] helo=worc)  
by finch-post-10.mail.demon.net with smtp (Exim 2.12 #1)  
id 119sda-000K6V-0A; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:02:31 +0000  
Message-ID: <037501bed9d9\$939d4c0\$6b04dec2@worc.demon.co.uk>  
From: "Robert M Worcester" <worc@mori.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Roger Mortimore" <roger.mortimore@mori.com>  
Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"  
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:46:05 +0100  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I guess we all have our difference interpretations and definition, tongue in cheek or not.

I differ from each of these definitions, and have I guess done so for years. Much as I hate to enter into an AAPOR ding-dong from abroad, my definition (British Public Opinion: A Guide to the History and Methodology of Political Opinion Polling, Blackwells, 1991) is as follows:

'I define an opinion poll as a "representative survey of a defined population'. I go on to differentiate between surveys generally and polls specifically, by the end use, which in the case of polls is the intended



publication of the findings.

Butler and King (The British General Election of 1964, Macmillan, 1965), said 'Polling is after all only a systematic expansion of reporting.'

Former Prime Minister, the late Lord (Harold), Wilson, in his Presidential Address to the Market Research Society of Great Britain in 1978, defined private polling for a political party as 'political market research'.

My view is that all quantitative research asking people to answer questions about their behaviour, knowledge and/or views is 'survey research', and that client, methodology and archiving has nothing to do with it.

Public opinion polls are surveys done with the primary objective of the findings being published and/or broadcast, no matter their commissioning agency, media, government, business or NGO/charity.

Private opinion polls are done for political parties/advocacy groups, which may or not ever be published, but that is not their prime objective,

Market research is survey research (and other types of research) which use interviews to assess the market for an company, product or service, again usually not for publication and in any case publication is not the prime objective.

We say in our latest book, Worcester & Mortimore, 'Explaining Labour's Landslide' (Politico's, 1999), "What polls (and I use the term more or less interchangeable with 'surveys', although there are those who use 'polls' only to describe 'political' soundings)...".

I certainly agree with Warren's second go at this subject, and can't agree with Harry that it isn't important; if we could agree, then we might begin to teach the media how to differentiate between good surveys/polls, and 'voodoo' polls, which plague all good survey researchers, whether employed by government, academia, NGO or the private sector!

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

From: Ronald E. Langley <langley@pop.uky.edu>

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

Date: 28 July 1999 14:01

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

If one accepts Mr. Mitofsky's distinction between polls and surveys by looking at who is conducting them, then I respectfully suggest that the statement that there are no other distinctions is incorrect. There may be a great many differences between surveys and polls (so defined) with respect to their methodology. Many conducting polls do not schedule callbacks, do not use very many (if any) additional attempts to reach a phone number after an unsuccessful first attempt, and do not attempt refusal conversion. Most, if not all, surveys conducted by and for government and academic institutions use these methods.

Also, where do legitimate marketing research surveys (polls?) fit into this scheme?

At 08:15 AM 7/28/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>The definition of a poll is very easy. A poll is something done by or  
>for the media. A survey is something done by academics and government.  
>A poll can become a survey if it is archived at a respectable academic  
>archive. Otherwise, there are no differences.

>

>At 11:39 AM 7/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>>You need a definition of "polling" -- specifically, one that relates  
>>it to the types of surveys that are conducted by the market research  
>>industry  
and  
>>other sponsors, including commercial studies done by companies whose  
>>names are strongly associated with polling. That is not a simple  
>>exercise.

>>

>>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>>Voice (610) 408-8800

>>Fax (610) 408-8802

>>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>-----Original Message-----

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

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

>>Cc: Greg.Winter@wsj.com <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

>>Date: Tuesday, July 27, 1999 10:36 AM

>>Subject: Might You Help the WSJ?

>>

>>

>>>

>>>

>>>AAPORNETters,

>>>

>>>If any of you can help Wall Street Journal writer Greg Winter (see below),

>>>please do so, and also please post your reply here on AAPORNET, where

>>>I'm sure most of us would welcome having an informed answer to his

>>>query.

>>>

>>> -- Jim

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>----- Forwarded message -----

>>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 18:48:56 -0400

>>>From: "Winter, Greg" <Greg.Winter@wsj.com>

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

>>>

>>>Dear Prof. Beniger,

>>>

>>>I am a reporter with the Wall Street Journal who is desperately

>>>seeking

an

>>>estimate of the size of the polling industry. I know that marketing

>>>research, for example, runs about \$5 billion each year. But how

>>>about polling? Can you give me an estimate?

>>>

>>>Thanks a lot,

>>>Greg Winter

>>>(407) 420-6941

>>>

>>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>>

>>>

>

>

>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

>New York, NY 10022

>

>212 980-3031

>212 980-3107 fax

>

>e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com

>

>

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (606)257-4684

Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (606) 323-1972

University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771

403 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu

Lexington, KY 40506-0056

<http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srchome.htm>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jul 29 10:03:08 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id KAA14580 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:03:07 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id KAA24579 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:03:06 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:03:06 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

In-Reply-To: <004701bed9df\$cf83ac40\$9dcac3d1@default>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907290955550.4848-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Thu, 29 Jul 1999, James P. Murphy wrote:

> My take is that a poll is a process of enumeration, with or without  
> sampling,

The phrase "with or without sampling" makes no sense, because "without sampling" can mean only one of three things:

1. an nonrandom or unscientific sample
2. a 100-percent sample or census
3. a 0-percent sample (sitting on one's hands)

All three cases are easily called a "sample," as you have just seen.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Thu Jul 29 10:14:47 1999

Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])

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

id KAA20096 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:14:45 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo19.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 2JDZa06251 (4257);

Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:13:32 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <da8257f5.24d1e5bb@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:13:31 EDT

Subject: (no subject)

To: s.kraus@notesmail2.csuohio.edu

CC: 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 22

Sid:

In sequence, here are the four e-mails sent-out and hurled back by Ohio

State

in connection with Shawn McNulty's request for internet-access data. First,

though, the standard greeting-cum- rejection from the qmail-send program at

is1.net.ohio-state.edu.:

"Hi. This is [the program]. I'm afraid I wasn't able to deliver your message to the following addresses. This is a permanent error; I've given up. Sorry it didn't work out.

<ts7072@ohstmvs.uts.ohio-state.edu>:

E-Mail no longer supported on the Mainframe"

1. First try:

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites, number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some



help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

2. Then, to aapornet@usc.edu:

It appears that only you possess the key to Ohio State's e-mail system. I had exactly this problem when I wrote to Sid Kraus about some question he raised via AAPORNET.

Then I had his personal e-mail address; here I don't, so I wonder if you'd do me the kindness of sending either the cc to aapornet@usc.edu of my letter to

Shawn or a forward of this.

Thanks much.

paharding7@aol.com (Phil Harding)

3. Next, and without the knowledge that aapornet had been in touch with you:

Sid:

The attached has taken a very circuitous route since it was first sent to Shawn McNulty in reply to his AAPORNET query. When neither I nor the folks at aapornet@usc.edu were able to transmit it to him via Ohio State's mechanism for handling e-mail, I remembered being able to get past that when I replied to your question about

Don't Know responses.

If you would do me the kindness either of forwarding to Shawn what I'm now sending to you or simply e-mailing me Shawn's e-mail address, I'd be most grateful.

Phil Harding  
paharding7@aol.com

-----

Forwarded Message:

Subj: Internet Penetration Among Households and Businesses

Date: 7/28/99 1:03:11 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: PAHARDING7

To: smcnulty@haglerbailly.com

CC: aapornet@usc.edu

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a

web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites, number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

4. And, finally, again to you:

Sid:

The requested clarification is contained in a mailing sent off literally

minutes ago and before I'd gotten to your note. I'd have done better to wait, but I really didn't know that aapornet@usc.edu and I had been on the same page as to how best to try to reach Shawn.

Thanks much

Phil

\*

And that, Sid, is the history to this point of what may well be a continuing

saga if this doesn't make it through your e-mail address. It's the one I've

been using (s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu), it's the return address on the e-mail you sent me this morning, but none of that has seemed to much matter.

At least, with this letter, the correspondence is all in one place, which will surely facilitate, among other things, post-mortem collection of my papers.

Phil

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Thu Jul 29 10:20:04 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id KAA22333 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:20:03 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp2x29.chesco.com [209.195.202.157])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA18699

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:20:00 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <005401bed9e6\$3e6897a0\$9dcac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:17:30 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Referring to a census as a "100 percent sample" in order to make the point intended is a little lame. The fact is that there are lots of polls in which everyone's opinion (vote, whatever) is obtained.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Thursday, July 29, 1999 1:04 PM

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

>

>

>On Thu, 29 Jul 1999, James P. Murphy wrote:

>

>> My take is that a poll is a process of enumeration, with or without

>> sampling,

>

>The phrase "with or without sampling" makes no sense, because "without

>sampling" can mean only one of three things:

>

> 1. an nonrandom or unscientific sample

> 2. a 100-percent sample or census

> 3. a 0-percent sample (sitting on one's hands)

>

>All three cases are easily called a "sample," as you have just seen.

>

>

> -- Jim

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Thu Jul 29 10:31:43 1999

Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])

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

id KAA26564 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:31:42 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo12.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5FDDa05141 (3996);

Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:30:39 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <fa3efe43.24d1e9be@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:30:38 EDT

Subject: Fwd: failure notice

To: aapornet@usc.edu

CC: NiceElwood@aol.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1\_fa3efe43.24d1e9be\_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 22

--part1\_fa3efe43.24d1e9be\_boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

You apparently have a way of getting in touch with Sid Kraus by e-mail,  
which

I clearly do not. Would you -- could you -- do your very best to put in his

hands this latest stab (rejected, as have been all its predecessors) at  
bringing order to the Shawn McNulty affair? It would save not only my time  
but what remains of my mind  
as well.

Many, many thanks.

Phil Harding  
paharding7@aol.com

--part1\_fa3efe43.24d1e9be\_boundary

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Disposition: inline

Return-Path: <>

Received: from aol.com (rly-za04.mail.aol.com [172.31.36.100]) by  
air-za03.mail.aol.com (v60.18) with ESMTP; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:15:23  
-0400

Received: from is1.net.ohio-state.edu (is1.net.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.48.8]) by rly-za04.mx.aol.com (v60.18) with ESMTP; Thu, 29  
Jul 1999 13:15:10 -0400

Received: (qmail 29217 invoked for bounce); 29 Jul 1999 17:15:10 -0000

Date: 29 Jul 1999 17:15:10 -0000

From: MAILER-DAEMON@is1.net.ohio-state.edu

To: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Subject: failure notice

Hi. This is the qmail-send program at is1.net.ohio-state.edu. I'm afraid I  
wasn't able to deliver your message to the following addresses. This is a  
permanent error; I've given up. Sorry it didn't work out.

<ts7072@ohstmvs.uts.ohio-state.edu>:

E-Mail no longer supported on the Mainframe

--- Below this line is a copy of the message.



Return-Path: <PAHARDING7@aol.com>

Received: (qmail 29213 invoked from network); 29 Jul 1999 17:15:10 -0000

Received: from orb1.osu.edu (128.146.225.191)

by is1.net.ohio-state.edu with SMTP; 29 Jul 1999 17:15:10 -0000

Received: (qmail 12591 invoked by alias); 29 Jul 1999 13:15:09 -0400

Received: (qmail 12537 invoked by uid 0); 29 Jul 1999 13:15:08 -0400

Received: from usc.edu (@128.125.253.136)

by orb1.osu.edu with SMTP; 29 Jul 1999 13:15:08 -0400

Received: from usc.edu (localhost [127.0.0.1])

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

id KAA20372; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:15:06 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])

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

id KAA20096 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:14:45 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo19.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 2JDZa06251 (4257);

Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:13:32 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <da8257f5.24d1e5bb@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:13:31 EDT

Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

Precedence: bulk

X-PH: V4.4@orb1

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

To: s.kraus@notesmail2.csuohio.edu

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: (no subject)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 22

X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Sid:

In sequence, here are the four e-mails sent-out and hurled back by Ohio State

in connection with Shawn McNulty's request for internet-access data. First,

though, the standard greeting-cum- rejection from the qmail-send program at is1.net.ohio-state.edu.:

"Hi. This is [the program]. I'm afraid I wasn't able to deliver your message to the following addresses. This is a permanent error; I've given up. Sorry it didn't work out.

<ts7072@ohstmvs.uts.ohio-state.edu>:

E-Mail no longer supported on the Mainframe"

1. First try:

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites, number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

2. Then, to aapornet@usc.edu:

It appears that only you possess the key to Ohio State's e-mail system. I had exactly this problem when I wrote to Sid Kraus about some question he raised via AAPORNET.

Then I had his personal e-mail address; here I don't, so I wonder if you'd do me the kindness of sending either the cc to aapornet@usc.edu of my letter to Shawn or a forward of this.

Thanks much.

paharding7@aol.com (Phil Harding)

3. Next, and without the knowledge that aapornet had been in touch with you:

Sid:

The attached has taken a very circuitous route since it was first sent to Shawn McNulty in reply to his AAPORNET query. When neither I nor the folks at aapornet@usc.edu were able to transmit it to him via Ohio State's mechanism for handling e-mail, I remembered being able to get past that when I replied to your question about

Don't Know responses.

If you would do me the kindness either of forwarding to Shawn what I'm now sending to you or simply e-mailing me Shawn's e-mail address, I'd be most grateful.

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

-----

Forwarded Message:

Subj: Internet Penetration Among Households and Businesses

Date: 7/28/99 1:03:11 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: PAHARDING7

To: smcnulty@haglerbailly.com

CC: aapornet@usc.edu

Shawn:

There's less than perfect agreement as to the current percentage of households with access to the internet. Nielsen Media Research maintains a web-site at:

<http://www.nielsen-netratings.com/> which, as the name suggests, shows some teaser data to get prospective clients interested in Nielsen NetRatings, its

syndicated internet-usage service. These publicly available data may be all

you need; they're based on a panel operation (like that on which Nielsen bases its national television ratings) and your colleague, should he or she so desire, can look at more than just access (trends, most popular sites, number of hits, maybe demo breaks, and so on.)

As for business access to the internet, I confess to having no clue. For all

I know, one of the many Nielsen Media Research websites can give you some help. My own inclination would be turn to that firm again, but this time just as a guide to get you started. Its president is Mr. John Dimling; if

you call his office in New York City, you'll receive I think, a helpful and courteous response from his secretary/assistant. It won't be necessary to try to talk with Mr. Dimling directly.

Good luck.

paharding7@aol.com (Philip A. Harding)

4. And, finally, again to you:

Sid:

The requested clarification is contained in a mailing sent off literally minutes ago and before I'd gotten to your note. I'd have done better to wait, but I really didn't know that aapornet@usc.edu and I had been on the same page as to how best to try to reach Shawn.

Thanks much

Phil

\*

And that, Sid, is the history to this point of what may well be a continuing

saga if this doesn't make it through your e-mail address. It's the one I've

been using (s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu), it's the return address on the e-mail you sent me this morning, but none of that has seemed to much matter.

At least, with this letter, the correspondence is all in one place, which will surely facilitate, among other things, post-mortem collection of my papers.

Phil

--part1\_fa3efe43.24d1e9be\_boundary--

>From mas2@christa.unh.edu Thu Jul 29 11:06:37 1999

Received: from christa.unh.edu (christa.unh.edu [132.177.137.10])

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

id LAA10604 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:06:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from straus.unh.edu (faculty3-cis0167.unh.edu [132.177.92.167])

by christa.unh.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA24238

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 14:06:33 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <009f01bed9ed\$8f7c09e0\$a75cb184@straus.unh.edu>

Reply-To: "Murray A. Straus" <mas2@christa.unh.edu>

From: "Murray A. Straus" <mas2@christa.unh.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Suggestions for a general contractor for a multi-nation survey

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 14:09:54 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_009C\_01BED9CC.07FE1380"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3612.1700

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3612.1700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_009C\_01BED9CC.07FE1380

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I am looking for help in finding an organization that would act as a general contractor who arrange contracts with survey research organizations in as many countries as possible to replicate a survey I plan. The general contractor would also coordinate and monitor the work, and deliver a cleaned data file in SPSS format. So, if you are part of an organization that could be the general contractor, or can suggest an organization to me, I will be very appreciative.

This request arises because I have been invited by an anonymous donor (honestly!) to submit a application for funds to support the research I have in mind. At this point, the potential donor requires a concept paper from me and a ball park estimate form a survey research organization. However, it is needed next week! Obviously, the estimate will necessarily be very rough.

I would like a ball part cost estimate for two different levels of work. One level would be a 20-30 minute survey in each country. The other level would be a 5 question add-on to be included in omnibus surveys or surveys conducted for other purposes. (I contacted the International Social Survey about an add-on, but their schedule is booked too many years in advance.) I



do not know which, if either, this donor will decide to support

The topic of the study is spanking children by parents, i.e. legal corporal punishment. For the five question add-on option, there will be a question on approval of spanking, two questions on corporal punishment experienced by the respondent as a child, and two questions on the respondents' spanking of their own children. The 20-30 minute stand-alone survey would include more detail about corporal punishment and also questions to test theories about etiology and effects.

I have been heavily involved in research on corporal punishment by parents in the last few years and published a book on it in 1994 (*Beating The Devil Out of Them: Corporal Punishment in American Families*), and my research on this issue is widely recognized. I am appending a bio-summary at the end of this e mail for your information.

I plan to do both the usual types of statistical analysis (regression, anova, etc) with the individual respondents as the units of study, and also "macro" or "aggregate" level analyses. In the latter, the units of study are the nations. If, for example, the survey is replicated in 23 countries, that mode of analysis will have an N of 23. For this reason it is essential that the study be replicated in as many nations as possible. I have considerable experience with macro level analysis (three books and a number of journal articles) and I am familiar with the problems and willing to tolerate them and to be flexible. For example, it is likely that in some countries, the survey may have to be restricted to major cities, in which case I would restrict the cross-national comparisons to comparing cities.

A complication is that the respondents must be parents of a child from birth

through age 17 and living at home. This would require screening for the 20-30 minute survey. If the add-on question approach is used, it would require tacking the questions on to surveys until there was a large enough N of respondents with children. "Large enough" for this research means an N of 1,000 in each country. This size is needed in order to estimate the rate of corporal punishment for children of each age.

In summary, what I need right now is (1) How many nations are likely to be included for the 5 question add-on, and for the 20-30 minute interview. (2) Ball park cost estimates for the 20-30 surveys of 1,000 parents in each country, and for the add-on questions in enough surveys in each country to have an N of 1,000 respondents with children living at home. If the donor is favorable based on the concept paper, there will be time for the survey general contractor to develop a specific price.

I hope someone can get back to me soon on this.

Thanks,

Murray A. Straus, Professor of Sociology  
& Co-Director, Family Research Laboratory  
University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824  
Phone: 603 862-2594 Fax: 603 862-1122  
E-mail MAS2@CHRISTA.UNH.EDU

See the Family Research Laboratory web site <http://www.unh.edu/fri> for bibliography of books and papers by members of the lab, conference announcements, and information about the lab faculty and research program.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY -- MURRAY A. STRAUS

Professor of Sociology, founder and Co-Director of the Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire (since 1968). Previously taught at the Universities of Minnesota, Cornell, Wisconsin, Washington State, York (England) Bombay (India), and the University of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka).

EDUCATION: Ph.D. in Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1956.

### OFFICES IN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES:

- \* President, Society For the Study of Social Problems (1989-90)
  
- \* President, Eastern Sociological Society (1991-92. and Vice President 1976-77)
  
- \* President, National Council on Family Relations (1972-3)
  
- \* Member of the Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science  
(1971-73)
  
- \* Chairperson of Task Force on Corporal Punishment of the American Psychological Association, Division 37, 1992-94
  
- \* Member of the National Academy of Sciences panel reviewing research on child maltreatment, 1992-93

### OTHER HONORS:

- \* Ernest W. Burgess Award of the National Council of Family Relations for

outstanding

research on the family in 1977

\* American Sociological Association award for contributions to  
undergraduate teaching in

1979.

\* Distinguished Contribution Award, New Hampshire Psychological Society,  
1992

\* Citizen Of The Year, National Association of Social Workers, NH chapter,  
1994

\* Research Career Achievement Award, American Professional Society on the  
Abuse of  
Children, 1994

PUBLICATIONS: Author or co-author of over 200 articles on the family,  
research methods, and

South Asia; and fifteen books including:

\* Understanding Partner Violence. National Council on Family Relations,  
1995

\* Stress, Culture, and Aggression. Yale University Press, 1995

\* Beating the Devil Out of Them: Corporal Punishment In American Families.  
Lexington/Jossey-Bass, 1994

\* Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to  
Violence in

8,1145 Families. Transaction Press, 1990

\* Four Theories of Rape In American Society: A State Level Analysis, Yale,  
1989. To be

reprinted in late 1993 in paperback

\* Handbook Of Family Measurement Techniques. Sage 1990 (previous ed., 1969,  
1978)

- \* Intimate Violence: The causes and Consequences of Abuse In the American Family. Simon and Schuster, 1988
- \* Social Stress in the United States. Auburn House/Greenwood, 1986
- \* Crime and the Family. C.C. Thomas, 1985
- \* The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research. Sage, 1983
- \* The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence. Univ.of Minn Press, 1980.
- \* Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Doubleday, 1980
- \* Sociological Analysis. Harper and Row, 1968

STATISTICS: Born June 18, 1926. Married, 2 children. Social Security Number 395-22-5903

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_009C\_01BED9CC.07FE1380

Content-Type: text/plain;

name="BIO-SUMF.TXT"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: attachment;

filename="BIO-SUMF.TXT"

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY -- MURRAY A. STRAUS

Professor of Sociology, founder and Co-Director of the Family Research = Laboratory, University of New Hampshire (since 1968). Previously taught at the = Universities of Minnesota, Cornell, Wisconsin, Washington State, York (England) Bombay (India), and = the University of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka).

EDUCATION: Ph.D. in Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1956.

#### OFFICES IN SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES:

- \* President, Society For the Study of Social Problems (1989-90)
  
- \* President, Eastern Sociological Society (1991-92. and Vice =  
President 1976-77)
  
- \* President, National Council on Family Relations (1972-3)
  
- \* Member of the Council of the American Association for the Advancement =  
of Science  
(1971-73)
  
- \* Chairperson of Task Force on Corporal Punishment of the American =  
Psychological  
Association, Division 37, 1992-94
  
- \* Member of the National Academy of Sciences panel reviewing research = on  
child  
maltreatment, 1992-93

#### OTHER HONORS:

- \* Ernest W. Burgess Award of the National Council of Family Relations = for  
outstanding  
research on the family in 1977
  
- \* American Sociological Association award for contributions to =  
undergraduate teaching in  
1979.
  
- \* Distinguished Contribution Award, New Hampshire Psychological = Society,  
1992
  
- \* Citizen Of The Year, National Association of Social Workers, NH =

chapter, 1994

\* Research Career Achievement Award, American Professional Society on = the Abuse of Children, 1994

PUBLICATIONS: Author or co-author of over 200 articles on the family, = research methods, and =20

South Asia; and fifteen books including:

\* Understanding Partner Violence. National Council on Family = Relations, 1995

\* Stress, Culture, and Aggression. Yale University Press, 1995

\* Beating the Devil Out of Them: Corporal Punishment In American = Families.

Lexington/Jossey-Bass, 1994

\* Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations = to Violence in

8,1145 Families. Transaction Press, 1990

\* Four Theories of Rape In American Society: A State Level Analysis, = Yale, 1989. To be

reprinted in late 1993 in paperback

\* Handbook Of Family Measurement Techniques. Sage 1990 (previous ed., = 1969, 1978)

\* Intimate Violence: The causes and Consequences of Abuse In the = American Family. Simon

and Schuster, 1988

\* Social Stress in the United States. Auburn House/Greenwood, 1986

\* Crime and the Family. C.C. Thomas, 1985

\* The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research. Sage, = 1983

\* The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence. Univ.of Minn Press, 1980.

\* Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Doubleday, 1980

\* Sociological Analysis. Harper and Row, 1968

STATISTICS: Born June 18, 1926. Married, 2 children. Social Security =  
Number 395-22-5903

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_009C\_01BED9CC.07FE1380--

>From HOneill536@aol.com Thu Jul 29 13:08:35 1999

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

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

id NAA29461 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:08:34 -0700

(PDT)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

by imo27.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5PKDa01390 (4184)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:07:13 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <b71b54b0.24d20e71@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:07:13 EDT

Subject: Re: "Polls, Surveys, & the English Language"

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 21

Diane - Yes and if you are a qualitative researcher you want to find out how

people feel about being either an insie or an outsie.



To the rest of you let's just do our research professionally and not worry about whether it is a poll or a survey.

Harry O'Neill

>From HOneill536@aol.com Thu Jul 29 13:17:10 1999

Received: from imo29.mx.aol.com (imo29.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.73])

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

id NAA03171 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:17:09 -0700

(PDT)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

by imo29.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5RGMa06268 (4184)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:15:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <d484deb4.24d21073@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:15:47 EDT

Subject: Re: Might You Help the WSJ?"Poll definition"

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 21

Bob - Let's just concentrate our efforts on teaching the media the difference

between "good" and "bad" research and not get hung up on what we call it.

The

later will only confuse them even more.

We are an industry/profession with serious, the definition of a poll or a survey is not one of them.

Harry O'Neill

>From mtrau@umich.edu Thu Jul 29 13:31:57 1999

Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11])

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

id NAA08920 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 13:31:55 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from umich.edu (isr-146-52.isr.umich.edu [141.211.146.61])

by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id QAA28975; Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:23:16 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37A0B924.CBBA872A@umich.edu>

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 16:27:16 -0400

From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: Roberta <rlbruhnk@u.arizona.edu>, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Survey Research

References: <3.0.6.32.19990729104725.007aa800@pop.u.arizona.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Roberta - Thank you for your inquiry. I am forwarding your Email to our membership's Email group. I am sure you will receive multiple responses from this group. There are several government or government sponsored surveys that have very large samples, as well as surveys of consumers

related to customer satisfaction issues.

If you need any additional help, please feel free to contact me again. Mike

Traugott

Roberta wrote:

> Dr. Traugott,

>

> Mine name is Roberta Bruhn-Keup and I work for Dr. Bryan Williams of

> the Arizona Prevention Center at the University of Arizona. I am

> writing to you at the suggestion of Gwen Kaplan of Survey Sampling.

> We have recently concluded a survey of over 8000 respondents and are

> looking for studies of similar size to compare response rates, etc.

> We are curious to find out if you or anyone that you know has this

> type of information. Do you have any idea of what the largest surveys

> have been?

>

> We are also especially interested in surveys dealing with stakeholder

> and environmental issues, as our survey dealt with residents living

> near chemical weapons stockpile sites.

>

> If you could help us with this information, we would be very grateful.

> If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at the number

> listed below, or contact Dr. Bryan Williams at either

> bryanw@u.arizona.edu or

> (520) 626-3406.

>

> Thank you,

>

> Roberta Bruhn-Keup

> rlbruhnk@u.arizona.edu

>

> University of Arizona Prevention Center

> Environment, Behavior, and Risk Research Lab

> P.O. Box 245163

> Tucson, Arizona 85724

> (520) 626-3411

> FAX (520) 626-8369

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Fri Jul 30 08:05:03 1999

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.19])

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

id IAA02611 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 08:05:02 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from galaxian.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@galaxian.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.92])

by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id  
LAA03413

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 11:04:59 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (mbednarz@localhost)

by galaxian.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id LAA13685

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 11:04:59 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1999 11:04:59 -0400 (EDT)

From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>

X-Sender: mbednarz@galaxian.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Job Postings - Data Services (forwarded)

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.9907301101010.12477-100000@galaxian.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

Please respond directly to ISR/Univ. of Michigan

SRC Director's Office

P.O. Box 1248

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248

Subject: FW: Data Services job posting on web sites

-----

> The Institute for Social Research, at the University of  
Michigan, is

> currently seeking qualified applicants for three positions. The  
> University of Michigan is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity  
> Employer. Please submit resume and cover letter outlining your  
> education, experience, and skills to SRC Director's Office, P.O. Box  
> 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248. For more information about the  
> Institute for Social Research, visit our web site at  
> <http://www.isr.umich.edu/>

>

>

> MANAGER, SURVEY SERVICES LAB

> Basic Function and Responsibilities: To participate in the

- > management team of the Survey Research Center's Data Collection and
- > Processing Services Unit via membership on the lead team and in the
- > leadership of various work teams for centralized data collection
- > operations and survey services activities in the Survey Services
- > Laboratory; to promote technical and methodological innovation within
- > the unit as well as support efforts to procure contract and grant
- > awards to maintain production and development capacity of the
- > department as well as the expansion of new markets and services.

>

- > Duties to be Performed: Plan, assign, coordinate and review the work
- > of functional staff, including regular, contingent, and temporary
- > members. Lead the recruitment and hiring of Survey Services
- > Laboratory staff. Evaluate the staff performance, assess needs for
- > staff development and training, as well as plan and implement training
- > programs. Oversee the scheduling and conduct of the unit's
- > multi-project workload comprised of centralized phone surveys, mail
- > surveys, data coding, direct data entry, quantitative data collection
- > (e.g., focus groups and cognitive
- > interviewing) and special projects (e.g. behavior coding, pretesting,
- > methodological experiments.) Take the lead in developing and maintaining
- > projection of unit's workload and available capacity. Develop and maintain
- > administrative procedures and personnel practices related to the unit's
- > operations. Initiate developmental projects that will create or improve
- > cost effective systems related to survey and administrative procedures.
- > Plan and administer functional team operating budgets and monitor budget
- > expenditures. Represent the Data Services Unit in meetings with
- > researchers and administrators from other units with authority to commit
- > the resources of the SSL to project work plans and schedules.

>

> Necessary Qualifications: A Bachelors degree in a related field

or

> an equivalent combination of education and experience is necessary.

> Reasonable amount of progressively responsible experience in the

> conduct of survey data collection operations including experience in

> at least four of the key data collection/processing phases.

> Supervisory experience is necessary. A Masters degree and reasonable

> knowledge of statistical methods and sampling techniques is desirable.

>

> SENIOR SURVEY SPECIALIST

> Duties to be Performed: To plan, execute and oversee data

> collection projects from design through analysis; to coordinate with

> Primary Research Staff and other operations personnel on all types of

> complex data collection and developmental projects, specializing in

> development and management of projects utilizing new methodologies or

> technological innovations; to participate in proposal preparation.

>

> Necessary Qualifications: Bachelor's degree in a social science

> discipline or equivalent combination of education and experience; six

> or more years experience in three or more areas of survey research

> using complex designs, i.e., sampling, data collection, data

> processing, application programming, analysis, methodology; experience

> in the design and conduct of methodological projects; experience

> managing projects in various modes, including automated data

> collection; experience in questionnaire design, familiarity with data

> collection, data processing and data management; knowledge of general

> interviewing techniques and survey procedures; ability to recognize

> and respond to project needs; demonstrated organizational and

- > interpersonal skills; effective verbal and written communication
- > skills; advanced statistical skills, e.g., frequencies, contingency
- > tables, chi-square, correlations, bivariate and multivariate analyses;
- > experience using IBM compatible microcomputers and word processing,
- > database management systems, spreadsheet, and statistical analysis
- > software; experience with a computer-assisted interviewing software
- > system; ability to work under pressure. Desired qualifications
- > include: Master's degree in a social science discipline; experience
- > working with specific software used by the department: Word, WordPerfect,
- > dBase, SAS, Excel, and Surveycraft; experience conducting focus groups and
- > cognitive interviews; experience making presentations of findings and
- > study results; experience conducting advanced quantitative and/or
- > qualitative analyses; constructing complex variables and indices.

>

#### > SURVEY DIRECTOR

- > Basic Function and Responsibilities: Direct all aspects of survey
- > data collection projects (i.e. sampling, data collection, coding, data
- > processing, application programming, analysis). Coordinate with
- > Primary Research Staff and other operations personnel in the
- > management of projects with highly complex or high risk designs with
- > full authority, accountability and decision-making regarding budget,
- > purchases, and hiring of staff. Author major sections or subsections
- > of proposals. Conduct methodological investigations.

>

- > Duties to be Performed: Development of survey research project
- > designs: Consult with ISR or external clients and principal
- > investigators on new and/or complex projects. Initiate project work
- > plans and schedules in consultation with study staffs and other



- > members of the project team. Develop complex questionnaires including
- > basic implementation, formatting, and critical review of question
- > wording and context. Develop computer-assisted interviewing
- > instruments. Oversee project budgeting process. Document all phases
- > of the data collection process and provide study staff with on-going
- > reports of project status. Lead proposal development team and/ or
- > review proposal sections. Author major sections or subsections of
- > proposals. Design and conduct study-specific interviewer and coder
- > trainings, briefings, and debriefings. Develop or integrate new
- > methods such as new training techniques or the use of new innovations
- > in technical or administrative approaches. Design and implement
- > quality control procedures across all phases of data collection and
- > processing. Initiate the evaluation and revision of procedures.
- > Monitor data collection and processing progress including production,
- > budgets/ costs, and data quality. Coordinate focus groups and
- > cognitive interviews. Provide leadership/oversee the work of staff
- > assigned to team. Participate in screening/ interviewing for selection of
- junior members of Survey Management team. Mentor staff.
- >
- > Necessary Qualifications: Master's degree in a social science
- > discipline or equivalent combination of education and experience.
- > Seven or more years experience managing survey research projects (from
- > proposal development and research design through data collection,
- > analysis and reporting of results). Demonstrated experience with the
- > process of applying for and managing large scale contracts; excellent
- > oral and written communication skills. Desired qualifications
- > include: scientific knowledge of and/or research background in one or
- > more of the following
- > fields: health and health care services, economics, aging, education.

> Demonstrated experience in scientific research development.

>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jul 30 08:50:29 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id IAA14908 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 08:50:29 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id IAA02944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 08:50:27 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1999 08:50:27 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: How to Access the AAPORNET Archives

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907300824410.17075-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

APPORNET 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...

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

Archive: aapornet (path: aapornet) -- Files:

log9411 (1 part, 41916 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9412 (1 part, 163380 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9501 (1 part, 90858 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9502 (1 part, 78861 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9503 (1 part, 115012 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9504 (1 part, 179491 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9505 (1 part, 129033 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9506 (1 part, 167020 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives  
log9507 (1 part, 382804 bytes) -- GSS Annotated Bibliography available  
online  
log9508 (1 part, 307844 bytes) -- (Fwd) NSF Appropriations  
log9509 (1 part, 342393 bytes) -- Proctor & Gamble rumor-legend (fwd)  
log9510 (1 part, 339841 bytes) -- COTIM-95 Fellowships  
log9511 (1 part, 298781 bytes) -- Re: CBS Screening Survey/Chance

## Newsletter

- log9512 (1 part, 183901 bytes) -- Methods/Statistics Teaching Position
- log9601 (1 part, 362226 bytes) -- National Budget
- log9602 (1 part, 434223 bytes) -- Deadline for Newsletter -- Today
- log9603 (1 part, 879471 bytes) -- Re: Exit Poll Projections Create Primary

## Confusion

- log9604 (1 part, 478917 bytes) -- name recognition!
- log9605 (1 part, 285668 bytes) -- POSITION OPENINGS
- log9606 (1 part, 271260 bytes) -- Re: Yankelovich-New Yorker Survey of

## Blacks

- log9607 (1 part, 261477 bytes) -- attitudes toward lawyer solicitation
- log9608 (1 part, 243948 bytes) -- List Assisted RDD Samples
- log9609 (1 part, 156936 bytes) -- InterCASIC '96 registration materials
- log9610 (1 part, 153181 bytes) -- Op Scan Mail Questionnaires
- log9611 (1 part, 235473 bytes) -- Re: missing males
- log9612 (1 part, 107211 bytes) -- Conference submission info?
- log9701 (1 part, 156301 bytes) -- Response rates in RDD surveys
- log9702 (1 part, 138249 bytes) -- Re: AMOS
- log9703 (1 part, 164432 bytes) -- Graphics programs
- log9704 (1 part, 156906 bytes) -- AAPOR '97 Friday Evening Update
- log9705 (1 part, 170513 bytes) -- Results of AAPOR Elections
- log9706 (1 part, 70063 bytes) -- AAPORNET digest 558
- log9707 (1 part, 118833 bytes) -- Job opening at Westat
- log9708 (1 part, 31900 bytes) -- research position
- log9709 (1 part, 245930 bytes) -- Institute for Policy Research Job

## Opening

- log9710 (1 part, 317379 bytes) -- RE: list vs unlisted HH
- log9711 (1 part, 182414 bytes) --
- log9712 (1 part, 251783 bytes) -- AAPOR Proposals are due today, Dec 1st,

but if...

log9801 (1 part, 344234 bytes) -- (Copy) Re: Request for information

log9802 (1 part, 669316 bytes) -- Tuesday Reception For Marty Riche

log9803 (1 part, 181064 bytes) -- Request for information on millenium

polls

log9804 (1 part, 421372 bytes) -- Re: Survey Incentives

log9805 (1 part, 581547 bytes) -- Re: Canvassing via Internet

log9806 (1 part, 314716 bytes) -- so-called "margin of error"

log9807 (1 part, 124886 bytes) -- Job posting (fwd)

log9808 (1 part, 220870 bytes) -- In Census Issue, Partisanship Cancels

Out Logic

log9809 (1 part, 215780 bytes) -- response rates

log9810 (1 part, 545224 bytes) -- Forum Plan Suggestions

log9811 (1 part, 1019718 bytes)-- The Minnesota Poll

log9812 (1 part, 507914 bytes) -- London Conference - Final Call for

Papers (fwd)

log9901 (1 part, 199495 bytes) -- Census Sampling and New Speaker

log9902 (1 part, 441574 bytes) -- Faculty Position: Massey University, NEW

ZEALAND

log9903 (1 part, 588022 bytes) -- RE: Another Kish sampling method

question: What are the statistical

log9904 (1 part, 779704 bytes) -- Re: WINNER OF T-SHIRT SLOGAN CONTEST

log9905 (1 part, 342462 bytes) -- Web sites of major presidential

candidates

log9906 (1 part, 454422 bytes) -- Re: Evaluation Opportunity - NSF

log9907 (1 part, 586289 bytes) -- Re: Weighting Procedures Question

\*\*\*\*\*

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Jul 30 09:50:19 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])

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

id JAA04514 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 09:50:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp23.vgernet.net [205.219.186.123])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA02955

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jul 1999 12:53:26 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37A1D7F5.5B4B1C6E@jwdp.com>

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1999 12:51:01 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: How to Access the AAPORNET Archives

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907300824410.17075-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It appears from this that the AAPORNET archives are NOT Y2.94K  
compliant:

Failing drastic and immediate action, in November of 2094, the log names  
will wrap around upon themselves, thus causing our great-grandchildren to  
lose access to the historic content of our flames and musings.

In a chain reaction, we may see planes fall from the sky, Social Security

emerge from bankruptcy, or even more calamitous side-effects.

It is not too soon to sound the clarion call for AAPOR to reform its wicked ways and kill the Y2.94K bug before it devours us all.

Jan Werner

jwerner@jwdp.com

---

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

>



> APPORNET 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...

>

>

-- Jim

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

> Archive: aapornet (path: aapornet) -- Files:

- > log9411 (1 part, 41916 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9412 (1 part, 163380 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9501 (1 part, 90858 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9502 (1 part, 78861 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9503 (1 part, 115012 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9504 (1 part, 179491 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9505 (1 part, 129033 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9506 (1 part, 167020 bytes) -- AAPORNET List Archives
- > log9507 (1 part, 382804 bytes) -- GSS Annotated Bibliography available  
online
- > log9508 (1 part, 307844 bytes) -- (Fwd) NSF Appropriations
- > log9509 (1 part, 342393 bytes) -- Proctor & Gamble rumor-legend (fwd)
- > log9510 (1 part, 339841 bytes) -- COTIM-95 Fellowships
- > log9511 (1 part, 298781 bytes) -- Re: CBS Screening Survey/Chance  
Newsletter
- > log9512 (1 part, 183901 bytes) -- Methods/Statistics Teaching Position
- > log9601 (1 part, 362226 bytes) -- National Budget
- > log9602 (1 part, 434223 bytes) -- Deadline for Newsletter -- Today
- > log9603 (1 part, 879471 bytes) -- Re: Exit Poll Projections Create  
Primary Confusion
- > log9604 (1 part, 478917 bytes) -- name recognition!
- > log9605 (1 part, 285668 bytes) -- POSITION OPENINGS
- > log9606 (1 part, 271260 bytes) -- Re: Yankelovich-New Yorker Survey of  
Blacks
- > log9607 (1 part, 261477 bytes) -- attitudes toward lawyer solicitation
- > log9608 (1 part, 243948 bytes) -- List Assisted RDD Samples
- > log9609 (1 part, 156936 bytes) -- InterCASIC '96 registration materials

- > log9610 (1 part, 153181 bytes) -- Op Scan Mail Questionnaires
- > log9611 (1 part, 235473 bytes) -- Re: missing males
- > log9612 (1 part, 107211 bytes) -- Conference submission info?
- > log9701 (1 part, 156301 bytes) -- Response rates in RDD surveys
- > log9702 (1 part, 138249 bytes) -- Re: AMOS
- > log9703 (1 part, 164432 bytes) -- Graphics programs
- > log9704 (1 part, 156906 bytes) -- AAPOR '97 Friday Evening Update
- > log9705 (1 part, 170513 bytes) -- Results of AAPOR Elections
- > log9706 (1 part, 70063 bytes) -- AAPORNET digest 558
- > log9707 (1 part, 118833 bytes) -- Job opening at Westat
- > log9708 (1 part, 31900 bytes) -- research position
- > log9709 (1 part, 245930 bytes) -- Institute for Policy Research Job

#### Opening

- > log9710 (1 part, 317379 bytes) -- RE: list vs unlisted HH
- > log9711 (1 part, 182414 bytes) --
- > log9712 (1 part, 251783 bytes) -- AAPOR Proposals are due today, Dec 1st, but if...
- > log9801 (1 part, 344234 bytes) -- (Copy) Re: Request for information
- > log9802 (1 part, 669316 bytes) -- Tuesday Reception For Marty Riche
- > log9803 (1 part, 181064 bytes) -- Request for information on millenium polls
- > log9804 (1 part, 421372 bytes) -- Re: Survey Incentives
- > log9805 (1 part, 581547 bytes) -- Re: Canvassing via Internet
- > log9806 (1 part, 314716 bytes) -- so-called "margin of error"
- > log9807 (1 part, 124886 bytes) -- Job posting (fwd)
- > log9808 (1 part, 220870 bytes) -- In Census Issue, Partisanship Cancels

#### Out Logic

- > log9809 (1 part, 215780 bytes) -- response rates
- > log9810 (1 part, 545224 bytes) -- Forum Plan Suggestions

- > log9811 (1 part, 1019718 bytes)-- The Minnesota Poll
- > log9812 (1 part, 507914 bytes) -- London Conference - Final Call for Papers (fwd)
- > log9901 (1 part, 199495 bytes) -- Census Sampling and New Speaker
- > log9902 (1 part, 441574 bytes) -- Faculty Position: Massey University, NEW ZEALAND
- > log9903 (1 part, 588022 bytes) -- RE: Another Kish sampling method question: What are the statistical
- > log9904 (1 part, 779704 bytes) -- Re: WINNER OF T-SHIRT SLOGAN CONTEST
- > log9905 (1 part, 342462 bytes) -- Web sites of major presidential candidates
- > log9906 (1 part, 454422 bytes) -- Re: Evaluation Opportunity - NSF
- > log9907 (1 part, 586289 bytes) -- Re: Weighting Procedures Question
- >

> \*\*\*\*\*

>From lcohen@sric.sarnoff.com Sat Jul 31 06:14:06 1999

Received: from sric.sarnoff.com (sric.sarnoff.com [130.33.11.52])

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

id GAA04373 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 06:14:05 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from sric.sarnoff.com ([130.33.11.109]) by sric.sarnoff.com

(Netscape Messaging Server 3.0) with ESMTP id AAA14731

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 09:14:02 -0400

Message-ID: <37A2F6BD.AD7F82B4@sric.sarnoff.com>

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 09:14:37 -0400

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en]C-CCK-MCD (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Researchers, Survey" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear All,

In an article in this morning's NY Times entitled, "A Law Opening Research Data Sets Off Debate" there is a discussion of a one sentence amendment to the 4,000 page appropriations bill, already passed, that enables anyone, under the Freedom of Information Act, to request and get all data produced by a published study paid for with any public dollars. The article goes on to say this has included the names and addresses of participants, including children, of some studies funded with Federal moneys. I believe this strikes at the core of the respondent confidentiality issue and leaves survey researchers that are using any public money potentially vulnerable to having to choose between violating their respondent confidence or a potential supeona. The artical ends with, "The list [of data that can be requested] is virtually limitless and can be extended in areas other than halth and safety." Should we be concerned?

Larry Cohen

lcohen@sric.sarnoff.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jul 31 07:58:46 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id HAA15322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 07:58:46 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id HAA09357 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 07:58:45 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 07:58:45 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907310757290.7853-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Folks,

I also read Philip Hilts's article on the front page of this morning's New York Times and agreed with Larry Cohen that, in his words, "this strikes at the core of the respondent confidentiality issue and leaves survey researchers that are using any public money potentially vulnerable to having to choose between violating their respondent confidence or a potential supeona," and did so even before finding his generous alert here on AAPORNET. Here's Hilts's article.

-- Jim

July 31, 1999

Law on Access to Research Data

Pleases Business, Alarms Science

By PHILIP J. HILTS

The proposition is simple enough: Public dollars pay for a lot of scientific research, so data from that research should be available to the public.

At the request of Senator Richard C. Shelby, Republican of Alabama, a proposal saying just that passed quietly one evening last October, without hearings or debate, as a one-sentence amendment to the 4,000-plus-page appropriations bill. Under the amendment, anyone can write a request to the Government under the Freedom of Information Act and get "all data produced" by a published study paid for with any public dollars, and potentially receive everything from a summary of findings to a scientist's notebooks or E-mail or, in some cases, information about patients.

---

One little sentence, but far-reaching consequences.

---

"Experience has shown that transparency in government is a principle that has improved decision-making and increased the public's trust in government," Shelby stated in explaining the law's premise.

For too long, he said, Americans "have been unable to access federally funded research data despite the significant impact of this data in the policymaking process."

The law has the United States Chamber of Commerce delighted. "In the regulatory reform arena there may never be a more important issue," its Web site reads. It says that companies would be better able to scrutinize the data that policy makers use when they issue regulations, and it adds, "This would be the first time the business community has ever been provided with the basis for the bureaucracy imposing \$700 billion in annual regulatory costs on us."

The conclusion: "If implemented properly, this rule will do more for regulatory reform than all the legislation passed in the last 10 years!"



But scientists and university administrators, who took some time to notice the law, are alarmed. They fear that corporate or political interests will use the law to hamper research on controversial subjects, tie up scientists in red tape, circumvent confidentiality agreements and thwart Government regulations. While they agree with the general notion of giving the public access to research data, they assert that data from any study, no matter how rigorous, can be made to appear questionable if examined by hostile experts and publicists.

"We have now concluded that the legislation constitutes a broad political attack on both science and on the Federal regulatory apparatus," Nils Hasselmo, president of the Association of American Universities, said in a letter to Vice President Al Gore on Wednesday. He added that "we are very concerned that such an effort could involve actions designed to discredit scientists and discourage researchers from addressing controversial topics."

At a hearing about the law before a House subcommittee on government management and technology earlier this month, scientists recalled previous clashes between science and industry and said they feared the law would

increase such cases.

In one example, Dr. Paul Fisher at the Medical College of Georgia published a study in 1991 of what small children know about tobacco brands. He found that Joe Camel was a figure known just as well as Mickey Mouse by 6-year-olds, and that they knew the brands of cigarettes in some detail.

The cigarette maker R.J. Reynolds decided it wanted to see Dr. Fisher's data and do its own analysis. The company wanted not only all the raw data, but the names and addresses of the children who were interviewed so the company could go back to "re-interview" them. Dr. Fisher fought the case in court, but ultimately the college's own president agreed that the company should have access to the data. Dr. Fisher resigned from the college, and Reynolds got most of the data it wanted, although it did not contact the children. The litigation dragged on for years and made Dr. Fisher decide not to do research on tobacco issues ever again.

Supporters of the law dismiss the possibility of harassment. But critics point out that Senator Shelby started work on the amendment after Harvard researchers, citing confidential patient

information, declined to give Congress their raw data in a two-decade-long pollution study. The study, sponsored by the Environmental Protection Agency, was instrumental in creating a 1997 Federal regulation that required stronger controls on sources of small particle emissions, including cars and power plants. Among the companies that opposed the regulation was Alabama Power and Light.

Ultimately, Harvard compromised by giving the data to a bipartisan group, funded by both the E.P.A. and the auto industry, which is auditing the data and conclusions.

---

An invocation of the Freedom of Information Act alarms scientists.

---

After that episode, Senator Shelby recommended that businesses be able to get the raw data themselves for analysis and re-interpretation.

"I strongly believe that federally funded research data that is used to drive public policy should be available to the taxpayers who paid for

it," he said in a statement today.

But Kevin Casey, who as senior director of Federal and state relations at Harvard University was involved in the dispute over the pollution study, called the Shelby amendment a backdoor attack on regulations like the emissions rule.

"This is not about getting the public information," he said. "It is about attacking regulations on pollution and other areas."

Through the new regulation, Casey asserts, the Republicans are able to attack environmental laws under the guise of sunshine laws and not lose public support, as they have for their more open challenges in recent years.

"The Shelby amendment is a backdoor way to achieve the same goal," Casey said. "It allows company lawyers to harass scientists collecting data on the most sensitive and controversial issues -- such as environmental health and pollution -- to slow down the research used to make policy."

The real impact of the amendment will not be known until it goes into effect later this year; it is now being formulated into regulations by

the Office of Management and Budget. Among the questions facing the office is how to define "data" -- does it mean blood samples and archeological finds as well as written work? Under a draft of the regulations, those who want data must ask for it under the Freedom of Information Act, by submitting a request to the agency that gave the grant to the scientist. The scientist then would turn over all data -- including names and addresses of patients and other private and commercially secret information -- to the agency. Then, the F.O.I.A. office of that funding agency would determine what must be given to the requester and what must be withheld.

The information act carries protections against giving out some kinds of information, including commercial trade secrets or financial data, and private information such as medical records.

Administrators at the National Institutes of Health, the agency that finances the largest percentage of biomedical research, said they were concerned about the cost of collecting and storing all the raw data. As it is, in fiscal year 1998, N.I.H.'s F.O.I.A. office had 20 full-time employees answering 1,200 requests at a cost of \$500,000. And despite the legal protections, administrators say they worry, too,

about the confidentiality of patient records.

"Even if they redact the name and address, there are other ways to identify the patients -- if it was a female patient at a certain hospital with a particular diagnosis, that might be enough to identify them," said Wendy Baldwin, the institutes' deputy director for extramural affairs.

Members of Senator Shelby's staff said that while they understood the worries of scientists, they believe that the F.O.I.A. rules will prevent disclosure of private or trade secret information. And, if problems do occur after the rule is in place, "we can address those. We will be alert to those."

In most areas of science, the way to test the mettle of a study is not to examine data, but to do another study, said Carol Scheman, vice president for governmental affairs at the University of Pennsylvania, but for some kinds of studies, she said, "Senator Shelby is right. There are real issues of how to share data."

For example, in the pollution studies by Harvard's School of Public health, thousands of subjects were followed for more than two decades.

That kind of work is unlikely to be copied. So some other method must be used to review the data behind the scientists' final conclusions, she said.

Industry is not uniformly in favor of the new rule. Pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies, for example, fear that the rule will jeopardize university-industry agreements. If a scientist's data can be fetched through F.O.I.A., so can information they have shared with the scientist. This means, potentially, that competitors could learn much about the progress of their commercial work through the new rule.

The Washington watchdog group OMB Watch also points out that the rule is aimed at nonprofit groups while leaving the corporations who work with government funds untouched. The amendment applies to hospitals and other nonprofit groups that get grants from the government, but excludes other groups that get contracts from the Government. "Thus, it applies to a Y.M.C.A. that receives a Federal grant, but not to Boeing that is doing a range of research through contracts," Gary D. Bass, a spokesman for the group, said in a July 15 statement.

But other business and advocacy groups are

enthusiastic. Those on the record in favor of the Shelby amendment include Gun Owners of America, which has complained about research that shows guns in the home are several times more likely to kill family members by accident than intruders on purpose. In Washington, several dedicated anti-regulatory groups have lined up in favor of the Shelby rule, including the Competitive Enterprise Institute and Citizens for a Sound Economy.

In its Web site, the Chamber of Commerce, notes that huge masses of data can be fetched from scientists -- data to challenge E.P.A. regulations on clean air and water, data supporting the global warming agreement called the Kyoto Protocol. "This list is virtually limitless and can be extended into areas other than health and safety," it says.

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*



>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jul 31 08:32:30 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id IAA19344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 08:32:29 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id IAA12251 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 08:32:29 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 08:32:28 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: More Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907310757290.7853-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907310831120.10086-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Below find the United States Chamber of Commerce response to Senator Shelby's one-sentence amendment to the 4,000-plus-page appropriations bill, as mentioned by Philip Hilts in his front-page story in today's New York Times.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

<http://207.175.107.92/policy/6-environment/issues/737/ac990323.htm>

Grassroots Action Information Network

U.S. Chamber of Commerce

March 23, 1999

In The Regulatory Reform Arena, There  
May Never Be A More Important Issue!

DETAILS: A new law requires the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to direct all Federal agencies to provide the Public with access to the studies and the data used to support regulations. This would be the first time the business community has ever been provided with the basis for the bureaucracy imposing \$700 billion in annual regulatory costs on us. We need your support, and we need it now! Unfortunately, OMB has received thousands of comments from the opposition asking for this rule to be weakened. We need 10,000 letters or emails sent to OMB supporting this requirement. Your effort need only be a paragraph. The final date for comments to OMB is April 5, 1999.

Business Has the Right-to-Know  
the Supporting Data for Regulations!

IMPACT: If implemented properly, this rule will do more for regulatory reform than all the legislation passed in the last 10 years! OMB's proposed revision requiring the release of the data supporting a rule or policy will allow the public, for the first time, to challenge the agency based on the facts as determined by the research, not just on the information the agency

selects as appropriate to support its policy position. With such data in public hands, agencies will have a much harder time imposing regulations on the business community without substantial evidence.

Are any of these issues important to you?

If so, here's your chance to do something about it.

Data to challenge EPA's proposed tougher PM/Ozone regulations; Economic data underlining the Kyoto Protocol; EPA's data its "environmental justice" claims; EPA's epidemiological data supporting its entire Superfund program; EPA's entire Urban Air Toxics program; OSHA's Ergonomics proposals; EPA's data supporting second-hand smoke; Data from various agencies on breast implants; All of the data from government funded studies the impact of pesticides on humans; Data developed by environmental groups using federal funds; Data underlying EPA databases; EPA's data about business that is on the Internet; Data underlying EPA's risk based assessment tools that attempt to interpret for the public the impact of pollution on health and safety.

The list is virtually limitless and can be extended into areas other than health and safety.

#### Action Needed

Please contact OMB and request the issuance of its Requirements on the Release of Information Supporting Regulations, and opposition for any weakening of the requirements.

Write to:

F. James Charney, Policy Analyst  
Office of Management and Budget  
Room 6025, New Executive Office Building  
Washington, DC

Or email comments to: [Fredrick\\_J.\\_Charney@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Fredrick_J._Charney@omb.eop.gov)

For Additional Information

For more information or questions about this proposed rule, please contact  
Louis Renjel at (202) 463-5532 or [lrenjel@uschamber.com](mailto:lrenjel@uschamber.com) or call James  
Charney at (202) 395-3993.

---

U.S. Chamber of Commerce | 1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062 | Send us your comments

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From barry@arches.uga.edu Sat Jul 31 08:34:12 1999

Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])

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

id IAA19955 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 08:34:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from archa9.cc.uga.edu (arch9.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu

(LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.00FBE718@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;

Sat, 31 Jul 1999 11:31:30 -0400

Received: from archa14.cc.uga.edu (arch14.cc.uga.edu [128.192.95.114])

by archa9.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA37656

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 11:34:08 -0400

Received: from localhost (barry@localhost)

by archa14.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA64274

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 11:34:08 -0400

X-Authentication-Warning: archa14.cc.uga.edu: barry owned process doing -bs

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 11:34:07 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>

X-Sender: barry@archa14.cc.uga.edu

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9907310757290.7853-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.10.9907311123370.24710-100000@archa14.cc.uga.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

This is fascinating. People you normally don't find on the side of public access to information have managed to come out that way as part of a political attack. Neat move.

Normally I take the position that the public's business should be conducted in public, and that goes for documents, data, and all the rest, especially if those results influence policy. Looks like I'll find myself with some strange bedfellows.

It does raise all kinds of confidentiality concerns if you are conducting research funded by the public, although this seems to strike more at biomedical research more than any other type. In my own little pond, I can see IRBs insisting on introductory language to respondents informing them that others could access their data. Talk about a chilling effect.

Interesting intersection of philosophy (public's business, public access vs privacy) and the practicalities of conducting research.

---

Barry A. Hollander      College of Journalism  
Associate Professor      and Mass Communication  
barry@arches.uga.edu      The University of Georgia  
phone: 706.542.5027      Athens, GA 30602

web: <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

>From esinger@isr.umich.edu Sat Jul 31 09:14:30 1999

Received: from runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.144.15])

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

id JAA24837 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 09:14:28 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])

by runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.5/2.3) with ESMTP id MAA29869 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 12:14:27 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <K7BL3FKC>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 12:15:56 -0400

Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E02168DC5@isr.umich.edu>

From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@isr.umich.edu>

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

Subject: RE: More Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 12:15:09 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Unfortunately, the Chamber of Commerce solicitation resulted in a massive outpouring of mail to OMB's request for comment on its proposed regulations implementing the Shelby amendment; as a result, the mail ran 60% in favor of the amendment. OMB is expected to issue a revised set of regulations any day, with a very short comment period (maybe less than 30 days) because Shelby is pushing for prompt implementation. It would be very useful if AAPOR united behind a position designed to (a) assure an orderly process of disclosing research data relevant to policy decisions and regulations; and (b) protected the confidentiality of respondents (and therefore also the integrity of the research process). Prompt archiving of research data, with identifiers removed, is one response that might have a chance of satisfying both concerns. I'd like to see the AAPOR Council take a position on this issue, preparatory to the OMB request for comment.

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

From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]

Sent: Saturday, July 31, 1999 11:32 AM

To: AAPORNET

Subject: More Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

Below find the United States Chamber of Commerce response to Senator Shelby's one-sentence amendment to the 4,000-plus-page appropriations bill, as mentioned by Philip Hilts in his front-page story in today's New York Times.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

<http://207.175.107.92/policy/6-environment/issues/737/ac990323.htm>

Grassroots Action Information Network

U.S. Chamber of Commerce

March 23, 1999

In The Regulatory Reform Arena, There  
May Never Be A More Important Issue!

DETAILS: A new law requires the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to



direct all Federal agencies to provide the Public with access to the studies and the data used to support regulations. This would be the first time the business community has ever been provided with the basis for the bureaucracy imposing \$700 billion in annual regulatory costs on us. We need your support, and we need it now! Unfortunately, OMB has received thousands of comments from the opposition asking for this rule to be weakened. We need 10,000 letters or emails sent to OMB supporting this requirement. Your effort need only be a paragraph. The final date for comments to OMB is April 5, 1999.

Business Has the Right-to-Know  
the Supporting Data for Regulations!

IMPACT: If implemented properly, this rule will do more for regulatory reform than all the legislation passed in the last 10 years! OMB's proposed revision requiring the release of the data supporting a rule or policy will allow the public, for the first time, to challenge the agency based on the facts as determined by the research, not just on the information the agency selects as appropriate to support its policy position. With such data in public hands, agencies will have a much harder time imposing regulations on the business community without substantial evidence.

Are any of these issues important to you?

If so, here's your chance to do something about it.

Data to challenge EPA's proposed tougher PM/Ozone regulations; Economic data underlining the Kyoto Protocol; EPA's data its "environmental justice" claims; EPA's epidemiological data supporting its entire

Superfund program; EPA's entire Urban Air Toxics program; OSHA's Ergonomics proposals; EPA's data supporting second-hand smoke; Data from various agencies on breast implants; All of the data from government funded studies the impact of pesticides on humans; Data developed by environmental groups using federal funds; Data underlying EPA databases; EPA's data about business that is on the Internet; Data underlying EPA's risk based assessment tools that attempt to interpret for the public the impact of pollution on health and safety.

The list is virtually limitless and can be extended into areas other than health and safety.

#### Action Needed

Please contact OMB and request the issuance of its Requirements on the Release of Information Supporting Regulations, and opposition for any weakening of the requirements.

Write to:

F. James Charney, Policy Analyst  
Office of Management and Budget  
Room 6025, New Executive Office Building  
Washington, DC

Or email comments to: [Fredrick\\_J.\\_Charney@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Fredrick_J._Charney@omb.eop.gov)

For Additional Information

For more information or questions about this proposed rule, please contact  
Louis Renjel at (202) 463-5532 or lrenjel@uschamber.com or call James  
Charney at (202) 395-3993.

---

---

U.S. Chamber of Commerce | 1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062 | Send us your comments

---

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Sat Jul 31 09:44:54 1999

Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.64.234])

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

id JAA29121 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 09:44:53 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from c54386-a.btnrug1.la.home.com by pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX

3.2/UCB 5.64/4.03)

id AA15301; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 11:37:00 -0500

Message-Id: <003001bedb74\$08a96100\$de2a0418@c54386-a.btnrug1.la.home.com>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 11:44:59 -0500

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-Msmail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5

X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3155.0

Yes, it's interesting and ironic. Since the beginning, public opinion researchers (private, public, university, etc.) have assumed on one hand that they are simply a fly on the wall, but on the other hand, spoken of their contributions to democracy and have willingly participated in influencing law, policy, and opinion itself. In other words, survey researchers have become a "player" in the democratic political process. Now other players are treating us as a player, and we're somehow surprised. We're not quite the fly on the wall we pictured ourselves as.

I'm also very concerned about this new development. My first impulse is to say we should advocate a solution along the lines of scientific research, not along the lines of special interest/lobbyist combatants. That is, publicly-funded data should be archived and freely available, once the original researcher has finished the primary analysis, but all identifying information about respondents should be removed. The special interest/lobbyist combatant tactic is to weaken one's opponent at his/her vulnerable point. There is no real attempt here to reach some "truth," but rather for one player to attack another player.

If we have really become players in the political process, this sort of attack may come with the territory. I hope we can maintain enough of our fly-on-the-wall character to retain the scientific validity of what we do. I don't know all the answers to this, but I do think part of the issue has to do with our dual character.

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

225-388-1140

225-388-5102 fax

fweil@lapop.lsu.edu

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

From: Barry A. Hollander <barry@arches.uga.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Saturday, July 31, 1999 10:26 AM

Subject: Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

>

> This is fascinating. People you normally don't find on the side of  
> public access to information have managed to come out that way as  
> part of a political attack. Neat move.

>

> Normally I take the position that the public's business should be  
> conducted in public, and that goes for documents, data, and all the  
> rest, especially if those results influence policy. Looks like I'll  
> find myself with some strange bedfellows.  
>  
> It does raise all kinds of confidentiality concerns if you are  
> conducting research funded by the public, although this seems to  
> strike more at biomedical research more than any other type. In my  
> own little pond, I can see IRBs insisting on introductory language to  
> respondents informing them that others could access their data. Talk  
> about a chilling effect.  
>  
> Interesting intersection of philosophy (public's business, public  
> access vs privacy) and the practicalities of conducting research.

>

>-----

>Barry A. Hollander      College of Journalism  
>Associate Professor      and Mass Communication  
>barry@arches.uga.edu      The University of Georgia  
>phone: 706.542.5027      Athens, GA 30602

>

> web: <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

>

>

>From Scheuren@aol.com Sat Jul 31 10:34:42 1999

Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7])

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

id KAA05159 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Jul 1999 10:34:41 -0700

(PDT)

From: Scheuren@aol.com

Received: from Scheuren@aol.com

by imo17.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5SSOa09417 (4072);

Sat, 31 Jul 1999 13:33:56 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <1140f620.24d48d83@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1999 13:33:55 EDT

Subject: Re: More Re: Public Access to Rs' Names & Addresses

To: aapornet@usc.edu

CC: fscheure@ui.urban.org, lrcohen@uci.edu, rhahn@aei.org

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 21

Dear Colleagues:

The new access required by law to data collected at public expense deserves the attention it is now getting. I have appreciated all the AAPORNET comments

so far and would like to add my support (with some qualifications) to what Eleanor Singer has suggested. As you will recall she said the following:

It would be very useful if AAPOR united behind a position designed to --

(a) assure an orderly process of disclosing research data relevant to policy

decisions and regulations; and

(b) protected the confidentiality of respondents (and therefore also the integrity of the research process).

Prompt archiving of research data, with identifiers removed, is one response that might have a chance of satisfying both concerns. I'd like to see the AAPOR Council take a position on this issue, preparatory to the OMB request for comment.

---

Regarding (a) I am in complete agreement and consider this potentially quite feasible too. Regarding (b) I am not sure how feasible it will be in all cases to protect respondent confidentiality. For many opinion surveys this might be straightforward but not necessarily in general -- a point she and I have discussed and which was the subject of a workshop she organized last December at the Institute for Survey Research.

---

Let me mention that the latest issue of Science has a Policy Forum (July 23, 1999; pages 535-535) devoted to this topic. The Forum, by Linda Cohen and Robert Hahn, makes 5 excellent recommendations which I have paraphrased below. After each recommendation I offer my own view for whatever it is worth.

Recommendation 1: Data access should be restricted in application to economically significant regulations developed by regulatory agencies.

(My comment on this is that this would be the way to begin and might, with



further congressional action, become the full extent of the law.)

Recommendation 2: Data access should be limited to new federally funded grants and agreements.

(My take on this is that it would be unfair in the extreme to make the law's

application retroactive. An obvious point but it needs to be said emphatically.)

Recommendation 3: The researcher should be required to provide as full a rendering of the data set as possible.

(Nice formulation but quite vague. Eleanor's second point tries to define this by focusing on confidentiality protection as the key requirement. It would be good to have a recommendation on when the data are to be released too. Perhaps along with the publication of the findings. Something implied elsewhere in the Forum.)

Recommendation 4: There should be a National Academy Panel, after 5 years, to evaluate the economic, social, and scientific impacts of the regulation.

(A sunset provision or a point to fine tune the regulations is essential, even if such a big change were not so controversial.)

Recommendation 5: Congress should create an agency to replicate findings that have economically significant impacts of \$100 million or more. Replication

is

a key to ensuring the quality of results. The requirement for replication before promulgation is critical.

(The need for another agency is something the framers of the new law may not

have envisioned. It may make sense, especially for data that cannot be generally released.)

—  
A further comment. In my view some data sets cannot be made anonymous using the tools we have now as researchers. Work by people like Don Rubin at Harvard may change this but it will take time. Recommendation 5 is a way around this problem for some data that could not be made available without restrictions.

All the best, Fritz